

UC Berkeley

IURD Working Paper Series

Title

The Development of Vocational Rehabilitation Programs. 1880-1940: A Case Study in the Evolution of the Provision of Public Services in the United States

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6c21q9rp>

Author

LaRue, Charlotte

Publication Date

1972-09-01

THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMS,
1880-1940: A CASE STUDY IN THE EVOLUTION OF THE
PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE UNITED STATES

Charlotte LaRue

September 1972

Working Paper No. 188/RS014

Frederick C. Collignon, Project Director - Michael B. Teitz, Principal Investigator

Project for Cost Benefit Analysis and Evaluation of Rehabilitation Services

The research reported here is being supported by a grant from the
Rehabilitation Services Administration of the Social and Rehabilitation
Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

FOREWORD

Daily pressures of administration and the demand for products often prevent decision-makers and policy analysts from seeing their work in the light of longer trends and larger forces that shape the society of which they are a part. Yet, programs and policies clearly reflect the deeper values and changing social patterns of the times. If it is difficult for us to see those values amid short-run conflicts and political uncertainties, they are no less present now than they were in the past. One way to comprehend how programs are being shaped and the realistic options for development, is to examine how those programs emerged historically. That is the purpose of this paper.

In this analysis, based on her Master's thesis in the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California, Berkeley, Ms. LaRue examines the evolution of the vocational rehabilitation program in the United States from the late nineteenth century up to the Second World War. This was the crucial period for the shaping of the program into its present form. From a largely voluntary function, looking back toward the less complex society before the Industrial Revolution, the social process for dealing with the physically handicapped was reformulated into the Federal-state system that still remains the basis for its present structure. The process involved both rethinking the nature of society's commitment to the handicapped, and convincing those in power that the programs consistent with that reformulation were both desirable and feasible. Over a period of sixty years, the effort was successful in both respects.

In the latter part of the twentieth century, as institutions for delivering social services come under increasing pressure and seem unable to maintain their effectiveness, we can benefit from looking at a similar period in the past. As the United States moves into what has been called the post-industrial society, there is no reason to expect that the intensity of change and the demands on its institutions will be any less than in other periods of transition. Policy analysts and decision makers now face the task of finding forms for social service institutions that can answer needs and respond both to persisting and newly emerging values of our society. An historical perspective, providing insight into the origins of programs, can lead to a more powerful understanding of the future.

Michael B. Teitz and Frederick C. Collignon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	ii
Chapter I Introduction	1
Chapter II The Avant-Garde	9
Chapter III The Origins of the Vocational Rehabilitation Services	24
Chapter IV The Establishment of a Federal Program	42
Chapter V Developments and Constraints in the 1920's	59
Chapter VI The Ratification of a Public Service	69
CONCLUSION	74
FOOTNOTES	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The historical perspective, in program evaluation, is frequently assigned a literal role, and relegated to the past. A common caricature of public services and agencies portrays them as elephantine, encumbered by antiquated procedure, and resistant to change. Ironically, however, decisionmakers in these agencies become so absorbed by current pressures, that their decisions are formed in the context of the present rather than in appreciation of the program's history. While goal evaluation necessarily focusses on a particular target, it cannot afford to diverge far from prevailing social values, lest the program lose its public base. Evolution of a public service is therefore worthy of study, for developmental analysis reveals the original objectives and their modification over time, as well as the social forces that gave expression to the goals. In determining appropriate program objectives, the evaluator, seeing present programs in the light of the past, gains an insight into their future.

Over the past century, dramatic transformations have occurred in public policy toward the provision of social and urban services in the United States. From a predominantly private market and charitable orientation, these services have gradually been conceived as a public function, delivered through national agencies and supported by taxation. The changes may be traced to the impact of exogenous factors, and to internal forces -- the development of society itself. Affected by these pressures, and

perceiving the need for public responsibility, society responded by providing whole new classes of services within the public sector. This new social concept should be recognized not as an isolated expression, but as a synthesis of the existing social structure with the impacting forces. Thus while the development of a public service embodies change, it also incorporates fundamental and unchanging aspects of the particular American creed and values. The establishment of a vocational rehabilitation program provides a good illustration of such a synthesis, for it was propelled by strong external and internal forces, and yet retains some of the most basic American principles.

The evolution of public service provision has evoked a variety of interpretations among historians and social scientists. A single-causation theory is illustrated by Harold Wilensky and Charles Lebeaux, who envision the pressures of industrialization as "...the major determinants of the social problems which created the demand for social welfare services."¹ More specific in his orientation, Roy Lubove has concentrated on the development of a social security program. In The Struggle for Social Security, he describes its evolution as "...the clash between social insurance goals and the ideology and institutions of voluntarism"², the latter representing traditional ideals of limited government, individualism, and self-support, and the former proposing the transference of responsibility from the private to the public sector.

Other historians have made no attempt to isolate a dominant change agent, and have sought motive forces within the society itself. Dwelling on the transformations in social philosophy, Robert Bremner³ has undertaken a comprehensive survey of movements and actors who awakened a "new view of poverty" and fostered reform, with its accompanying concept of social responsibility.

David Rothman and Michel Foucault present a quite different perspective. Less preoccupied with the establishment of public responsibility, they focus on the psychology of a society that created services for the dependent classes. Rothman regards the phenomenon of the asylum as an attempt to establish order:

The response in the Jacksonian period to the deviant and dependent was first and foremost a vigorous attempt to promote the stability of a society at a moment when the traditional ideas and practices appeared outmoded, constricted, and ineffective...the asylum, they believed, could restore a necessary social balance to the new republic....⁴

In a similar vein, Michel Foucault⁵ proposes that the insane asylum resulted from an Enlightenment endeavor to control madness through the powers of reason.

Within the field of vocational rehabilitation, historians have not deeply considered the process of service development. While C. Esco Oberman⁶ provides an account of the various programs that contributed to the system, he does not attempt a causal interpretation. Mary MacDonald's study⁷ examines in detail the vocational rehabilitation legislation, but is not concerned with the origins of the movement. Writing in the 1920's, Oscar Sullivan and Kenneth Snortum⁸ perceived three primary sources for vocational rehabilitation: the Charity Organization Societies, the efforts for crippled children, and the workmen's compensation laws. These accounts have not, however, emphasized other significant origins. Nor have they distinguished between programs that afforded precedents as public services, and those elements that added less to the programmatic content than to the awakening public concern (such as the Charity Organization Societies).

All of these studies of public services have taken a systematic approach to evolution. Seeking an explanatory factor of system of forces --

salient trends and pressures, instrumental social philosophies, and leading personalities -- they have interpreted the development of policy in the framework of that system. In this paper, development is modelled in a more synthetic sense: although the impacting forces are critical to the instigation of a demand for public services, the response will be conditioned by traditional values and by the prevailing social structure. Isolating neither the pressures nor the existing social characteristics as causal factors, the formative process is described in terms of their interaction.

This model conceives of program evolution as a series of social responses to the impacting forces. The developmental pattern falls into several stages, each culminating in some decisive step toward establishment of a public service. While each stage is progressive, representing a positive change, it is also synthetic in that traditional values merge with the new ideas. As the action (new policy) is the product of change stimuli acting upon social values, the latter form an integral part of the response. The American traditional self-concept appears in the literature as the familiar themes of individualism, faith in the rights of man, and equal opportunity. Interwoven with this endowment from Enlightenment ideals, one finds the Protestant work ethic and the peculiar quality of optimism prevalent in American society. During the colonial period and the history of the early republic, this ideal gave rise to what Wilensky and Lebeaux have defined as a "residual" conception of social welfare, holding to a belief that "...social welfare institutions should come into play only when the normal structures of supply, the family and the market, break down."⁹ Such a conception was the logical outgrowth of a society founded on a belief in self-support and the infallibility of conscientious work.

Within the early American society, the residual conception remained unchallenged despite the existence of the social imbalance created by poverty and dependency. Society conveniently ignored the broader implications of such threats, by discounting them as temporary aberrations or as a sad, but not terribly pressing fact of life: "the poor we have always with us." Toward the end of the 19th century, this complacent attitude was shaken by the impact of industrialization. Intensifying the social imbalance, the pressures of this period initiated the first stage in the development of public services. Poverty, dependency, and disability presented a more substantial threat to the social self-concept, as industrialization and its ramifications constricted opportunities for individual success. The impending crisis did not elicit an immediate response through the political process. However, the aggravation of the imbalance factor stimulated an avant-garde, as intellectuals and reformers called for a more comprehensive and permanent approach to the alleviation of poverty and dependency. Charging the public sector with this responsibility, they performed the critical task of initiating a new concept of public service, the "institutional" view, which "...sees the welfare services as the normal, 'first line' functions of modern industrial society."¹⁰ The avant-garde faced obvious difficulties in rationalizing a program of public support with the traditional doctrines of individualism. In solution, they offered the idea of rehabilitation. Proposing a public service designed to promote self-support and productivity, the avant-garde negotiated a successful compromise.

The gradual permeation of such concepts throughout society enabled the fragmented roots of vocational rehabilitation to take shape, through demands for the public provision of hospital and medical services, workmen's

compensation, vocational education, and employment counseling. By the second decade of the 20th century, the states had initiated some forms of public vocational rehabilitation, harbingers of an evolved concept of welfare services. But this incremental development proved insufficient to bring the vocational rehabilitation program to the federal level. The exertions of the avant-garde had prepared the ground. Yet the precipitation of a national program in 1920 required a forcing variable, which presented itself in the form of World War I.

The passage of the Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act opened the second stage in the evolution of the program. In many respects, vocational rehabilitation had reached a plateau which extended for more than a decade following the 1920 legislation. The Act had not authorized permanent funding for the service, indicating its experimental basis. Efforts by supporters to secure this permanence were continually denied throughout the 1920's and early 1930's. This lag in activity may be attributed to the combined effects of general societal inertia and to the prevailing characteristics of the era -- a conservative reaction to the progressivism of the first decades. A developmental period in terms of the concept of public responsibility and rehabilitation, Stage II viewed the implementation of the legislation, and the forces set in motion by the Act continued to define the program and gather support. Yet they were held in abeyance by the apathy of the twenties and by society's gradual digestion of radical changes in policy. Conclusive action once again necessitated a precipitating force. In this case, the effects of the 1930's depression triggered the response, initiating the third and final stage. The concept of public responsibility was confirmed in the Social Security Act of 1935, which funded the vocational rehabilitation program on a permanent basis.

The foregoing discussion has described the policy response as an interaction between the stimulus -- the perceived need -- and the traditional concepts of society. While this model predicts a change in the provision of welfare services (from residual to institutional), it does not envision a fundamental alteration in social values and in the welfare concept itself. Social welfare is a concept relative to a particular society, a standard that incorporates prevailing modes and values. Independence and productivity, for example, characterize the ideal American existence. Posing a threat to such an image, disability and dependency evoke a reaction to eliminate the imbalance. Society's promotion of welfare thus reveals itself as a standardization process, and as a conservative attempt to correct a violation of its traditional values. Adhering to social canons, American welfare activities have sought to conform the deviants to the normal image. And the history of solutions to the problem of the disabled illustrates the protective reaction: early attempts to expel the imbalance by incarceration (asylums), the benevolent but corrective institutions, and even the more modern endeavors to merge rehabilitants with the rest of society.

The emergence of public services represents an evolution of the means, but not the goals, of welfare provision. The shift in means from a residual to an institutional service reflects a changing view of dependency and a realization of public responsibility. Yet the goals, rooted in the constructs of the American self-image, remained constant and provided the continuum over which the responses evolved. A federal vocational rehabilitation program, as it appeared in the 1930's, gives evidence of the changing attitude toward the disabled and of the evolving concept of welfare services. Its underlying objective, however, continued

to seek correction of imbalances and restoration of individual self-support. The establishment of the program has deep significance for continued evolution of public attitudes. Endorsement of public welfare services implies a concern for the human condition that reaches beyond the somewhat materialistic goals upon which the program was founded. While these undercurrents may not be explicit in the formative period, operation of the program provides a feedback effect on the public consciousness, such that subtle but perceptible changes in the values themselves appear. As the avant-garde prepared the way for the development of public services, so the program itself contributes to the generation of further social change.

CHAPTER II
THE AVANT-GARDE

Prevailing welfare policies in the 19th century

Public support for the disabled can hardly be considered a radical innovation of the late 19th century. Government in the United States had long accepted a role as provider for the dependent classes. Imported to the colonies, the Elizabethan Poor Laws established this responsibility within the colonial legislatures, and as Blanche Coll has written,

...the 'right' to public assistance has always been acknowledged to be more unconditional than that which might be bestowed through voluntary benevolence. The United States has an unbroken tradition of public responsibility for the care of the destitute. ¹

Government provision was not limited to paupers: although more sporadic, the early legislatures showed a disposition to furnish support for the disabled as well. As early as 1773, the Virginia House of Burgesses opened a mental hospital, and Pennsylvania and New York established general hospitals in 1752 and 1793 respectively. Kentucky's Pauper Idiot Acts in 1793 allocated state funds for the care of indigent idiots, and publicly supported schools for the deaf were founded between 1810 and 1820.

Given such a prevailing policy regarding state care for dependents, what then was the contribution of the movement during the latter half of the 19th century? To begin with, the existing institutions, however laudable, were conspicuously few in numbers. Furthermore, any praise for the social awareness of the early governments should be

tempered with a more critical inspection of their philosophy. Far removed from modern welfare policies, the attitudes embodied in the early institutions and legislation manifested the "residual" concept of welfare services, in which "...social institutions should come into play only when the normal structures of supply, the family and the market, break down."² Such a conception ignores the presence of dependents as a product and inevitable part of society, and hence a permanent responsibility of society. It was characteristic of the early American society, in the flush of its optimism and belief in the unfailing power of honest work, to view paupers and cripples as strangers and outcasts who were somehow responsible for their own misfortune. Hangovers from medieval superstition further endowed these unfortunates with a stigma of individual responsibility. Unwilling to accept the permanence of a social imbalance created by such deviants, the public reacted with temporary stop-gap solutions, and the inability to envision a more constructive measure resulted in society's equation of public assistance with public relief. The provision of welfare was further imbued with religious sentiment: the burden of the poor was less a social than a moral responsibility. Although many of the early institutions included a program of constructive work, the goal of such instruction remained on a moral rather than an economic plane. Society conceived of these occupations as a healthy and salutary measure, but with little hope that the disabled could actually become independent and self-supporting.

The residual concept continued to dominate public policy and social thinking throughout the 19th century. It was not until the 1870's that an avant-garde began to challenge this concept by evolving the idea of social rather than personal responsibility, and presenting rehabilitation

as an alternative to relief. This decade opened the "age of reform" as described by such historians as Eric Goldman and Richard Hofstadter. Although political and social reforms did transpire in prior periods, they contributed little to a program of public welfare provision. The activities of the Jacksonian era and the anti-slavery movement, while founded on principles of democracy, federalism, and egalitarianism, did not engender a consciousness of social responsibility for the dependent classes. Such changes in attitude were the product of post-bellum societal development.

The development of the avant-garde

The pressures of the late 19th century shook the foundations of existing concepts of public services, and prepared the ground for the nascent "institutional" concept, which "...sees the welfare services as the normal, 'first line' functions of modern industrial society."³ Basic to this metamorphosis was the new perception of public responsibility which arose from the realization that dependency and disability are the creation of society as a whole rather than the fault of the individual. Simultaneously, an alternative to the dole presented itself in the concept of rehabilitation, a notion most attractive to the American mind. In developing and promoting these ideas, the agitation of the avant-garde proved essential to the evolution of public services, for it set a precedent, awakened a consciousness, and formulated a framework for subsequent legislative action. Wilensky and Lebeaux have written that

America's response to the human problems of industrialism represents a constantly moving compromise between the values of security and humanitarianism (whether in the form of paternalism or unionism), on the one hand, and individual initiative and self-reliance in the competitive order on the other. ⁴

Americans clung tenaciously to the traditional values, and even the distress and disruption of their society brought on by industrialization and other pressures of the 1870's and 1880's could not totally undermine their ideals. It was the function of the avant-garde to dissolve the traditional concept of public service, to negotiate the compromise, and to construct a rationalization that would facilitate a subsequent acceptance of changing government role. Charles Bonaparte, defining in 1891 the functions of the Charity Organization Societies, evinced the following opinion of their role in social reform:

...we cannot work this miracle by ourselves, neither can we reach the same end by getting the State to work it for us... there is no lesson so plainly taught by history, as that when the law would establish a standard of morals for which public opinion is not prepared, it builds on sand. ⁵

While the last three decades of the 19th century functioned as the formative stage in the development of public service concepts, the ideas of this avant-garde did not bear fruit before the 20th century, meeting continual challenges until the 1930's brought on the social security legislation.

The primary stresses that forced the avant-garde into an advocacy position were internally generated, the results of an evolving society. Industrialization and its effects disrupted the basis upon which American society had built its ideals. The expected rewards of individualism and hard work could no longer be reaped in a society characterized by concentration of power in the hands of corporations, growing inequality of income, and increasing rigidity of class structures. As the possibilities for individual coping with life and business attenuated, the increasing specialization of industry caused technological unemployment at a time when the labor market was forced to absorb masses of uneducated immigrants.

And the closing of the frontier plugged the traditional escape valve, imposing another check on the expectation of unlimited opportunity which had been a fundamental belief in American society. Finally, and critical to the problem of the disabled and dependent, was the alteration of the family structure and the emergence of the nuclear family: the mobile and smaller family units proved less able to assimilate and care for despondent members. The results of these trends created major increases in dependency, and insecurity supplanted optimism to a degree that Americans had never experienced before. Numerous panics and depressions accompanied and accelerated this insecurity. The year 1873 brought a major depression, followed by another in 1884-1885. Manifestations of the widespread instability, labor protest, strikes, and violence arose in the 1880's, culminating in the Homestead strike of 1892 and the Pullman strike of 1894. The severity and degree of such developments clearly demonstrated that the problems of dependency could no longer be attributed to individual moral failings.

It would, however, be a mistake to cite industrialization as the sole agent of change, for innovations in science and technology made a further impact on ideological development. While industrialization forced a confrontation of the problems of dependency, an evolving medical and social science afforded a means of negotiating a response. The period of the avant-garde produced a proliferation of studies in the causes of poverty and disability (particularly feeble-mindedness). Reports of these investigations appeared frequently in the Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections as, for example, A. O. Wright's report in 1884, and the papers of Dr. Edward Mann and Dr. Nathan Allan in 1876.⁶ Robert Hunter and Amos Warner, whose contributions will

be discussed later in this chapter, published significant studies on poverty in the 1890's. By the close of the century, substantial strides in the science of restoring the disabled were well recognized. The rise of scientific social work and of increasing investigations into the causes and cure of poverty and disease not only pointed out the fallacy of individual responsibility, but indicated a restorative process that was acceptable to society.

* * *

The avant-garde can be subdivided into three contributing elements that together produced a changing attitude and laid the foundations for social action. Waves of social and political thought during this period gave rise to the idea that society (and more particularly, government) is responsible for the misfortune of its components. The humanitarian movement, proliferating voluntary charities, focussed concern upon the dependent classes, and evolved a constructive concept of charity, that emphasized rehabilitation rather than relief. Finally, the medical sector, the growing body of professionals who worked with the crippled and disabled, and the emerging science of social work, contributed an expectation of restoring these dependents to a productive status.

Shifting social and political thought

Although the forerunners of social change were responding to the signs of distress, a predominantly laissez-faire attitude characterized the general social thinking throughout the 19th century. Buoyed by Herbert Spencer's Social Darwinism and the gospel of such men as Andrew Carnegie, the contemporary creed, as described by Robert Bremner, held that:

Poverty is unnecessary (for Americans), but the varying ability and virtue of men make its presence inevitable; this is a desirable state of affairs, since without the fear of want the masses would not work and there would be no incentive for the able to demonstrate their superiority; where it exists, poverty is usually a temporary problem and, both as its cause and cure, it is always an individual matter. ⁷

Challenges to this doctrine issued from numerous sectors. In 1848 Horace Mann was advocating the public support of education. Asserting that "Poverty is a public as well as a private evil,"⁸ he proposed education as the "great equalizer." Samuel Gridley Howe, in a Report Made to the Legislature of Massachusetts Upon Idiocy (1848) spoke of the "sacred responsibility" of the public to care for and restore the idiots.⁹

Blaming society for the existence and increase of idiocy, Howe wrote that

We regard idiocy as a diseased excrescence of society, as an outward sign of an inward malady....It appeared to us certain that the existence of so many idiots in every generation must be the consequence of some violation of the natural laws. ¹⁰

But, although the public made a scattered response to such demands in the form of state-supported schools and institutions, the idea of public responsibility had not fully penetrated the greater American consciousness, as exemplified by President Franklin Pierce's veto of the Dorothea Dix mental hospital bill in 1854. Pierce's conception of government's role did not extend to what he considered the personal problems of the individual.

The pressures of the 1870's and 1880's, however, brought stronger and more widespread reactions. The Populist movement, which achieved electoral success in the 1890's, was the first political movement to emphasize government responsibility for the evils of society. Although the Populists did not espouse socialist ideals, and were basically conservative in their values, the means advocated for reform involved public provision and intervention. The timely appearance of Henry George's

Progress and Poverty in 1879 received an enthusiastic response and helped to publicize the idea that wealth and poverty are the outgrowth of the operations of society as a whole. Following upon the heels of Populism, Progressivism represented an even greater demand for governmental control. In its extreme form, as expounded by Herbert Croly in The Promise of American Life (1909), Progressivism called for a powerful national state which would define and protect the public interest. While noted for their attacks on blood-thirsty corporations, these movements carried with them extensive social welfare elements. The Progressive concern for health hazards, slums, and child labor contributed significantly to the concept of public responsibility and provided the tools for the reform legislation of the early 1900's.

The emergence of social responsibility was not solely a function of political movements. The "social gospel" had its roots among the Protestant clergymen and featured such men as Washington Gladden and Josiah Strong. These men viewed with alarm what they saw as the growing moral depravity of the 1890's and attributed it to the environmental and economic insecurity which overwhelmed the individual. Emphasizing an organic conception of society, they challenged the notion of personal fault, and laid the burden of reform at the feet of society.

Socialism itself was attracting a surprising following during this period. The socialist leader, Daniel DeLeon, politically active in the 1890's, was followed by the even more successful Eugene Debs. In 1901, the Socialist Party convention attracted a large following from the solid American middle class, and later years saw several socialists as third party candidates.

A further response or challenge to Social Darwinism arose from its own ranks with the formulation of Reform Darwinism. While remaining within the body of Darwinian theory, the Reform Darwinists chose to counter the Spencerian doctrine of survival of the fittest with an emphasis on environmentalism. Spearheaded by such men as Walter Rauschenbusch, Richard T. Ely, and Clarence Darrow, the Reform Darwinist movement absolved the guilt of the paupers by attributing their condition to the structure and economic laws of society, and called for a system that would provide an environment where everyone would have an equal chance.

The contribution of the voluntary organizations

The philanthropic basis of the movement that spawned so many voluntary organizations in the latter half of the 19th century cannot be denied. Yet it departed from earlier concepts of charitable works in its opposition to a system of public relief and its advocacy of the institutional rehabilitation of the unfortunate. As early as 1839, the Seaman's Aid Society of the City of Boston, an organization for the relief of sailors' families, reported that their society's

...object is not merely the charity of alms-giving, but that nobler benevolence, which seeks to raise the poor above the necessity of receiving alms. ¹¹

Led by Massachusetts in 1863, the 1860's saw the development of state boards of charities which expressed a similar sentiment:

The great problem of all charity, public or private, is how to diminish suffering without increasing, by the very act, the number of paupers; how to grant aid, in case of need, without obliterating the principle of self-reliance and self-help. ¹²

Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, writing in 1883, criticized outdoor relief as condemning the poor to a continual status of poverty, and maintained that

...the necessary relief...shall also insure a distinct moral and physical improvement on the part of all those who have recourse to it -- that is, discipline and education should be inseparably associated with any system of public relief. ¹³

Mrs. Lowell was instrumental in the formation of the American Charity Organization Societies (COS), a movement which swept the United States in response to the economic and industrial distress of the 1870's.

Established on a municipal basis in the late 1870's, the Charity Organization Societies acted as clearing houses for information, and provided organizational and referral services. In Charities Review, the organization's official publication, Francis G. Peabody set forth the "new" doctrine of the COS in his consideration of "The Problem of Charity" (1893):

The new forms of industrial life, the vastly greater social complexity, the increasing wealth, the manifold inventions, and the democratic spirit of the last fifty years have made for us a new social environment, with new problems calling for new rules of conduct...the old charity was simply the unreflecting expression of the sheer emotion of pity; the new charity directs this emotion along definite economic lines. The old charity satisfied the feelings of the giver by alms, the new charity educates the receiver to do without alms. ¹⁴

The field of social work owes a debt to the voluntary organizations and to the COS in particular, for their formative role in the development of case work. In the belief that "...emphasis should be placed on private initiative and 'rehabilitation of the individual client'," ¹⁵ the members of these societies sought rehabilitation through personal visits, advice, and financial aid. Such contact by the "friendly visitors" was preceded by thorough investigation of the client's background and surroundings, and preparation of a plan for rehabilitation. Case work, which had its beginnings among these volunteers, became a fundamental element of the

methodology of social work in general. As the field matured, the role of the volunteer was taken over by a growing body of professionals, and by public as well as private welfare organizations. When the vocational rehabilitation program was established in 1920, case work formed the basic method in administering the service. Blanche Coll, however, has pointed out that

For all its self-proclamation as a 'new' or 'scientific' charity, the COS philosophy and methods of operation were in many respects a rehash of earlier themes. Poverty was of the natural order. Unemployment was minimized. Pauperism, the archenemy, was regarded as a disease resulting from personal defects and evil acts.... 16

Although the voluntary movements contributed to the concept of rehabilitation by instilling the idea of reforming the poor and dependent, their attitude toward these dependents was still rooted in earlier concepts of personal responsibility. It remained for other elements such as the medical profession and the sociologists to modernize such beliefs.

Developments among the professionals: medicine and sociology

While the social and political elements were attacking the entrenched concepts of individual responsibility, the medical and professional sector developed the means for rehabilitation, and the rise of scientific social work constructed the framework for a more rational approach to poverty. The 19th century had seen rapid strides in medicine, both for cripples in orthopedic surgery, and for the other categories of the dependent disabled -- the mentally ill, the retarded, the blind, and the deaf and dumb.

Rehabilitation of the deaf and dumb achieved the earliest and most substantial progress. The startling success of Samuel Gridley Howe in

educating a deaf, dumb, and blind girl at Boston's Perkins Institute was documented at length in his contributions to the Institute's Annual Reports, beginning in 1837 (later published in 1893 by Julia Ward Howe as The Education of Laura Bridgeman). Since the establishment of the first institution for the deaf and dumb at Hartford in 1817, a group of professionals made such progress in the teaching of articulation (as opposed to sign language) that in 1869, E. M. Gallaudet, a leading figure in the profession, wrote that "a class once only a burden to society" was not "able to earn the means for their own subsistence."¹⁷ In 1878, the Wisconsin Phonological Institute was established, and in 1880, the New England School for Deaf Mutes. That same year, Gallaudet reported proudly on the placement of graduates from the National Deaf Mute College as teachers, journalists, lawyers, and draftsmen.¹⁸

Care of the mentally retarded in the United States began with a few cases at the Perkins Institute in 1848. The decade of the 1850's saw the founding of numerous institutions led by Syracuse in 1851, Pennsylvania in 1853, and Connecticut in 1858. By 1898 there were 24 public institutions for the mentally retarded. The association of Medical Officers of American Institutions for Idiots and Feeble-minded Persons was formed in 1876, and in 1880 the Bureau of Education's Annual Report concluded that

The results of these schools for feeble-minded children confirm the opinion...that a small proportion may be made self-supporting, that a further larger proportion may be trained to do some useful work; and that as a general rule, the habits of the remainder can be improved so as to make their lives happier to themselves and less burdensome to others. ¹⁹

Progress among the blind exhibited a similar degree of growing professionalism and confidence in the restorative process. Braille had

been invented in 1829, although it was slow in finding widespread usage. Perkins Institute, the first institute for the blind, was established in Boston in 1829. By 1872, in a report on the annual convention of the instructors of the blind, Samuel Howe could write that

There is doubtless a greater proportion of really self-supporting blind persons in the United States than in any other country. ²⁰

Within the field of orthopedic surgery, the development of special facilities for cripples was led by Dr. John Ball (1789-1862), and in 1839 the first private hospital for cripples was opened in Boston under the direction of Dr. John Paul Brown. Bellevue Hospital's medical college established the first Chair of Orthopedic Surgery, occupied by Dr. Lewis Sayre (1820-1900). Articles on the care and treatment of cripples proliferated in medical journals in the 1880's, 1890's and early 1900's, and the American Journal of Orthopedic Surgery was founded in 1902. New York initiated public services for the crippled with the opening of the Hospital for the Ruptured and Crippled in 1863, and the New York Orthopedic Hospital and Dispensary in 1865. Practitioners of the 19th century gave early emphasis to vocational training, as evidenced by the establishment of the New England Industrial School for Cripples at Boston in 1893.

Accompanying these developments in medicine and among the professional instructors, the emergence of "scientific social work" engendered a more rational approach to the problem of poverty and disability. Characterized by an attempt to seek out the extent of disease and to discover the causes of disability and poverty, it was an approach that contested both the laissez-faire attitude and the charitable moralists. In 1880, the Bureau of Education reported on investigations into the causes and

prevention of idiocy, stating their intention to continue such research until

...results will be reached which will aid legislation and individual prudence in limiting the number of feebleminded and lessening the burden of caring for and educating them, which morally rests upon the state. ²¹

A further indication that concern for such enumerations had penetrated to the federal level, the 1890 Census included a "Report on insane, feebleminded, deaf and dumb."²² The studies of Amos Warner contributed significantly to the molding of a scientific attitude. In 1895, Charities Review published "Concerning Causes of Poverty," a review of his statistical study, American Charities.²³ The conclusions of his research blamed ill health and disease for the problems of poverty and led Warner to a cyclical theory of poverty:

Disease produces poverty, and...poverty produces disease;... poverty comes from degeneration and incapacity, and...degeneration and incapacity come from poverty. ²⁴

Industrial accidents and industrial disease, he maintained, were responsible for initiating this vicious circle. Warner's work posed a direct challenge to the moralists of the COS movement. The most extensive assessment of poverty was carried out by Robert Hunter, a prominent figure in settlement house work. Published in 1904 in his book, Poverty, the results of his study indicated that 12% of the population or ten million people were living in poverty. Hunter's definition of poverty included "persons not able to obtain those necessaries which will permit them to maintain a state of physical efficiency."²⁵ Framing the problem in terms of insufficiency and insecurity rather than dependency and personal failure, his definition alleviated the stigma on the individual. Although the latter studies focussed more on poverty than disability, they

held obvious significance in shaping attitudes toward dependency and welfare in general through their attack on the notion of individual responsibility and their forthright attempt to isolate the problem rather than to ignore the sources of distress.

* * *

The avant-garde can be credited with a threefold function. It developed and promulgated the concept of social responsibility: eroding the previous tradition of blaming the individual for his misfortune, it prepared the way for social legislation in which society shoulders the burden not as a charity but as a permanent and natural function. In formulating the concept of rehabilitation, a solution in keeping with traditional ideals, it enabled American society to espouse a program of public service. And, finally, it aroused the public consciousness by constant exposition of the problem, through institutional work, through publications, and in the political arena.

In so doing, the avant-garde was reacting to the pressures of industrialization and endeavoring to rationalize the obvious need for security with the entrenched American ideals of individualism and self-help, a value system which the avant-garde itself could not forsake. The compromise thus negotiated is the logical outcome of the American concepts: while promoting public responsibility and demanding public action, it still sought to retain the American work ethic and the possibility of self-support through rehabilitation. It therefore remained a conservative expression of values, and a paradoxical attempt, through public means, to fight off the threat to an individualized American concept of welfare.

CHAPTER III

THE ORIGINS OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

The vocational rehabilitation system, by its complexity, defies a simple account of its origins. In its evolved state, the system comprehends not only physical restoration, but also vocational training and placement. Although never entirely separable from the others, each element drew from the resources of several movements which established themselves during the late 1800's and the first decade of the 20th century. The principal characteristics of vocational rehabilitation appeared in four such movements: vocational education, special schools and hospitals for the disabled, employment bureaus, and workmen's compensation. As components in the development of vocational rehabilitation, these movements contributed the programmatic material for the system, and performed another function as well. By confirming itself as a publicly provided service, each root represented an advance in the concept of public responsibility for dependents and hence paved the way for the federal provision of vocational rehabilitation. Yet despite this advance, it will be most evident from the sentiments of the proponents, that these increments in the maturation of an institutional concept of welfare services were fundamentally an expression of traditional values, and an endeavor to solidify a conception of public welfare that embodied these values.

The vocational education movement

To a large extent, vocational rehabilitation originated in the

vocational education movement, a development with mixed consequences. As the two programs were distinctly different in administration and service method, the early identification of vocational rehabilitation with vocational education hindered the development of the former. Yet vocational education did provide a basis for the educational side of rehabilitation, and established industrial and technical training programs, later to be integrated into the vocational rehabilitation system. The exponents of the movement were less politically active than some other groups (notably workmen's compensation) in promoting the Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. Nevertheless, the role of vocational education as a framework for resulting rehabilitation programs is illustrated by the designation of state Boards of Education as the administrators of the program under the act. Vocational education set an early precedent in the public provision of services and the recognition of such a need. Moreover, the movement was a primary manifestation of the preservation of traditional concepts, for it was predicated upon the belief that a productive, self-supportive status, brought about by the appropriate education, would insure the welfare of each individual.

As suggested in the previous chapter, federal support for education was an established principle. An ordinance in 1784 confirmed public concern for education through the land-grant system, by reserving one lot within each municipality for the maintenance of a public school.¹ The role of Horace Mann in encouraging government support has been observed above, as well as the efforts of Samuel Gridley Howe. In 1862, the Morrill Act set an important standard in establishing "...a program of stimulating and favoring with financial grants specialized types or aspects of education...."²

Not surprisingly, it was the period of the 1870's and 1880's that induced a concern for vocational education, or "industrial education," in the contemporary terminology. And once again one can look to industrialization as the spur to this awakening interest. At a time when immigration (both external and internal, from the emancipated blacks) was flooding the market with low-skilled workers, the advance of industry was creating technological unemployment. As Wilensky and Lebeaux have pointed out, the increasing specialization of industry had the two fold effect of requiring new skills and rendering existing skills obsolete.³ Recognizing the need for massive retraining, the Bureau of Education's Annual Reports began during this period to include surveys and studies of industrial education, urging the increased state support of such programs. In 1880 this Report, advocating public appropriations for industrial education, viewed the following as the sources of unemployment: 1) the attenuation of apprenticeship; 2) the increase, through urban growth, of the struggling poor; 3) the influx of freedmen to industry; and 4) the growth of industrial "fine arts." Noting progress to date, the Report observed that

These conditions have caused the adoption of various educational expedients which are intended to make up existing deficiencies, to supply industrial training suitable to the capacity of the pupils, and to furnish a gradually increasing quantity of labor trained for the uses of the community...the healthy self-activity of our people is thus manifest in the various methods adopted to attain the several objects desired.⁴

The vocational education movement found initial sources of support among the voluntary organizations. Some of the earliest reported activities (as cited in the Bureau of Education Report) were those of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston and the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicancy, who

believed in "...proper education of children as of the greatest practical importance in solving the problems of pauperism and crime."⁵ But the public sector also readily perceived the need for such education. By the 1870's Massachusetts and New York had enacted requirements that the public schools include some form of industrial training.⁶ Special industrial schools were established through private action by 1885; the Workingman's School of New York City and the Boston Manual Training School. In 1881 New Jersey passed an act for the establishment of industrial training schools and Ohio, Illinois, Nebraska, and Minnesota all reported some form of industrial training within their public school systems.⁷

Despite these developments, the principle of public support for these institutions was not totally engrained in the public consciousness. Charles Loring Brace, a leading figure in the Children's Aid Society, heartily advocated industrial schools, but contended that they should remain under private management:

The public school system...does not reach the classes that need it most...Whatever is done for this great class of exposed and destitute children must be done by private associations, though it is but fitting that they should have public assistance.⁸

And a Circular of Information published by the Board of Education in 1884 contained the following comment regarding industrial education:

...it would be better for them to be established and maintained during the experimental stages by wealthy and benevolent individuals than by the public. Experiments should not be tried on a large scale by the public.⁹

The passage of time, however, served only to aggravate the problem. In 1912, a speech in the Senate by Carroll S. Page supported appropriations to aid the states in vocational education and reflected the fear of masses flocking to the cities and to industry, unprepared

for work.¹⁰ The mounting distress of the unemployed, together with the need of industry for a more adequate labor force created pressures, not only from organized labor, but from management as well. The Annual Report of the Bureau of Education observed in 1912 that

...the press fairly teems with editorials and signed articles which indicate an overwhelming sentiment in favor of enlarging and extending the scope of education in this country to include the training of the great mass of our workers for wage earning occupations of every kind.¹¹

Social workers, educators, employers, and national organizations, noted the Report, were urging national grants for such education. Cited among the proponent associations were the American Federation of Labor, the American Association for Labor Legislation, and the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, together with the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Southern Commercial Congress.¹² Surveying the legislation for vocational education, as it was now termed (in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Indiana, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, New York, Illinois, New Mexico, Rhode Island, and Washington), the Annual Report commented that

The movement for vocational training in the public schools is now at a crisis in this country. With the vocational principle fully acknowledged, with more or less complete systems of vocational education in operation in half a dozen states and in numerous cities, and with constant demands from all sources for the extension of vocational training, the movement is not yet making the headway it should.¹³

The Report also concluded that "The unquestionable tendency in American education is toward broadening the responsibility of the State..." and asserted the duty of society to patch up its defectives.¹⁴

During the first decade of the 20th century, the concept of conservation of national resources emerged as a powerful argument for

vocational education and rehabilitation in general. The Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, publishing its report in 1914, stressed the idea that unemployment is waste and that to conserve labor is an efficient economic measure.¹⁵ Vocational education, it maintained, is a national function, and one which is "...a wise business investment for our Nation..."¹⁶ It further pointed out that "Industrial and social unrest is due in a large measure to a lack of a system of education fitting workers for their callings,"¹⁷ and justified national grants for vocational education on the basis of the urgency of this situation which could not be met by the efforts of the states. Summarizing the Commission hearings, at which labor and management were well represented, the Report stated that "An overwhelming public sentiment shows the need for vocational education in this country."¹⁸

The perceived social obligation found its final expression with the creation of the Federal Board for Vocational Education through the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. In many respects the Act was a purely practical economic measure. A Federal Board for Vocational Education Bulletin in 1918 expressed the functions of the Board as insuring economic independence, conserving trade skill, adjusting supply of labor to demand, and developing new vocational skills.¹⁹ And the elements of social and philanthropic concern in such a program can be traced directly to the

economic interpretation of public welfare. In the words of the Commission, vocational education would "...provide an educational system for our workers to improve their efficiency and thereby better their own and the community's well-being."²⁰

Special hospitals and schools

The medical sector exhibited a similar urgency in its perception of public services as the responsibility of the state. While the vocational education movement developed the idea of rehabilitation through education, the emergence of special hospitals and schools for the disabled contributed inputs to the process of physical restoration. Even in the first stages, however, disentangling physical from educational restoration proves problematic. From the beginning, some of the special schools and hospitals provided their patients with training, and in some cases placement. Motivated by a common philosophy, both movements sought the restoration of a deviant to normal productive status. Their implementation of the principle of rehabilitation thus manifested the traditional American concept that equated welfare with productivity.

Early efforts by Samuel Gridley Howe and Dorothea Dix initiated the advocacy of public provision for special schools and hospitals. Yet the impetus for their establishment was originally more philanthropic than economic or practical. Howe's argument for the support of idiots stemmed from a belief in the rights of such unfortunates to sustenance and education, while the vocational education concept was founded on the necessity of educating a labor force.²¹ The goal of individual self-support was, however, embedded in the minds of the physicians and instructors, and it was not long before it combined with the concept of rehabilitation to produce an effective economic argument for providing

services to the disabled. This realization is exemplified in the following comment from the 1882 Convention of the Instructors of the Blind:

It is our work to take these contrasting and widely diversified powers and develop from them men and women who shall be fitted and honored to take a useful place in society....²²

And a speech at the Annual Convention of the Instructors of the Deaf in 1887 evinced a parallel sentiment:

...many deaf-mutes, even after every advantage has been afforded them, continue to be helpless charges to their friends through life....They run about from place to place seeking, it would seem, a soft job, or that El Dorado where money grows on trees and where hard labor is unknown....It therefore devolves upon us to devise ways and means to make our institutions places for the real battle of life.²³

In 1869, Gallaudet commented that

Far from being regarded in the days of its inception as a charity...the work of deaf-mutes has now come to be looked upon as an essential feature of that system of education...the basis of which may be shown to rest on considerations of pure state selfishness...to educate the deaf and dumb is cheaper than to leave them in ignorance.²⁴

The productive possibilities of the curative process were therefore well recognized by the turn of the century, and had formed the central core of the concept of rehabilitation. The ultimate expression of the traditional ideals as fundamental precepts to the rehabilitation process is embodied in an article in the 1907 issue of The Craftsman, entitled "Work for the Deformed: What Is Being Done to Give Crippled Children a Chance to Become Useful Members of Society":

Even among those who can never grow old enough to take their place among the wage earners, the desire to do something ought to be gratified....To all those who are old enough to realize their own afflictions, the desire to work, to be on a par with their fellows in this one respect, becomes an absorbing passion.²⁵

The concept of conservation of national resources, a product of the early 20th century, bolstered the economic argument. In his introduction to Edith Reeves' work, The Care and Education of Crippled Children in the

United States (1915), Douglas McMurtrie viewed the future of the movement

...not only as a means of abating a vast amount of cruel and needless suffering, but also as an economic measure to preserve to the community a great number of useful and effective individuals who would otherwise become hopelessly dependent.²⁶

By 1913 and 1914, medical officials were writing that

It has long been considered that the education and training of normal persons is a profitable thing for cities and states to do, but it is certain that a much larger proportion of those who are crippled become dependent if not made the object of special care. Economically, therefore, the state is simply using ordinary business foresight.²⁷

The earliest schools and hospitals for the disabled were the result of private effort. Most of the institutions mentioned in the previous section did not issue from public action: the 1817 school for the deaf and dumb, Perkins Institute for the Blind in 1829, the first hospital for cripples in 1839, and the New York Hospital for the Ruptured and Crippled in 1863. The public sector did, however, recognize in some measure its responsibility to the disabled, with the result that numerous state legislatures provided support for these institutions although the management remained in private hands. Such was the case, for example, with Perkins Institute²⁸ and the New York Hospital for the Ruptured and Crippled.²⁹ In 1871, the Annual Report of the Bureau of Education wrote favorably of this situation, maintaining that the institutions should be "...kept out of the sphere of local politics and the scramble for office."³⁰ Despite this disposition to leave such activities to the private sector, the states showed an increasing willingness to provide for the disabled: the Bureau of Education statistics recorded 40 out of 58 state-supported institutions for the insane in 1869-70;³¹ 16 out of 26 such institutions for the blind were recorded in 1871;³²

and in 1873, 17 out of 41 institutions for the deaf and dumb were receiving state support.³³ By 1878, progress in the establishment of this service was reflected in the following comment for the Report: "The instruction of deaf-mutes is steadily advancing and is no longer regarded as a charity, but as an essential part of a system of free education."³⁴

The rising number of industrial and transportation accidents, coupled with the epidemic of polio in the first decade of the 20th century (particularly severe in 1909) accelerated the development of facilities for the disabled. Crippled children were the first to receive widespread attention and care; the disastrous effects of polio gave rise to a proliferation of institutions and professional studies during this period, as evidenced by Douglas McMurtrie's bibliography³⁵ and Edith Reeves' enumeration of institutions. According to Oscar Sullivan and Kenneth Snortum, in their work, Disabled Persons, Their Education and Rehabilitation, this period saw the publication of the first book dealing specifically with the problem of the disabled, Alice Solenberger's study, One Thousand Homeless Men (1911).³⁶ It was, moreover, the effects of accidents which spurred the formation of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults in 1907 (later the Easter Seal Society)³⁷ and the interest of the Russell Sage Foundation in 1908 generated the New York Federation of Associations for Crippled Children and Adults in 1913.³⁸

Such activities were not limited to private associations. At the beginning of the 20th century some of the states began to incorporate special schools for the disabled into the general school system. As early as 1885, a Wisconsin bill instituted day schools for the deaf and dumb.³⁹ Special classes for cripples in the Chicago schools were

Corrections which in 1901 called for the establishment of a federal bureau encompassing this field.⁴⁹

Although other areas of social concern such as child labor, minimum wage, public health and other forms of education were receiving the attention of the federal government, the treatment and training of the disabled remained a responsibility of the states, and most of the advocates of public support looked to the states as the source. The establishment of federal responsibility was to result from the coalescence of the roots into a vocational rehabilitation program through the legislation and development of the system in the 1920's.

Workmen's compensation

As a root of rehabilitation, the workmen's compensation movement performed the role of a coordinating force in establishing a system of vocational rehabilitation rather than contributing to the programmatic content. Prior to the passage of the 1920 Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act, several states applied vocational rehabilitation measures -- physical and educational restoration -- along with their workmen's compensation laws. As Oberman has written, "It was considered by the leading spokesmen for workmen's compensation that the program could not be fully successful without a well-administered vocational rehabilitation activity."⁵⁰ And, as Chester Gleason of the Massachusetts Industrial Accident Board wrote in 1920, "...the mere payment of pecuniary benefits to the disabled did not discharge in full the debt of society to the crippled man."⁵¹ Oscar Sullivan, an early Director of Rehabilitation, reported that the Minnesota system was a direct outgrowth of workmen's compensation. The movement performed a further vital function in publicizing the problem of the disabled:

An important weapon that all the proponents of vocational education needed, and one that was largely supplied through workmen's compensation operations was statistical information on disability... for the first time it became apparent that civilian living was more dangerous than life in the army during a war. Such information had a dramatic impact on legislators considering vocational rehabilitation bills. ⁵²

Finally, as will be seen in succeeding chapters, the various associations connected with workmen's compensation were the most active in promoting vocational rehabilitation legislation.

Workmen's compensation legislation was a direct outgrowth of alarm over the increasing number of industrial and other civilian accidents. Although in 1891, an article in Charities Review contended that "the state insurance of working men seems incompatible with the spirit of American institutions,..."⁵³ by the first decade of the 20th century the states had assumed an active role in discharging public responsibility toward the disabled worker. In 1902 Maryland enacted the first cooperative insurance law,⁵⁴ and although it was ruled unconstitutional, it was followed by a Massachusetts compensation law in 1903⁵⁵ and a New York law in 1910.⁵⁶ On the federal level, the U.S. Philippines Commission promoted compensation legislation in 1905 and the federal government provided for its employees in 1908.⁵⁷ By 1911, compulsory compensation laws were in existence in ten states.⁵⁸ A growing demand for labor, particularly after 1914, undoubtedly encouraged this assumption of public responsibility. Commenting on the mid-decade industrial growth, a Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin by Chaney and Hanna remarked that

Instead of an influx of labor from European countries such as had hitherto accompanied every revival of industrial activity, there was an actual emigration. The demand for labor led to the introduction of entirely new labor elements and to a movement from place to place such as had never before occurred. ⁵⁹

Such developments gave impetus to the accident prevention movement and to the doctrines of national efficiency and conservation of national resources. As Francis Donoghue, medical advisor to the Massachusetts Industrial Accident Board wrote in 1916:

...this movement is undoubtedly due to a growing consciousness and realization that the value of the human being engaged in productive labor...is one of the country's strongest assets.⁶⁰

Donoghue's interpretation of the basic principles of the compensation laws encompassed 1) rehabilitation of injured persons, 2) financial relief during the readjustment period, and 3) accident prevention.⁶¹ And, as Chester Gleason wrote in 1920, "We have sought to educate the public to an appreciation of the economic value of the residual functions of the handicapped man."⁶²

Elements of vocational rehabilitation began to emerge in the administration of these laws. Viewed by historians as the first attempt at vocational rehabilitation, Regina Dolan's study of the employability of disabled workmen for the Wisconsin Industrial Commission in 1918 resulted in her continued work under the Commission in the placement of injured workers.⁶³ The Minnesota Department of Labor and Industries undertook a similar study in 1917,⁶⁴ and in 1918 a division under the Massachusetts Industrial Accident Board was directed by the state legislature to provide placement and training for the industrially disabled.⁶⁵ In 1919 and 1920, the following states initiated rehabilitation measures in connection with workmen's compensation: North Dakota, Rhode Island, California (1919) and Oregon and Virginia (1920).⁶⁶ These laws varied in the services offered; some provided placement only, while others included physical and vocational restoration. A few states passed broadly applicable and comprehensive legislation. The Minnesota law in

1919 provided for "persons disabled in industry and otherwise"⁶⁷ and a New Jersey law in 1919 covered the whole range of the handicapped and furnished all phases of rehabilitation.⁶⁸ New York legislation, similar to that of New Jersey, was passed in 1920.⁶⁹

While the states were initiating their separate rehabilitation programs, the workmen's compensation officials were agitating for support of vocational rehabilitation at the federal level. The International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions (I.A.I.A.B.C.), formed in 1913, spearheaded this operation. In 1916, Dr. Francis Donoghue urged the Association to support vocational rehabilitation,⁷⁰ and at their convention in 1917, the following sentiment was expressed:

On the eve of America's active participation in the European war and by reason of Canada's efforts, this continent has been shocked into endeavor to restore disabled soldiers and sailors to industry. Tonight it is urged that the work of rehabilitating industry's cripples be hastened. From the economic and national standpoint, a cripple is a social loss....⁷¹

A resolution was passed to further legislation on industrial vocational rehabilitation.⁷² A later conference in 1918 endorsed the Smith-Bankhead bills and appointed a committee to further legislation.⁷³

In its role as an advocate of public responsibility, the workmen's compensation movement also embodied the ideals of the traditional concept of welfare. A speech at the 5th Annual Meeting of the I.A.I.A.B.C. in 1918 affords a prime example of this concept:

The problem, then, is the restoration of the producing and earning power of cripples. The measure of national weal is the producing power of the citizens; the measure of individual weal is in fact, if not in theory, the individual earning power...⁷⁴

Employment bureaus

Public employment bureaus provided a final link in the system of vocational rehabilitation and a further step in the assumption of public

responsibility. It has been noted above that much of the placement activity ensued from the operations of the special schools and hospitals and from the workmen's compensation boards, as well as from some of the special schools and hospitals. Yet the development of employment bureaus, as a separate movement, reinforced the concept of public service provision.

The earliest employment services were the fruit of voluntary organizations. In 1877 the Labor Exchange was organized in Washington, D.C. Reflecting the trend toward rehabilitation rather than relief, its stated purpose was

...to devise means of employment of poor laborers in public works...to bring poor laborers into communication with employers without expense...to correct as far as possible the evils of indiscriminate alms-giving.⁷⁵

By the 1890's the Charity Organization Societies had established special employment bureaus for the handicapped,⁷⁶ and the American Journal of Care for Cripples reported on activities of a COS Employment Bureau for the handicapped during the years 1905-1912.⁷⁷ In 1916 the Federation of Associations for Cripples maintained an employment bureau for cripples, the functions of which were taken over by the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men in 1917.⁷⁸

In part through the devastating effects of technological unemployment, and in part as a response to the pressures of immigration, "vocational guidance" gained increasing attention during the first decade of the 20th century. As reported by the Commissioner of Labor in 1910, movements were undertaken in New York, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis.⁷⁹ Although the promoters were largely private organizations such as the Vocation Bureau in Boston⁸⁰ and the High School Teachers Association in New York,⁸¹ the public sector had instituted employment services as early as 1890. A 1913 report by

Frank Sargent for the Bureau of Labor Statistics spoke of "...the belief that it is the duty of the State to make some provision for its unemployed."⁸² Numerous states established free employment bureaus. Ohio led the rest with five offices in 1890, and California, New York, and Illinois established bureaus in 1893, 1896, and 1899 respectively. The years 1900-1910 saw a growing trend, and by 1912 fifteen states had made some attempt to provide for the unemployed.⁸³

The federal government initiated employment service activities in 1907 when the Division of Information of the Bureau of Immigration organized a public employment system at the immigration station in New York.⁸⁴ By 1914 the unemployment problem had become so severe that both management and labor were demanding the establishment of a National Bureau. In the ensuing legislative activity in 1914, Mr. MacDonald reported a bill out of the Labor Committee, asserting that

The necessity of legislation of this character is denied by no one...It is also agreed that the problem cannot be handled effectively except by an agency having the power and scope of a national bureau.⁸⁵

In that same year, Congress established a National Employment Bureau within the Bureau of Labor.⁸⁶

Prior to the rehabilitation legislation itself, the federal government did not provide employment guidance specifically for the disabled. This function emerged through implementation of the rehabilitation legislation, as will be seen in the following chapter. Yet the development of public employment agencies figures as an important facet in the growth of public care for dependents, and in a programmatic sense, it helped to pave the way for a rehabilitation system. Moreover, it is an immediate reflection of the belief that self-support and employment, as opposed to "indiscriminate alms-giving," most accurately measure the public welfare.

The status of vocational rehabilitation prior to federal legislation

By 1920, the developments in vocational education, special hospitals, employment bureaus, and workmen's compensation had delineated the components of vocational rehabilitation. Within eight states, the first steps in a vocational rehabilitation program itself were initiated, in conjunction with workmen's compensation. Of these, New York, New Jersey, and Minnesota had established quite comprehensive systems.

Precursors to vocational rehabilitation, the four movements gradually confirmed themselves as public programs, and promoted the acceptance of society's permanent responsibility to its dependent members. As such, they represent the implementation of concepts formulated by the avant-garde, for while reaching toward the principle of institutional welfare services, their rehabilitative goal reveals a reaction to protect social ideals. The conceptual and programmatic foundation constructed by these movements concluded the achievements of the first stage. Coalescence of their efforts and the establishment of a federally supported vocational rehabilitation program required a more substantial pressure than their individual endeavors. Supplying this force, the impacts of World War I opened the second stage in the evolution of vocational rehabilitation.

CHAPTER IV

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL PROGRAM

This analysis has operated on the hypothesis that in the development of social policies, stimulation by exogenous or endogenous pressures is filtered through an established set of ideals. A protracted process, the accomplishment of this filtration or negotiation requires the conditioning of the public consciousness by a group of the avant-garde. In assessing the emergence of policy regarding vocational rehabilitation, Mary MacDonald concluded:

...extreme attitudes had been modified sufficiently for the idea of vocational rehabilitation of all the disabled -- not only of the wounded soldier -- to have gained wide public support in the years 1917-1920. ¹

This was the function of the avant-garde and the various strands of public service that later combined to produce a rehabilitation system. In terms of the model, it represents stage I: the pressures provoked a sufficient imbalance to set in motion an avant-garde. The efforts of this group, through the innovation of an idea of rehabilitation, enabled various programs to take shape (both through economic and social arguments). As these programs -- the roots of vocational rehabilitation -- established themselves, they set precedents, not only in the concept of public provision of services, but also in the acceptance of an ideal of rehabilitation. Their modification of original attitudes toward public responsibility and toward the disabled prepared the public for vocational rehabilitation legislation. An article in Outlook (1917)

entitled, "The Passing of the Cripple," exemplified both the changing perceptions that evolved through Stage I, and the means by which they came about:

The Cripple disappears, and instead the injured or disabled man becomes a person with a different potential of usefulness than he had previously developed, our task in this case consisting largely in endeavoring to find and develop this potential.²

But, although this stage awakened a consciousness and built a foundation, policy regarding rehabilitation was not yet confirmed, for the steps thus far were piecemeal: either incomplete in terms of a system of rehabilitation, or confined to a state level and hence incomplete in terms of public service provision which finds its ultimate expression in the federal assumption of responsibility.

As a further premise, the model has predicted that a forcing variable or pressure will bring about definitive action, given that the stage is set by the avant-garde. In the case of vocational rehabilitation, World War I provided the requisite impetus. Oscar Sullivan and Kenneth Snortum have asserted the following as reasons for the acceptance by the public of vocational rehabilitation: the idea of conservation of national resources, the concept of national efficiency, the belief in public support of education, the idea of social justice to the worker, the concern over public health, and the notion of the philanthropic functions of the federal government.³ The effects of World War I were such as to bring these ideas to a peak. The war boosted vocational rehabilitation in three major ways: it heightened the pressure of such concepts as national efficiency, conservation of resources, and public health; in meeting the needs of the war disabled, it stimulated improvements in the technology and services for the crippled; and finally it aroused a philanthropic zeal over the plight of the veterans, which

carried over to civilian vocational rehabilitation.

The increasing demand for labor brought on by the war and its stimulation of the economy lent renewed potency to the argument that reclamation of the disabled conserves national resources and contributes to national efficiency. Reflecting on this effect, Lieutenant Colonel Harry Mock of the Surgeon General's Office maintained that the efforts of "social and economic movements" had come to fruition as "the greatest by-product of the war."⁴ Stressing the need for manpower and noting the efforts for the war disabled, he concluded that the reclaiming of civilian workers stemmed from the necessities of the war:

...from our efforts to win this war and at the same time to pay the Nation's debt to those disabled in the fight, at home or at the front, will come this great by-product, Human Conservation and Reclamation.⁵

A second feature in the impact of World War I revealed itself in the development of services and technology for the cripple. As Harry Mock noted in 1918, massive preparations were made for the care of disabled servicemen upon their return from the war, both in terms of vocational and physical restoration.⁶ The Soldier Rehabilitation Act in 1918 had provided for a federal program of vocational rehabilitation for these veterans. Although the accomplishment of rehabilitation was fragmented between the Federal Board for Vocational Education, authorized by the Soldier Rehabilitation Act to administer vocational restoration, and the Surgeon General's Office, which provided for physical restoration, the rehabilitation of veterans can at least be credited with including these two phases. Activities were not limited to the federal government. In 1917 the New York Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men was established by the Red Cross for the purpose of research and demonstration in the field of rehabilitation of veterans.⁷ The publications of the

Institute give evidence of the extensive investigations into curative, training and placement processes as well as the task of educating the public to the acceptance of the disabled.⁸ Statistical, vocational, and technical studies in the American Journal of Care for Cripples likewise demonstrate the extent of the study and the state of the art.⁹ Although much of this work was instigated by the necessity of the war veterans, the techniques were immediately transferable to civilian vocational rehabilitation.

Public sympathy aroused over the war disabled focussed attention on the problem of the cripple in general. As described by Homer Folks, a "...very deep interest in the disabled soldier...gave us this impetus toward rehabilitation which promises to leave us with a permanent...plan for dealing with disabled civilians."¹⁰ And an article by William Bennett Munro, professor of law at Harvard, gave the following opinion:

...we have already passed through a great social revolution in our hearts and minds. The war is not the result of it, but the war has hastened its conclusion. The day of the individualist and individual property rights has passed away forever...in favor of a new ideal of community happiness and welfare. The community -- city, county, state and nation -- must step in and take over a great many economic and humanitarian enterprises hitherto conducted privately or not at all....¹¹

Although this viewpoint is perhaps a bit extreme, it does indicate that the war was a culminating factor in impressing responsibility for social services upon the public consciousness and that, as John Lapp wrote, "It took a war...to give us the vision of the necessity of putting men back on their feet physically and vocationally."¹²

The public rehabilitation of disabled soldiers has not been considered a direct root of vocational rehabilitation for several reasons. Although the federal government had been providing support for veterans since the first national pension in 1776,¹³ this service remained purely

a pension until World War I. There was no notion of rehabilitation, no consideration of the economic advantages of rehabilitating the disabled.¹⁴ Such provisions thus contributed little to the concept of rehabilitation. Secondly, war pensions were not a continuous institution or social service program, but were enacted intermittently for limited periods of time as the situation demanded. They were therefore directly in opposition to any growing concept of "institutional" public service provision. Finally, the pensions were not representative of a general trend toward increasing public responsibility, as the war hero evoked a response that was imbued with sentiment and did not embody any permanent change in public perception of its role regarding dependents. It is interesting to observe, in this regard, that the amount of public support for veterans' pensions varied directly with the popularity of the war.

In connection with World War I, however, and as a direct precipitant of the Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act, public provision for disabled soldiers proved significant in rousing public consciousness and improving technology. Equally important was the legislative and administrative precedent established by the Soldier Rehabilitation Act. As Mary MacDonald has written,

The war focused attention on the whole problem. When the vocational rehabilitation of disabled soldiers was placed under the Federal Board for Vocational Education the federal framework for a program of civilian vocational rehabilitation was complete -- a federal agency was directly engaged in rehabilitation....¹⁵

Previous sections of this paper forecast the coalescence of the roots of rehabilitation into a national program, through the 1920 National Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This event requires some qualifying explanation, for it would be misleading to disseminate the image of a massive federally-operated structure, involving a chain of federally-supported hospitals, employment agencies, and training schools, each

representing the culmination of one of the roots. Quite the contrary: the vocational rehabilitation program, in its early stages, was a partial operation from the standpoint of a comprehensive rehabilitation system. To begin with, the establishment of the program within the departments of vocational education constrained its definition to a decidedly vocational emphasis. According to a bulletin from the Federal Board for Vocational Education in 1927,

...vocational rehabilitation...may involve several forms of rehabilitation, but it should be noted that the vocational rehabilitation service which has been established in the states is limited in so far as expenditures of funds and services are concerned to such activities as are directed to vocational reestablishment. The vocational rehabilitation service has been conceived fundamentally as one of vocational advisement and training. ¹⁶

Further, the initial legislation did not even provide funds for physical restoration. And, finally, the principle of cooperation with other agencies, together with the case method established a system whereby the vocational rehabilitation agencies acted as co-ordinators, contracting out the actual work of rehabilitation to other agencies.

The significance of the vocational rehabilitation legislation lay more in the fact of the program's existence than in the extent of its provision, and in its inclusion of all disabled persons, not merely those injured by industrial accidents. It afforded a major foothold in the establishment of the principle of social responsibility for dependents. Furthermore, the roots of vocational rehabilitation had coalesced in the minds of many of the administrators. The legislation's definition of rehabilitation, "the rendering of a person disabled fit to engage in remunerative occupation,"¹⁷ gave the states leeway to extend their programs beyond vocational training. As a Federal Board for Vocational Education bulletin stated in 1921:

Rehabilitation can best be considered as having two general phases -- physical and vocational. The success of vocational rehabilitation depends to a very large extent upon the success of physical restoration...the state board should solicit and encourage the interests of the medical profession and the hospitals in the work of vocational rehabilitation. 18

Although in the strict sense, the program retained its emphasis on vocational training, and was to some degree hampered by this focus, the administrators chose a broad interpretation of rehabilitation and set in motion the beginnings and the advocacy of a comprehensive system. By 1921, as will be described below, the case method for vocational rehabilitation had already been carefully delineated by the Board, and it included all phases of the process. While the permanence of appropriations and the full extent of the program as a federal responsibility yet remained to be established, the federal duty to provide a system was secured, and the principles of a comprehensive system had been set forth.

The 1920 Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act, although it marked a step in establishing the system, left the fate of the program in balance, as the legislation provided appropriations for a four year period only. A sum of \$750,000 was allocated for the first year with \$1,000,000 for each succeeding year, subject to renewal of the appropriations in 1924. On the federal level, the Federal Board for Vocational Education was determined as the responsible agency. The states were to receive allotments on a basis of the ratio of their population to the total population of the 48 states. The legislation provided that the recipient states comply with several requirements. Approval of the legislation by the state legislatures was a prerequisite, and the states were to empower their state boards of vocational education to administer the program and provide for supervision of the training programs. Those

states with operating workmen's compensation boards were required to provide for cooperation between these boards and the vocational rehabilitation program. Federal funds were to be matched by state expenditures for the program, and as a final requirement, the legislation specified the annual submission of program plans and reports.¹⁹

The scope of the legislation was broad in that it defined the disabled as "...any person who, by reason of a physical defect or infirmity, whether congenital or acquired by accident, injury, or disease, is, or may be expected to be, totally or partially incapacitated for remunerative occupation...."²⁰ But despite this breadth of definition, restrictions prevailed in the placement of the program within the vocational education administrations, and the absence of physical restoration. The former administrative measure was perhaps most injurious to the development of the program. The vocational education agencies were in no way appropriate to the administration of vocational rehabilitation. In the first place, vocational education required only the setting up of classes and the supervision of training programs, while vocational rehabilitation was a highly individualized process, requiring a multiplicity of services and the tailoring of these services to the specific case. Moreover, as Mary MacDonald has observed,

in vocational education, the state boards for vocational education operated no programs, they were concerned with the supervision of local secondary schools and teacher training...Not only was vocational rehabilitation a very different type of service, but the state boards for vocational education were to be called upon actually to operate a program when they had not previously done so.²¹

The legislation as it emerged was substantially shaped by its supporting interests. Despite the all-embracing definition of the disabled, the act has been considered as designed for the industrially

disabled, and with good reason, for the exponents of industry and labor were primary forces in promoting the legislation. The workmen's compensation group, as represented by the I.A.I.A.B.C., had designated a formal committee to further legislation, and the activities of this body were reflected throughout the legislative process, as seen in their letters of support,²² and their testimony at the hearings held by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in 1918.²³ Mary MacDonald has suggested that this orientation toward industrial accidents was responsible for the emphasis on vocational training and the neglect of physical restoration. As she put it,

...it was for the victims of industrial accidents that the law was primarily designed. This group would secure medical and surgical treatment under most compensation laws, and their living expenses during training could be secured at least theoretically through compensation payments.²⁴

The measure for cooperation between workmen's compensation and the state boards of vocational rehabilitation was a probable result of the interests of this group.

The Federal Board for Vocational Education also played a major role in the support and design of the legislation, being largely responsible for the ensuing administrative structure. As administrator of vocational rehabilitation for veterans, the Board was a logical choice for heading the civilian vocational rehabilitation program. This designation was encouraged by Dr. Charles Prosser, director of the Federal Board, who felt that a continuation of the existing cooperative relationship as established by the Smith-Hughes Act would facilitate the administration of vocational rehabilitation grants.²⁵ Thus, although the Federal Board for Vocational Education was not really the originator of the vocational rehabilitation movement, its role as federal administrator

and the support it had lent to the legislation brought about the adoption of a measure which had pervasive effects on the program.

Representing the medical and philanthropic interests, the leading spokesman was Douglas McMurtrie of the Red Cross Institute for the Crippled and Disabled. McMurtrie had been instrumental in the passage of the comprehensive New Jersey legislation in 1919, and he now appeared at the Congressional hearings to advocate a broader approach to vocational rehabilitation:

...I should like to call to your attention...that rehabilitation of the disabled does not consist solely in vocational education. It is as largely a piece of social work as it is education.²⁶

Supporting McMurtrie in his request for the inclusion of provisions for physical restoration, Harry Mock pointed out that to extend vocational education services alone was a piecemeal measure.²⁷ Although Mock and McMurtrie failed to secure action on a more comprehensive system, they were successful in extending the provisions of the act to the entire class of the disabled, and in gaining acceptance of a broad definition of rehabilitation. Both of these definitions as they appeared in the legislation, were drawn from the New Jersey rehabilitation bill sponsored by the Red Cross Institute.²⁸

The bills for civilian vocational rehabilitation were introduced in the House by Representative William Bankhead and in the Senate by Senator Hoke Smith in August of 1918. The ensuing debate in Congress and in the hearings revolved around three major issues: the scope of the legislation with regard to the definition of persons disabled, the constitutionality of the provision -- the states rights argument, and the subject of economic justification. The definition of "persons disabled" wavered between two alternatives. On the one hand, several legislators

felt it should be limited to those disabled in industry or any other "legitimate occupation." A more sympathetic element sought to extend the definition to cover all disabled persons, subject, of course, to the expectations of their return to work. When the issue arose in the hearings, the more comprehensive definition received strong support from Dr. Harry Mock, and Dr. Charles Prosser²⁹ as well as from the National Association of Manufacturers.³⁰ In the Senate, however, a conservative element asserted itself. Senator Sherman condemned such an extension as Bolshevistic, and as an attack on individual responsibility. "As it is now framed," he contended, "it will cover...every criminal, every vagrant, every loafing failure."³¹ Despite such protestations, the Senate adopted an amendment, as introduced by Senator Smoot, extending services to the entire class of the disabled.³²

Debate over the constitutionality issue raged throughout the legislative process. During the hearings, R. M. Little argued that "Federal legislation is needed because the problem is national,"³³ and "This is too big a job for private enterprise."³⁴ The sentiment of national responsibility recurred throughout the testimony. In Congress, Representative Frank Mondell maintained that "There is...a growing sentiment in favor of national leadership" and a "growth of the sentiment of the country in favor of progressive legislation."³⁵ As proof of the widespread support, both Senate and House records included letters from workmen's compensation commissions, labor departments, educators, social agencies, trade unions, medical societies, and insurance companies.³⁶ A statement by Mr. Newton evoked both the traditional concept of welfare and the question of public responsibility:

...changed conditions have made (the workman's) welfare a matter of personal concern. Congress is given power to legislate to promote the general welfare of the Nation. The general welfare

requires that every man and woman be a producer. This bill will assist in making him one. ³⁷

There were, however, those who questioned the extent of this Congressional power and challenged the progressive sentiment. Senators Sherman and King decried the invasion of states rights³⁸ and Representative Walsh, protesting that the federal responsibility and power did not extend to men crippled in private enterprise, stated that "...I do not believe that the Federal Government should further go into this matter of rehabilitation and extend it along paternalistic lines."³⁹ In response to these challenges, the supporters of the bill pointed to federal action taken in support and regulation of industry⁴⁰ and appropriations for agriculture, notably hog cholera. The exasperation of Representative Fess showed itself in his outcry, "You are voting for hogs and not for men."⁴¹ To those who waved the flag of states rights it was offered that federal intervention would be minimal and that federal grants were merely to serve as a "stimulus" to the states.⁴² A precursor to this policy existed in the Morrill Act of 1862, which encouraged the development of state educational facilities by means of federal grants.⁴³ Prior to the vocational rehabilitation legislation, Congress had enacted several laws providing grants-in-aid. Most recently, the Smith-Hughes Act had set a precedent for grants to the states for the promotion of education and social welfare.⁴⁴

The economic issue was also widely debated. Some opposition to the bill was raised as a result of reluctance to produce further strains on the federal treasury, but this was countered by the increasingly popular argument of conservation and national efficiency, as embodied in Senator Smith's statement:

There is not a man in this House that does not believe that a sound man is preferable for our national welfare to a man who is incapacitated as an economic question. We cannot afford, therefore, to vote down this bill...as an economic question, so far as our country is concerned, a man who can support himself is preferable to one who cannot, the one being an asset and the other a liability. It changes a man from a consumer to a producer.⁴⁵

The utilitarian argument, in connection with the continual citation of the rising number of industrial accidents, afforded the proponents a powerful leverage. Nevertheless, the bill required extensive political manipulation before it was finally signed into law in June of 1920. Negotiation for a separate civilian vocational rehabilitation program had begun immediately following the refusal of Congress to include civilians in the Soldier Rehabilitation Act. Spokesmen for workmen's compensation, notably R.M. Little, secured the support of several congressmen in their effort, and the resulting bill was introduced by Representative Bankhead in August of 1918.⁴⁶ The two-year delay in passage can be attributed principally to a determined opposition to extended federal grants, the onset of the conservative reaction of the 1920's. The Wilson administration gave little attention to vocational rehabilitation, and the 65th Congress took no action on the bill. When the 66th Congress opened, the Republican Party held the majority. The most vocal opposition to federal grants came from the northeastern Republicans. Although several grant-in-aid laws had been passed by the Democratic Congresses of 1913-1919, the vocational rehabilitation bill received relatively weak support from that party. Despite the volume of criticism from some of its members, it was the Republican Party that contributed the largest number of positive votes.⁴⁷ Already encumbered by debate over the question of grants and states rights, the legislation encountered further delays through partisan squabbling over

parliamentary questions. This delay proved a great hindrance, for as time passed, indifference set in, and support lagged. Even in view of favorable reports from the education committees, the proponents were hard put to muster sufficient votes to secure passage.

* * *

Although the federal legislation did not provide funds for all phases of rehabilitation, the program itself was from inception a comprehensive system, for the states accepted the broad definition of rehabilitation and in many cases themselves provided the additional necessary services. And while they exhibited a wide degree of variability in administration, the case method and the caseworker system prevailed throughout.

The case method, as described in Chapter II, originated among the voluntary associations in the 1870's and 1880's. By the 1920's, however, it had expanded considerably in scope. Prior to World War I, a growing body of professionally trained workers replaced the volunteers within social agencies. Developments in psychology stimulated the development of casework, and the writings of such professionals as Mary Richmond contributed to the definition of the method.⁴⁸ During the first decade of the century, hospitals in Boston, New York, and Baltimore began to make use of social caseworkers.⁴⁹ Public welfare agencies also embraced the case method. When in 1915 New York took the lead in a series of state child welfare acts, the administering agencies followed a casework methodology.⁵⁰ Edith Reeves' study has pointed out that many of the clinics for crippled children employed visiting nurses who performed the functions of caseworkers.⁵¹ And many of the early experiments in vocational rehabilitation, as those of

Dr. Arthur Gillette and Regina Dolan, exhibited characteristics of casework. Oriented toward the individual, and based on extensive background research, casework formed a natural basis for vocational rehabilitation, which requires both individualized treatment and comprehensive knowledge of the client's condition, both physical and vocational. Its suitability as a methodology was recognized by contemporary officials, as exemplified by Oscar Sullivan and Kenneth Snortum,⁵² as well as by the federal administering agency. The Annual Report of the Federal Board stated that "...vocational rehabilitation is a case problem. Disabled persons cannot be handled in groups."⁵³

Within the definition of this study, casework cannot be considered a root of vocational rehabilitation. These origins were public services that established themselves as social responsibilities and formed the precursors to vocational rehabilitation in both philosophy and programmatic content. A method rather than a program, casework does not fall into this category. But its contemporaneous evolution presented the incipient vocational rehabilitation program with the logical technique for administration.

As early as 1921, a formalized procedure for handling the case had been developed, as indicated by a Federal Board for Vocational Education bulletin. The sequence included: 1. referral, 2. contact, 3. interview and determination of eligibility and job objectives, 4. determination of rehabilitation plan, 5. follow-up by the case worker or "agent."⁵⁴ The rehabilitation plan was tailored to the individual and comprised physical restoration and vocational training of the following four possible types: 1. through public or private institutions (schools or vocational training institutions), 2. on-the-job

training, 3. correspondence instruction, 4. tutorial sessions. The case worker or "agent" was responsible for contracting with public health services, hospitals and clinics for prosthesis and physical restoration, and with special or public schools and with employers for the vocational training. He was further responsible for placing the client in a job. The various elements of rehabilitation thus coalesced in the person of the agent who provided the coordination. As a Federal Board bulletin in 1927 described the vocational rehabilitation agency,

Its chief and fundamental function is to provide the service of counsel and advisement, both as to employment and training, and to exercise such supervision of the disabled persons or of the agencies cooperating....⁵⁵

The vocational rehabilitation agencies availed themselves of all possible services from these cooperating agencies, both public and private. Such "cooperative administration" involved sharing the rehabilitation costs among the vocational rehabilitation and cooperating agencies, with the expenses serving as part of the states' matching funds.⁵⁶ By 1927, however, several states had established their own vocational rehabilitation hospitals, clinics, and convalescent homes.⁵⁷

In the administration of the program, the vocational rehabilitation departments, located in the vocational education boards, usually consisted of a technical staff who reported to the director of the board. The staff was responsible for guiding the "supervisors" who generally had control of territorial divisions. The supervisors, in turn, monitored the activities of the agents.⁵⁸ The size and definition of this structure varied greatly from state to state. In many cases, the duties of the vocational rehabilitation staff overlapped with those of the vocational education. An account of the early administration in

Arkansas, for example, showed the duties of vocational rehabilitation as simply superimposed on the existing vocational education structure.⁵⁹ As observed above, this was not a situation beneficial to the development of vocational rehabilitation.

CHAPTER V
DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRAINTS IN THE 1920's

The action precipitated by World War I brought a close to Stage I. A system of vocational rehabilitation was officially established by the federal government, thus coordinating the various contributory roots, and realizing the goals of the avant-garde. However, as recognized in the foregoing chapter, the program did not yet stand in its mature form. In describing the evolution of a system of public service provision, the model has predicted a three-stage process, the initial establishment being followed by a period of settling, prior to the constitution of the evolved program. In this instance, the lag was due in part to the mood of the period immediately following the 1920 vocational rehabilitation legislation.

The decade of the 1920's represents a deadlock in the evolution of the vocational rehabilitation system. A growing bureaucracy proceeded to develop the programmatic content and became increasingly vocal in its demands for full public support. But the progress which might have resulted from this activity was stymied by general inertia, an obstacle to any innovation, and specifically by the conservative reaction which set in after 1920 and which crippled progressive legislation. Although the developmental forces were held in abeyance, they were making progress in the evolution of the concept of vocational rehabilitation and in mustering support. Thus upon the arrival of the

second forcing variable, the depression, the confirmation of vocational rehabilitation could be readily accomplished. This chapter will describe the opposing forces -- the vocational rehabilitation movement and the conservative reaction -- and summarize the legislative action (or inaction) that ensued.

By establishing a vocational rehabilitation program in 1920, the legislation created the forces for its self-perpetuation, for it propagated a bureaucracy of officials and administrators which, once formed, provided a primary source of support for the continuation of the service. These officials came from a number of fields, many of which had been formative factors in the vocational rehabilitation legislation: vocational education, workmen's compensation, and various medical or social organizations, both public and private. Participation in further legislative efforts demonstrates their assumption of advocacy: while the first hearings in 1918 witnessed representatives from a wide range of associations and boards, the principal supporters at subsequent hearings on the renewal of the legislation comprised state or federal officials.¹ In 1925, the efforts of this group were coordinated through the National Civilian Rehabilitation Conference (later the National Rehabilitation Association), an organization whose membership included those persons employed by the state or federal government in the vocational rehabilitation of disabled civilians.² As will be seen later, the organization was instrumental in the legislative process.

In terms of the philosophy of public service provision, this element was firm in its conviction of federal responsibility. In 1926, Oscar Sullivan and Kenneth Snortum, prominent rehabilitation officials, dismissed paternalism as a dead issue and contended that the only valid

question was one of need and efficiency: if a social program could be best accomplished by the federal government, "...then the task should be assumed by government regardless of antiquated laissez-faire doctrines in economics...."³ The 1925 National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled Civilian revealed similar opinions. Homer Folks, although representing a voluntary organization, applauded rehabilitation as a state and federal function:

This is infinitely better than if there had grown up a series of voluntary agencies more or less indefinite, aiming to accomplish what is at heart a public duty and a proper public function.⁴

R.M. Little, chief of the New York State bureau of rehabilitation, made the following progressive statement:

There is a growing national consciousness which cannot be satisfied with different levels of intelligence, public spirit, education, and the economic and social well-being of the people. The original conception of the States being separate and distinct sovereignties...is fast being modified by the exigencies of national growth and development.⁵

An article in the 1927 Social Service Review further observed that the development of specialized care had brought about the transference of previously local functions to centralized authority.⁶

The 1925 Conference gave expression to the changing attitude toward the disabled. In the words of John Lapp of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

One of the faults that we have had in the past is that accidents and other human disasters have been considered personal....It is not the individual who causes these things.⁷

Referring to conservative Darwinism as a "coarse materialistic doctrine," he protested that "...we don't even have survival of the fittest in America today. We have the survival of the lucky."⁸ Yet the officials also recognized the economic component of vocational rehabilitation and were not blindly philanthropic:

...we can hardly expect the sympathetic and emotional interest... to be a sufficient basis for a prominent state service of this kind. The movement was started to achieve economic and social values. Rehabilitation is the fitting of a physically handicapped person for a remunerative occupation. ⁹

The Federal Board itself voiced an economic justification in urging the permanent establishment of the system:

...policy should be that vocational rehabilitation be permanently recognized as an important and vital part of our national program of conservation...a part of our national effort to attain the highest degree of efficiency as a nation. ¹⁰

The corps of bureaucrats, while promoting the philosophy, developed the method and program of the rehabilitation system as well. It has been noted above that the two major aspects of rehabilitation -- its comprehensiveness and its individualized basis -- were recognized by the rehabilitation officials from the start. In 1921 the Federal Board for Vocational Education began publishing bulletins defining the rehabilitation process and the case method. That this process should include physical restoration is evident from the following comment in the 5th Annual Report of the Board:

If the rehabilitation service is to render any assistance, at all, its first obligation is to determine the possibility of physical rehabilitation, and no effort should be spared to assist the person to secure the best of medical or surgical treatment. ¹¹

Thus, although the federal legislation had not provided for such services, the bureaucracy had recognized the necessity of a comprehensive system and was pressing for its realization. In 1922 and 1930, the Board published Bulletins 120 and 148, for the purposes of clarifying the program. These bulletins gave extensive consideration to the role and duties of the agents, and they provided detailed descriptions of the sequence of steps involved in the handling of a case, as well as guidelines

for utilizing the services of other agencies.¹² The rehabilitation system appears to have been fully defined by this time. Rehabilitation officials showed a further concern for the task of educating the public to the acceptance of cripples. The 1925 National Rehabilitation Conference devoted a session to this topic in an attempt to find better methods of allaying public fears and prejudices against the disabled.¹³

The work of the bureaucracy, however, encountered formidable opposition, as the 1920's ushered in a shift in temper from the progressivism of the first two decades to a conservative reaction. In 1920, the incoming Harding regime administered the coup de grace to a waning Wilsonian liberalism. Fatigued of philanthropy and reform in the aftermath of the war, and enjoying a boom of prosperity, the nation elected a government which allied with business interests to the downfall of progressivism. And Henry Ford assumed Andrew Carnegie's role as the "folk hero" of the era. Centralization and government intervention were now directed toward business efficiency. As envisioned by Secretary of Commerce Hoover, it was "a new era of national action, in which the federal government forms an alliance with the great trade associations and powerful corporations."¹⁴ Richard Hofstadter has observed,

Among the intellectuals themselves, upon whose activities the political culture of Progressivism had always been so dependent, there was a marked retreat from politics and public values toward the private and personal sphere.¹⁵

The Babbitry and ostrichlike behavior of the twenties were accompanied by an upsurge of intolerance: the post-war Red scare resulted in a movement to wipe out Bolshevism, strict immigration laws were passed, and the activities of the Ku Klux Klan reached a peak. It was the era of

the Scopes trial, the Sacco-Vanzetti case, and of Prohibition, a pitiful caricature of reform. Needless to say, the ground was hardly fertile for promoting a program that gave federal money to the disabled.

As might be expected, Congress was reluctant to extend federal subsidies. Sullivan and Snortum, writing at the time, lamented that "...altruistic sentiment ebbed...under insistent pressure for retrenchment."¹⁶ Even in the absence of such a mood, the inertia of old ideas would have been difficult to budge. The states rights argument ran strong throughout the period, and continual questions arose regarding the extent of federal prerogative in controlling or providing for the welfare of the citizens. As late as 1930, opposition to federal intervention was voiced by the National Advisory Committee on Education, a body composed primarily of educators and educational administrators. The Report of the Committee, commenting on the increasing centralized control and federal intervention in education (and the resulting standardization), reacted against such a trend:

The American people must face the problem of conflict between our traditional policy of state and local autonomy and this growing trend toward federal centralization....It is the conviction of this Committee that harm results when intimacy between schools and their patrons and neighbors is disturbed by remote control of a distant authority. ¹⁷

Such words appear as a discordant note when it is recalled that initial support for a federal program of vocational education and vocational rehabilitation had come from these very ranks of educators. It serves as an indicator of the effect brought about by the retrenchment of the 1920's. Even at the 1925 National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation, Homer Folks prefaced his remarks on the effectiveness of the federal program by saying that he realized that it was not "...very popular to say anything in favor of Federal aid right now."¹⁸

In the face of this discouraging situation, the vocational rehabilitation legislation came up for renewal of appropriations in 1924. The proponents of the bill to extend the program relied heavily on economic arguments and reports on the progress of the system. Representative Frederick Dallinger, who introduced the bill, asserted that

Vocational rehabilitation of the disabled citizen is not only a social problem, but it is a social economy...this legislation may be looked upon as part of a national program of conservation of national resources.... 19

Appealing to traditional ideals and to the anti-Bolshevist sentiment, he continued:

An independent self-supporting citizen in a satisfactory wage-earning employment is much less inclined toward radicalism and much less likely to be influenced by the agitator. 20

Continuing support for the bill came from the Federal Board for Vocational Education, the I.A.I.A.B.C., the American Federation of Labor, and the National Association of Building Trades Employers. 21

There was vigorous opposition, however, on the basis of constitutionality and states rights, enhanced by President Coolidge's opposition to expansion of federal subsidies. 22 Led by Representative Henry Tucker, the states rightists maintained that the bill was "an unwarranted and unconstitutional encroachment on states rights," 23 and that it forced the states to tax themselves extravagantly and unnecessarily. Tucker's speech in the Senate contended that the welfare clause in the Constitution did not apply to individual restoration to health, and that the federal government had no power to legislate on this subject. He concluded that "...this is a matter for, first the family to look after a disabled person,...and then the community, and, failing that, the State." 24 The supporters responded with counter arguments of considerable

legal complexity and Representative Bankhead reiterated his assertion that the intent of the legislation was merely to stimulate state action.²⁵ However, the consequences of such conflict produced an act which extended the authorization of appropriations for six years, but did not actually carry the appropriations, thus requiring Congress to act annually in order to continue to program.²⁶

In 1929, when legislative activities commenced in anticipation of the 1930 renewal, the bill, as introduced, had been drafted by the National Rehabilitation Association (N.R.A.). It contained, not surprisingly, amendments designed to give greater autonomy to the vocational rehabilitation divisions (within the departments of vocational education) as well as a proposal for indefinite extension of the appropriations and increases in the size of the grants.²⁷ At the hearings, proponents cited the rising number of disabling accidents each year, and maintained that federal responsibility had been established in the promotion of vocational training, the conservation of national resources, and the maintenance of national welfare. Other supporters came from various labor organizations, educational officials and organizations, employers associations, medics, and voluntary organizations.²⁸ The question of constitutionality and the welfare clause of the Constitution came under a great deal of fire. During the hearings held by the House Committee on Education, representatives of the Women Patriot Publishing Company and the Sentinels of the Republic voiced their opposition to the bill on Constitutional grounds.²⁹ Arguments of a similar bent arose in Congress, although Representative Reed maintained that "...Congress throughout almost all its history has acted upon a liberal interpretation of the welfare clause in the Constitution."³⁰ Congressional proponents also

made reference to the success of the program via reports from the various state administrations.³¹ The progressive elements were denied their hopes, however, for the law as enacted failed to increase appropriations (although minimum allotments and administrative budget of the Federal Board was increased) and to provide indefinite extension, the funding being extended for three years only.³²

In 1931, Representative William Bankhead introduced a bill sponsored by the N.R.A., which again attempted to increase grants and obtain permanent authorization.³³ By this time, the economic success of the program had proven itself, and cost-benefit arguments were used extensively in its support. Senator Patterson cited the earnings increases of the rehabilitants, and stated that the program had justified itself socially.³⁴ Observing the economic benefits as well as the urgent need of the program due to accidents, Senator Ellzay contended that vocational rehabilitation was equally as legitimate for the federal government as a national highway program.³⁵ The bill received widespread public support, through resolutions, telegrams, and letters from public officials, management and labor, health and welfare agencies, educators, and rehabilitation officials.³⁶ The latter were prominent in arguing the case for vocational rehabilitation at the hearings of the Education Committee. Opposition to permanent authorizations issued from the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which still envisioned the rehabilitation act as a temporary measure, and from the Sentinals of the Republic, presenting the usual constitutionality argument.³⁷ Also supporting states rights were Representatives McDuffie and Palmisano. The former, alarmed at the progress of such federal activities, envisioned their precipitation

of further federal encroachments: "If these come, what next?"³⁸ The opposition was sufficient to block the desired increase in appropriations, and the extension was still limited to four years.³⁹ Over twelve years, the advocates of vocational rehabilitation had succeeded only in holding their ground, for the spirit of the twenties had dampened their attempt to secure permanent legislation, to broaden services, and to increase appropriations.

CHAPTER VI

THE RATIFICATION OF A PUBLIC SERVICE

The previous chapter has demonstrated the difficulty encountered in securing a permanent status for the vocational rehabilitation program. Social inertia exhibited itself in both the unwillingness to relinquish the principles of local control, and the lingering prejudice against the disabled. As expressed by Oberman:

Most of the leaders in the movement were writing and speaking in enlightened terms, but not all of them could fully succeed in freeing themselves from the old confusion of disability with indigency, and of indigency with improvidence and lack of personal worth. The great lesson of the "great depression" -- that worthy and deserving people, also, could fall upon evil days -- had not yet been learned well enough by enough people. ¹

With the onslaught of the depression, however, utter necessity shattered social inertia. Carrying with them the permanent confirmation of vocational rehabilitation, reforms of the period brought an end to the second stage in the evolution of this program.

The significance of the depression in shaping public attitudes toward dependency merits further attention. Previous discussion has set forth the response sequence whereby pressures on society forced a re-evaluation of the public role in providing for its dependent classes. The rehabilitation solution that resulted was a logical outgrowth of social ideals. Yet as Richard Hofstadter has pointed out, the progressive reforms were accomplished during a period of general economic prosperity:

The whole reformist tradition...displayed a mentality founded on the existence of an essentially healthy society; it was chiefly concerned not with managing an economy to meet the problems of collapse but simply with democratizing an economy in sound working order. ²

During the depression, however, the economy was devastated and the prevailing situation posed a more substantial threat to the traditional individualistic ideals than ever before in the experience of the nation. The acknowledgement of public provision, as an endowment of the depression, stemmed less from a rational solution (as the rehabilitation concept promoted by the avant-garde) than from necessity and enforced empathy -- the "great lesson." Moreover, the distressed country was now willing to accept federal support and intervention, where it had previously held out for local control. In the case of vocational rehabilitation, the depression did not lend credence through substantiation of the economic-conservation argument, as the unemployment situation was severe enough without adding to the labor market. However, the general support of public programs and for dependents sufficed to carry the program where it had failed in the past.

Richard Hofstadter has written that

The New Deal, and the thinking it engendered, represented the triumphs of economic emergency and human need over inherited notions and inhibitions. ³

The role of necessity as a forcing variable cannot be contended; yet examination of some provisions of the New Deal reveals that the old ideals had by no means been abandoned. The Social Security Act affords an example. While providing for more massive federal aid and responsibility, the thrust of the act shows an attempt to ensure employment as opposed to a dole, and its measures promote rehabilitation rather than relief. The Report to the President of the Committee on Economic

Security in 1935 reflects the two basic elements of the solution initiated by the avant-garde. In the first place, public provision was to be an "institutional" welfare service: the Report envisioned employment measures as "...a permanent policy of the Government and not merely as an emergency measure."⁴ Secondly, the goal precluded almsgiving by seeking to provide the means of self-support:

In placing primary emphasis on employment, rather than unemployment compensation, we differ fundamentally from those who see social insurance as an all-sufficient program for economic security.⁵

Thus, despite the dramatic changes in policy and attitude wrought by the depression, one still finds society referring back to traditional ideals and attempting to ensure their realization.

The Committee on Economic Security had made specific reference to the vocational rehabilitation program in its consideration of measures to counteract the effects of the depression:

The work done [vocational rehabilitation] has shown gratifying annual increases, even in the depression, but it is still small in comparison with the need. The desirability of continuing the program and correlating service to workers in the general program of economic security we believe to be most evident.⁶

Despite this recommendation, the Economic Security bill, as introduced in Congress in 1935, contained grants for the care of crippled children but made no provision for vocational rehabilitation. The National Rehabilitation Association and other supporters, failing again in 1935 to secure permanent and increased grants for vocational rehabilitation through amendment of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, attempted to achieve their objectives through the Economic Security Act. Appearing before the Senate Committee on Finance, W.M. Walker of the N.R.A. stressed the past success of the program (75% increase in rehabilitants

from 1930 to 1935) and maintained that an act which provided for crippled children should include vocational rehabilitation as well: "...it is logically part of this permanent program of economic security."⁷ Similar arguments were presented to the House Committee on Ways and Means as John Lee, state division of vocational rehabilitation supervisor for Michigan, read from a report on his state showing both the need for and the economic significance of the program.⁸ His reasoning proved sufficient to convince the Committee, who later drafted the Social Security bill. Encompassed in this bill were provisions for the permanent funding of the vocational rehabilitation program and for increased appropriations (\$1,938,000 for grants and \$102,000 for federal administration).⁹

The vocational rehabilitation measures received no opposition in Congress. Representative Fletcher stressed the economic success of the program and the efficiency afforded by a federally operated system. He further asserted that Congress

...recognized the vocational rehabilitation of the physically disabled as a vital part of our national program of conservation of human as well as natural resources. The depression has emphasized the wisdom of having established it.¹⁰

Senator Harrison's confidence enabled him to state that he had not bothered to discuss the sections of the Social Security bill dealing with public health and rehabilitation because "...they are along traditional lines, merely augmenting and extending these services, and meeting universal approval."¹¹ With this minimal discussion of vocational rehabilitation, the Social Security Act was passed in 1935.

The secured position of the program facilitated continued steps in the development of vocational rehabilitation. Amendments to the

Social Security Act in 1939 awarded the program further increases in appropriations, and a revision of policies in that year permitted the use of federal funds, matched by the states, to cover maintenance costs during training.¹² Substantial changes in the program were brought about by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1942. In this legislation, vocational rehabilitation was redefined to include "any services necessary to render a disabled individual fit to engage in a remunerative occupation," and specific provision was made for "corrective surgery or therapeutic treatment," hospitalization, transportation, licenses, prosthetics, and training materials.¹³

By 1943, vocational rehabilitation had achieved federal support of all elements in a comprehensive system. Its proponents, however, did not cease their agitation for continued development of the program. Forecasting future evolution, many were pressing for the reduction of restrictions defining the client group as those with an expectation of substantial remunerative productivity. The obstacles they would encounter are exemplified by a rather condescending informational booklet, Your Vocational Rehabilitation, published by the N.R.A. itself in 1943. The writers cautioned that "Since the object of rehabilitation is employment, it is obvious that not every disabled person can be accepted for rehabilitation service."¹⁴ To those eligible, they dispensed these words of encouragement:

...you can make yourself successful....No one else can do it for you....No one can help you if you don't help yourself....By cultivating a good disposition and the right attitude toward your work, you can make yourself superior to the majority of people. ¹⁵

A statement of this nature indicates the degree to which traditional ideas were embedded in the concept of vocational rehabilitation.

CONCLUSION

In the conviction that a familiarity with the antecedents contributes to the solution of contemporary policy problems, this study has examined the origins of the vocational rehabilitation program. Although there has been no intention of producing specific policy recommendations, the conclusions arising from the investigation bear policy implications.

The analysis has generated two major propositions: that the evolution of policy surrounding a public service program is the product of a stimulus-response interaction between society and the impacting forces: and that the response is the logical outgrowth of that society's traditional values. Expanding this latter concept, the model describes the response as a conservative reaction to protect these values and to correct a threatening social imbalance. Applied to vocational rehabilitation and its potential development, such a conclusion suggests that an increasing public acceptance of the service will be a function of the degree to which it is perceived as correcting the imbalance. This feature could result in two departures in public appreciation of vocational rehabilitation, contingent on the management of the program. Correction of the imbalance through increased economic productivity was the original goal of rehabilitation, appealing to individualistic values. Yet excessive emphasis on the economic argument imparts a utilitarian character to the program, swallowing humanitarian elements and reinforcing the

tendency toward purely economic justification. An alternative approach might reduce this economic accent by emphasizing social health. Stressing the alleviation of imbalance through development of a well-adjusted population rather than through the production of dollars alone, this policy could encourage a sounder attitude toward the disabled. Humanitarianism would supersede materialism, as the basis of public support for an "institutional" service.

The latter approach is both more desirable and more difficult, all the more problematic considering the economic framework of the original program and its policies. But if the concept of vocational rehabilitation is to evolve beyond its inceptive level, recognition of this second emphasis should enter into the program objectives and their presentation to the public. Current program developments project optimism for such a trend.

Since the 1940's, major changes have taken place in vocational rehabilitation. The field has viewed the growth of a high degree of professionalism. In subsequent amendments to the legislation, several measures have expanded the definition of eligibility and broadened the scope of rehabilitation services. Recent programmatic innovations include the extension of services to the family of the handicapped and to cases of psychological disorder, as well as the provision of follow-up care after closure. For purposes of eligibility, the pending 1972 legislation has defined the "severely handicapped" as "...any individual who 1) has a physical or mental disability and 2) can reasonably be expected to benefit from rehabilitation services."¹ The breadth of this definition and the reduction of the vocational emphasis represent a significant shift in the programs' underlying philosophy. A provision of this nature

extends beyond the scope of the original legislation, and presents a sharp contrast to the principles upon which it was based. Moreover, it denotes an attenuation of the materialistic element and a further reduction of the sense of personal responsibility for disability.

This study has maintained a specific focus on the initial establishment of a vocational rehabilitation program, its sources and the process of its confirmation. Emphasizing the conservative nature of society's response, it has described public services as a change in the means of welfare provision rather than an alteration of the concept of welfare. The name itself, vocational rehabilitation, reveals its origins in an individualistic tradition. Recent advances indicate an evolution beyond this point, and suggest a change in the concept of welfare: that economic self-support no longer proves sufficient as a measure of social well-being. Analysis of such a transformation must examine not only exogenous pressures and societal maturation, but the forces internal to the program as well. Once founded, a program and its adherent professionals produce an additional development impetus. A model for evolution beyond the initial establishment must incorporate this factor, for its impact has been substantial. The emergence of a concept of rehabilitation from that of vocational rehabilitation signals this new stage in social responsibility and the public provision of services.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare (New York: The Free Press), p. 17.
2. Roy Lubove, The Struggle for Social Security, 1900-1935 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 14.
3. Robert H. Bremner, From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States (New York: New York University Press, 1956).
4. David J. Rothman, The Discovery of the Asylum, Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971), p. xviii.
5. Michel Foucault, Madness and Civilization, A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason (New York: Random House, 1965).
6. C. Esco Oberman, A History of Vocational Rehabilitation in America (Minneapolis: T.S. Dennison and Co., Inc., 1965).
7. Mary E. MacDonald, Federal Grants for Vocational Rehabilitation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944).
8. Oscar M. Sullivan and Kenneth O. Snortum, Disabled Persons, Their Education and Rehabilitation (New York: The Century Company, 1926).
9. Wilensky and Lebeaux, op. cit., p. 138.
10. Ibid.

CHAPTER II

1. Blanche D. Coll, Perspectives in Public Welfare (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 19.
2. Wilensky and Lebeaux, op. cit., p. 138.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 42.

5. Charles Bonaparte, "What a Charity Organization Society Can Do and What It Cannot," Charities Review, I, no. 5 (1892), p. 203.
6. Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1884 (Boston: George H. Ellis, 1886); Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1876 (Albany: Joel Munsell, 1876).
7. Robert H. Bremner, From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States (New York: New York University Press, 1956), p. 16.
8. Horace Mann, "Twelfth Annual Report to the Legislature of Massachusetts" (1848), in Louis Filler, ed., Horace Mann on the Crisis in Education (Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1965), p. 119.
9. Samuel Gridley Howe, Report Made to the Legislature of Massachusetts Upon Idiocy (Boston: Coolidge and Wiley, 1848), p. 25.
10. Ibid., pp. 8-9.
11. Sixth Annual Report of the Seaman's Aid Society of the City of Boston (Boston: James B. Dow, 1839), p. 3.
12. Bremner, op. cit., p. 46.
13. Ibid., p. 48.
14. Francis G. Peabody, "The Problem of Charity," Charities Review, III, no. 1 (1893), p. 5.
15. Walter A. Friedlander, Introduction to Social Welfare (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 168.
16. Coll, op. cit., p. 44.
17. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1870 (Washington, D.C.: 1870), p. 372.
18. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1880, p. clxxiii.
19. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1880, p. clxxix.
20. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1872, pp. 435-436.
21. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1880, p. clxxix.
22. U.S. Department of the Interior, Census Office, Report on the Insane, Feeble-Minded, Deaf and Dumb, and Blind in the United States, by John S. Billings, M.D. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895).

23. "Concerning the Causes of Poverty," Charities Review, IV, no. 3, (1895), pp. 142-146.
24. In Coll, op. cit., p. 61.
25. Ibid., p. 64.

CHAPTER III

1. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1884-1885, p. xi.
2. U.S., National Advisory Committee on Education, Federal Relations to Education: Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education: Part I, Committee Findings and Recommendations (Washington, D.C.: National Capital Press, Inc., 1931), p. 11.
3. Wilensky and Lebeaux, op. cit., pp. 58-67.
4. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1880, pp. ccxxxiv-ccxxv.
5. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1878-1879, p. xcxviii.
6. Ibid., pp. ccxxxiv-ccxxxv.
7. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1884-1885, pp. ccvii-ccviii.
8. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1875, p. clxxiv.
9. U.S., Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Public Instruction in Industrial Pursuits, by Charles Marble, Circular of Information no. 4 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1884), p. 129.
10. U.S., Congress, Senate, Vocational Education Speech of Hon. Carroll S. Page, Sen. Doc. 845, 62nd Cong., 2nd Sess., 1912.
11. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1912, v. I, p. 287.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., p. 21.
14. Ibid., p. 292.
15. U.S., Congress, House, Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, House Doc. 1004, 63rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1914, pp. 18-19.
16. Ibid., p. 12.

17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Soldiers and Sailors, Bulletin no. 5 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918), p. 12.
20. U.S., Congress, House, Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, House Doc. 1004, 63rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1914, p. 17.
21. Howe, op. cit., p. 53.
22. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1882-1883, p. cxvii.
23. Proceedings of the 11th Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf (Sacramento: State Office, Supt. of State Printing, 1887), pp. 12-14.
24. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1870, pp. 371-372.
25. Mertice M'Crea Buck, "Work for the Deformed: What Is Being Done to Give Crippled Children a Chance to Become Useful Members of Society," The Craftsman, XXI (Apr., 1907-Sept., 1907), p. 194.
26. Edith Reeves, The Care and Education of Crippled Children in the United States (New York: Survey Associates, Inc., 1914), p. 13.
27. H. Winnett Orr, "The Relation of Politics to the State Care of Crippled and Deformed," Journal of the American Medical Association, LXI (1913), pp. 1521-1522.
28. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1871, p. 448.
29. Reeves, op. cit., p. 108.
30. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1871, p. 448.
31. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1870, pp. 532-533.
32. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1871, pp. 680-691.
33. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1972, pp. 680-681.
34. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1874, p. 774.
35. Douglas C. McMurtrie, Bibliography of the Education and Care of Crippled Children (New York: Douglas C. McMurtrie, 1913).
36. Oscar M. Sullivan and Kenneth O. Snortum, Disabled Persons, Their Education and Rehabilitation (New York: The Century Co., 1926), pp. 10-11.

37. C. Esco Oberman, A History of Vocational Rehabilitation in America (Minneapolis: T.S. Dennison and Co., Inc., 1965), p. 105.
38. Katherine Shrady, "The History of the Federation of Associations of Care for Cripples," American Journal of Care for Cripples, I, no. 1 (1914), pp. 21-22.
39. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1884-1885, p. ccxxxiii.
40. Shrady, op. cit., p. 56.
41. Gwilym Davis, "The Education of Crippled Children," American Journal of Care for Cripples, I, no. 1 (1914), p. 8.
42. Reeves, op. cit., p. 144.
43. Ibid., p. 170.
44. Ibid., p. 145.
45. Ibid., pp. 161, 166.
46. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1880, p. clxviii.
47. Reeves, op. cit., p. 226.
48. U.S., Congress, House, Report of the Committee on Education, House Rept. 2424, 56th Cong., 2nd sess., 1901, p. 5.
49. S.P. Breckinridge, "Frontiers of Control in Public Administration," Social Service Review, I (1927), p. 86.
50. Oberman, op. cit., p. 122.
51. U.S., Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Proceedings of the 7th Annual Meeting of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, Bulletin no. 281 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), p. 123.
52. Oberman, op. cit., p. 124.
53. R. Mayo-Smith, "Workmen's Insurance," Charities Review, I, no. 2 (1891), p. 54.
54. Oberman, op. cit., p. 119.
55. U.S., Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Labor, Recent Action Relating to Employer's Liability and Workmen's Compensation, by Lindley D. Clark, Bulletin no. 90 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910), p. 676.

56. Oberman, op. cit., p. 120.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., p. 121.
59. Bureau of Labor Statistics, The Safety Movement in the Iron and Steel Industry, 1907-1917, by Lucian Chaney and Hugh Hanna, Bulletin no. 234 (1918), p. 14.
60. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, Bulletin 210 (1917), p. 212.
61. Ibid., p. 213.
62. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Proceedings of the 7th Annual Meeting of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, Bulletin 281 (1921), p. 126.
63. Oberman, op. cit., p. 213.
64. Sullivan and Snortum, op. cit., p. 18.
65. Ibid., p. 18.
66. Ibid., p. 19.
67. Oberman, op. cit., p. 214.
68. Sullivan and Snortum, op. cit., p. 19.
69. Ibid.
70. Oberman, op. cit., p. 215.
71. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, Bulletin no. 248 (1917), p. 187.
72. Ibid., p. 301.
73. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Proceedings of the 5th Annual Meeting of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, Bulletin no. 263 (1919), p. 224.
74. Ibid., p. 203.
75. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1878, p. cxcix.
76. Sullivan and Snortum, op. cit., p. 10.

77. "Editorial Notes," American Journal of Care for Cripples, II, no. 4 (1915), p. 178.
78. Gertrude Stein, "Placement Technique in the Employment Work of the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men," Publications of the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men, Series I, no. 9 (New York: Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men, 1918), p. 3.
79. U.S., Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Labor, 25th Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, 1910 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911), p. 412.
80. Ibid., p. 419.
81. Ibid., p. 412.
82. U.S., Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Labor, Statistics of Unemployment and the Work of Unemployment Offices, by Frank B. Sargent, Bulletin no. 109 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913), p. 35-36.
83. Ibid.
84. Catalogue of the Public Documents of the 63rd Congress and of All Departments of the Government of the United States, July 1, 1913 - June 30, 1915 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918), p. 601.
85. U.S. Congress, House, Report of the Committee on Labor to Accompany H.R. 19015, House Rept. 1429, 63rd Cong., 3rd sess. (1915), p. 71.
86. Catalogue of the Public Documents of the 63rd Congress and of All Departments of the Government of the United States, July 1, 1913 - June 30, 1915 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918), p. 601.

CHAPTER IV

1. Mary E. MacDonald, Federal Grants for Vocational Rehabilitation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), p. 8.
2. "The Passing of the Cripple," Outlook (1917), in American Journal of Care for Cripples, V, no. 2 (1918), p. 237.
3. Sullivan and Snortum, op. cit., pp. 509-514.
4. Lt. Col. Harry E. Mock, "Human Conservation and Reclamation," American Journal of Care for Cripples, VI, no. 1 (1919), p. 5.
5. Ibid., p. 10.

6. Mock, op. cit., pp. 6-7.
7. Oberman, op. cit., p. 150.
8. See Publications of the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men, Series I and II (New York: Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men, 1918, 1919).
9. American Journal of Care for Cripples, VI, VII, VIII (1918, 1919).
10. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Proceedings of the National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled Civilian, 1925, Bulletin no. 104 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), p. 93.
11. William Bennett Munro, "Civic Responsibility for Public Welfare," California State Conference Social Agencies Bulletin, II, no. 1 (1918), p. 11.
12. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Proceedings of the National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled Civilian, 1925, Bulletin no. 104 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), p. 88.
13. Oberman, op. cit., p. 137.
14. Ibid., p. 149.
15. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 30.
16. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation in the United States, Bulletin no. 120 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), p. 88.
17. Public Law 236, 66th Congress, June 2, 1920, Sec. 2.
18. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Industrial Rehabilitation, General Administration, and Case Procedure, Bulletin no. 64, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), p. 9.
19. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 58.
20. Public Law 236, 66th Congress, June 2, 1920, Sec. 2.
21. MacDonald, op. cit., pp. 42-43.
22. 58 Congressional Record 1452-1455 (June 20, 1919).
23. U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Education and Labor, Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons Disabled in Industry, Joint Hearings before the Committees on Education and Labor on S. 4922, 65th Cong., 2nd sess., 1918.

24. MacDonald, op. cit., pp. 44-45.
25. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 41.
26. Ibid., p. 45.
27. U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Education and Labor, Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons Disabled in Industry, Joint Hearings before the Committees on Education and Labor on S. 4922, 65th Cong., 2nd sess., 1918, pp. 40ff.
28. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 49.
29. U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Education and Labor, Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons Disabled in Industry, Joint Hearings before the Committees on Education and Labor on S. 4922, 65th Cong., 2nd sess., 1918.
30. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 55.
31. 58 Congressional Record 1388 (June 19, 1919).
32. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 49.
33. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Education and Labor, Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons Disabled in Industry, Joint Hearings before the Committees on Education and Labor on S. 4922, 65th Cong., 2nd sess., 1918, p. 8.
34. Ibid., p. 10.
35. 58 Congressional Record 6741 (Oct. 11, 1919).
36. Ibid., pp. 1452-1455 (June 10, 1919).
37. Ibid., p. 7035 (Oct. 16, 1919).
38. Ibid., p. 512 (June 2, 1919).
39. Ibid., p. 6645 (Oct. 9, 1919).
40. Ibid., p. 7029 (Oct. 16, 1919).
41. Ibid., p. 7041 (Oct. 16, 1919).
42. Ibid., p. 513 (June 2, 1919).
43. U.S. National Advisory Committee on Education, Federal Relations to Education: Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education: Part I, Committee Findings and Recommendations (Washington, D.C.: National Capital Press, Inc., 1931), p. 11.
44. Oberman, op. cit., p. 224.

45. 58 Congressional Record 6645 (Oct. 9, 1919).
46. Oberman, op. cit., p. 216.
47. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 52.
48. Friedlander, op. cit., pp. 171-172.
49. Ibid., p. 381.
50. Coll, op. cit., pp. 78-79.
51. Reeves, op. cit., p. 36.
52. Sullivan and Snortum, op. cit., p. 129.
53. U.S. Federal Board for Vocational Education, Annual Report, 1926 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), p. 121.
54. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Industrial Rehabilitation, General Administration and Case Procedure, Bulletin no. 64 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), p. 28, ff.
55. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation in the United States, Bulletin no. 120 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1927), p. 35.
56. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 185.
57. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation in the United States, Bulletin no. 120 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1927), p. 60.
58. Ibid., p. 34.
59. University of Arkansas Department of Vocational Teacher Education, History, Philosophy and Principles of Rehabilitation ([Fayetteville]: University of Arkansas, College of Education, Department of Vocational Teacher Education, 1957), p. 14.

CHAPTER V

1. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 68.
2. Oberman, op. cit., p. 357.
3. Sullivan and Snortum, op. cit., p. 515.
4. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Proceedings of the National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled Civilian, 1925, Bulletin no. 104 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), p. 14.

5. Ibid., p. 111.
6. S. P. Breckinridge, "Frontiers of Control in Public Welfare Administration," Social Service Review, I (1927), p. 84.
7. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Proceedings of the National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled Civilian, 1925, Bulletin no. 104 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), p. 89.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., p. 112.
10. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Annual Report, 1921 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), p. 346.
11. Ibid., p. 313.
12. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation in the United States, Bulletin no. 120 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1927), p. 148.
13. Ibid. pp. 129ff.
14. Ibid., p. 239.
15. Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform, From Bryan to F.D.R. (New York: Random House, 1955), p. 286.
16. Sullivan and Snortum, op. cit., p. 27.
17. National Advisory Committee on Education, Federal Relations to Education: Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education: Part I, Committee Findings and Recommendations (Washington, D.C.: National Capital Press, Inc., 1931), p. 11.
18. U.S., Federal Board for Vocational Education, Proceedings of the National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled Civilian, 1925, Bulletin no. 104 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), p. 12.
19. 65 Congressional Record 8292-8293 (May 10, 1924).
20. Ibid., p. 8293.
21. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 63.
22. Ibid., p. 64.
23. Ibid., p. 65.

24. Cited in U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Hearings before the Committee on Education on H.R. 7138, 71st Cong., 2nd sess., 1930, p. 127.
25. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 65.
26. Ibid., p. 66.
27. Ibid., pp. 67-69.
28. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Hearings before the Committee on Education on H.R. 7138, 71st Cong., 2nd sess., 1930.
29. Ibid., p. 127.
30. 72 Congressional Record 7890 (April 28, 1930).
31. Ibid., p. 7882.
32. MacDonald, op. cit., pp. 69-70.
33. Ibid., p. 71.
34. Reports from the states illustrated the earnings increases. As recorded in the 1930 hearings, Michigan reported an increase in rehabilitants' earnings from \$2.28 per week to \$25.39 per week. Minnesota had rehabilitated between 150 and 200 cases per year with annual earnings of \$1000. The Congressional Record for May 18, 1932 included New York's statistics: rehabilitants averaged \$1000 per year as compared to their previous maintenance costs of \$300 per year. (Note: all figures represent the contemporary dollar value.)
35. 75 Congressional Record 10581 (May 18, 1932).
36. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 71.
37. Ibid., p. 73.
38. Ibid., p. 75.
39. Ibid., p. 74.

CHAPTER VI

1. Oberman, op. cit., p. 265.
2. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 306.
3. Ibid., p. 316.

4. U.S., Committee on Economic Security, Report to the President of the Committee on Economic Security (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), p. 9.
5. Ibid., p. 49.
6. Ibid., p. 48.
7. U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Finance, Economic Security Act, Hearings before the Committee on Finance on S. 1130, 74th Cong., 1st sess., 1935, pp. 425-426.
8. U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Ways and Means, Economic Security Act, Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 4120, 74th Cong., 1st sess., 1935, pp. 464-466.
9. MacDonald, op. cit., pp. 81-82.
10. 79 Congressional Record 5599 (April 13, 1935).
11. 79 Congressional Record 9270 (June 14, 1935).
12. Oberman, op. cit., p. 275.
13. Ibid., p. 286.
14. Henry D. Hicker and Frank H. Hart, Jr., Your Vocational Rehabilitation (Roanoke, Virginia: National Rehabilitation Association, 1943), p. 6.
15. Ibid., pp. 8-11.

CONCLUSION

1. U.S., Congress, House, A Bill To Amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 92nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1972, H.R. 8395, pp. 127-128.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Public Documents

1. Congressional Debates and Laws

Congressional RecordUnited States Statutes at Large

2. Hearings and Reports of Congressional Committees (chronologically).

U.S. Congress. House. Report of the Committee on Education. House Rept. 5, 56th Cong., 1st sess., 1899.

_____. House. Report of the Committee on Education. House Rept. 2424, 56th Cong., 2nd sess., 1901.

_____. Senate. Vocational Education Speech of Hon. Carroll S. Page. S. Doc. 845, 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1912.

_____. House, Report of the Committee on Labor to accompany H.R. 19015. House Rept. 1429, 63rd Cong., 3rd sess., 1915.

_____. Senate. Committee on Education and Labor. Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons Disabled in Industry. Joint hearings before the Committees on Education and Labor on S. 4922. 65th Cong., 2nd sess., 1918.

_____. House. Committee on Education. Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons Disabled in Industry or Otherwise and Their Return to Civil Employment. Hearings before the Committee on Education on H.R. 12880. 65th Cong., 3rd sess., 1919.

_____. House. Committee on Education. Vocational Rehabilitation. Hearing before the Committee on Education on H.R. 7138. 71st Cong., 2nd sess., 1930.

_____. House. Committee on Ways and Means. Economic Security Act. Hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 4120, 74th Cong., 1st sess., 1935.

_____. Senate. Committee on Finance. Economic Security Act. Hearings before the Committee on Finance on S. 1130. 74th Cong., 1st sess., 1935.

_____. House. A Bill to Amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.
92nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1972, H.R. 8395.

3. Publications of Federal Departments

U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Labor. 25th Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, 1910. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911.

_____. Recent Action Relating to Employer's Liability and Workmen's Compensation, by Lindley D. Clark. Bulletin no. 90. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910.

_____. Statistics of Unemployment and the Work of Unemployment Offices, by Frank B. Sargent. Bulletin no. 109. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education: 1879-1912. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

_____, Public Instruction in Industrial Pursuits, by Charles Marble. Circular of Information no. 4. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1884.

_____. Census Office. Report on the Insane, Feeble-Minded, Deaf and Dumb, and Blind in the United States, by John S. Billings, M.D. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Safety Movement in the Iron and Steel Industry, 1907-1917, by Lucian Chaney and Hugh Hanna. Bulletin no. 234. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918.

U.S. Federal Board for Vocational Education. Annual Reports: 1917-1924. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

_____. Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Soldiers and Sailors. Bulletin no. 5. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918.

_____. Industrial Rehabilitation, General Administration and Case Procedure. Bulletin no. 64. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921.

_____. The Proceedings of the National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled Civilian, 1925. Bulletin no. 104. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926.

_____. Vocational Rehabilitation in the United States. Bulletin no. 120. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1927.

4. Miscellaneous Public Documents

Catalogue of the Public Documents of the 63rd Congress and of All Departments of the United States, July 1, 1913 - June 30, 1915. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918.

International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions. Proceedings of Annual Meetings: 1916-1919. Issued as Bulletins of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1916-1933. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1916-1933.

Report of the Proceedings of the First National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons Disabled in Industry or Otherwise, 1922. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914.

U.S. Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education. Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914.

U.S. Committee on Economic Security. Report to the President of the Committee on Economic Security. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935.

U.S. National Advisory Committee on Education. Federal Relations to Education, Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education: Part I, Committee Findings and Recommendations. Washington, D.C.: National Capital Press, Inc., 1931.

II. Private Sector: Primary Sources

Bonaparte, Charles. "What a Charity Organization Society Can Do and What It Cannot." Charities Review, I, no. 5 (1892), pp. 201-210.

Breckinridge, S.P. "Frontiers of Control in Public Welfare Administration." Social Service Review, I (1927), pp. 84-99.

Buck, Mertice M'Crea. "Work For the Deformed: What Is Being Done to Give Crippled Children a Chance to Become Useful Members of Society." The Craftsman, XII (Apr., 1907 - Sept., 1907), p. 193.

"Concerning the Causes of Poverty." Charities Review, IV, no. 3 (1894), pp. 142-146.

Davis, Gwilym. "The Education of Crippled Children." American Journal of Care for Cripples, I, no. 1 (1914), pp. 5-13.

"Editorial Notes." American Journal of Care for Cripples, II, no. 4 (1915), pp. 175-192.

Hicker, Henry D., and Frank Hart, Jr. Your Vocational Rehabilitation. Roanoke, Virginia: National Rehabilitation Association, 1943.

Howe, Samuel Gridley. The Education of Laura Bridgeman, a compilation of reports published by Julia Ward Howe. Boston: 1893.

_____. Report Made to the Legislature of Massachusetts Upon Idiocy. Boston: Coolidge and Wiley, 1848.

Mayo-Smith, R. "Workingmen's Insurance." Charities Review, I, no. 2 (1891), pp. 49-54.

McMurtrie, Douglas C. Bibliography of the Education and Care of Crippled Children. New York: Douglas C. McMurtrie, 1913.

Mock, Lt. Col. Harry E. "Human Conservation and Reclamation." American Journal of Care for Cripples, VI, no. 1 (1918), pp. 5-11.

Munro, William Benett. "Civic Responsibility for Public Welfare." California State Conference Social Agencies Bulletin, II, no. 1 (1918), pp. 11-12.

Orr, H. Winnett. "The Relation of Politics to the State Care of Crippled and Deformed." Journal of the American Medical Association, LXI (1913), pp. 1521-1522.

Painter, Charles F. "The Responsibility of the Public in Solving the Problem of the Care of the Crippled." American Journal of Care for Cripples, V, no. 1 (1918), pp. 192-201.

"The Passing of the Cripple." Outlook (1917), in American Journal of Care for Cripples, V, no. 2 (1918), pp. 237-238.

Peabody, Francis G. "The Problem of Charity." Charities Review, III, no. 1 (1893), pp. 1-16.

Proceedings of the Eleventh Convention of the American Instructors of the Deaf. Sacramento: State Office, Supt. of State Printing, 1887.

Proceedings of the National Conference of Corrections and Charities, 1876. Albany: Joel Munsell, 1876.

Proceedings of the National Conference of Corrections and Charities, 1884. Boston: George H. Ellis, 1885.

Reeves, Edith. The Care and Education of Crippled Children in the United States. New York: Survey Associates, Inc., 1914.

Shrady, Katherine. "The History of the Federation of Associations for Cripples." American Journal of Care for Cripples, I, no. 1 (1914), pp. 21-27.

Sixth Annual Report of the Managers of the Seaman's Aid Society of the City of Boston. Boston: James B. Dow, 1839.

Stein, Gertrude. "Placement Technique in the Employment Work of the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men." Publications of the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men, Series I, no. 9 (1918).

University of Arkansas, Department of Vocational Teacher Education. History, Philosophy, and Principles of Rehabilitation. [Fayetteville]: University of Arkansas, College of Education, Department of Vocational Teacher Education, 1957.

III. Private Sector: Secondary Sources

Bremner, Robert H. From the Depths, The Discovery of Poverty in the United States. New York: New York University Press, 1956.

Coll, Blanche D. Perspectives in Public Welfare. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Filler, Louis, ed. Horace Mann on the Crisis in Education. Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1965.

Friedlander, Walter A. Introduction to Social Welfare. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Foucault, Michel. Madness and Civilization, A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason. New York: Random House, 1965.

Gillin, John L. Poverty and Dependency. New York: The Century Company, 1921.

Goldman, Eric. Rendezvous with Destiny, A History of Modern American Reform. New York: Random House, 1952.

Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform, From Bryan to F.D.R. New York: Random House, 1955.

Kanner, Leo. A History of the Care and Study of the Mentally Retarded. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.

Lubove, Roy. The Struggle for Social Security, 1900-1935. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

MacDonald, Mary E. Federal Grants for Vocational Rehabilitation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Oberman, C. Esco. A History of Vocational Rehabilitation in America. Minneapolis: T.S. Dennison and Co., Inc. 1965.

Sullivan, Oscar M., and Kenneth O. Snortum. Disabled Persons, Their Education and Rehabilitation. New York: The Century Company, 1926.

Wilensky, Harold, and Charles N. Lebeaux. Industrial Society and Social Welfare. New York: The Free Press, 1958.