

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

**“How to Handle Your Double Job”: Maternal Employment, the
State, and Childcare in World War II, 1942-1946**

By

Emily Grace Yekikian

June 2023

A paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts degree in the
Master of Arts Program in the Social Sciences

Faculty Advisor: Gabe Winant
Preceptor: John McCallum

World War II was a unique moment when perceptions of womanhood, motherhood, and labor clashed because of the issues surrounding child welfare. Existing scholarship on women's experience of the Second World War reveals that this history is far more nuanced than the common perception of Rosie the Riveter, symbolized by her denim overalls, red bandana, and flexed bicep muscle.¹ Polly Crow found herself thrust into the workforce when her husband, William, was drafted in 1943 and she was left to take of herself and their nine-month-old son.² Jayne Lynott Carroll tucked her infant son in at 10 o'clock at night and then went to work the graveyard shift at a nearby war plant, leaving Billy in the care of her friend Sue, who she shared her home with.³ The stories of Polly and Jayne, though just two women, represent the millions of mothers who were suddenly faced with serious practical problems about how to manage their double job of wage work and homemaking.⁴ Mass-mobilization for total war created an extreme situation. The draft caused the withdrawal of men from the workforce and sustaining the war effort placed extraordinary production demands on the nation's economy. Women, then, were left to undertake new roles and navigate changes to existing ones.

Questions of childcare point to interesting issues surrounding the cultural anxiety that arise when women, but especially mothers, work outside of the home. While women were not

¹ Karen Anderson's *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women During World War II*, Susan Hartmann's *The Homefront and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s*, and D'Ann Campbell's *Women at War with America: Private Lives in a Patriotic Era* are landmark works that helped to bring the experience of American women during World War II to the forefront. As such, they read largely as surveys of the women's experience during the war years. They tackled questions such as: Was this a watershed moment for women's liberation as gainful employment opportunities abounded? How did women respond the pressures of war on the home front as well as the warfront? Or was the liberative potential of the period stymied by gendered norms? These questions seep into several historiographies including those of women, labor, family, children, and social welfare. Historians, sociologists, economists, political scientists, and social workers have all taken their stab at breaking open the nuances involved in childcare during those war years.

² Judy Barrett Litoff and David C. Smith, eds., *Since You Went Away: World War II Letters from American Women on the Home Front* (Oxford University Press, 1991), 145.

³ Jayne Lynott Carroll, "Raising a Baby on Shifts," *Parents Magazine*, October 1943, 20, 77-78, 80. From the Library of Congress, (accessed March 14, 2023).

⁴ Gladys Denny Shultz, "If You're Needed in a War-Plant, Mother... here are ideas on how to manage your double job," *Better Homes & Gardens*, June 1943, 9, 59-61. From the Library of Congress, (accessed March 13, 2023).

strangers to work, both remunerated and not, prior to 1940—especially African American women who historically had to work outside of the home compared to their white counterparts—the Second World War was the first time that women entered the labor force en masse. Poor, working, and middle-class women of all ethnicities and races took up the patriotic call and the economic opportunity to do their part in the war effort. Between 1940 and 1944 female employment grew by nearly half, from 13 million to 19 million, as roughly six million women took up jobs in occupations from manufacturing to clerical work.⁵ Young, single women made up the majority of women workers at the onset of the war, but overtime older women and married women joined the fold.⁶ Particularly after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, which prompted the entry of the United States into the Second World War, it became clear that more men would be needed on the military front, stimulating women to fill the roles left by them as war production needs ramped up in the years that followed.

The proportion of working women who were mothers, especially of children younger than fourteen, was small in comparison to other classifications of working women. Specifically, 20 percent of all women working in major defense centers had children under fourteen and the percent of mothers with children under six rose from 9 percent in 1940 to 12 percent in 1944.⁷ Yet, that was still a significant increase, especially when considering that mothers with children

⁵ U.S. Department of Labor. Women's Bureau: Changes in Women's Employment During the War, Special Bulletin No. 20, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1994; Stoltzfus, Emilie. "Child Care: The Federal Role During World War II." Congressional Research Service, June 29, 2000. <https://crsreports.congress.gov>. RS20615

⁶ Susan M. Hartmann, *The Home Front and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s*, (Twayne, 1982), 78. Hartmann notes that more than 2 million women who entered the workforce during the war years were 35 years of age or older. The percentage of those aged 35-44 in the labor force grew from 27.3 to 37.2 percent and the proportion of women aged 45 and over at work grew from 16.4 to 21 percent.

⁷ D'Ann Campbell, *Women at War with America: Private Lives in a Patriotic Era*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), 82. While the numbers and percentages do vary between sources, they are all roughly similar. Susan Hartmann provides statistics too, noting that more than half a million women with children under ten took up wartime employment. The numbers of this population of women grew from 7.8 to 12.1 percent in 1944. Hartmann, *Home Front and Beyond*, 78.

at home were initially discouraged from work. Formal policy from the Roosevelt administration on employing mothers with children under 14 came from the War Manpower Commission in a 1943 statement asserting that “special efforts to secure the employment of women with young children be deferred until all other sources of local labor supply have been exhausted, in order that established family life will not be unnecessarily disrupted.”⁸ However, that policy soon became incompatible with the war production needs of the nation. While an increasing number of women accepted employment in all sectors, it was their move into traditionally male occupations, like factory work, that chiefly caused reservations. During the war years, the government (and society writ large) was unable to reconcile traditional notions of familial and gender roles with the need for war production. This was new territory for many women, families, and the government and it created much public discord.

This essay explores how the federal government dealt with an issue that was historically outside of its purview: childcare. Specifically, through an analysis of congressional hearings, it examines the novel and complicated problems that arose when an unprecedented number of women with children went to work.⁹ During the month of June 1943, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and Committee on Education and Labor held two hearings regarding the Federal provision of childcare.¹⁰ Placing them in conversation with one another highlights a

⁸ Susan E. Riley “*Caring for Rosie’s Children: Child Care, American Women and the Federal Government in the World War II Era*” (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1996), 380.

⁹ Hearings are a method by which committee members gather information. Business dealt with in hearings may be broadly classified into four types: legislative, oversight, investigative, and consideration of presidential nominations. “Frequently Asked Questions about Committees,” United States Senate, https://www.senate.gov/committees/committees_faq.htm#:~:text=Hearings%20are%20a%20method%20by,and%20consideration%20of%20presidential%20nominations. Hearings offer “differing perspectives on the issues of the day as congressional committees take testimony from a wide range of individuals to inform decisions on legislative proposals or investigative proceedings,” from “Legislative & Executive Publications,” Homepage, ProQuest Congressional, <https://congressional.proquest.com/congressional/search/basic/basicsearch>.

¹⁰ *Wartime Care and the Protection of Children of Employed Mothers: Hearings on S.876 and S.1130, Before the Committee on Education and Labor, 78th Cong., 1st Sess., (1943); Community Facilities: Hearings on H.R. 2936, Before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, 78th Cong., 1st Sess., (1943).*

distinct moment in time in American history, where the federal government, for the first and only time, directly funded childcare services. Three weeks apart, amid total mobilization for the war effort, these hearings reveal the difficulties of solving the practical issue of child welfare once women, who traditionally occupied this caretaker role, were extracted from the home and inserted into the labor force. It was true that at the most practical level, Congress was attempting to figure out what to do in such extraordinary times. However, beneath the veil of wartime practicality, we see the highly political nature of the questions that are brought to light upon inspection of these two specific hearings. Should the federal government provide childcare provisions? For whom? Where? How?

The summer of 1943 was a pivotal moment for childcare policy debates and decision making at the federal level. As the military draft was expected to extend to an increasing number of men, there was anticipation that industries would need to tap into the nation's reserve labor supply of women with children. Not only did legislation need to be passed in order to continue to fund war programs, but government officials, social workers, as well as members of religious groups and other social organizations also feared that the present and continuing uptick in women's employment would result in countless children running free and unsupervised without care facilities during the summer break between school years as well as for the duration of the war.¹¹ Consequently, the government, the public, and mothers were all forced to confront the issues surrounding childcare, and to do so hurriedly.

¹¹ *Committee on Education and Labor Hearing*, 30. These hearings, and the decisions that Congress needed to make based off of them, were time-sensitive because it was also important that a decision be made, and related actions be carried out before Congress went into its summer recess.

War impacted areas across the nation felt the intense strain on their resources as extreme population growth due to the in-migration of women to these areas searching for employment opportunities soared. According to a preliminary War Manpower Commission report from 1943, for example, the greater Los Angeles area saw its population of children between 2 and 16 more than double between February and June of that year, going from 73,386 to 189,307 and projected that by December it would rise to 362,508.¹² Likewise, Mobile, Alabama's population doubled and the Detroit-Willow Run area saw a 400,000-person increase in its labor force.¹³ Due to the severity of the population growth as well as the speed with which it happened, these communities lacked adequate infrastructure such as housing, schools, sanitation, hospitals, and recreational facilities to support their new settlers. The need for both organization and funding were pressing. However, this was no simple task in peacetime let alone amid a national move toward a full wartime mobilization effort. Making the task of supplying these communities with necessities even harder was that Congress was working with very little prior legislative ground, especially in the realm of childcare.

During the depression era, the federal government authorized the Works Project Administration (WPA) to operate a nursery program. Yet, it was actually the Lanham Act of 1940 that set the stage for federal funding to be directly appropriated for childcare services. Through the Lanham Act the federal government sponsored a federally subsidized universal childcare system for the first, and only, time in United States' history¹⁴ The act, however, was initially, and predominantly, a national defense housing construction program. Yet, Congress

¹² Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 98.

¹³ Ibid., 113; Karen Anderson, *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women During World War II*, (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981), 12.

¹⁴ An Act To expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes, Pub. L. No. 76-849, 54 Stat. 1125 (1940). The Act is colloquially referred to as the Lanham Public Housing Act or Lanham Act because it was sponsored by Senator Frederick G. Lanham (D-TX) and will be referred to as the Lanham Act in this essay.

came to realize that more than housing made up a community and communities over-burdened by wartime industrial growth needed a great deal more public works to operate. A year later, in June of 1941, Congressman Frederick G. Lanham (D-TX) proposed an amendment to the Act to allowed funding to go to the building of essential public spaces. Specifically, Title II of the Act was understood to authorize the federal funds toward the “maintenance and operations of public works which are necessary for the health and safety of persons engaged in the war effort.”¹⁵ No language was childcare was ever actually written into the act. Only through the approval of the President’s Bureau of Budget, which categorized childcare centers as recreational facilities, did childcare services in war-impacted areas become eligible for federal funding. Thus, the federal government’s wartime childcare program “began to take shape without Congressional debate and without the passage of legislation specifically authorizing these services,” but rather through backdoor administrative decision making.¹⁶

All persons—senators, federal agency employees, and representatives of local and national organizations dealing with child welfare—agreed that funds to establish and maintain child facilities were necessary and acknowledged it had to be done quickly. Yet, as Karen Anderson describes it, “the day-care program taxed the imagination and resources of federal and local officials alike as they faced the challenge of organizing, financing and creating day-care facilities.”¹⁷ When asked if there was any “disposition on the part of anyone” to stop the “very necessary work” of childcare, Senator Carl G. Hayden (D-AZ) responded that while no one wanted the work to stop, what was at stake in these hearings was a consideration of the best way

¹⁵ *Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing*, 25.

¹⁶ Riley, “Caring for Rosie’s Children,” 349.

¹⁷ Anderson, *Wartime Women*, 122.

to go about funding, constructing, and maintaining childcare services.¹⁸ Childcare was an “essential part of the war effort and Congress should not allow a disagreement as between two agencies of Government... permit the work to stop,” warned Senator Hayden.¹⁹ Intergovernmental fighting, including disagreements regarding how childcare provisions should be best administered, caused substantial dithering at the federal level and ultimately created a “bureaucratic nightmare” that hindered the federal childcare program from ever becoming successful.²⁰ The two agencies at odds with one another were the Federal Works Agency (FWA) and the Federal Security Agency (FSA). The FWA administered public construction, building, maintenance, and public works relief functions and laws while the FSA oversaw food and drug safety, education funding, and the administration of public health programs. The lengthy debates on which of these agencies would ultimately possess administrative oversight of federal childcare services calls attention to the various special interests of the stakeholders involved, be it political, economic, or racial.

Under the Lanham Act, the national defense housing program came under the administration of the FWA. Then, the subsequent addition of Title II into the Lanham Act which allowed funds to go to recreational facilities (and which indirectly included childcare services) meant that now childcare services also came under the realm of the FWA, vis-à-vis the agency’s War Public Service program.²¹ The fact that the federal childcare program was being administered through what was essentially a construction agency, which had no experience in child welfare or any other social service responsibility, caused alarm and frustration for those

¹⁸ Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 8 (statement of Congressman Elbert D. Thomas (D-UT), Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Anderson, *Wartime Women*, 122.

²¹ During the World War II the FWA was divided into two divisions. These were War Public Works, which dealt with construction matters, and War Public Services that oversaw general services, which included childcare funding and maintenance.

already involved in that work. In his testimony, Charles P. Taft, the Federal Security Administrator, nudged at the crux of the debate when he insisted that “this is not just an interagency fight but a matter of fundamental principle, whether services should be administered through a service agency or through a construction agency.”²² Being that the FSA was responsible for directing the nation’s social service programs and its relevant subsidiary agencies, the Children’s Bureau and Office of Education, both of which were primarily interested in the welfare of children, they saw glaring gaps in the haphazardly developed and poorly administered Lanham Act childcare program. For example, the FWA initially neglected its responsibility to fund and maintain childcare facilities in war impacted areas and did not approve its first day-care center until August 31, 1942, over a year after Title II amended the Lanham Act.²³ In the eyes of the FSA, the FWA was slow to approve and fund the necessary childcare facilities and the program was ultimately failing to meet the needs of mothers in war areas.

The FSA, and its allies in the Children’s Bureau and Office of Education, contended that the FWA was wholly inadequate to oversee a childcare program, which they believed was a “particularly sensitive service” that “required the skilled work of trained social workers, educators, and others.”²⁴ Accordingly, the FSA proposed specific legislation that outlined an alternative childcare program under S.1130, the War-Area Child-Care Act of 1943. This proposed legislation envisioned a childcare program that was more thoroughly thought out, included comprehensive childcare services in nursery schools, day-care centers, and elementary

²² Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 18.

²³ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 54-55

²⁴ Riley, “Caring for Rosie’s Children,” 350.

schools, and provided high quality standardized services.²⁵ The War-Area Child-Care Act also put forth a framework that included coordination between the federal, state, and local levels. The FSA believed this organizational method would work better than the FWA's direct federal to local model particularly because it would supplement existing state welfare and educational agencies and supplement their funds through a grant-in-aid basis. Dr. Martha Elliot, Associate Chief of the Children's Bureau argued that childcare "services should be concentrated in a unified state program under the administration of agencies already charged with similar responsibilities"²⁶ Thus, making use of the "experience" and "expert knowledge" of agencies at all levels of government who are already in the business of providing care and education for children.²⁷ Depending on the type of plan submitted by a state to the FSA, day-care center service or an extended school service, it would be approved by the either Chief of the Children's Bureau and Commissioner of Education, accordingly. Final approval, then, was sanctioned by the FSA administrator, Charles P. Taft. Fundamentally, the War-Area Child-Care Act proposed a change in administrative authority over the wartime federal childcare program that would put the FSA, and not the FWA, in charge. While the FWA may have initially hesitated to fulfill its responsibility for developing and maintaining childcare services, it certainly did not want to give up control of the program, nor did those in charge believe they needed to.

The FWA operated on the notion that childcare centers were strictly emergency wartime construction projects and believed the FSA to be out of touch of immediate wartime needs. To some extent, the attacks leveraged by the FWA at the FSA's proposed childcare program were

²⁵ A Bill to provide for the care of children of mothers employed in the war areas in the United States, and for other purposes, S.1130, 78th Cong., (1943) is outlined in full in the Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 1-4; See also Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 18, for more general discussion on the scope of the bill.

²⁶ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 56.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 57.

reasonable. The War-Area Child-Care Act program had lofty ambitions and included a vast range of services. To emphasize the extent of services that were proposed to be covered under the War-Area Child-Care Act, it is worth citing them in full. The services included

information and advisory services for mothers, group services for children, nursery schools, child-care centers, before-and-afterschool care, foster-family day care, adequate health and nutritional supervision to safeguard children in various types of care, emphasis on summer programs, integrated State and local programs covering all these services, definition of responsibilities of welfare and educational agencies, use of all appropriate facilities and services of public and nonprofit private agencies... [and] use of available services of Children's Bureau, and the Office of Education in aiding State welfare and education departments.²⁸

For the FSA and its subsidiaries, only a program that could provide all these services could be considered adequate for the care and wellbeing of children. These services were not, and could not, be covered under the auspices of the Lanham program, another reason why the FSA argued that the existing program was inherently insufficient to undertake the care of children. However, due to the already existing strain on resources both material and human, implementing a program of this kind seemed totally impractical to the FWA.

Moreover, the actual operation of childcare centers outline in the War-Area Child-Care Act was rigidly defined. Those who considered themselves child welfare experts emphasized the need for trained staff and specific types of meals to be served and recreational activities to be offered. Although these plans were designed with the well-being of children in mind, amid war, it makes sense that this program was perceived as too strict, and detractors complained of possible delay and inefficiency in creating such meticulous childcare centers. For example, the Scranton School in New Haven (Connecticut) was a model childcare facility. A “well-balanced meal” was served to children at noon. The two-hour-long after school program was both educational and recreational. The first hour placed emphasis on “vigorous” play outdoors while

²⁸ Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 18.

the second focused more on creative outlets. Children could choose the activity they wished to participator, but “a definite program of activities [was] scheduled for various days of the week.”²⁹ In Vallejo, California a nursery school in a housing project operated similarly. This nursery school opened at 6am to accommodate mothers working the first shift at factories. It served breakfast to the early arrivals, which was “followed by a period of indoor play with clay, blocks, paint paper and crayons.”³⁰ Then at “about 9 o'clock the children [went] outdoors to play with sand, blocks, wagons, tricycles, boxes, teeter-totter, and slide.”³¹ Lunch included “orange juice and cod-liver oil” and then the children came indoors “to rest, to listen to stories and music, and to play until dinner is served at 12 after which they take a nap.”³² These are examples of the kinds of regulated, high-quality services the FSA believed necessary to support children’s well-being and wished to provide nationally under the War-Area Child-Care Act.

These ideal childcare situations, however, were uncommon and to Florence Kerr, director of the FWA’s War Public Service program, the need for childcare services was already being taken care of, without the elaborate conditions recommended by the FSA. In both hearings Kerr reported that, as of June 1943, over a quarter of a million children of working mothers were covered and that it was being executed with small administrative overhead. Kerr projected that if operation continued undisturbed, the FWA could provide facilities to cover over a million children by the end of 1943.³³ Further, Kerr argued that the present FWA method of an explicitly wartime measure that included decentralized responsibility, no federal interference in local school supervision, and flexible funding made it the more efficient and more practical system. As

²⁹ Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 23-24.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 24.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 25

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 31-33; Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 34-36.

such, a major concern for Kerr was that transitioning authority of the childcare program from FWA to another agency “mean[t] loss of time and diminution of service with no compensating value to the children of America.”³⁴ As this debate shows, each faction thought the other to be insufficient, causing further delay to a very necessary service.

Debates over delays, inadequate funding, and shoddy facilities concerned Congress. Important to them was not only which agency was best suited for the task, but which program would allow women with children to enter and stay in the workforce with as little disruption as to production as possible. This economic interest of the federal government was tied to the issue of childcare because insufficient childcare provisions resulted in absenteeism. Women with children perpetually moved in and out of the workforce, especially during the summer months when children were out of school. There were various causes of absenteeism, but the main reason was family need. For working mothers “employment often interfered with more important responsibilities,” such grocery shopping, laundry, cooking, and cleaning. Many women with children were new to the workforce, and many mothers did enjoy working, but they did not abandon their roles as mothers and housewives once they stepped foot on the shop floor. Though many women needed or wanted to work to supplement their incomes, they saw wage work as secondary.³⁵ This frustrated both employers and the federal government. Accordingly, it made sense to believe that providing mothers with childcare facilities would curtail absenteeism and potentially even encourage more women with children to pick up work.

However, bureaucratic infighting between the FWA and FSA as well as the general lack of funding for childcare services prevented the government, under the Lanham Act program,

³⁴ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 33; Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 36.

³⁵ Campbell, *Women at War with America*, 133. Additionally, these already time-consuming tasks were only made more difficult due the wartime strain on resources, rationing and higher prices for goods.

from meeting the needs of working mothers at the speed that was required. Moreover, even when federally sponsored childcare facilities were constructed, multiple shortcomings undermined their utility. Childcare centers were often inaccessible to mothers. Either they were not open during the hours mothers needed the services or inconveniently located. Furthermore, many mothers did not know what day-care centers were. As the predominant caretaker, mothers were understandably hesitant or even resistant to placing their children in the care of strangers in places they were unfamiliar with. These spaces were also marred by stigmatized conceptions of public assistance and most women felt that sending their child to a day-care center reflected poorly on them as mothers.³⁶ Ultimately, the assumption that by simply providing the centers would solve the manpower issue proved false. There was a severe disconnect between the needs of working mothers and the government, but specifically the Lanham Act program operated by the FWA and even the idealistic program proposed by the FSA.

Furthermore, the issue of race was yet another hurdle facing Congress as they weighed two programs under the two different agencies against one another.³⁷ The United States was still a racially segregated nation during World War II. The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps were all segregated and the integration of many war manufacturing plants in northern cities caused fierce tension.³⁸ Though not a central topic of debate in either hearing, race did play into the discussion of which program would be most effective. The only testimony to discuss race in relation to

³⁶ Campbell, *Women at War with America*, 185, 196-97, 230-3.

³⁷ A discussion of race in the Second World War, more generally, but also regarding childcare and domestic services deserves further consideration and a much more thorough discussion than the scope of this paper allows for.

³⁸ There is a large literature on race during World War II. For more specific references to race and workplace tensions see Ruth Milkman, *Gender at Work: The Dynamics of Job Segregation by Sex During World War II* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987); McEuen, Melissa A. McEuen, "Women, Gender, and World War II," *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of American History*, 9 Jun. 2016, <https://oxfordre-com.proxy.uchicago.edu/americanhistory/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199329175.001.0001/acrefore-9780199329175-e-55>; and Kevin Boyle, "The Kiss: Racial and Gender Conflict in a 1950s Automobile Factory." *The Journal of American History* 84, no. 2 (1997): 496–523. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2952568>.

childcare was that of Thomasina Walker Johnson, a representative of the Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority, an organization of college-educated African American women. Johnson opposed transferring the authority of the federal childcare program from the FWA to the FSA and its subsidiaries. Johnson was concerned that a program where funds were distributed to states “where separate facilities” were required by law would “be full of instances of injustices to Negroes and a lack of concern for their welfare.”³⁹ Thus, due to racist state politics the needs of black working mothers and their children could potentially be ignored under the childcare program that was proposed by FSA in the War-Ara Child-Care Act. Discrimination of funding and services was already an issue, even under the FWA where funds were distributed directly from the federal government to local communities. In Arkansas, for example, of the 1,600 children being cared for under federal childcare centers only 30 were African American.⁴⁰ In whatever way the federal government was going to get involved in childcare, it was important that black and white children received equitable care. Thus, while the hearings may not have discussed the issue of race at length, race played a significant role in the United States’ war effort as a whole.

In the debate over a federally sponsored childcare program, the nation could take two routes. Congress could decide to continue with the Lanham Act program, with the FWA at its helm. Or it could choose an entirely new route by pushing forward the War-Area Child-Care Act, putting the FWA in charge of handling childcare services. Because the FWA viewed childcare as strictly a wartime emergency project, the haphazard program stymied war production by keeping mothers from being able to obtain or stay in war work. Yet, the integrated comprehensive program of the FSA raised concerns of its own. On the issue of race, there was

³⁹ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 82.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 83.

concern that any operation at the state level could lead to discrimination in funding and services provided. What's more, the suggestion to create one comprehensive program that integrated all levels of government brought forth ideological concerns regarding the role of the government in family matters.

Another major question at stake in these debates was defining, or redefining, what the role of government is. Concerns regarding the role of the government in what was traditionally a private familial issue drove much of the conversation regarding the development of a federal childcare program. While during the Great Depression and New Deal eras, the government greatly expanded its reach, there was still uncertainty surrounding how far that reach should extend, and if getting involved in matters of the home was an appropriate course of action, even in a state of emergency. Should the government be in the business of taking care of children? The bureaucratic infighting that took place between the FWA and FSA was largely on logistical grounds and concerned what agency would be able to control federal childcare services. However, the question of how childcare provisions would be administered also struck at many fundamental beliefs about family, home, and understandings of gendered spheres.

In particular, the hearings held in June of 1943 highlight the controversies surrounding the constitutionality of Federal involvement in child welfare. This was especially relevant to the Lanham Act, which had no language written in it directly permitting federal monies to go to childcare facilities in the first place. Consequently, Congress had very little legislative leeway to work with in trying to sustain some sort of wartime childcare program. In attempting to mediate the unexpected consequence of unsupervised children that home front mobilization caused,

Congress had to define how far they were willing to go in guarding the welfare of its nation's children.

Clearly, the need for some form of childcare was there, but there was no consensus as to how to meet that need and Congress was essentially debating between two directly opposing options. Would they maintain the loose childcare system under the Lanham Act, which technically possessed no legislative language on federally funding childcare services? Or would they, under the proposed War-Area Child-Care Act, end up confirming legislation that created a novel federal childcare program? Some, like Senator Robert A. Taft (R-OH), “never could see anything in the Lanham Act that permitted any day care whatsoever” and believed that it was “an entire abuse of authority to do anything with the Lanham Act appropriation for anybody below school age.”⁴¹ Being that the Lanham Act was created for the purpose of constructing housing in war-impacted areas, Taft’s argument fundamentally challenged the expansion of the act into the realm childcare services at all, especially because it was done through backdoor administrative maneuvering. For Taft, even the acute need for childcare and the pressure of the war which demanded quick solutions, did not permit the bypassing of appropriate legislative processes, especially when the issue at hand proposed considerable extension of federal authority into the private sphere. Contrary to Taft’s views, Senator Hayden argued that “you cannot have a contended mother working in a war factory if she is worrying about her children, and you cannot have children running wild on the streets without a bad effect on the coming generations. It is entirely proper the federal Government should appropriate money to that because Congress declared war.”⁴² Hayden believed that it was incumbent on the Federal to support childcare services because it was the federal government who declared war and in doing so caused the

⁴¹ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 54.

⁴² Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 8.

increase of working mothers. The testimonies of Eleanor Fowler, Secretary-Treasurer of the Women's Auxiliaries of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Kathryn Hill, executive secretary for the Committee for Care of Children in Wartime in New York took the same stance as Hayden. Both leaned on the argument that it was the federal government's responsibility to support childcare services during the war and that it was not an inconceivable extension of federal authority.

Beyond the pragmatic issues of authority, William F. Montavon, Director of the legal department for the National Catholic Welfare Conference, opposed to the War-Area Child-Care Act on ideological reasons. He argued that the duty of the government in the field of child welfare was primarily to "uphold and strengthen the family."⁴³ Whereas the Lanham Act was an entrance into the realm of aiding local agencies facing an emergency situation "without imposing any unnecessary Federal supervision and standardization," the War-Area Child-Care Act symbolized a "final step of government care," wherein the government entered into family affairs. Montavon's testimony also highlights that the way childcare would be administered had deep ideological ties to America's history with welfare and charity. In Montavon's opinion, administration under the FWA was a better solution for its more trepidatious approach via directly providing federal monies to localities in need, but he also rather preferred money go instead to voluntary aid associations that aided downtrodden families, viewing that as the "true democratic and American way of dealing with community problems."⁴⁴ While this view was not the dominant opinion expressed in the War-Area-Child-Care Act hearing, these claims speak to the historical perception of welfare in America, in that aid was provided by local community services whether religious or ethnic and that the federal government had no place in that process.

⁴³ Ibid., 82.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 85.

Thus, it was feared that the War-Area Child-Care Act, which would have considerably extended the realm of the nation's social safety net, would alter family relations, and subvert the institution of motherhood.

In line with the debates concerning the overall extension of federal reach into the private sphere, was another issue regarding potential federal interference in the operation of local schools that received Lanham program funds to support childcare services. Utilizing schools was an obvious method to provide wartime childcare, but it was not as easy as setting up before-and-after-school programs for children already in school and whose mothers worked. The hearings highlight that it was important schools maintained autonomy over their educational operations because, while the federal government's role in education is complicated, traditionally the federal government does not oversee the nation's public schools. Largely, it is the individual municipalities that are in charge of running and funding public schools. Both the FWA and FSA claimed that their programs maintained this local/federal distinction best. The Lanham Act specifically outlined that "no department or agency of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds have been or may be expended pursuant to this title, nor... affect its administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials for instruction."⁴⁵ In having a program where the local community applied directly to the FWA for childcare service funding, it was argued that this would protect school officials from any state or federal officials interference. On the other hand, it was argued that the War-Area Child-Care Act would alleviate problems of local/federal boundaries, because it proposed a coordinated framework that incorporated local, state, and

⁴⁵ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 32.

federal priorities to ensure each there was agreement at each level. Ultimately, it was necessary that the Federal did not exert jurisdiction on public schools, regardless of the program of choice.

The debates in these two hearings present the nuanced problems and differing views surrounding the extension of the Federal into the private sphere. Furthermore, they call attention to the ideological component to creating a federally sponsored childcare program as opposed to the practicality and necessity of establishing wartime care. If women, it was supposed, were only working for the duration of the war, then any childcare provision would only need to last equally as long. By placing administrative duty under the FWA, instead, it was more likely that federally supported childcare would only last as long as the war did and therefore be better able to curb the loosening of norms that had occurred. In contrast, a more comprehensive legislated program could imply a more permanent federally supported childcare program that outlasted wartime demand.

As such, the potential permanency of the childcare program under the War-Area Child-Care Act raised considerable hesitation as well as outright protest for some more conservative factions represented in the hearings. Testimony from Alan Johnston, General Counsel of the FWA, pushed even further on the issue of setting up a substantial, comprehensive, and coordinated childcare program. “The new proposal,” Johnstone began, “represents a considerable change in the attitude of the Federal Government toward education and child care, which is bound to involve long debate and considerable controversy.”⁴⁶ This statement suggests that the proposed program under the War-Area Child-Care Act would substantially alter the nation-state’s relationship to the private sphere—something the government was not prepared to confront, at least not amid an all-out war effort. “A program of this kind,” argued Major-General

⁴⁶ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 86.

Phillip B. Fleming, the Federal Works Administrator, “should have its primary emphasis on emergency and wartime aspects rather than on techniques and standards.”⁴⁷ Fleming continued stating that he did “not feel that this Congress [was] anxious to set up a wartime program of child care in the permanent machinery.”⁴⁸ Monsignor John O’Grady, of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. Expressing his discontent with working mothers and the implications of a more comprehensive childcare program asking the committee, rhetorically, “Are we merely interested in long-term programs, or are we interested in the construction of ships and of tanks and of planes now?”⁴⁹ In attempting to curb the relaxed gendered standards that war mobilization had wrought, the view that women working in such vast numbers and in traditionally male-dominated industries as temporary, and that childcare should be too, was repeatedly emphasized.

The weight of the decision on which federal childcare program to choose and the implications of this important decision troubled Congress. If Congress approved a piece of legislation that built infrastructure at the federal level for childcare programs, would women feel inclined to keep working beyond the war knowing that there was another means for their children to receive care? While there was an acknowledgement that some women “unfortunately” would have to continue work outside of wartime necessity, more of a concern was placed on “appropriate” family structures, which aligned with existing political, social, and economic customs and systems.⁵⁰ Though more conservative Congressmen, FWA officials, and Catholic organizations argued that a more far-reaching program of childcare under the FSA was

⁴⁷ Committee on Education and Labor, 45.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 41.

⁵⁰ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 56 (statement of Congressman Francis Maloney (D-CT), Chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds).

not politically viable or socially acceptable, they still agreed that providing some form of childcare services was necessary to sustaining the necessary war production. Not only this, but an inferior childcare program threatened the wellbeing of children, and subsequently, the future generations of Americans. Thus, Congress was faced with a difficult paradox.

The immediate pressure of wartime needs as well as the assumed, though uncertain, temporariness of a large female workforce in addition to the apprehension around supporting specific childcare legislation caused significant dallying in Congress. Yet, the lack of a decision as to whether to keep funding the Lanham Act program or create a new childcare program had serious consequences as hundreds of thousands of children needing care continued to go without.

Concern regarding children's welfare was another flashpoint in these hearings. There was fear that mothers working outside the home would lead to the destruction of American nuclear family and especially result in the juvenile delinquency of "latchkey children."⁵¹ Juvenile delinquency was the term used to describe adolescent aged youth who went unsupervised and therefore able to act in what was considered bad behavior. For young boys, this could mean anything from staying out late in the evening, underage drinking, vandalism, or petty theft. For young women, delinquency was associated more with sexual deviancy. Young women seen out late, in predominantly male spaces like bars, or alone with a group of men were considered to be displaying delinquent behavior. Additionally, some young women during the war years ran away from home to war-impacted areas or military bases in hopes to find a husband quickly. Often, either through being caught by the police or ending up husband-less and penniless, they found

⁵¹ "Latchkey kid(s)" or "latchkey child(ren)" was the phrase used to describe children of school-aged and under fourteen usually, who were impacted by the war often left with parental supervision and often were seen with a key on a string around their neck.

their way back home or stayed and acquired war work. While there was an increase in these kinds of mischievous behaviors, instances of juvenile delinquency for both teenaged boys and girls, did not reach the epidemic rates that warranted the alarm expressed by the testimonies in both of these hearings.⁵² Yet, disruption to family life and the question of who was going to step in to occupy the role of mother, and if that was going to be the federal government, had serious political and ideological implications not only in terms of the federal government's reach into the private sphere but also for the institution of motherhood itself.

There was genuine worry from policymakers, government agency officials, and the public about what the effects on children would be if their mothers were not at home to raise them. Testimony from Mrs. Eugene Meyer, a member of the National Child Welfare League of American, illustrates just how great the fear surrounding child neglect was. In her rather sensational and impassioned speech, she described a three-month long tour of war areas across the nation. Being "so horrified by the neglect of our children," she explained witnessing "not only schools that were hopelessly overcrowded, but... cities in which two and three thousand children were roaming the streets... [and] in schools where children appeared... without having had a thing to eat, neither breakfast nor lunch." Included were also tales of children who sat in movie theatres and beer halls until midnight because there was no other place for them to go.⁵³ Mrs. Meyer's testimony highlights the severity of the perceived juvenile delinquency problem along with great social anxiety it caused. The concern for juvenile delinquency was real and severe, yet it was manipulated to fit the arguments of those who fell on either side of the childcare debate in these hearings.

⁵² Campbell, *Women at War with America*, 202-203; Anderson, *Wartime Women*, 91-109.

⁵³ Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 71.

Child welfare experts who supported the passage of the War-Area Child-Care Act felt that only a more thorough childcare program would solve the uptick of juvenile delinquency. These experts ranged from government agency officials such as Dr. Martha M. Elliot, Associate Chief of the Children's Bureau, Bess Goodykoontz the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Education to Miss Dorothy Pearse, the director for day-care under the Childcare and Protection agency, and Elmer U. Tropman, Acting Director of the Council of Social Agencies, along with various superintendents representing school districts from across the nation. They argued that severity of child neglect spurred from the delays and insufficient funding occurring under the existing FWA model. Moreover, they blamed the FWA's shortcomings as the cause of the increased delinquent behavior and, as a result, that nation was already experiencing the negative effects of a lack of child supervision infrastructure. The hearings bring to light how many applicants for Lanham Act funding were often found wanting. In Buffalo and Erie counties, for example, their application for Lanham Act funds had not been responded to for over one and half months.⁵⁴ Similarly, in North Dakota, impatience had "swelled into indignation" where the need for day-care services was insufficient and confusing due to the lack of cohesion between the services being provided to the various communities in need.⁵⁵ The hodgepodge nature of the FWA method hindered communities in being able to provide care for children of all ages. For these child welfare minded individuals, only a comprehensive and integrated childcare program would remedy the delinquency problem.

Yet, on the other hand, the uptick of delinquent behavior only furthered highlighted that mothers needed to be at home with their children. As delinquency increased working mothers became scapegoats even though most mothers went into workforce at the beckoning of the

⁵⁴ Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 51.

⁵⁵ Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 61.

government in addition to their own economic necessity.⁵⁶ Rather than place blame on the unavailability of sufficient childcare facilities and services to help mothers shoulder their double burden of wage work and caretaking, proponents of a limited childcare program under the Lanham Act argued instead that the American family was collapsing because mothers were leaving the home for the shopfloor. An interesting moment of dialogue between Monsignor O’Grady, of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and Congressman Charles O. Andrews (D-FL) captured this tension between federal childcare and family life. Speaking to the committee, the Monsignor warned that there was going to be a “very serious family problem—getting these women back into the home... If we are going to have any civilization, we have to have families.”⁵⁷ To which, Congressman Andrews agreed, responding that the “basis of our civilization, the American way of life, is the American home... and without it, there is not anything much.”⁵⁸ This short interaction between the Monsignor and the Congressman echo the presumption that women would go back into the home sphere after the war ended, though noting that it would be difficult to get women to go back to the home if they were able to become reliant on federally supported and readily available childcare services. The concern for children’s well-being was manipulated in this instance to push forward the view that, in developing a childcare program, the nation could play a role in the breakdown of its own families. Though, this kind of comment fails to acknowledge that it was a difficult decision for women with young children to take up work and they did not willingly desire to abandon their children.⁵⁹

Furthermore, this exchange between the Monsignor and Congressman underscores the apprehension towards the potential impact childcare would have in the postwar era, particularly

⁵⁶ Hartmann, *Homefront and Beyond*, 82.

⁵⁷ Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds Hearing, 41.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 41-42.

⁵⁹ Campbell, *Women at War with America*, 14.

on the American family. Though no one could know how long the war was going to last, there was an attempt through the perfunctory approach to childcare under the Lanham program to maintain the norms that American society held before it entered the war. The American family and home, with the mother at its center, was being threatened by wartime needs. Thus, the debate surrounding juvenile delinquency, which brought out concerns about the state of family life, was an attempt to negotiate how considerable, or not, any change to the institution of motherhood would be. The National Catholic Welfare Conference, for example, was opposed to any federal sponsored childcare. Worried it would ruin family life, the Conference's legal department's director Dr William F. Montavon, commented on "whether or not there exists in the United States today a scarcity of manpower so acute as to justify the employment of mothers in great numbers is debatable."⁶⁰ He continued, declaring "there is no room, however, for debate of the proposition that national interest is served best when the mother and the child remain in the home together."⁶¹ Not only does Dr. Montavon's testimony speak to the distress more conservative factions held regarding the employment of mothers in the first place, but it also probes at the deeper apprehension of their employment in that the government could not take the place of the mother. Moreover, it invokes that, as he supposed, mothers staying at home (to deter delinquency) was in the interest of the nation's future.

Interestingly enough, both sides agreed, or at least leveraged to their own benefit, that the juvenile delinquency issue was troubling not only because of their concern for children's well-being and family life, but also because of the impacts a generation of lawless children could have on the nation's future. This furthered the anxiety expressed in the hearings regarding the lasting impacts of wartime childcare policy and the ways participants in the hearings tried to negotiate

⁶⁰ Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 81.

⁶¹ Ibid.

the extent of that impact. Mrs. Harriett Houdlett, claimed that “a well-rounded child care program will not only help to win the war by making more women war workers available, but will also help to assure the well-being of the present generation of children who are the future of our country.”⁶² A representative from the National Council of Jewish Women similarly stated that better childcare was “protecting our investment in post-war America by caring for today's children.”⁶³ Echoing that sentiment, Kermit Eby, asserted that, “America's greatest asset is her children. It is this asset which we want to protect in wartime as much as in peacetime.”⁶⁴ Additionally, “democracy,” declared Mrs. Catherine Gelles, “cannot afford to take chances with the physical and mental health of its children.”⁶⁵ In their pleas to Congress, both sides presented arguments connecting the well-being of the family to American democracy. With their undertone of wartime rhetoric, these claims powerfully showcase the politicization of children’s welfare and moral anxiety surrounding the possibility of irreversible change to motherhood, no matter the type of childcare program.

As the discourse surrounding juvenile delinquency makes clear, supporters on either side of the childcare program debate centered their line of reasoning around children’s well-being and the prosperity of the nation. Employing this argument highlighted society’s unease around working mothers and the impacts that could have on children, but it did not at all consider the well-being of employed mothers. This was the case even though working mothers were, in essence, the impetus for the bills, acts, hearings, and debates having to do with federal support of childcare. Had mothers of younger children never entered the workforce in such droves, it is

⁶² Committee on Education and Labor Hearing, 53 (statement of Mrs. Harriett Houdlett, Associate in Charge of Education, American Association of University Women).

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 69 (statement of Kermit Eby, Department of Research and Education, Congress of Industrial Organizations).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 93 (statement of Mrs. Catherine Gelles, Secretary-Treasurer of the Women’s Auxiliaries, International Representative of United Auto Workers-Congress of Industrial Organizations on Child Care and member of the Way County (Detroit) Office of Civilian Defense Child Care Committee).

likely the issues discussed in these hearings would not have been addressed, at least not perhaps until later in the 20th century.

Missing from these hearings entirely are the voices of the working mothers themselves. Though there was some recognition that childcare services would help mothers, absent from the hearings was a consideration of working mothers' own needs and the types of childcare services that would have best served them.⁶⁶ Working mothers, instead, were used as pawns in a game of policymaking for the various special interest groups to fashion the type of childcare program which best suited their own political and ideological views. While Congressmen, government officials, childcare experts, and representatives of various national organizations quarreled about the right childcare program to implement, mothers headed very little of the benefit from these debates. Childcare centers did serve a small proportion of children, but outside care was an "extraordinary benefit" and "personal, private, [and] idiosyncratic" means of care remained the dominant method mothers used to get by.⁶⁷ Attempting to preserve traditional gendered roles in the long run while allowing the temporary loosening of restraints to aid the war effort in the short-run resulted in an overall poorly developed, poorly encouraged, and poorly utilized federal childcare program under the Lanham Act program.

In the end, the War-Area Child-Care Act passed through the Senate but never made it out of the House and, consequently, did not become legislation. Hopes for a federal universal childcare program were dashed. Congress ultimately decided to stay with the method already in use, funding going to the construction and maintenance of childcare facilities and services through the Lanham Act, overseen by the FWA. Still, childcare under the Lanham Act program

⁶⁶ Riley, "Caring for Rosie's Children," 241-305.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 241-44, 263.

was officially defunded in 1946 and most government childcare facilities closed soon thereafter if they had not already.

Up until now, much of the literature discusses whether there was continuity or change of women's roles in society as a result of their experience with the Second World War. It is well documented that the war, while remarkable, did not change values or norms as much as first believed. Many women who entered the workforce were not able to sustain any semblance of a career.⁶⁸ The post war "antifeminist backlash" and push of women back into the domestic sphere came from social as well as economic pressures.⁶⁹ The return of veterans who would need jobs was a factor, but the burdens placed on women to preserve the home front were not made manageable and many women, especially mothers, were eager for respite from years of trying times.⁷⁰ Collectively, wartime pressures pulled women in too many directions. Women had to manage the economic strain that came with high prices and limited material goods, rationing, maintaining victory gardens, volunteering when they could, and obtaining employment when possible, all while still finding the means, energy, and time to care for children and the home.

These two hearings from June 1943 came at a critical moment. Would the government, through the proposed War-Area Child-Care Act, signify support of women working outside of the home by establishing a federally supported childcare program? Would a more hands-off approach that viewed childcare as an impermanent, emergency measure curb any loosening of gendered norms that the urgency of wartime enabled? By examining these hearings, we see

⁶⁸ Campbell, *Women at War with America*, 83.

⁶⁹ Hartmann, *Home Front and Beyond*, 212. Hartmann uses the phrase antifeminist backlash in her book, but notes that the phrase was termed by historian Leila J. Rupp in her chapter, "The Survival of American Feminism: The Women's Movement in the Postwar Period," in Gary Reichard and Robert Bremner, eds., *Reshaping America: Society and Institutions, 1945-1960* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982), 33-66.

⁷⁰ Campbell, *Women at War with America*, 223.

firsthand the different perspectives that informed Congress's course of action and can better understand why the government made the decisions they did regarding childcare during the war. My argument has sought to illuminate the nuance and complexity of novel problems that arose when mothers went to work, and children needed to be cared for. Moreover, I have attempted to highlight that debates in these hearings over intra-agency fighting for administrative control between the FWA and FSA, the extension of federal authority into traditionally private familial matters, and juvenile delinquency and the future of the nation are bound up in the larger concern regarding potential changes to the institution of motherhood. In a time of crisis and uncertainty, these hearings show us that there was an earnest attempt from individuals with more traditional views to maintain American society's pre-war standards of family, womanhood, motherhood, and the workforce. A limited federal childcare program during the war was one way in which these norms could be sustained.

Yet, the story of childcare and maternal employment in the United States did not end when the axis forces surrendered. The labor force still retained a substantial amount of female participation and women's workforce participation steadily increased after the 1940s.⁷¹ Now, it is commonplace for mothers to work outside of the home. As of 2022, the labor force participation of all mothers with children under 18 reached 72.9%.⁷² However, childcare provisions have not caught up to match the growing need of working mothers in the United States. As Abby Cohen describes it, the federal government has provided funding for childcare programs in "fits and

⁷¹ "Table 1. Women as proportion of all workers, by occupational status, 1940-1947," in Campbell, *Women at War with America*, 239. This table shows that when considering all occupations, women made up 25.9% of the workforce in 1940, 36.0% in 1945, and 27.9% in 1940. Anderson's figures show the percent of women working which jumped from 28.9% to 33.0% in the 1940s and continued to rise thereafter, reaching 41.0% by 1968. Anderson, *Wartime Women*, 7.

⁷² U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES — 2022.," April 19, 2023.

starts,” with no system at all but rather “a collection of funding streams.”⁷³ What remains is a question of why the federal government continues to stay away from the issue of creating a comprehensive federally sponsored childcare program.⁷⁴

⁷³ Abby J. Cohen, “A Brief History of Federal Financing for Child Care in the United States,” *The Future of Children* 6, no. 2 (Autumn 1996): 26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1602417>.

⁷⁴ In the early 1970s, another bid at a federally funded universal childcare program emerged. The Comprehension Child Development Act of 1971 was proposed. This act would have created a compressive child development program for all children with federal standards and federal funding for training and facilities. It was ultimately vetoed by President Nixon on very similar grounds that it did not come pass during the Second World War, with Nixon citing that it would undermine a family-centered approach to child rearing. Cohen, “A Brief History of Federal Financing for Child Care,” 32. Public support for childcare services has become wrapped up in the political battles over welfare legislation and still remains irresolute.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Karen. *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women During World War II*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Buck, Pearl S. --, et al. *Women's Magazines, 1940-1960: Gender Roles and the Popular Press*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1998.
- Campbell, D'Ann. *Women at War with America: Private Lives in a Patriotic Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Carroll, Jayne, L. "Raising a Baby on Shifts." *Parents Magazine*. October 1943. From the Library of Congress. (Accessed March 14, 2023).
- Cohen, Abby J. "A Brief History of Federal Financing for Child Care in the United States." *The Future of Children* 6, no. 2 (1996): 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1602417>.
- Dratch, Howard. "The Politics of Child Care in the 1940s." *Science & Society* 38, no. 2 (1974): 167–204. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40401779>.
- Enoch, Jessica. "There's No Place Like the Childcare Center: A Feminist Analysis of <Home> in the World War II Era." *Rhetoric Review* 31, no. 4 (2012): 422–42. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41697863>.
- Hartmann, Susan M. *The Home Front and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s*. Twayne, 1982.
- Litoff, Judy Barrett, and David Clayton Smith, eds. *American women in a world at war: Contemporary accounts from World War II*. No. 1. Rowman & Littlefield, 1997.
- Litoff Judy Barrett, and David C. Smith, eds., *Since You Went Away: World War II Letters from American Women on the Home Front*. Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Parker, Pauline E. --, et al. *Women of the Homefront: World War II Recollections of 55 Americans*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2002.
- Porter, Harry W. "The Lanham Act." *History of Education Journal* 3, no. 1 (1951): 1–6. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3659219>.
- Riley, Susan E. "Caring for Rosie's Children: Child Care, American Women and the Federal Government in the World War II Era." PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley. 1996.
- Riley, Susan E. "Caring for Rosie's Children: Federal Child Care Policies in the World War II Era." *Polity* 26, no. 4 (1994): 655–75. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3235099>.

- Shultz, Gladys D. "If You're Needed in a War-Plant, Mother... here are ideas on how to manage your double job." *Better Homes & Gardens*. June 1943. From the Library of Congress. (accessed March 13, 2023).
- Stoltzfus, Emilie. "Child Care: The Federal Role During World War II." Congressional Research Service, June 29, 2000. <https://crsreports.congress.gov>. RS20615.
- Tuttle, William M. "Rosie the Riveter and Her Latchkey Children: What Americans Can Learn About Child Day Care from the Second World War." *Child Welfare* 74, no. 1 (1995): 92–114. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45399026>.
- U.S. Congress, House, *An Act To expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes*, Pub. L. No. 137, 76th Cong., 1st sess., Introduced August 27, 1940.
- U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Education and Labor, *Wartime Care and the Protection of Children of Employed Mothers: Hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor*, 78th Cong., 1st sess., June 8, 1943.
- U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, *Community Facilities: Hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds*. 78th Cong., 1st sess., June 29 and 30, 1943.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. "EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES — 2022." April 19, 2023.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Women's Bureau: Changes in Women's Employment During the War, Special Bulletin No. 20, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1944.