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Problem

This study was designed to identify the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders between the period of 1900 and 1970 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children and the nature of their opinions and their affect, if any, on the enactment of Public Law 94-142.

Summary of the Methodology

A historical research design was used in conducting this study. After the data were collected, an indepth investigation of the opinions of the selected special educational leaders as reflected in the professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations regarding the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers was conducted. The content was analyzed to determine the relative emphasis and frequency of opinions concerning inclusion and exclusion.

Summary of the Major Findings

The findings of this study indicated that there were twenty-four recorded opinions from 1900 to 1963 by the selected educational leaders studied which emphasized exclusion of handicapped children into classes with their
nonhandicapped peers. The findings further indicated that there were four recorded opinions between the period 1962 and 1968 for inclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers by the selected educational leaders studied. The findings implied that historically these opinions did not affect the passage of the Public Law 94-142.

**Conclusions**

Based on the literature reviewed and the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Special educational leaders during the period 1900 to 1963 held the opinion that handicapped children should be excluded from the regular classroom with their nonhandicapped peers.

2. The education of the handicapped progressed from residential institutions to special schools, special classes to regular classes over a seventy year period.

3. Legislation for the handicapped was the result of public outcry of education for all.

4. No evidence was found that the opinions of the selected special educational leaders had an effect on the passage of Public Law 94-142.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Public Law 94-142 (The Education for All Handicapped Children's Act of 1975) is perhaps the most controversial piece of legislation affecting public schools in this country. This law expresses the commitment of legislators to include handicapped children in the mainstream of American public schools. It emphasizes educating this population in the least restrictive environment. This Law implies that handicapped children may be educated with their nonhandicapped peers. The phrase "least restrictive environment" has been interpreted by educators to mean integration of handicapped youngsters into regular classes with nonhandicapped youngsters.

With the enactment of this Law many educators have voiced their opinion against such a practice. As a result of this opposition which many believed to be a first time occurrence for any type of public law affecting the handicapped, several relevant questions surfaced. Among these questions were: What were the opinions of special educational leaders between 1900 and 1970 regarding inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children; and what was the nature of
the opinions expressed by selected special educational leaders; and were there any implications that their opinions affected the passage of P.L. 94-142?

There are no studies prior to the enactment of the law which assessed the opinions of special or regular educational leaders concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into regular classes with their nonhandicapped peers. However, there are studies that indicate that this issue (inclusion/exclusion) was addressed in theory but not in practice.

This study was conducted to ascertain the opinions held by selected special educational leaders prior to the enactment of the Law. It was further conducted to determine if these individuals' opinions could in retrospect indicate the enactment of Public Law 94-142.

Evolution of the Problem

During the fall of 1978, the investigator was engaged in a graduate course on "Issues and Concerns of Public Educators." As the only member of the group concentrating in special education, the investigator was asked to explore with colleagues, issues and concerns in this area. In doing so, the group expressed as a major concern, laws affecting public schools seem to emerge without the direct input of those who are largely responsible for implementing them. The group also indicated that they believed that the opinions of educators and more specifically special educational leaders concerning
the mandates of any public law would be implemented with or without those who are directly responsible if public opinion is strong enough to force legislation by Congress. As a result of these concerns and others raised by the group, the investigator sought to determine if there were recorded opinions and/or input from special educational leaders regarding inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children with their nonhandicapped peers and if these opinions affected the passage of Public Law 94-142.

Significance of the Research

Since research revealed no single document which delineated the opinions of special educational leaders concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into the mainstream of America's public school classrooms prior to the enactment of P.L. 94-142, this study was undertaken. As a result of the controversy of schools including handicapped children in regular classes with their nonhandicapped peers, this investigation was needed to help uncover the nature and opinions of special educational leaders prior to the enactment of the Law. It was believed that such a study would help educators to understand the historical development of placement of handicapped children and thus aid in understanding the rationale and evolution of P.L. 94-142. It was also believed that if this investigation indicated that special educational leaders have always supported inclusion arrangements of the handicapped into regular classrooms and if this information
was publicized, some of the onus and negative reaction to mainstreaming would be removed. Those who feel it was forced upon the educators by outside interference, specifically Congress, may have a change of heart and assist in facilitating the acceptance and implementation of the Law. Lastly, it was felt that this study would contribute to a stage in legislative history by documenting the impact of opinions of selected special educational leaders and their influence on the legislative process. In other words, a critical examination of the historical trends regarding the opinions of selected special educational leaders toward inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children with their nonhandicapped peers may enhance current educational practices.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to identify the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders from 1900 thru 1970, concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped peers and the affect of their opinions on the enactment of Public Law 94-142.

Research Questions

Two research questions emerged as a result of the rationale and problem delineated in this study.

1. What were the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations from 1900 thru 1970 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children?
2. What was the nature of the selected special educational leaders opinions and what affect did their opinions have on the enactment of Public Law 94-142?

Definition of Terms

1. Exclusion - refers to providing segregated or isolated settings for instructing handicapped children whether in residential institutions, special classes, special schools, or public school programs.

2. Inclusion - refers to integrating handicapped children, except the profound and severely handicapped, into classes with nonhandicapped children for instruction. Specifically, the term is used to denote the word "mainstreaming" which was derived as a result of educators' interpretation of the phrase, "least restrictive environment" which is mandated in Public Law 94-142.

3. Handicapped children - are those children who are classified by public schools as mentally retarded, hard of hearing and deaf, speech impaired, visually impaired, blind, emotionally disturbed, crippled or with specific learning disabilities as a result of psychological or other diagnosis.

Scope and Limitations

This study investigated the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children during the period 1900 thru 1970. The study was limited in that it reviewed only published materials (books, journals, speeches, and articles) of selected special educational leaders whose lives span the period under investigation. These persons were Walter E. Fernald, Henry H. Goddard, Lightner Witmer, Wallace J. E. Wallin, Edgar A. Doll, Samuel A. Kirk, William Cruickshank, Lloyd Dunn,
Maynard C. Reynolds, and Jack W. Birch. Their opinions were reflected in the organizational proceedings of the American Association on Mental Retardation (AAMD), the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), and the National Association of Retarded Citizens (NARC). These educational organizations were the most prevalent and active voice for the handicapped during the period under investigation and their leaders often determined the mood practices and principles within the era. Therefore, this study identified and utilized only these organizations and their dominant voices.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature related to the problem of this study covered the period that spanned from 1900 to 1970. Specifically, this review investigated histories that traced the placement of handicapped children in public schools prior to the enactment of Public Law 94-142 (The Education for All Handicapped Children's Act). This review sought to present the opinions of selected educational leaders as reflected in published materials (books, journals, speeches, articles, proceedings) of three educational organizations that addressed the care and treatment of handicapped children. The history of special education was covered according to periods as noted by Deutsch, Wallin, Doll, Chaves, Kirk, and Reynolds.

Historical Overview of the Placement of Handicapped Children in Public Schools

Cruickshank reported that by the 1870s, residential schools had been established for the deaf and blind and that up thorough 1920, every state or territory which was to become a state established some kind of facilities for handicapped
children. He agreed with Katz that these residential facilities did not escape the pessimism of the day. Particularly after the "Darwinist" mood swept the country, these institutions, located miles outside the cities, were easily ignored.\(^1\)

The period from 1900 to 1930 was known as the progressive era. According to Higham the Progressives more so than any other group in America transformed the social Darwinist jungle into the human capitalistic society. There was an appreciation for the crusading spirit, a responsiveness to indignation, and a sense of injustice.\(^2\)

Although the residential facilities appeared less than inspiring, the development of public day schools looked more promising according to Reynolds. He confirmed that not only did compulsory school attendance laws lead to the establishment of public special classes and schools, but more handicapped children than ever before were found in the cities since their parents and educators sought to keep handicapped youth within their communities. Reynolds ventured to reason that this pressure occurred because of increases in local populations; large cities made it difficult for parents to visit their handicapped children. In addition, Goddard's contribution to the concept of individual differences caused educational

---


professionals in the field of exceptionality to recognize the practicality and feasibility of homogeneous groups which could be accomplished through the medium of special schools and classes. Leaning on the contributions of Goddard regarding the concept of classification, Reynolds noted that between 1920 and 1930 the handicapped were being placed in special schools and classes based upon their intellect.\(^1\) He also gave an overview of the special classes and stated that they were taught for the most part by teachers who had been trained in residential facilities. Gallaudet College, for example, began training teachers for the deaf in 1890 and the Vineland Training School in New Jersey began training teachers of the retarded in 1904.\(^2\)

There were six full length histories noted in this investigation (Barr, Hollingworth, Wallin, Deutsch, Frampton and Kanner). Each reported a historical survey of the care and treatment of the mentally retarded. They noted that the first organizational arrangements in the United States were for the blind, deaf and retarded in custodial institutions. According to Wallin, these institutions stimulated interest in developmental and corrective education of the mentally deficient.\(^3\) These authors agreed that prior to the


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 16.

establishment of special classes the residential custodial schools were the only provision for the education of the handicapped. While the residential institutions were attempting to give relief to the growing population of handicapped children, educators believed that training retarded individuals was not going to result in their normalcy.\(^1\) Mann noted that when the Progressive Era (1900-1920) ended it gave way to the Age of Normalcy (1920-1930) and classification of the feebleminded awakened the consciousness of special educational leaders to various levels of normalcy and feeblemindedness.\(^2\) Hoffman concluded that compulsory education laws influenced special public classes for the handicapped and that they became the dumping grounds for all kinds of misfits.\(^3\) Heck formulated the growth of special education in 1869 in Boston. This was the first city to educate its own deaf at the Horace Mann School. In 1875, Chicago did the same and later the first class for the blind was established in 1896. In 1907, Wisconsin passed a day school law for the deaf. By 1911, more than two hundred cities reported having classes for backward and mentally defective children. In 1913, the


number had risen to 248; and in 1914, at least 300 cities with populations of 10,000 and greater had organized classes for subnormal children.¹ Hewett stated that further progress in special education was delayed by the depression and World War II.² A status quo prevailed and socio-economic levels were easily defined. Bergan and Smith reported that the mentally retarded children of higher socio-economic levels were accepted more readily than mentally retarded children of lower socio-economic levels.³ However, by the end of the 1940s a number of states had organized programs in public schools for handicapped children. This upsurge really gained momentum during the late 1950s and the 1960s as the federal government intervened in the care and treatment of the handicapped. Grants were provided to state and local school districts for the education of handicapped children during this ten year period. Special schools and special classes were ideal for the separate but equal education of the handicapped.⁴

Although special programs declined during World War II, they began increasing steadily after 1948; from 176,000


²F. M. Hewett, Education of Exceptional Learners (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974), p. 57.


programs to 213,000 programs in 1958 to 390,000 programs in 1963. In 1948, Mackie reported that the population was reported to be 1,666,000.

The concept of the nature of man, that all men are created equal, prevailed in the 1950s when 'intellectuals' made a cult of alienation, a rise in the standard of living, the increase of opportunities for scholars, cultural pluralism, the welfare state, and a healthy balance of power between big business, labor, and government.

The rate of growth of special classes was also noted by Wallin, Deutsch, and Cruickshank. Wallin stated that there was a sense of obligation of social responsibility which strengthened the case for segregated education for the handicapped. The segregation of handicapped children into special classes closely paralleled the trend toward general ability grouping in schools which were advocated by Goddard. Wallin further stated that these children would receive a more individualized education in a special class than in the regular class where their needs could not be adequately met. He reported:

---

A common rationale for the administrative arrangement of segregation during this period appear to emphasize two themes. First, it was thought that the handicapped child could receive the aid and encouragement needed when taught by specially trained teachers who could adjust the curriculum. Second, a popular view was that normal children would be free from the restrictions imposed by the handicapped child in the regular classroom.1

When Deutsch and Kanner traced the history of special education they noted that the introduction of special classes put the major task into the hands of the educators. And, Barr, Hollingworth, and Frampton basically described the special classes and schools that they traced.

Reynolds and Rosen observed that toward the end of the 1940s a number of states had organized public school programs to provide educational services to the handicapped. These were isolated, categorical special education classes for children with different kinds of handicaps.2 Children who were moderately and severely retarded during this time were not the responsibility of the public schools according to Lilly.3 There appeared to be little interest in considering a rationale for segregated special classes. The expansion of services for the handicapped can largely be explained by

---

1Ibid., p. 74


recent federal legislation. Legislative acts, such as Kennedy's signing the Mental Retardation Facilities Act in 1963 appropriated over $50 million for the education of the handicapped; the establishment of the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth under the Office of Education; the appropriation of $11 million in 1964-65 for scholarships and fellowships for prospective teachers; and researchers of the handicapped have made it quite obvious that the role of federal legislation in the advancement of special education has been unsurpassed by any other single factor.¹

After World War II and the Nazi crematoria it was no longer possible to ignore the nativist phobias of the Populist-Progressive movements. The dangerous enemies to humanity were Marx, Hitler, and Mao.² The benign neglect of the handicapped on the home front went overshadowed and upstaged.

Much of the federal legislation for the handicapped was passed between 1957 and 1967. In 1955 the physically handicapped, the educable mentally handicapped, the trainable, and the socially or emotionally maladjusted were provided with educational programs in Illinois, Iowa, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Washington, and West Virginia. Forty eight states had some provisions for the physically handicapped and

the educable mentally retarded were provided with some type of care in forty-six states. The trainable mentally retarded received care in nineteen states and the socially and emotionally deviant had some provisions made for them in fifteen states. As of 1956, thirty states had permissive legislation whereby the local school districts could initiate local special education programs and could then request financial or consultative assistance from the state. Mandatory legislation whereby the local districts were required to provide educational services for the handicapped existed in thirteen states. A combination of permissive provisions and mandatory provisions existed in five states.¹

The present trend in special education appears to be mainstreaming exceptional children into regular classrooms. This trend is the most pervasive movement in special education today. It is the purpose of Public Law 94-142 to assure that all handicapped children have available to them, within the time periods specified in section 612(2) (B), a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs, to assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents or guardians are protected, to assist states and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped

children and to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children.¹

The Council for Exceptional Children adopted in April 1976, the widely accepted definition of "mainstreaming" as viewed in the Law. Briefly, it states that, "mainstreaming is a belief which involves an educational placement procedure and provides for exceptional children based on the conviction that each child should be educated in the least restrictive environment in which his educational and related needs can be satisfactorily met."² Based on the Law and the definition, institutions, special schools, and special classes are integrating handicapped children in regular classrooms. The concept of resource rooms and resource teachers seem to be rapidly increasing.

Summary

The literature reviewed in this study was divided into three periods: (1) From the Residential Institutions to the Depression, 1900-1930; (2) From the Depression to the Aftermath of World War II, 1931-1950; and (3) From World War II to the Emerging Trend Toward Inclusion, 1951-1970).

The review indicated that in the beginning only institutional facilities were available to handicapped children.


However, with the advent of compulsory public education, the handicapped began attending public schools. Public schools argued for and organized special classes for these youngsters. Many believed that they had to be taught skills to work, earn a living, and be self-supporting. Heck, Hoffman, Hewett and Doll recorded the rate of growth of the population of the handicapped and noted that they could not be disregarded. Deutsch, Katz, Kanner and Cruickshank advocated for the established common practice of special schools and classes for the education of the handicapped from 1900 to 1920. Residential institutions were the first teacher-training institutions that stimulated interest and development of corrective education. Wallin alluded to the segregated classes as being the best environment for the handicapped. These authors recorded the history of the handicapped.

Over the years, special classes and special schools have floundered. The review of the literature indicated that presently the trend is that of placing handicapped children into the least restrictive environment. In many instances this has been in classes with nonhandicapped peers. The literature revealed little or no opinions concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the research design employed in this study. The chapter is composed of three sections which include a description of the research design, justification of the selection of sources used in gathering the research and an explanation of the manner in which the data was analyzed which led to the conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

This study was designed to identify the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders from 1900 thru 1970, concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers. Specifically, two research questions were investigated. These questions were:

1. What were the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations from 1900 to 1970 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children?

2. What was the nature of the selected special educational leaders' opinions and what effect did their opinions have on the enactment of Public Law 94-142?
Research Design

A historical research design was used in conducting this study. Historical research is the critical investigation of events, developments, and experiences of the past, the careful weighing of evidence for validity of the sources of information from the past, and the interpretation of the weighted evidence.\(^1\) This study, like similar studies, collected the historical data related to the opinions of a selected group of educational leaders as reflected in the professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations between 1900 and 1970 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children in classes with nonhandicapped peers. The earliest histories covering the period of time outlined in this investigation were reviewed. Kerlinger says that, "the historical method, differs from other scholarly activity only in its rather elusive subject matter, the past, and the peculiarly difficult interpretative task imposed by the elusive nature of its subject matter."\(^2\) Frampton, one of the oldest primary sources used in this investigation, concluded:

The difficulties in assembling materials on this type are limitless. Much basic evidence is obscure or inaccessible, chronicled records are incomplete and often contradictory, and recognition of problems involved has been in particular areas rather than interrelationships.\(^3\)


\(^2\)Ibid.

The historical method was selected because it has long been important in educational research. Outside of the intrinsic interest of history it is necessary to know and understand educational accomplishments and developments of the past in order to gain a perspective of present and possibly future directions.¹

A wide discussion of sources and persons were used to secure as accurate and expansive material as possible. Six full length histories (Barr, Hollingworth, Wallin, Deutsch, Frampton and Kanner); selected issues from seven journals (Journal of Special Education, Journal of Psycho-Asthenics, American Journal on Mental Deficiency, Mental Retardation, Exceptional Children, American Journal of Psychology, and Proceedings); and selected proceedings, minutes, discussions, and reports of three educational organizations (The American Association on Mental Deficiency, The Council for Exceptional Children, The National Association on Retarded Citizens) dating back to 1860 were reviewed and examined. This study included personal correspondence with five of the selected special educational leaders (Kirk, Reynolds, Birch, Dunn, and Cruickshank) and twelve educational organizations (The American Association on Mental Deficiency, The Council for Exceptional Children, The National Association for Retarded Citizens, Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, National Education Association, National Society for the Study of

¹Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, p. 699.

The full text retrieval method was utilized as the procedure for gathering data. The Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) was used to help gather the data. Only those reports and writings which included the opinions of the selected educational leaders as reflected in the professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations were utilized. Ninety-nine proceedings and minutes of the American Association on Mental Deficiency were reviewed in order to gather the opinions of the selected educational leaders. Excluded from the sample were those reports, minutes, proceedings and literature of those educational leaders who did not address the inclusion or exclusion of the handicapped with nonhandicapped peers. Also excluded were surveys, textbooks, biographies and other secondary sources. The materials in the investigation met the following established criteria:

1. Published between 1900 and 1970 or prior to 1900; and

2. Provided the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children in classes with nonhandicapped peers.
This design enabled the researcher to critically investigate events, developments and experiences of the past concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into classes with nonhandicapped peers. The primary source, the original repository of a historical datum, like an original record kept of an important occasion, an eye-witness description of an event, or minutes of organizational meetings or publications written by those being studied in which their opinions and or attitudes are stated was used.¹

**Justification of Selected Sources**

In studying the problem of this study, the researcher reviewed published documents dating back to 1860. These early writings pointed to organizations and individuals in which the origin of special education stems. As a result of this process, three organizations were identified as the oldest advocates and contributors to special education.

**Selected Educational Organizations**

The American Association on Mental Deficiency (AAMD) founded in 1876 has a membership of more than 11,000 and a staff of more than 17 and 11 regional groups. The organization is composed of physicians, scientists, teachers, educators, administrators interested in the general welfare of the mentally retarded. Their publications date back as far as 1876. *Proceedings*, their first publication, was chief source of knowledge of the institutional movement of the nineteenth century.

¹Mental Retardation Past and Present, p. 64.
The Journal of Psycho-Asthenics replaced Proceedings in 1896 and was again replaced by Annual Proceedings until 1940 when the American Journal on Mental Deficiency was established. In 1963 Mental Retardation was launched as a vehicle for expression of opinions and reports on various developments in the field of mental retardation.

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) founded in 1922 is an association of professional personnel and other persons whose principal purpose is to advance the education of all exceptional children and youth both gifted and handicapped in the United States and Canada. By 1963 CEC was heavily involved in promoting federal legislation affecting handicapped and gifted children. It participated in the establishment of the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped. In 1975, the membership totaled 67,000, of whom one-third were student members, with 906 chapters, 49 state and provincial federations and 4 branches. The organization is composed of teachers, students, administrators and professionals with major concerns for those children and youth whose instructional needs differ sufficiently from the average to require special services and teachers with specialized qualifications.

The National Association for Retarded Citizens (NARC) was founded in 1950. NARC is an organization which has

---

1Ibid.

2Ibid., p. 71.
served as a social catalyst at local, state, and national levels to galvanize political change, modify public attitudes, and stimulate professional attention in a manner virtually without parallel among voluntary service organizations. In 1975, the total membership of 218,000 in more than 1700 state and local units collaborated with the professionals of AAMD and CEC primarily as an organization of people with a personal interest in retarded persons. It has focused primarily on public information, public action surveillance of the quality of service and advocacy for the rights and interest of retarded children and adults. NARC has given priority attention to the extension of learning opportunities or severely and profoundly retarded children. The organization's efforts led to the amendments of the 1954 Rehabilitation Act and the first piece of federal legislation specifically for mental retardation, Public Law 85-926 which was enacted in 1958.¹

There were eleven special educational leaders identified in this study. These persons were members and officers of the aforementioned organizations. These leaders were:

Selected Educational Leaders

Henry H. Goddard (1866-1957) was Director of Research at the Training School at Vineland, New Jersey, in 1906. His twelve years at Vineland permitted him to establish the first psychological laboratory devoted to the study of the

¹Ibid., p. 43.
retarded. He translated and adapted the Simon-Binet Intelligence Scale for use in the United States. He conducted the classic study of mental retardation as an inherited trait, reported in 1912 in the Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeblemindedness. Goddard's paper on "Suggestions for a Prognostical Classification of Mental Defectives," proposed the term feebleminded with three subdivisions, low, middle and high. He was the president of AAMD in 1915.¹

Lightner Witmer (1867-1956) established the first psychological clinic in the world in 1896. This event marked the beginning of clinical psychology and the diagnostic approach to teaching. His work of continual clinical observation of the retarded while they were engaged in various learning activities served as a model for special classes in 1910. He wrote the first book on the teaching of handicapped children, The Special Class for Backward Children.²

Walter E. Fernald (1869-1924) was one of the first in the field of mental retardation to classify students on the basis of total development rather than on the basis of test results alone. His paper, presented at the 1912 annual meeting of the AAMD, "The Burden of Feeblemindedness," summed up the public attitude toward the feebleminded. As superintendent of the Massachusetts school for the feebleminded, he


proposed compulsory surgical sterilization to prevent hereditary transmission of feeblemindedness. His ideas eventually led to passage of Massachusetts legislation for the segregation of defective delinquents.¹

Frederick Khulmann (1876-1941) was one of the early users of the 1908 Binet Simon Intelligence Scale. The Kuhlmann-Goddard debates led to marked reduction in efforts to spend state funds on personnel to train the feebleminded, and gave further impetus of ideas of segregation and permanent institutionalization as well as sterilization. Kuhlmann pointed out that using the difference between life age and mental age was a measure that had to be taken into account. His argument rejected the idea of mental age over chronological age and aided in the development of the concept of intelligence quotient.²

J. E. Wallace Wallin (1876-1969) wrote one of the first books devoted to the education of the handicapped. His appointments in psychology and education at the Vineland Training School, St. Louis Public Schools, Baltimore Public Schools and the Delaware Department of Public Instruction established the principle that public schools should provide programs for the education of the handicapped.³

¹Sloan and Stevens, A Century of Concern: A History of the American Association on Mental Deficiency, pp. 73-77.  
²Ibid., pp. 79-81.  
Edgar A. Doll (1889-1968) developed the Vineland Social Maturity Scale. As director of research at Vineland Training School in 1925, he developed the criteria for mental deficiency and noted the impossibility for the cure of the mentally retarded. He provided the measuring level of social functioning. As president of the AAMD in 1936, he argued that social age provided a more effective basis of classification for purposes of care and training of the retarded than did mental age.¹

Samuel A. Kirk (1904) was heralded as the outstanding professional in education by the Council for Exceptional Children in 1966. He was the past president of the Council for Exceptional Children and is deemed the Father of Learning Disabilities, a term he introduced in 1963.²

Lloyd Dunn (1915) was honored by the Council for Exceptional Children with the Wallin Award in 1980. He served on President Kennedy's Panel of Mental Retardation and served as CEC's president from 1958-1959. His article, "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded: Is Much of It Justifiable?", sparked the controversy over special class placement.³

William M. Cruickshank (1915) was honored by the Council for the Exceptional Children in 1965 with the Wallin Award.

³Ibid.
for his contributions to special education. He served as the Council's president in 1960 and has over 150 publications to his credit. His writings on "Misfits in Public Schools," opened the question of placement of the handicapped in 1969.¹

Maynard C. Reynolds (1924) served as a president of CEC also. He received the Council's highest award, the J. E. Wallace Wallin Award for service to handicapped children in 1971. His service on the National Advisory Committee led to the innovative programs of Title III. His statement in a publication with Jack W. Birch on Education in All America's Schools (1977), on the inclusive swing of the pendulum toward inclusion of the handicapped in the regular classroom sparked interest in this area by others.

Jack W. Birch (1915) served as the president of CEC from 1960 to 1961. He has published over two hundred books relative to special education. He is a fellow of the American Association on Mental Deficiency.²

All of the above selected special educational leaders held membership in the American Association on Mental Deficiency. All of the current (those living) special educational leaders have received the Council for Exceptional Children's highest award, the J. W. Wallace Wallin Award, and have served as the Council's president.

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
The current authors were contacted by mail and their written statements are in the appendix of this study. These authors and their writings are deemed the most outstanding special educational leaders in the field of special education, the fathers of the discipline, and more specifically the foundation or voice for the country's movement in the care, education, and placement of handicapped persons.

**Data Analysis, Method and Procedure**

After the data were collected an indepth investigation of the opinions of the selected group of educational leaders was conducted. Two approaches to data analysis were employed. The first phase entailed a formal, systematic analysis of the data. In this instance the material was reviewed pertaining to the statements, that is, opinions regarding the placement of handicapped children into special classes, special schools, residential institutions, by special educational leaders. The second phase entailed a formal, systematic analysis of the rationales submitted by special educational leaders for inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into special classes, special schools or residential institutions. Content analysis was used to determine the relative emphasis of frequency of various communication phenomena: propaganda, trends, styles, changes in content, readability. Content analysis is considered a method of observation and measurement.¹

After the data were collected and read, only those statements, that is, opinions concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children in special classes, special schools, or residential institutions by the educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations were analyzed. Specifically, the following research system was utilized in an attempt to analyze content analysis relative to the stated research problem:

a. When was the statement/opinion recorded?
b. Who made the statement/opinion?
c. How often was the statement/opinion recorded?
d. Who agreed or disagreed with the statement/opinion?
e. What result did the statement/opinion have?
f. What rationales were offered for the statement/opinion?

The framework for analyses was as follows: Opinions were classified as to inclusion/exclusion. The inclusion statements were further classified as to the regular classroom placement. Statements of rationales were classified according to the social view of the educational leaders; that is, whether they supported the inclusion or exclusion of the handicapped from normal societal arrangements. The framework for analyses also included any variations according to the nature and severity of the handicapped, that is, mild, moderate, severe, or profound condition.
The data were examined in order to answer the problem and research questions delineated in this study. This information was used to draw conclusions, implications and recommendations delineated in Chapter V.
CHAPTER IV

RESULT OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter reviewed and discussed the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders prior to the enactment of Public Law 94-142 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers. Specifically, two questions were studied: (1) What were the opinions of these special educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings and reports of educational organizations between the period 1900 and 1970 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children; and (2) what was the nature of their opinions and were there any implications that their opinions affected the passage of P.L. 94-142?

For the purpose of this study inclusion referred to integrating handicapped children, except the profound and severely handicapped, into classes with their nonhandicapped peers for instruction. Exclusion referred to providing segregated or isolated settings for instructing handicapped children whether in residential institutions, special classes, or special schools within public school programs.
The selected special educational leaders studied were Walter E. Fernald, Henry H. Goddard, Lightner Witmer, Wallace J. E. Wallin, Edgar A. Doll, Samuel A. Kirk, William Cruickshank, Lloyd Dunn, Maynard C. Reynolds, and Jack W. Birch. These individuals were past and/or current members and officers of the oldest educational organizations (AAMD, CEC, NARC) whose writings and voices were heard during the period 1900 thru 1970. Many of these individuals received the Council for Exceptional Children's highest award, the Wallin Award, and served as the Council's president and/or president of the American Association on Mental Retardation.

The materials in the investigation met the following criteria:

1. Published between 1900 and 1970 or prior to 1900; and

2. Provided the opinions of this selected group of selected special educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children in classes with their nonhandicapped peers.

All the minutes, proceedings, addresses, reports and writings which discussed inclusion or exclusion of the handicapped children with their nonhandicapped peers were reviewed. Professional journals from the AAMD, CEC, and NARC from 1900 to 1970 were used because these organizations were identified as the oldest advocates and contributors to special education.

As described earlier in Chapter Two, the history of special education fell into three periods: (1) From the
residential institutions to the depression, 1900-1930; (2) From the depression to the aftermath of World War II, 1931-1950; and (3) From World War II to the emerging trend toward inclusion, 1951-1970.

The discussion of the selected special educational leaders' opinions and the nature of their opinions appear in summary statements in Tables I, II, and III. Figures 1 and 2 list the educational organizations and the selected special educational leaders' opinion concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers. These are categorized according to three periods. (See Appendices).

Findings

From the Residential Institutions to the Depression, 1900-1930

Walter E. Fernald

In his address in 1893, Walter E. Fernald pointed out that the first public institutions specifically constructed for the care and treatment of the feebleminded were organized strictly as educational institutions. He quoted Samuel Howe who said: "This institution, being intended for a school, should not be converted into an asylum for incurables." Fernald further pointed out that the burden of caring for the

Table I
Summary of the Findings
From the Residential Institutions to the Depression, 1900-1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Educational Leader</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter E. Fernald</td>
<td>The History of the Treatment of the Feebleminded, AAMD (1893)</td>
<td>&quot;The brighter class of the feebleminded should have permanent care.&quot;</td>
<td>They are a menace to society. They are annoyance to normal students.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Mentally Defective Children in the Public Schools,&quot; Journal of Psycho-Asthenics (1903-4), AAMD</td>
<td>&quot;In an institution the child's life is carefully supervised.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;For the welfare of the child and society.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Proceedings: NEA,&quot; Volta Review (1906)</td>
<td>&quot;All degrees of mental defects are defects that should be protected and prevented from marriage.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;They produce their own kind. For the welfare of society and for the welfare of the child.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Burden of Feeblemindedness,&quot; Journal of Psycho-Asthenics (1912)</td>
<td>&quot;The feebleminded are parasitic, predatory class never capable of support or managing their own affairs.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;They cause unutterable sorrow at home and are a menace and danger to the community.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Thirty Years Progress in the Care of the Feebleminded,&quot; Journal of Psycho-Asthenics, AAMD (1924)</td>
<td>&quot;The feebleminded cannot be permanently segregated in institutions.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;They can adjust at home.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Educational Leader</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry H. Goddard</td>
<td>&quot;Impressions of European Institutions and Special Classes,&quot; Journal of Psycho-Asthenics AAMD (1908)</td>
<td>&quot;They think that special education is going to make them normal.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;None of the teachers understand the cases.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Causes of Backwardness and Mental Deficiency in Children and How to Prevent Them,&quot; NEA (1911)</td>
<td>&quot;Never letting go of them, keeping them for the rest of their lives.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;They shall become harmless and useful and happy as they can be made. Give them training.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeblemindedness, 1912</td>
<td>&quot;Once feebleminded never made normal. They should be segregated and sterilized.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;They are incapable of taking their place in the world.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Training of Defective Children, 1915</td>
<td>&quot;Give them the kind of training they can take to live in a social environment like a colony.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;It is much kinder and more humane.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightner Witmer</td>
<td>The Special Class for Backward Children, 1911</td>
<td>&quot;They are educable and can be trained in the public day school but it would be undesirable to do so.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Segregation of these children in order that they may not pass their lives among normal children.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Provisions for Exceptional Children in Public Schools, Bulletin U.S. Bureau of Education, 1911</td>
<td>&quot;Institutions ought to be able to train the difficult cases. The educable can be trained in the public day schools.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not pass their lives among normal children, with the danger of moral contagion and and the possibility of propagating their kind.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Educational Leaders</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace J. E. Wallin</td>
<td>Education of Mentally Handicapped Children, 1924</td>
<td>&quot;The public schools duty to identify them, segregate them in special schools for training.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;To equip them for practical remunerative service. To be self-sufficient.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proceedings: Journal of Psycho-Asthenics, AMD (1922)</td>
<td>&quot;The goal of the school to train and educate.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;To provide for their particular needs where they cannot hamper the work of the normal pupils.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address: Ohio State Teachers Association, 1923, CEC Exceptional Timetables</td>
<td>&quot;The mentally backward should be placed in ungraded classes for individual attention and training they require.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;In order for the state to economically educate its children and not hamper the work of the normal pupils.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar A. Doll</td>
<td>Address: NEA Journal of Psycho-Asthenics, 1924</td>
<td>&quot;Vital that special class work should function in graduating special class children to society.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;So they will never reach institutions and make adapting to home and community life.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
unimprovable or lower class idiots was great; for every five idiots cared for, four were restored to productive community life. He said:

The home care of a low grade idiot consumes too much of the working capacity of the wage earner of the household that often the entire family becomes pauperized. Humanity and public policy demand that these families should be relieved of the burden of these helpless idiots.¹

Fernald pointed also to the problem of the brighter class of the feebleminded who became drunkards, and thieves. He emphasized the desireability of assuming permanent care of these people because they reproduced their own kind. He stated: "There is hardly a poorhouse in this land where there are not two or more feebleminded women with one to four illegitimate children each."²

Speaking on "The Mentally Defective Children in the Public Schools," Fernald noted that backward children were in every ordinary school. He stated, "Children who are too feebleminded to be taught properly in ordinary elementary schools' special classes have been shown to be incapable of receiving any proper benefit from instruction given in the special classes."³ Fernald reasoned, "A parent with a refined, comfortable, well regulated home would prefer the

²Ibid.
special classes to an institutional school. These classes would relieve the annoyance felt by the normal student in those classes which involved defective children.¹

Permanent custody was stressed in Fernald's paper in 1906. According to Fernald, genetic causes were relative to the degree of deficiency of mental capacity which required different treatment. He said, "All degrees are a result of defects of the brain and cannot be cured."² He also pointed out:

Training would benefit some but not all children, especially the idiot and the lower grade imbecile. The brighter class becomes prostitutes, vagrants or petty thieves. They should be prevented from their own weakness and the cupidity of others. They should be prevented from marriage and the reproduction of their kind.³

A paper presented at the 1912 meeting of the AAMD by Walter E. Fernald summed up what was becoming the public attitude toward feeblemindedness during this period. Fernald said:

The feebleminded are a parasitic, predatory class never capable of support or managing their own affairs. The great majority ultimately become public charges in some form. They cause unutterable sorrow at home and are a menace and danger to the community.


Feebleminded women are almost invariably immoral and if at large, usually become carriers of venereal disease or give birth to children who are as defective as themselves. The feebleminded woman who marries is twice as prolific as the normal woman.¹

Fernald felt that the problem of feeblemindedness constituted one of the great social economic burdens of this period. He aimed at public consciousness and continued:

Every feebleminded person, especially the high grade imbecile, is a potential criminal, needing only the proper environment and opportunity for the development and expression of his criminal tendencies. The unrecognized imbecile is a most dangerous element in the community. There are many crimes committed by imbeciles for everyone committed by an insane person. The average prison population contains more imbeciles than lunatics. The term "defective delinquent" is applied to this special class of defectives where the mental lack is relatively slight, though unmistakable and criminal tendencies are marked and constant. The only way to reduce the number of feebleminded is to prevent their birth.²

In 1924 Fernald stated the objectives of AAMD: (1) The establishment of special classes for feebleminded children in large towns and cities, and (2) the segregation of mentally deficient persons for institutional care and training, with permanent segregation of those who cannot make satisfactory special adjustment in the community. Fernald concluded his president's address:

We now know that all of the feebleminded cannot be permanently segregated in institutions. We believe that the vast majority will adjust themselves; at home

²Ibid., p. 92.
as they have always done in the past. Our newer knowledge on unselected defectives verifies our belief that there are good defectives and bad defectives but seems to show the good vastly outnumber the bad.1

Henry H. Goddard

In his paper of 1908, Goddard stated that the high grade imbeciles in the special classes were not going to be made normal. He said:

To my mind the unfortunate thing about it is that almost none of the teachers understand the cases, but think that this special education is going to make them normal. It is a very unfortunate state of affairs. This great body of people, the educators and friends of education and also the medical and institutional people should be working together for the one great need, the permanent custody of all mental defectives.2

In a paper presented to the National Education Association (NEA) in 1911, he concurred with the mood of the period, to keep the feebleminded in the residential institutions for the rest of their lives. He said:

The great problem is to recognize these type of children; to take them out of the regular classes; to place them in special classes and give them the kind of training which they can take; to do for them the best that can be done under the circumstances, never letting go of them, keeping in touch with them, not until they are sixteen years of age only,


but throughout the rest of their lives, to the end that they shall become not only as harmless as possible, but as useful and happy as they can be made.¹

Goddard continued:

They are not mentally defective in the sense of the term, but merely backward. They must be led on patiently; they may require five years to do what average children do in four. The mentally defective or feebleminded on the other hand, who through either hereditary or other causes are so badly retarded in mentality that they can never overcome their difficulty and must always be incapable of taking their place in the world. They should be segregated completely in institutions and sterilized.²

In his book in 1915 he stated:

A child once feebleminded is never made normal. A very, very small percentage of them can be trained so that they may be able to eke out a miserable existence, perhaps supporting themselves; but it is probably cruel to require even that of them. It would be much kinder and more humane to give them the opportunity to live in a social environment like a colony.³

Goddard's rationale for placement in a social environment like a colony was... "where the harder problems of life do not come up to them, but where they can work and do as much as they are capable of doing, and can therefore live comfortably and happily."⁴


²Ibid., p. 1041.


⁴Ibid.
Lightner Witmer

During this period, Witmer wrote, "The backward child will show us the educational way for all children."\(^1\) Witmer followed the tenor of the times that the feebleminded were a burden to society and thereby required segregation. He stated:

Handicapped children for their own safety and for the safety of the children with whom they may be associated in the public schools, it is desirable that they should be removed from the schools and placed in institutions. Some are educable and can perhaps be trained in the public day schools, but it would be undesirable for them to be so treated. The most dangerous types of moral imbeciles come in this class. These children, some competent authority connected with the public school system, should be quick to recognize. Experts should be called in and the school authorities ought to lend their every assistant to obtain legal sanction for the segregation of these children in special institutions, in order that they may not pass their lives among normal children, with the danger of moral contagion and the possibility of propagating their kind.\(^2\)

In an attempt to distinguish between those cases which should be sent to institutions and those which should not, Witmer said:

It stands to reason that an institution which controls every hour of a child's existence—sleeping or awake—ought to be able to provide more effective training for difficult cases than can the public schools in day classes. In distinguishing between those cases which should not, we must take into consideration whether the child requires that kind

---


\(^2\) Ibid.
of work which the public school cannot supply in day classes.¹

Wallace J. E. Wallin

Wallace J. E. Wallin 1915 said:

It is the public schools duty toward the feebleminded to identify them, segregate them in special schools and provide them with the type of training that would directly and maximally equip them for practical, remunerative service, in state or municipal colonies.²

His rationale was the feebleminded could be trained and educated to the extent that they could become self-sufficient.

In 1922 before the AAMD, Wallin said:

My experience leads me to agree that the percentage of feebleminded criminals is quite small. It should be the goals of the school to train and educate feebleminded persons in our community.³

In an address to CEC he said:

Special classes must be flexible so that the child can be transferred from one class to the other. Furthermore, the terms feebleminded, mentally defective, imbecile and moronic for children in special classes or special schools should be abandoned.⁴

Wallin also suggested:


⁴Wallace J. E. Wallin, Address, CEC Exceptional Timetables (1923): 18.
In order that the state may economically educate its children according to their several needs, it is necessary that all the feebleminded be diagnosed and classified as early as possible so that they may be provided with the type of instruction which will fit their peculiar needs and so that they may be removed from the regular grades where they hamper the work of the normal pupils. The mentally backward should be placed in upgraded classes where they can be given the individual attention and the type of training they require.¹

Edgar A. Doll

Doll's address to the NEA summarized the progression of special education during this first period. He said:

We are remembering and are being reminded more and more of the necessity for caring for these large numbers of feebleminded in special classes, thereby relieving institutions of much training work that would otherwise have to be done there. It is also particularly vital that special class work should function as far as possible in graduating special class children to society so they will never reach institutions. The compulsory education laws and the change in the composition of the population have brought about a very serious change in the school populations of today. The school today have the first generation of that undesirable immigration period of the last 20 years. They have also many children who formerly, for economic reason or lack of compulsory education, did not attend school. So it should not be surprising that we find large numbers of children in the public schools today that cannot profit by ordinary courses. A practical definition of the feebleminded is those who cannot profit by ordinary school knowledge.

Only a small percentage of the feebleminded have antisocial or troublesome behavior. The larger percentage of the defectives diagnosed are able to make a comfortable adaptation to home and community life.¹

From the Depression to the Aftermath of World War II, 1931-1950

Edgar A. Doll

Edgar Doll's president's address to the AAMD re-emphasized his concern for social competency regarding the handicapped. He said:

It is evident that for the majority of patients' mental deficiency must be viewed as a condition which can best be ameliorated through industrial and social training, sometimes euphemistically termed occupational therapy.²

Doll recognized feeblemindedness was regarded as incurable and that systems of training could be established for social adequacy under certain conditions. He stated:

We may think of many of the high grade feebleminded as capable of social survival with a fair degree of success, if they are given such social assistance as will make their permanent institutional care unnecessary.³

Doll advocated extreme departures from traditional education in favor of special education. He said:

Special classes in the public schools and educational departments in public institutions have attained a high level of


³Ibid., p. 42.
### Table II

**Summary of the Findings**

*From the Depression to the Aftermath of World War II, 1931-1950*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Educational Leader</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edgar A. Doll</td>
<td>&quot;Current Thoughts on Mental Deficiency,&quot; <em>Journal of Psycho-Asthenics</em> (1936)</td>
<td>&quot;Special classes have attained a high level of instruction, but we must make radical departures if we are to make progress.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Capable of social survival with a fair degree of success if given social assistance.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry H. Goddard</td>
<td>&quot;The Psychology of the Status Quo of Exceptional Children,&quot; <em>Journal of Exceptional Children</em> (1939) CEC</td>
<td>&quot;The special class is applicable to the backward and the feebleminded. They are happy with their work and no problem of discipline, truancy or delinquency.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Children with the lowest mentality need training, both for their own sakes and for the sake of the public. Without training they are helpless.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel A. Kirk</td>
<td>&quot;Are Mentally Handicapped Children Segregated in the Regular Grades?&quot; <em>Journal of Exceptional Children</em> (1950) CEC</td>
<td>&quot;It should not be assumed that handicapped children will be accepted by their non-handicapped peers.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Children segregate other children in their midst.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instruction, but must we not make radical departures from existing educational concepts if we are to make further progress? The traditional goal of education has been to produce more talent rather than exploit existing talent.¹

Doll recognized a critical difference existed between good social habits and inability to adjust in the community. He also recognized that the feebleminded had many abilities, and that people ignored them because they were blinded by their disabilities. He reasoned:

If we could ever learn to teach the feeble-minded what they can master and will make use of, and if we could accept them as they are rather than trying to make them over into what we would like them to be, we could probably take critical steps toward a new day in the training of the feeble-minded.²

Doll further stated:

Among ourselves we say that the feeble-minded are trainable, but not educable. Why then do we continue to consume their energies along the lines of education and thereby deprive them of the benefits of training? Can we not conceive all aspects of their living as providing training opportunities? Why should training be confined to the classroom and shop? Can we not anticipate the day when attendants will be replaced by teachers and every phase of institutional living will be capitalized for its inherent training value?³

Doll recognized the practical difficulties of adequate diagnosis and adequate proof of the hereditary nature of mental

¹Ibid.
²Ibid., p. 43.
³Ibid., p. 44.
mental deficiency. Nonetheless, he also viewed sterilization as a basic measure of control because he continued:

Surely there can be no doubt that many of the feebleminded should be sterilized for their own protection and advantage, as well as for the benefit of society. In these instances, much good for the patient and for society could be accomplished if sterilization were permissible on a selective basis.¹

Another measure of control was segregation, that is, exclusion in residential institutions, special classes, or special schools. Regarding segregation Doll said that the pendulum had swung both ways with respect to the advantages of institutional care as compared to community supervision. He noted:

Certainly we shall do well to consider the institution as a school rather than as an asylum, training and graduating its pupils rather than holding them for life, and returning them for further care if that be necessary.²

Henry H. Goddard

Henry H. Goddard in 1939 acknowledged that there were no children who could not profit by instruction. Once again he emphasized instruction and training of the feebleminded. He said:

Even the lowest mentality need instruction and training, both for their own sakes and for the sake of the public. Without training they are helpless and become paupers and criminals.

¹Ibid., p. 45.
²Ibid.
Even the lowest grade idiots that must have custodial care are cared for at less expense when they are trained. Those that cannot be cared for in the local school, because of their low condition, may be sent to the State School as our Institutions for the Feebleminded ought to be called.¹

Samuel A. Kirk

In 1946 Samuel A. Kirk questioned the placement of the handicapped. He said:

Those who favor the placement of mentally handicapped children in the regular grades are favoring this procedure without considering the fact that children themselves may segregate other children in their midst.²

Prior to Kirk's questioning, the practicality and feasibility of homogeneous grouping was viewed as promising. Kirk questioned further and concluded:

It should not now be assumed that because children in regular grades are segregating exceptional children that placement of the children in special class is accomplishing the desired result. Special education should continually ask: Do the mentally handicapped children placed in special classes continue to do other things after they have been placed in special classes? Are they becoming more socially unacceptable in their community after placement in the special class? These are some of the questions that must be answered before it can be stated that the special class is the last answer to the problem.³


³Ibid., p. 88.
Samuel A. Kirk

Samuel Kirk raised the question in 1951, "Can mentally handicapped children adjust to the traditional public school grade?" Kirk did not directly answer the question. Instead, he inferred that the conditions under which the handicapped were placed in the special classes raised questions. He said:

This problem has been argued for many years, yet we have very little experimental evidence to support one or another point of view. Many mentally handicapped children are allowed to sit in the grades. If they are docile and obedient, they are tolerated. If they become aggressive because of continual failure, they are given some attention and are excluded as incorrigibles or as mental deficient, or are sent to special classes or special schools.

The special classes were in the regular schools and they were to provide the mentally handicapped with opportunities for wider experiences through contacts with normal children. In 1962 Kirk re-emphasized the dilemma of segregation. He stated:

---


2Ibid., p. 123.

*The best plan yet discovered is the special class with the so-called enriched curriculum. Some school people still are opposed to the segregation of the gifted. However, the arguments advanced are just as applicable to the backward and the feebleminded who no one objects to segregating. In these classes the children are happy in their work and there is no problem of discipline, truancy or delinquency.*

Table III
Summary of the Findings
From World War II to the Emerging Trend Toward Inclusion, 1951-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Educational Leader</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel A. Kirk</td>
<td>Educating the Retarded Child, 1951</td>
<td>&quot;Special classes are another form of ability grouping.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;It is no more segregating than grouping according to their chronological ages.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Are Special Classes Beneficial?&quot; The Slow Learner, 1962</td>
<td>&quot;Special classes are not universally accepted as being beneficial.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The issue has not been resolved either from a philosophical standpoint or from empirical evidence.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cruickshank</td>
<td>The Exceptional Child in Contemporary Education, 1952</td>
<td>&quot;Special class is an essential part of the educational program.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Administrative policy insofar as educationally and philosophically possible.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Education of Exceptional Children and Youth, 1958</td>
<td>&quot;Those things which can be considered good in the special class should be retained and further perfected.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We do not have research to assure ourselves that it really will.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Education of Exceptional Children and Youth, (2nd Ed.) 1967</td>
<td>&quot;Special classes are appropriate for educable mentally handicapped children as well as for others.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Must focus on occupational and social needs as successfully adjusted adult citizens.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Educational Leader</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Dunn</td>
<td>Exceptional Children in the Schools, 1963</td>
<td>&quot;We cannot assume that handicapped children will be accepted by their non-handicapped peers by placing them in the regular classrooms. Physical integration does not assure social integration.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Extreme pressure for physical integration.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Special Education for the Mildly Retarded—Is Much of it Justifiable?&quot; Exceptional Children (1968)</td>
<td>&quot;We must stop segregating them by placing them into our allegedly special programs.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Our past and present practices are morally and educationally wrong.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard C. Reynolds</td>
<td>Exceptional Children Council for Exceptional Children, 1962</td>
<td>&quot;It can be a disturbing experience for a child to be placed in a special class or any type of special program.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Normal home and school life should be preserved if all possible. It should be no more special than necessary.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Policy Statements: Call for Response,&quot; Exceptional Children, CEC 1971</td>
<td>&quot;Special education should be arranged so that normal home, school, community life is maintained whenever feasible.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Special education placements should be made only after careful study and for compelling reasons.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack W. Birch</td>
<td>&quot;The Invisible College on Mainstreaming,&quot; Exceptional Children CEC, 1970</td>
<td>&quot;I'm talking about children being right in the same classes.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The only reason for removing any child from a regular class setting is that you absolutely find it impossible to provide the education that child needs in that setting.&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Unfortunately, the term segregation has been used to include the placement of educable mentally retarded children in special classes. This is misleading since the term originally applied to the removal of children from the school, the home, and the community for placement in institutions, hospitals, and residential centers. Realistically, the placing of children in special classes in the public school is just another form of ability grouping. It is no more segregation than grouping children according to their chronological ages.¹

William Cruickshank

In a lecture in 1952, Cruickshank emphasized integration based upon certain requisites, namely; complete assessment of the child, adequately prepared teachers and small classes.

He said:

It is our further considered judgment that the special class is an essential part of the educational program for the child with retarded mental development. Such a program, however, cannot be a traditional custodial program, busy work, or watered down educational offering. It must be a developmental program, different from that provided for normal children, in keeping with occupational and social needs as a retarded adult. The factor of a special class program need not result in complete isolation for these children. Integration of these special classes into the total school program should be the aim of every good administrator insofar as educationally and philosophically possible.²


In his book in 1958, Cruickshank again stressed the necessity for special classes for the handicapped. He said:

Those things which can be considered good in the special class should be retained and further perfected. Those elements which give rise to sound hope for integration should immediately be put to the test. Integration may indeed work, but we do not have the research at present to assure ourselves that it really will.¹

Cruickshank noted the development of education for exceptional children in 1967. After acknowledging the various groups and parental involvement due to the increase of the number of handicapped children being served in the public schools, he stated:

Special education classes are appropriate for educable mentally handicapped children as well as for others. These classes, however, must also be focused on deficits conceptualized in terms of the occupational and social needs of the retarded as successfully adjusted adult citizens. They must contain children who are appropriately diagnosed and who are genuinely retarded as opposed to those who have experienced serious cultural or environmental deprivation.²

Lloyd M. Dunn

In 1963 Dunn contrasted physical integration and social segregation. He said:

We appear to have passed through the era of extreme pressure for physical integration of exceptional children into the regular


grades. It now seems clear that we cannot assume that handicapped children will be accepted by their nonhandicapped peers simply by placing them in the regular classroom. In other words, physical integration does not assure social integration. In fact pupils may be more cruelly segregated socially in a program when they are not accepted by their classmates than in one where they are physically separated from average pupils during school hours for academic instruction. Whenever a child is rejected by his peers it is the responsibility of the school to work at gaining social acceptance for him.1

Based on the information provided by Dunn, integration and segregation were not clearly defined because socially and physically handicapped children could be segregated physically and socially and yet not be integrated physically and socially with their nonhandicapped peers. For clarity, he continued:

When he cannot find success and social recognition in the regular grades (or even in some modification of the regular school plan) he should be provided the opportunity of finding acceptance in another program. Social integration with physical integration is always a possibility with the unusual child in the regular classroom.2

According to Dunn the attitudes of the administration could make the difference regarding social segregation and physical integration. He stated:

The attitudes fostered by the administration among faculty, pupils and parents and the ingenuity exhibited in solving the problems


2Ibid.
involved, constitute approaches that can produce both social acceptance and psychological integration.¹

In 1968 Dunn prefaced his article by stating that he had loyally supported and promoted special classes for the educable mentally retarded for the last twenty years but with growing disaffection. He said:

In my view, much of our past and present practices are morally and educationally wrong. We have been living at the mercy of general educators who have referred their problem children to us. We have been generally ill prepared and ineffective in educating these children. Let us stop being pressured into continuing and expanding a special education program that we know now to be undesirable for many of the children we are dedicated to serve.²

In a later publication, Dunn stated that neither segregated special schools and classes nor any other form of tracking will be viewed as a substitute for schools that are integrated in terms of ethnic background, race, and socioeconomics. Other children who were not necessarily handicapped physically were being placed in the special classes. Dunn said:

This expensive proliferation of self-contained special schools and classes raises serious educational and civil rights issues which must be squarely faced. We must stop segregating them by placing them into our allegedly special programs.³

¹Ibid.


³Ibid., p. 9.
Maynard C. Reynolds

Reynolds recognized the conflicting values in special education that surrounded segregation. He said:

It is correctly argued, for example, that removing a child from his home and neighborhood school for placement in a residential school is a serious matter. It may be convenient to make such placements routinely, but conflicting values emerge which in fact place extraordinary responsibility upon those who make such placement decisions.1

Regarding special services to the handicapped Reynolds said:

Similarly, it can be a disturbing experience for a child to be placed in a special class or any type of special program. But it is also inexcusable to delay or deny special services when they are needed. The prevailing view is that normal home and school life should be preserved if all possible. When a special placement is necessary to provide suitable care and education, it should be no more special than necessary.2

In a later publication once again Reynolds emphasized:

Special education should be arranged so that the normal home, school, and community life is maintained whenever feasible. Special education placements, particularly those involving separation from normal home life, should be made only after careful study and and for compelling reasons.3

---


2 Ibid., p. 368.

Jack W. Birch

Birch was one of the first special educational leaders to use the term mainstreaming, that is, placing handicapped children into regular classes with their nonhandicapped peers. Birch said:

When I think of mainstreaming I think simply of beginning education for all children together in the same schools (the neighborhood schools) and with the same overall teaching staff and individualizing education for those youngsters. I'm talking about all children being right in the same classes.¹

To Birch the principles, procedures, and techniques of teaching handicapped children were just as effective for regular class children. He stated:

I view mainstreaming as bringing high quality special education to all those children who need it, to the extent that they need it, and bringing it to them in the context of the regular class, at the same time that all the other children in the regular class are getting the high quality education that they need. I think that there are instances when the children we call exceptional also need and will profit from exactly the same thing that the other children profit from.²

Birch advocated integration of all handicapped children and he offered his rationale. He said:


²Ibid., p. 80.
The only reason, as I see it, for removing any child from a regular class setting is that you absolutely find it impossible to provide the education that child needs in that setting. And I mean when it is impossible.

Discussion of the Findings

From the Residential Institutions to the Depression, 1900-1930

Much of what happened during this period was the result of the men and women who attended the meetings of the American Association on Mental Deficiency (AAMD). These were the leaders in the scientific community and the most knowledgeable about feeblemindedness. These meetings set the tone for the thinking and opinions expressed by people outside of the discipline. Some of their opinions were translated into social and legislative action.

Most people believed brain defects could not be cured. The opinions of Fernald and Goddard were so highly regarded that sterilization laws were enacted in Massachusetts where Fernald was superintendent of the Templeton Farm Colony for the Feebleminded. Goddard's Kallikak Family, data on a family of imbeciles, was compiled while he headed the Department of Psychological Research at Vineland, New Jersey. His influence on public opinion initiated the eugenics movement with the resulting drive toward expanding the idea of sterilization.

\(^1\)Ibid.
Six states proposed compulsory surgical sterilization to prevent hereditary transmission of feeblemindedness. Goddard's, Kallikak Family, was taken as proof of the genetic origin of feeblemindedness. His data on the question of mental growth concluded that a very small percentage of feebleminded children were making any mental improvement. Goddard's influence in New Jersey also led local school boards to determine the number of handicapped children within school districts and provide special classes where there existed ten or more children who were handicapped.¹

It was generally felt that the higher grade of imbeciles were socially and morally defective. Therefore, the educational leaders advocated control of marriages, sterilization and exclusion of the handicapped in the institutions.

The early institutions had a large population of high grade or improvable class of idiots. The goal was to educate them so that they would be capable of supporting themselves. The state did not want to assume permanent care of the handicapped. Their goal was to return the handicapped to their homes after they had been trained and educated. Training had positive value for the high grade imbeciles.

Life age and mental age were factors relative to the objective scientific method of measuring intelligence. Classification was viewed as means of evaluating for diagnostic,

¹Henry H. Goddard, Exceptional Timetables (Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1912), p. 28.
planning, and placement purposes. A very small percentage of feebleminded children make some progress in mental improvement but the rate was slower than normal. The Goddard-Kuhlmann debated reduced efforts to educate and train the feebleminded and reinforced the reason for sterilization, segregation and permanent institutionalization. However, Kuhlmann did not express any opinion relative to the inclusion or exclusion of the handicapped during this period. He was considered in this period for his contribution which centered around the problem of classification.

With the broadening of the work of the residential institutions to include adults and lower classes of idiots, dissent on the matter of including the feebleminded into the educational environment whether in the special class, school or institution centered around the classification of the handicapped.

Fernald made the distinction between the various titles used. Idiocy described the whole range of mental defects specifically the lower grade. Imbecility referred to the higher grades. Feebleminded was a less harsh expression and satisfactorily described the entire range. Adults required permanent care while children, even in the special class, were there only temporarily. Fernald reasoned that children were tolerated in the community, but adults would have to be protected from themselves and others.
Goddard proposed the terms idiot, imbecile and feebleminded, each with three sub-divisions: Low, middle and high. By tying this classification to the Binet scale, he gave uniformity for commitment procedures to be used from institution to institution or state to state. The feebleminded were capable of learning but the methods of communicating with them had been improperly developed. The feebleminded could learn but it took them longer and required more patience. They could not learn up to the level of the normal but they could learn much beyond what was expected of them. Feeblemindedness was of an environmental nature and not entirely within the individual.

Edgar A. Doll also contributed to the idea of classification of the feebleminded. He divided the feebleminded into two types: Those who were stable and those who were habitually unstable. His interest in the defective delinquent and social competence resulted in the development of the Vineland Social Maturity Scale.

With classification, the special classes, special schools, and residential institutions grew. A larger population of handicapped children were visible and needed educational services. The institution was a haven for the hereditary nature of feeblemindedness and its incurability. By isolating and segregating them in the institution, propagation could be controlled and the purity of the group could be maintained. Once classification was established, the ambiguity of those
who required training, those who required special classes, and those who required the environment of the colony was removed. Special classes were for slow pupils who were not mentally defective but merely backward and could not progress at the rate that the ordinary school curriculum presupposed.

The institutions returned to the community the best behaved and brighter class of feebleminded, however, the defective delinquent and lower class feebleminded were permanently segregated. Those returned were educable and suited for special classes, schools or colonies. As the population of the handicapped grew, demands upon the state for funding also grew. Several alternative programs for rehabilitation in community oriented environments were proposed in place of permanent segregation in the institutions.

The colony was for the brighter class of the feebleminded where they received a form of industrial training as well as scholastic training. The renumeration from the resources of their work was used to defray expenses of operating the colony and thereby relieved some of the financial burden of the state.

The term "defective delinquent" had its roots in the term juvenile delinquent, inasmuch as Fernald stated that at least 25 percent of the inmates were habitually unstable. His recommendation for a complete and permanent census of the feebleminded persuaded Massachusetts to enact laws providing for separate segregation of defective delinquents in 1922.
Although training was perceived as necessary for the high grade feebleminded or backward, it was believed that neither the special class nor special education services would result in normalcy. The feebleminded need a method of training different from that of normal children. Witmer published the first book specifically about the special class as an approach to individualized instruction for the handicapped. The term trainable was introduced to denote the lower grade of feeblemindedness and the term educable was introduced to denote the higher grade of feeblemindedness. The distinction served as the acceptable segregation arrangement for the handicapped either in the residential institution or the special class. Witmer's individualized educational program involving an interdisciplinary team was a new approach to teaching and it served as a model for special education of the handicapped.

Concern for classification of the feebleminded revealed various groups and levels of feeblemindedness. However, the labels hindered their education. Wallin's *Education of Mentally Handicapped* indicated that no child should be committed to a residential institution if he could be educated in the special class or school. He further indicated that labels should be removed and trained teachers should teach the handicapped. The early teachers of the handicapped were trained in the categorical institutions for the blind and the deaf.

Some of the early special educational leaders (Fernald, Goddard, Kuhlmann, and Doll) were psychologists with medical
backgrounds whose concerns were mainly focused on the trainable and mentally defectives. Therefore, the residential institutions served the purpose of training in an isolated environment. Others were educators who championed the merits of the teaching profession and advocated educating the restorative or educables in special classes and schools. It was emphasized that the custodial cases or trainables should remain in the institutions.

Although it was suggested that labels be removed, there would still be some handicapped who would require individualized instruction in an environment suited to their needs. Basically, exclusionary practices were inescapable for the care and treatment of the handicapped. Based upon the positions of Wallin and Witmer, the quality and purpose of the institutions was less than inspiring for all the handicapped, especially the educable. The special class or school was beneficial for this purpose. The special class was for the annoyance experienced by normal students with the presence of handicapped children. This opinion emphasized the reason why the handicapped were not included in the regular classroom with their nonhandicapped peers.

The AAMD was the major source for Fernald, Goddard, Wallin and Doll to express their views. Goddard, Witmer and Wallin published extensively during the period 1900 to 1930. Fernald and Goddard addressed the issue of inclusion or exclusion five times and exemplified public opinion as
indicated in social and legislative action. The special educational leaders advocated segregation of the trainable and mentally defective in residential institutions and the colony. Special classes and schools, although exclusionary, were inspiring for the preparation of a self-supporting life in the community. Permanent segregation was advocated for the defective delinquents, idiots, and imbeciles who were a threat to society. The NEA and professionals outside of the AAMD recognized the problems related to the practicality and feasibility of homogenous grouping of the handicapped and were responsible for developing teacher education programs. The stated objectives of the AAMD summarized their position for the exclusion of some handicaps in the residential institutions and the segregation of others in special classes and schools.

From the Depression to the Aftermath of World War II, 1931-1950

Special education programs were influenced by the traditional scholastic classroom concept of education. The positive values of training were emphasized and were essential since the handicapped were being returned to the community in record numbers. It was expressed that these youngsters must be trained and educated to be self-supportive in life. Therefore, training of imbeciles was productive when they were trained along the lines of social adaptation in simple occupational pursuits rather than along the lines of academic and motor skills.
The educational problem was to provide those training situations and methods that would enable the handicapped to capitalize on their assets without exaggerating their disabilities. Therefore, the psychological debate of training versus community programs was an issue and it was re-emphasized that mental deficiency must be viewed as a condition that could be ameliorated through industrial and social training providing social assistance given in the community-based systems. The responsibility of supervision of the handicapped once they were returned was a problem. There was a desire for re-orientation and reexamination of traditional attitudes and practices in the field of mental deficiency. Supervision was suggested by a state public health nurse and/or state colony programs. These were extra-institutional care programs. Nonetheless, these programs were extensions of the segregation exclusion of the handicapped in the community.

One of the great advantages about the special classes was that their social habits could be regulated. Kuhlmann's address reviewed the conflicts between the advice of leaders in the field of mental deficiency and what the public permitted to be put into practice. He considered what would have happened if the opinions of the best authorities on mental deficiency had prevailed at all times, rather than giving in to public opinion. Public opinion had been swayed by educational leaders of the past, however, they were overruled and ignored during this time. In an effort to rally the AAMD, Kuhlmann singled out four matters of major importance which
heads of state institutions and others in authority recommended and pleaded for policies and procedures that were not put into practice. First was the necessity of limiting admissions to the state schools for trainable cases only. Failure of professional opinion to prevail had resulted in institutions which cared for all grades, rather than having separate custodial asylums. Second was the failure of institution industries to sell its products on the open market. Third was the failure to get permanent commitment of all mental defectives to state institutions. Fourth was the failure to get public support for the colony plan. At the close of his address, Kuhlmann pointed out that while experts made mistakes, they did not result in any great or lasting harm to the cause of mental deficiency. However, the poor vision and will of the public had hurt the mentally defective. His views did not reveal his position or rationale regarding inclusion or exclusion of the handicapped. Nonetheless, he raised the question relative to the effect of public opinion over the advice of the experts in the field of mental deficiency.

The problem of whether or not handicapped children were segregated when placed in special classes was not conclusive in the results of the studies that were available. Although the handicapped were physically present in the special classes, whether traditional or progressive types, they were still segregated. Kirk was the first special educational leader to question the benefit of the special class.
Ideas relating etiology of feeblemindedness to hereditary causes, prevention, and the interest in sterilization waned in 1940 due to the documented practices of Nazi, Germany. The Depression and World War II delayed progress in special education programs both in the residential institutions and in the community based programs. Public opinion was in conflict with the educational leaders. Attention was focused on maintaining existing programs rather than expanding existing programs.

The demand for permanent segregation in the residential institutions waned also. Those who advocated permanent custody and sterilization for the trainables, having recognized levels of classification for educables, shifted their emphasis to special classes and special schools. This shifting came about as a result of the practical application of measuring intelligence, adequate diagnosis, and proof of the hereditary nature of mental deficiency.

The opinions and rationales reviewed during the period 1931 to 1950 were summarized and tabulated. The AAMD was the major source for Doll and Kuhlmann, whose addresses highlighted the history of the organization in an attempt to restore public confidence in the efforts of the authorities in the field of mental deficiency. However, Kuhlmann made no references to inclusion or exclusion of the handicapped. The CEC was the major source for Goddard and Kirk to voice their opinion. There was a sparsity of opinions relative to the inclusion or exclusion of the handicapped with their
nonhandicapped peers because of the status quo of the social, political and economical climate in which the educational organizations and their leaders existed. The educational leaders perceived special education as a positive value for the preparation of a self-supporting life. Public opinion and the opinions of the educational leaders were in conflict according to Kuhlmann. Therefore, there was reluctance to expand special educational programs due to the lack of funds and public confidence.

From World War II to the Emerging Trend Toward Inclusion, 1951-1970

After the World War many service personnel with physical, educational and intellectual difficulties were recognized. Changing attitudes toward handicapped children, legislation, compulsory school laws, population changes and the development of new techniques for discovering handicapped children brought additional thousands to the schools. Thirty-four states passed legislation regarding special education in the local schools. Growth of separate facilities within public school systems for the handicapped was rapid. Seventeen states made some provisions for funding local programs, teacher training, and research. The expansion of services for the handicapped was based on the intervention of the federal government. Grants were also provided by state and local school districts
which established a number of programs and appropriated funding for research and education.¹

The war years of the 1940s brought societal interest in better education and training of the handicapped. Special education had taken many forms in order to provide a broad spectrum of administrative arrangements. Based on the information provided by the special educational leaders, it was generally agreed that children with special needs should be educated in regular classroom and neighborhood schools insofar as this arrangement resulted in good educational progress. However, sometimes it was necessary to provide special supplementary services or to remove children from regular programs, their homes and communities for placement in special day or residential schools. These administrative arrangements were now being viewed as separate but equal segregated placement for the handicapped. Societal interest questioned whether the special class could effectually provide the needed education for all handicapped children. The demand of parental groups, evidenced by NARC, who believed in the viability of special classes increased.

The rise of the Civil Right Movement initiated litigation in the form of class action suits for various grievances such

as the Brown vs. Brown of Education in 1954. The Brown decision set the first legislative measure toward equality in education for all children. It resolved the issue of segregation—the segregation of individual or groups of children. However, special education practices of placing handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers was being questioned.

The terms segregation and integration were confused in educational environments. Special classes were not viewed as segregated educational facilities located in regular public schools. They were separate and viewed as unequal because they contained the handicapped only. Kirk's question about special classes was aimed at the educable mentally retarded (or slow learners, as they were called in some localities) because special classes were not universally accepted as being beneficial to these children. The issue had not been resolved either from a philosophical standpoint or from empirical evidence. This philosophical debate continued even after the Brown decision in 1954.

There was apprehension to integration based upon insufficient evidence that integration would work. Integration was not the total solution to the problem. There were severely handicapped children and children with multiple handicaps who would frequently need a special class or special

school. For these children special placement was mandatory. There would be an inevitable need for special classes and residential schools for children with severe physical handicaps. The integration of some handicapped and the segregation of others raised many questions. Physical integration did not assure social integration because the special classes had become the dumping grounds for misfits. Those who advocated special classes for the educable mentally retarded had not recognized the infiltration of the culturally and socio-economically deprived. They made no references to the children who were from low status backgrounds, who were proliferating the special classes, whose civil rights were being maligned, and who were expanding special educational programs. The general educators were referring those children other than the handicapped to special classes. Dunn challenged the segregating practices of the special classes. The detrimental effects of labeling revealed that education was not only a right, but that education should be appropriate to the needs of the individual.

Educational services in the form of special classes, special schools, and residential institutions established a pattern of one system of education, regular or general education for normal children and another quite separate system for the handicapped. Reynolds recognized the importance of these services and indicated that these were the least restrictive services for the handicapped. The least restrictive environment was the best arrangement to provide quality special
education to all children who required such placement. Compared to Kirk, Cruickshank and Dunn, Reynolds did not designate the handicapped who were to receive special services. All children were exceptional and required special services.

Integration of the handicapped, according to some of the special educational leaders, depended on proper assessment of the handicapped. To segregate was educationally unsound; therefore, these special educational leaders recommended further study in order to resolve the philosophical debate surrounding placement of the handicapped. The right to education and the good intentions of special educational leaders concerning handicapped children resulted in inappropriate grouping and placement in the guise of special education. The IQ tests were sorting methods which produced scientific evidence that one was bright or dumb. Concern over the biasing effects of diagnostic categories and labels was brought about because the handicapped were placed in isolated, segregated, or tracked environments by the labels given to their condition. The labeling effect continued to perpetuate the sorting system according to age and ability grouping.

The efficacy of the special class, the academic and social benefit derived from such an environment did not alter the realization that the special class was an essential part of the education program. Various groups and parental involvement began to bring pressure upon the educational authorities
because they believed in the viability of the special class. They looked across all categories and noted the similarities and differences among handicapped children. In spite of the special educational leaders conflicting values regarding integration and segregation, they noticed that a sizeable percentage of handicapped being placed in special education classes were not so much handicapped as hard to teach. They pleaded for the special educational leaders to stop expanding programs. No original data was presented by the special educational leaders to prove any allegation of undesirability for special class. Arguments, negotiations and court action were initiated through NARC.

The opinions and rationales reviewed during the period 1951 to 1970 were summarized and tabulated. There were six publications related to the education of the handicapped by Kirk, Cruickshank, and Dunn. The special educational leaders were publishing their ideas. Their membership in the various educational organizations was mainly for exposure to the professionals in the field where their opinions could be heard. The CEC was the major source for Dunn, Reynolds, and Birch.

The integration of handicapped children in both public schools and communities under the aegis of mainstreaming, the least restrictive environment was viewed no more special than necessary when the labels were disregarded. The special educational leaders who claimed that all children could profit from instruction influenced Birch inasmuch as the mainstreaming movement was supported by a number of factors in 1970
such as: The activities of the parental groups; the intervention of the federal government; funding for state and local school districts and teacher training education; legislation and court decisions; value and attitude changes that emphasized the individual rather than the institution or society.

Summary

The selected special educational leaders' opinions indicated progression from benevolent caretaking, humanitarian concerns for the education of the handicapped in residential institutions to positive values of training and education in special classes and special schools. The nature of the selected special educational leaders' opinions indicated a shift from the exclusion of the handicapped toward inclusion into the regular classroom with their nonhandicapped peers. It was recognized that education should be appropriate to the needs of the individual child in the least restrictive environment and that special education should be no more special than necessary. The affects of the selected special educational leaders' opinions on the enactment of P.L. 94-142 were not attainable in this study and requires further research. However, the values and attitudes toward the handicapped by the public indicate that the opinions of the selected special educational leaders were akin to their value system and their later activity sought legislation toward inclusion of the handicapped with their nonhandicapped peers.
Composite Analysis (1900-1970)

Two research questions were investigated in this study. Specifically these questions were:

1. What were the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations from 1900 to 1970 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children?

2. What was the nature of the selected special educational leaders' opinions and what effect did their opinions have on the enactment of Public Law 94-142.

A composite analysis of the findings of the study indicated that the opinions of the selected special educational leaders could be classified according to the main issues that span the three periods outlined in the study. The main issues were:

1. **Social welfare and educational programs for the handicapped.** During the period from 1900 to 1930 there were clear indications of the basic approaches to feeblemindedness. The opinions of the selected special educational leaders maintained that these approaches were characterized by the assumption of the basic hereditary nature of feeblemindedness and its incurability, and by the solutions of control of: Marriages, sterilization, segregation and even euthanasia. It was noted that removing a feebleminded child from regular public school classes deprived them of the opportunity to mingle and imitate the more clever children and in that way make progress. However, in this zeitgeist, the laissez-faire policy allowed the fittest to fight it out, and the weaklings to die.
2. **Special educational programs for the handicapped** were exclusionary. The preferred measure of control was segregation of the handicapped either in the residential institutions or extra institutional care programs, or special classes or special schools. Children who were earlier in the century considered different and undesirable and were merely 'cared for' were now being educated. The old type of caretaking separated people with handicaps from their family and community. They were excluded and provided with educational training in personal care for good habits, and simple self-supporting occupations away from the nonhandicapped.

3. **Legislation placed the handicapped in educational settings.** Local school boards determined the number of handicapped children within their districts and provided funding for classes to teach them. In most instances classes were provided in places where there existed ten or more handicapped children. Schools for the blind and the deaf established early on served as models for the special classes and schools.

4. **Public opinion and federal government intervention expanded services and resources for the education of the handicapped.** With the enactment of the Veteran's Rehabilitation Act, the Mental Retardation Facilities Act, and the establishment of the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth under the Office of Education, scholarships and fellowships for teacher training programs and research advanced special education. The compulsory school attendance laws, the
discovery and the growth of the handicapped population persuaded local, state, and federal agencies to provide programs for the preparation of the handicapped for self-supporting lives in the community. Progressivism issued from an era of expansion.

5. Values and attitudes shifted from laissez-faire to progressive achievement for the handicapped. A unified front of values and attitudes surrounded the handicapped and was well established by 1961. Due to President Kennedy's influence, celebrities of stage, screen, and radio were enlisted to appear at fund raising events and were associated with specific organizations for the benefit of the handicapped. Funds and resources were readily available for various programs needed for the care, treatment, placement, and education of the handicapped.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the problem, major findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations drawn concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers prior to the enactment of Public Law 94-142.

Problem

This study was designed to identify the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders between the period 1900 to 1970 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children and the nature of their opinions and their affect, if any, on the enactment of Public Law 94-142.

Findings

For the purpose of this study inclusion referred to integrating handicapped children, except the profound and severely handicapped, into classes with their nonhandicapped peers for instruction. Exclusion referred to providing segregated or isolated settings for instructing handicapped
children whether in residential institutions, special classes, special schools, or public school programs.

Specifically, two questions were studied: (1) What were the opinions of a selected group of special educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings, and reports of educational organizations from 1900 through 1970 concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped, and (2) what was the nature of the selected special educational leaders' opinions and what affect did their opinions have on the enactment of Public Law 94-142.

The selected special educational leaders studied were Walter E. Fernald, Henry H. Goddard, Lightner Witmer, Wallace J. E. Wallin, Edgar A. Doll, Samuel A. Kirk, William Cruickshank, Lloyd Dunn, Maynard C. Reynolds, and Jack W. Birch. These individuals were past and/or current members and officers of the oldest educational organizations (AAMD, CEC, NARC) whose writings and voices were heard during the period 1900 through 1970. Many of these individuals received the Council of Exceptional Children's highest award, the Wallin Award, and served as the Council's president and/or president of the American Association on Mental Retardation.

The materials in the investigation met the following criteria:

1. Published between 1900 and 1970 or prior to 1900; and

2. Provided the opinions of this selected group of special educational leaders as reflected in professional journals, proceedings, and reports
of educational organizations concerning the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children in classes with their nonhandicapped peers.

The findings of this study indicated that there were twenty-four recorded opinions from 1900 to 1963 by the selected educational leaders studied which emphasized exclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers. The findings further indicated that there were four recorded opinions between the period of 1962 and 1968 for inclusion of handicapped children into classes with their nonhandicapped peers by the selected educational leaders' studies. No historical evidence was found regarding the impact these opinions had on the passage of Public Law 94-142.

Conclusions

Based on the literature reviewed and the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The selected special educational leaders during the period 1900 to 1963 held the opinion that handicapped children should be excluded from the regular classroom with their nonhandicapped peers because all degrees of feeblemindedness were the results of defects of the brain and could not be cured. Furthermore, educational training was not going to result in normalcy. The high grade imbecile was a potential criminal, a threat to society, and incapable of taking their place in the world; they should be segregated in institutions and sterilized.

2. The opinions of the selected special educational leaders after 1963 showed greater acceptance of including the handicapped into the regular classroom with their nonhandicapped peers because they felt that suitable care and education of the handicapped should be no more special than necessary; that special education placement should be made only after careful study and for compelling
reasons. The handicapped should be taught in the same schools in the same classes with the same teachers. Thus, it was concluded that the education of the handicapped progressed from residential institutions to special schools, special classes to regular classes over a seventy year period.

3. From 1900 to 1930 every state had some kind of facility for the education of the handicapped whether in the residential institution, special school, or special class. The high visibility of the handicapped who had returned from two world wars, two presidents who influenced attitudes and values concerning the handicapped, public opinion and interest led to legislation which emphasized special education designed to meet the needs of the handicapped. Therefore, it was concluded that legislation for the handicapped was the result of public outcry of education for all.

4. Although there were some inclusionary opinions expressed by some of the selected educational leaders prior to the enactment of Public Law 94-142 in 1975, there was no evidence to substantiate that their opinions concerning the inclusion of the handicapped into the regular classroom had significant impact upon the passage of the law. Therefore, it was concluded there were no opinions of the selected special educational leaders that affected the passage of Public Law 94-142.

Implications

As a result of the findings and conclusions, the following implications were drawn:

1. Based upon the opinions of the selected educational leaders that feeblemindedness was the result of brain defects and could not be cured, several states adopted laws for the segregation and sterilization of the feebleminded. Therefore, it was implied that the opinions of the selected educational leaders set the tone for what happened in special education during the early 1900s.
2. Residential institutions, special schools, and special classes flourished from 1900 to 1950 when they began to be questioned as being beneficial. By 1970 it was emphasized that special education need not be any more special than necessary and that the handicapped could be educated in the regular classroom with their non-handicapped peers. Therefore, it was implied that the passage of time affected change in special education.

3. Two presidents, celebrities of stage, screen and radio, civil rights and the intervention of the federal government influenced public opinion and interest. Therefore, it was implied that special education programs are an integral part of society, and special educational leaders' opinions alone did not materially affect the passage of Public Law 94-142.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were drawn as a result of the conclusions and implications of this study:

1. This study should be used by administrators, teachers, and educational organizations as a means of understanding how the opinions of special educational leaders affected the historical development toward the inclusion or exclusion of handicapped children.

2. This study should be published in research journals, reports, annals of education to highlight the impact that the opinions of special educational leaders have had on the educational policies affecting the handicapped.

3. This study should be shared with legislators and commissions whose opinions may affect policy formulations. It should be reviewed by those who implement or affect the policy to be carried out.

4. Seminars and sensitivity training sessions should be conducted with administrators, classroom teachers, and parents concerning the historical developments of the handicapped as a means of providing a broader understanding of this type of population and their inclusion into classes with nonhandicapped children.
5. A similar study should be conducted to cover the period 1970 to 1985 to assess the opinions of special educational leaders during this period to determine further the understanding of handicapped children. As this was the period during which the law was passed and implemented, further study may shed some light on the factors and forces which influenced its passage.
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THE EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
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Figure 1

1. The American Association
   On Mental Retardation 1876 1970

2. The Council For
   Exceptional Children 1922 1970

3. The National Association
   For Retarded Citizens 1950 1970
THE SELECTED EDUCATIONAL LEADERS
AND THEIR CONTRIBUTING PERIODS

Figure 2

1. Henry H. Goddard
   (1866-1957)
   1906 - 1918

2. Lightner Witmer
   (1867-1956)
   1896 - 1911

3. Walter E. Fernald
   (1869-1924)
   1893 - 1924

4. Frederick Kuhlmann
   (1876-1941)
   1912 - 1941

5. Wallace J. E. Wallin
   (1876-1969)
   1915 - 1955

6. Edgar A. Doll
   (1889-1968)
   1917 - 1936

7. Samuel A. Kirk
   (1904 - )
   1950 - 1970

8. Lloyd Dünn
   (1915 - )
   1958 - 1970

9. William M. Cruickshank
   (1924 - )
   1952 - 1970

10. Maynard C. Reynolds
    (1924 - )
    1965 - 1970

11. Jack Birch
    (1915 - )
    1960 - 1970
May 15, 1979

Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.,
Lecturer in Special Education
Spelman College
Atlanta, GA 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick,

There is a time to push for reform and a time to lie low. The contents of my article had been presented widely by me in speeches over the previous two years, and was well received. Thus I felt the article was timely, would stir up much controversy but would be likely to have an impact. The main opposition would come from the establishment -- administrators of special education empires who would find it most threatening.

Unfortunately the article did not have one effect that I had hoped it would have, namely to reduce sharply the number of children of the poor, labeled as handicapped, for special education purposes. Instead special educators have been very wily in defining "mainstreaming" as integrating children, labeled as handicapped and counted in the special education roles, into regular school programs. In my view, about half of children now labeled as exception children in this Country would be better off if they were not included in the special education count.

Sincerely yours,

Lloyd M. Dunn, Ph.D.
November 12, 1979

Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
Post Office Box 92041
Atlanta, GA 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

In response to your letter of October 9 I am sending herewith a paper on "Changing Roles of Special Education Personnel" which tells something of my views on the history of the mainstreaming movement. The major observation made is that the total history of special education is a story of movement from distal to proximal arrangements of schooling - a story of progressive (gradual) inclusion. In this sense mainstreaming is part of a long story and not a recent thing. I believe that legislation simply crystallizes these kinds of major steps along the way. I believe there is no evidence suggesting a back-and-forth, "pendulum-swing" type management of handicapped children in regular classes. Rather, the story has indeed been one of quite steady inclusiveness.

Sincerely,

Maynard C. Reynolds
Director

MCR/bw

encl.
Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
Post Office Box 92041
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

I like your dissertation topic. It should prove to be a distinct contribution to our field.

My own writings bear on your topic and below are several references. The Stigma and Schooling article appears to me to be most pertinent.

Best wishes in your work.

Sincerely,

Matthew Trippe
Professor of Education
Special Education, Speech and Hearing Sciences

Selected Publications


"Current Educational Programs for Emotionally Disturbed Children," A Focus on Maladjusted Children, Castricone and Gallien (Eds.), University of Virginia CEC, 1965, pp. 22-40.


"See the Cat, See the Cradle?" in Exceptional Children in Regular Classrooms, Reynolds, M.C. and Davis, M.D. (Eds.) Dept. of Audio-Visual Ext., University of Minnesota, 1971, pp. 31-42.
December 19, 1978

Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
PO Box 92041
Atlanta, Ga. 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

I hope that your doctoral supervisor is duly impressed by the fact that you have been able to dig out a 1962 article by Sam Kirk buried in an obscure Australian publication. If not, you should draw his/her attention to this evidence of your tenacious digging into the literature.

As a matter of fact, I read the symposium to which Kirk contributed a short while ago and, in a moment of self backscratching, felt that maybe for once we were a little ahead of our time in addressing the issue of "integration or segregation".

As a matter of fact, the monograph originated as sixteen separate articles which appeared in the journal Slow Learning Child, and we pulled them together into a single publication with the title as in your December 7 letter.

In specific response to your request, therefore, I am enclosing a photostat of Kirk's article but, to put this article into some sort of perspective, I am enclosing a photostat of the list of contributors, together with my introduction and summing up.

In 1962, one of my duties was to identify mentally retarded children who were to be educated in segregated special schools. Having spent all my educational life in Britain, I was (as my summing up indicates I think) a "segregationist" rather than "integrationist" but, although I believe that some ridiculous things have been said (as well as excellent things) allegedly in the name of "normalization", "mainstreaming", etc., I think my current position - which has shifted somewhat - is probably better summed up in a keynote address that I gave at a national conference in New Zealand to which I was invited a couple of years ago. For what it is worth, I am also enclosing a photostat of the transcript of that address. Its title, "No Alternative" almost says it all in a nutshell.

You asked for any other pertinent data that might be beneficial to your research. My own feeling is that the question "mainstreaming or separation" represents only one dimension of the question to be asked and is meaningless unless we address
ourselves to the other dimension, i.e. do teachers have the competencies necessary to teach educationally handicapped children? In other words, separation of educationally handicapped children to be educated by thoroughly competent teachers is infinitely to be preferred to mainstreaming with thoroughly incompetent teachers. Conversely, mainstreaming in a system that has teachers with appropriate competencies is infinitely to be preferred to a segregated system employing incompetent teachers. Only when we can accept as a "given" that teachers in a system have the appropriate competencies does the question "mainstreaming or separation?" take on a real meaning. Cruickshank said it well in a recent article - remarkably, from the same Slow Learning Child, but after the days of my editorship. I will enclose a copy of his article and also an executive summary of a research project with which we were recently associated and which is predicated on using resource teachers (with in-serviced regular class teachers) as the major thrust of delivery of special educational services and, in turn, the competencies required by teachers are related to our own teacher education program.

I hope you find the literature of some value in your research, and the best of luck!

Kindest regards,

John McLeod, Ph.D.
DIRECTOR

Encl.
October 30, 1979

Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
Post Office Box 92041
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

Thank you for your letter of October 17 which reached us October 29. Enclosed is an informational piece on National PTA's interest in exceptional children. If this is not sufficient for your purpose, we will be glad to make all of the materials in our library available to you (if you wish to come to Chicago to use them). I do not know where, or if, there are other complete collections of PTA information.

Our offices and library are open Monday through Friday (except on holidays) from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. They are in our headquarters building at the address on this letterhead.

Best wishes to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Alice Troy
Information Services Director

AT: yh
Enc.

This is another service of the National PTA.
Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
Post Office Box 92041
Atlanta, Georgia
30314

Dear Mr. Warrick;

As Dr. Semmel is presently out of the country, I am responding to your inquiry of 6 December, 1978.

Find enclosed a copy of our Center's Mainstreaming Resource Center Bibliography which includes the most recent references on mainstreaming.

For a more complete historical bibliography you might wish to purchase our manuscript draft entitled, "Mainstreaming: Perspectives on Educating Handicapped Children in the Public School" written by Melvyn I. Semmel, Jay Gottlieb and Nancy Robinson. A copy of the manuscript is presently priced at $3.50.

I hope that we have been of help to you.

Best of luck in your endeavors.

Very sincerely,

Mary A. Gossard
Assistant to the Director

Enc.
October 23, 1979

Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
Lecturer, Spelman College
Post Office Box 92041
Atlanta, Georgia  30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

We have bound copies of the proceedings of all conventions of this Association covering the past 100 years. Additionally, we have bound copies of the former "Silent News", now known as The Deaf American from around 1903. None may be removed from these premises, but scholars are welcome to do research in our offices. It would be best to make a definite appointment with Mrs. Edith Kleberg, our librarian.

You may wish to explore the possibilities of the libraries maintained at the following:

Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf
5034 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.  20016

Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf
3417 Volta Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C.  20007

Gallaudet College
Kendall Green
Florida Avenue & 7th Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C.  20002

We do not have many of the printed proceedings of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf or the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, but we are confident these may be found at the above-named institutions, and in all probability also at the Library of Congress. All of the above are primarily concerned with education, whereas the N.A.D. is a consumer-oriented association.

We do not know of any collection of materials which might serve your stated purposes in the Atlanta area. You might want to determine whether the library at the Georgia School for the Deaf in Cave Spring might have the Convention of
American Instructors of the Deaf proceedings; many State School libraries do have a fairly comprehensive collection of these publications. The phone number at the Georgia School for the Deaf is (404) 777-3310.

If we may be of further assistance, please advise.

Sincerely,

Edward C. Carney
Director, Public Information

ECC:mmb
November 14, 1979

Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
P.O. Box 92041
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

I am not too hopeful that our Society will have much information regarding your special dissertation topic. Although the Society has been in existence since 1902, there is probably not much that pertains directly to the subject of mainstreaming or separation; however, you are welcome to whatever help may be available that we might be able to give you.

I am enclosing a listing of recent publications which are available at the Publications Office at Northern Illinois University. You can see that the issues which are addressed in these publications are much broader in scope.

By action of the Executive Board of the Society, the University Library at Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois, has been designated as the repository of the archives of the Society; and Mr. Joe Bauxar, the University Archivist, has been designated as Archivist for the Society. All of the early records of the Society that are available are housed at the Northern Illinois University Library and are available to interested persons to be used for research purposes. Although the minutes of the early meetings, both of the Society and of its executive group, are by no means complete, the early publications of the Society (as the National Society of College Teachers of Education) are available; and some of these may, by chance, include the kind of information and/or material you are seeking.

I trust that this information has been helpful to you and wish you success in your research efforts.

Sincerely yours,

George V. Guy
Secretary-Treasurer

Enclosure
October 19, 1979

Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
Lecturer
Spelman College
P.O. Box 92041
Atlanta, GA 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

Thank you for your letter of October 17. The American Orthopaedic Association does not maintain a library, but I do have old Annual Meeting programs and Annual Reports in this office.

Dr. J. Hiram Kite, a member of the American Orthopaedic Association since 1935, lives in Atlanta and perhaps would be willing to help you.

Please advise if you need further information.

Sincerely,

Lois Stratemeier
Executive Secretary

cc: J. H. Kite, M.D.
Mr. Ulysses J. Warwick, Jr.
Lecturer
Spelman College
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Mr. Warwick:

I must apologize for being so slow in responding to your letter of October 17.

We have a complete file of all the yearbooks of the Society in our office here in Chicago. So far as I know, this is the only place where the complete set exists. Unfortunately, however, the yearbooks were not indexed until after 1942, so that volumes of that date and before are somewhat more difficult to use. There is, of course, a table of contents for each volume, and that could be of some help.

I am not myself sufficiently familiar with the extent to which NSSE volumes appearing before 1950 deal with the problem that is of special interest to you, but I would be surprised if there were a great deal. A glance at the titles of our yearbooks published before that date (you can find the complete list of all yearbooks published in any one of our volumes), does not suggest to me that you could expect to find very much there. Nevertheless, you are of course quite welcome to make such use of our set of the volumes as you wish if you care to come to Chicago for that purpose. The books would have to be used in our office, but we would be pleased to provide you with some space where you could work.

Very sincerely yours,

Kenneth J. Rehage
Secretary-Treasurer
June 20, 1980

Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
P. O. Box 92041
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

This letter is in response to your query regarding statistics in special education for 1900 to 1960.

I talked with Dr. Vance Grant, specialist in education statistics for the National Center for Education Statistics.

Dr. Grant believes that your best source for such information would be the Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, which was published from 1918 to 1958. He suggests that you go to a large public or university library and ask for the Biennial Surveys.

If you are unable to find a public or university library which has the Biennial Surveys, Dr. Grant suggests that you try a government depository library. If you are ever in the Washington area, you could have recourse to the NCES library.

If you have further questions, I suggest you contact Dr. Grant at the following address:

National Center for Education Statistics
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202
Telephone: 301/436-7900

Sincerely yours,

JEAN O'NEIL
Information Specialist

JO/jaz
January 28, 1980

Mr. Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
Lecturer, Spelman College
P.O. Box 92041
Atlanta, GA 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

Thank you for your letter of inquiry regarding the early records of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf. Although early volumes of the Volta Review should be available in Atlanta, either at a university or public library, other records of the Association are available only in our library. And, of course, we have all volumes of the Volta Review. We invite you to visit the Volta Bureau Library at any time -- I'm sure you will find it fascinating as do I. However, since our library is used primarily by scholars, we will need to know when you plan to be here so that we can prepare for your using our facilities.

If I can help in any way further, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Pickering Neel
Director, Children's Rights Program

SPN:dcf
October 12, 1979

Ulysses J. Warrick, Jr.
P.O. Box 92041
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dear Mr. Warrick:

Your letter of October 2 addressed to Dr. Cruickshank arrived while he was absent from the office due to illness. He has asked me to reply to you, bringing to your attention a volume titled Mainstreaming: A Practical Guide. This is authored by Dr. James L. Paul, Ann Turnbull, and Dr. Cruickshank. Therein you will find his comments with respect to the issue about which you inquire.

Sincerely yours,

Hazel Hunsche
Administrative Secretary
to Dr. Cruickshank

HH/ns
A PERSPECTIVE: THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD AND THE PTA

The National PTA has been concerned exclusively and consistently since its founding in 1897 with the education, health, and welfare of all of America's children.

Education is a necessary investment for individual development. Every child has unique traits, potentialities, and abilities. However, some children have traits or characteristics that require special programs and activities to enable them to develop their individual talents to the fullest. These constitute the groups we designate as exceptional children.

"Education for exceptional children is a high priority in modern America. National, state, and local resources -- financial and human -- focus to provide it. Expanding programs, new teaching media, valid research, favorable public attitudes, and improved school laws are but a few energizers for the new special education that has emerged -- indicative of an attitude which contrasts sharply with that taken as recently as two decades ago. Above the horizon are other actions that should generate additional services for exceptional children -- services which formerly were thought improbable or impossible." (Prophetic words from "Plan of Work, Exceptional Child," approved at the beginning of the seventies. Dr. Paul C. Vance, Chairman.)

With the reorganization of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in 1971 into five commissions, the National PTA exceptional child chairmanship (which had functioned since 1931) was dissolved as a separate entity but that position was encompassed in the Education Commission. Dr. Vance commented that: "This is entirely consistent with the national trend in special education. There has been a growing concern among professional special educators that categories and labels attached to handicapped children may be doing much disservice to exceptional children. The need is for these children to be included in the total education program and not be set apart physically or psychologically from the mainstream of education and life. The combined efforts of all the members of the Education Commission can now be directed toward promoting better education for all -- including exceptional children. In this union it is anticipated there will be much greater strength."

The National PTA has long worked diligently to disseminate information about those who have need of special services and education.

The primary purpose of the 1897 Conference, and of National PTA Conventions to this date, has been to promote knowledge about children and to spur action to do things for children sorely needed. Much information and instruction has been spread through these meetings, and through the printed word.

PTA members and others are kept informed of legislative needs and problems affecting all groups of exceptional children; and public support for research into causes and prevention of handicaps is stimulated; creating public interest in, and improving understanding of, the problems of educating exceptional children has been an important goal, and this has involved keeping abreast of changes in the philosophy of special education.
We have worked cooperatively with educators, other professionals, and other organizations and agencies that affect the welfare of such exceptional children as the mentally retarded; the gifted; the physically handicapped, including the orthopedically handicapped and chronically ill; the sensorially handicapped, including the visually and acoustically handicapped; those with defective speech; the socially and/or emotionally disturbed; children with specific learning disabilities (minimal brain dysfunction); and, in some instances, disadvantaged and deprived youngsters.

The National PTA is willing to work aggressively against those conditions that hamper the growth and development of children, but is equally aggressive in promoting those programs that benefit children.

Discussion, followed by action, has spanned the many decades of the organization's existence.

**EDUCATING THE HANDICAPPED CHILD**

"Happiness, contentment, adjustment, achievement—these are some of the key words which apply to the education of every child—no less to the handicapped than to the normal. If the medium which will secure such results for one group fails with another, then it is the medium that should be changed, not the result. But the result always is to be expressed in terms of the child rather than children—in terms of individual child life, child attitudes, child success in keeping with his ability to achieve rather than in terms of certain group standards of achievement." (Dr. Elise Martens)

In 1899, delegates approved a resolution stating that "the first duty of society is to give every child such environment as will fit him to choose between good and evil. To this end we give our most heartfelt support to all reforms which are preventive, educative and instructive, favoring for all classes of children, even those physically, mentally, or morally deficient, the same wise kindergarten and home education which shall fit them for their duties of citizenship."

In 1903, a committee on dependent, defective, and delinquent children was formed, and the needs of handicapped children were studied.

Delegates to the second convention learned about "some common errors in regard to the education of the deaf."

A 1908 resolution, approved by the delegates, recommended teaching of speech to deaf children at the natural age, without use of sign language. The prevention of deafness by ceasing to segregate the deaf, thereby preventing inter-marriage and perpetuation of the defect, was advised. The prevention of blindness through widespread dissemination of knowledge as to the cause and the means of prevention, with laws regulating the care of children at birth, was also recommended. This action followed discussion at a section meeting on abnormal children.
In 1911, a resolution advocated the establishment of special classes for backward children in every district having ten or more children three or more years behind grades; laws prohibiting the inter-marriage of feeble-minded and degenerate persons were favored; and the establishment of suitable institutions for the feeble-minded in every State in the Union, was advocated.

"Caring for the Crippled Child," a 1912 Child Welfare Magazine article, advocated establishment of special classes in the public school system, and the provision of transportation for the children to and from their homes.

The Third International Child-Welfare Congress (1914) recommended that "psycho-physical examinations be made of all children in common school grades, who are behind their grade for age more than three years, in order that mental and physical defects may be detected early and that defectives may be identified and their special education provided for."

Another resolution endorsed "the educational movement inaugurated by the National Association for the Study and Education of Exceptional Children, in the interest of the misunderstood and handicapped child, so as to save the millions of those who now grow up to be the misfits and derelicts of society. Excellent human material is wasted all the time, and it comprises growing minds of capabilities and even excellence. The aggregate of human failure represents a dynamic force of stupendous magnitude. This force is now destructive. It can, by proper methods of sanitation, physical and mental hygiene, educational and social reform, be converted into a helpful constructive power."

A Child Welfare Magazine article (1915), revealed "A New Joy for Crippled Children" [going to school].

In 1917, a resolution commended the U.S. government for numbering the blind and the deaf in the census of 1910 as an important step toward the curing of those evils, and recommended that the government in the coming census secure the enumeration of crippled children with a view to the future training of them to be independent, self-supporting children; in 1931, the United States Office of Education was urged to make a survey of all exceptional children in order to gain a more complete knowledge of their needs, and to provide adequately for their care and education.

A 1926 convention address on "Lost Children" by a Memphis juvenile court judge included recommendations for "Definite Pieces of Work": First, try to influence the boards of education in your respective communities to establish special classrooms for handicapped children in order that they shall not be removed from the personal care of their mothers and the environment of their homes. Second, endeavor to put some definite program across for the overbright child.

Child Welfare Magazine carried a series of articles on the education of crippled children, and PTAs were informed that they could help best by backing legislation, by seeing that special classes are started in all good sized towns after the laws are passed, and especially by fostering efficient home teaching of isolated or homebound cripples.
1929-30 Plan of Work, School Education, included: "Helping to develop educational opportunities for the blind, deaf, crippled, and otherwise physically and mentally handicapped children, to the end that every child shall have as good a chance as any other child to develop the powers and ability with which he has been endowed, and to be prepared to make his contribution to the social welfare."

1931 Convention Theme — "The Challenge of the Children's Charter": Charter was developed by White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. A convention address on "The Challenge of the Exceptional Child" concentrated on Section XIII of the Charter: "For every child who is blind, deaf, crippled, or otherwise physically handicapped, and for the child who is mentally handicapped, such measures as will early discover and diagnose his handicap, provide care and treatment, and so train him that he may become an asset to society rather than a liability. Expenses of these services should be borne publicly where they cannot be privately met."

1931 Juvenile Protection Report stated: "When the National Congress of Parents and Teachers accepted in its entirety the challenge of the Children's Charter, it settled for all time the oft debated question: Should the parent-teacher association concern itself with the socially handicapped child? The idea that the so called "normal" child was our sole objective, that the dependent, neglected, delinquent, or problem child was the charge of the court or welfare agency alone, closed a door of opportunity for usefulness to the parent-teacher association which the Children's Charter has opened wide.

"The erroneous thought which placed the socially handicapped in a class by themselves can be corrected through the medium of the parent-teacher association. To assist the unfortunate, to provide means for improved environment, to study causes of dependency, neglect, and delinquency will increase the interest and responsibility of individual members in all children and bring about a changed attitude regarding those in conflict with society. A change for usefulness and happiness for these children -- a place beside other children in every sense of the word -- with this in mind, the Juvenile Protection committee has set about its special task."

President's appeal in 1932 Child Welfare Magazine: "There are now in many communities schools for the education and development of the physically and mentally handicapped; yet many other cities and rural communities have either failed to recognize their responsibilities or have been unable to assume them financially. In many schools some of the handicaps have been considered mental though in reality they are physical, and other misunderstandings have injured the child's progress.

"My appeal to you as members of our Congress organization is that you assist in seeing that your community recognizes the needs of these little ones and makes suitable provision for the special education and environment necessary to give them comfort, cheer, and preparation for economic independence. Parents of handicapped children need to know that we are sympathetic and eager to assist them in their problems. They need as parents to know better how to develop the child in the home, and how to preserve and stimulate the best abilities of the child. Were we in their places we would better understand the heartaches that arise because of the difficulties they encounter. To them and to the children who are needing us more than the normal ones, we must respond intelligently and unselfishly."
1932 First convention conference on exceptional children. About 150 present. Examples were given of ways in which individual types of handicaps were being recognized and dealt with on a constructive basis. Importance of home training for the handicapped was stressed, as was the importance of special training for teachers of atypical children.

A 1933 Resolution "asked that special attention be given to safeguarding the rights of the handicapped and exceptional child so that his education may fit him to make the adjustments necessary for a satisfying life."

The chairman of the committee on the exceptional child reported to the Board of Managers in 1935 that "the committee on the exceptional child is concerned with both his physical and his educational welfare; and because the accent is on his educational welfare for the reason that that phase is probably the more neglected, the committee rightfully functions under the Department of Education." [She also asked that "The welfare of the gifted child not be forgotten. This particular group is so important that our chairmen should at least be in a position to advise and counsel parents as to bibliography on the subject, as well as to the educational opportunities available."

The 1934 Convention Conference on Exceptional Child took the form of a demonstration at a special school in Des Moines, which "brings together in one building, children with physical handicaps of various types, including orthopedic cripples, the deaf, children with seriously defective vitality." The principal emphasized the special opportunities afforded the children to help them look upon their handicap as a "challenge rather than a catastrophe."

A resolution on equal opportunity for all adopted in 1935 stated that in the case of handicapped children, education takes a very vital part. If Federal funds are provided for services to handicapped children, this fact should be given consideration and whatever educational program is proposed should be developed and administered by state educational agencies and submitted for approval to the United States Office of Education.

At a conference on Relationship of the Family to the Exceptional Child, at the 1936 convention, it was suggested that PTAs can help exceptional children to have an equal opportunity in life by electing boards of education whose members understand modern education and are willing to further modern programs, and by training parents in study groups, not for a series of five or ten lessons, but for a period of two to three years. [The brilliant child should be given an enriched program to prevent the probability of his becoming a drone. He should not be segregated because segregation leads to an undemocratic atmosphere.]

A convention conference discussion on Educational and Physical Welfare of Exceptional Child in 1937 brought out the important key position of PTA in seeking out "hidden away" children, usually the blind and crippled, that they may be given the advantages of special education, or physical restoration. [It was recommended that special study be given to home problems connected with the gifted child, and that bright children must be given plenty to do at school and at home.]
1938 convention consultation on exceptional child stressed the need for PTAs to: (1) study the state laws with respect to the care of handicapped children and their rights under the law. In many states there are programs of state aid, allotting state funds for the aid of crippled children; (2) set up in those states in which there is no effective survey of the cases, a survey of handicapped children within the area, through the cooperation of public school officials and state officials; and (3) secure the support of more adequate legislation in communities and states. Cooperation with other agencies was stressed.

The chairman closed his presentation at the 1941 convention conference on exceptional child with a discussion of modern trends in the handling of exceptional children. He pointed out the gradual turning away from the older concept of complete isolation with lifelong social distance between the handicapped and the normal, toward individualized treatment and education with retention of contacts with normal children. Since most exceptional children, whatever type, must live as adults in the world of ordinary people, they should be prepared so to live.

1941 findings committee report—section on "Equalized Educational Opportunity" included the statement that the public school...should provide for every child an opportunity to develop to the maximum of his capacity: ...Opportunity for the physically and mentally handicapped child in accordance with his abilities and needs.

In his annual report for 1942, the national chairman, committee on exceptional child, suggested that "a special contribution to the war effort could be made by developing facilities for the care of handicapped children in blackouts and other emergencies, in which they often have need of special care."

The convention findings report for 1942 emphasized that "support of public education must be maintained. We vigorously oppose any curtailment of educational opportunity for American children and youth. ... The handicapped child should receive instruction in accordance with his abilities and needs."

An article on "What Is the Crippled Children's Outlook?" in a 1944 National Parent-Teacher Magazine, stated that "The nation recognizes the need for physical care and subsidizes such care. But it has not shown similar interest in special education."

"Back of the Schools — The People," which appeared in the magazine in 1945, emphasized that "In every State of the Union there are children of all ages who have been deprived of educational opportunities because they are physically so handicapped that they must remain at home or because they live in isolated sections too far away from any schoolhouse or because the local school does not offer them the kind of program they need or even because they are kept at home to work. Perhaps yours is one of the fortunate communities in which a 100 per cent enrollment of school-age children has been achieved. But do not be too sure about that until you have gone into the highways and byways to seek out those who have been lost to the schools— or perhaps those who have never been found by them in the first place."
"...From the individual parent and citizen, through the community to the state authorities and legislators, lies the road of action."

A 1946 convention speaker addressed delegates on "Cooperative Action for Children," and emphasized that steps should be taken to extend educational services to 250,000 physically handicapped children. Only 1/8 of the children had been reached. She asked "Can we afford to deny them their rightful opportunities when we need only a few adjustments in our programs and in the physical aspects of our school buildings?"

1947 "Four Point Program's" point on "health" included the following specific objective: "Survey community provisions for the care and education of all exceptional children, including the physically handicapped, the mentally deficient, the emotionally troubled, and the gifted; work with appropriate agencies to give these children the special training they require to attain their best development; and act to secure necessary legislation to insure such provisions on a statewide basis."

The parent-teacher platform for 1948 advocated that further attention and study be given to the problem of providing an adequate education for the exceptional child, particularly in rural and sparsely settled areas. The 1950 platform stated that "within the school we will work together to: . . . see that developmental and special needs of children, youth, and adults are met by school, home, and community."

The chairman of exceptional child committee reported that she represented National PTA in 1952 at annual meetings of National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and the International Council for Exceptional Children, and that there was the repeated expression of need for parent education as a way of making more effective the special education of the child. There was recognition, by delegates from these three organizations, of the National PTA as the leading organization in parent education and the delegates turned to the PTA for such help.

The 1953 convention findings stated that "In order to achieve better schools for that free society we will use the full strength of the parent-teacher program to. . .advocate the continuation, and wherever necessary the expansion, of library services, school lunch programs, the maximum use of school plants, and special education services for children who are handicapped, gifted, retarded, or otherwise unable to benefit from a program designed for the 'average' student."

Field trip to San Francisco State College during the 1956 convention included discussion and demonstrations on meeting the needs of the exceptional children in the schools, and a review of problems and trends in special education.

"Education For All -- Do We Mean It?" a National Parent-Teacher Magazine article, included information on handicapped and isolated children, and reported that even with rapid development of special programs, not more than 1/4 of the nation's handicapped were receiving help they needed. In most cases, the lack of qualified teaching personnel and the high cost of special programs were the basic reasons for this unfortunate situation.
In 1961 the national chairman of exceptional child expressed continued concern for all types of exceptional children and stated that concern must be greater than ever with the child who is socially maladjusted as a result of being culturally and affectionally deprived. [He mentioned a whole new area of research on the characteristics of the creatively talented child being developed, and urged study of new types of programs for the nurturing of creativeness.] He urged chairmen to watch developments in programs for the mentally retarded, and to encourage the proper state agencies to join in efforts to improve mental capabilities of retarded children, in contrast to just training or educating them.

A statement was presented to House Committee on Ways and Means in 1963 in favor of amendments to Social Security Act concerning maternal and child health and mental retardation. National PTA supported the bill because it was workable and effective, making use of the well-tested approach of federal grants-in-aid to encourage action and administration by the several states. This legislation, which passed, was a very important breakthrough in efforts to promote the education and welfare of exceptional children.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education addressed the 1963 convention, and called attention to the national need for providing maximum opportunity for superior or gifted students, and to a similar responsibility to students at the other end of the scale—students with special problems, the culturally deprived, the mildly retarded. He commented that unless the schools are made strong, these students will be neglected. The delegates approved a resolution calling for the PTA to... exert a constructive stabilizing influence in the community...to mobilize national, state, and local resources to reduce the disadvantages of handicapped and underprivileged children through compensatory services, and thereby secure for every child the highest advantages in physical, mental, social and spiritual education.

"Extended Educational Programs for All Children" was the subject of a resolution approved by delegates to the 1967 convention. This included reference to the present aid program, and special groups of students beginning to receive needed attention. Substantial funds provided by local, state, and federal resources and by private foundations for programs helped to meet the needs of special groups such as the academically talented, the gifted, and the handicapped. That the effort should not be curtailed, was emphasized.

Children with learning disabilities were discussed in a 1974 convention workshop. Delegates approved a resolution on "Protecting Rights and Meeting Special Education Needs of Children," which suggested that PTAs and PTSAs urge pertinent state and local educational agencies to develop clear and consistent terminology, and attempt to minimize negative labeling of children with developmental disabilities; that PTAs and PTSAs stress to appropriate officials the need for cumulative school records to be periodically cleared of information that serves no constructive purpose; and that PTAs and PTSAs work for local programs of early diagnosis and intervention before problems of developmental disabilities reach more serious levels.
A report on the exceptional child titled "The Room That Isn't There...and the Teacher That Isn't Trained," together with guidelines to help PTAs work with their local school programs, was included in the Education Commission's newsletter.

Because of PTA's concern that adequate funding be provided for the Education Amendments Act of 1974, the National PTA Board of Managers voted to make full funding at the levels authorized a top priority. What's Happening in Washington readers were alerted to the necessity for prompt contact with congressmen. Background information given them on the funding revealed that there were no funds for the program to help school districts meet the higher cost for education of the handicapped. Many of these districts were under court order to provide an appropriate education for all children, and finding the money to carry out the mandate of the courts presented a tremendous burden to local school districts. No money was provided for new programs for the gifted and talented.

The 1974-75 Legislative Priority Item, on "Education for Handicapped Children" read: "Recent court decisions extending state responsibilities in the education of exceptional children have focused attention on the enormous financial repercussions of these findings. State and local budgets, already hard pressed, will require financial assistance to carry out the mandate that the public system must now educate all children. Previous federal aid in this area is not designed to meet the magnitude of the new responsibility. Costs for special education greatly exceed the normal costs per child, and a greater federal response to the financial responsibilities borne by state and local governments is urgent."

What's Happening In Washington carried information on the bills to improve educational services for handicapped children, action was urged, and PTAs were kept informed of their progress, until passage in December, 1975, of "The Education for All Handicapped Children Act," which is permanent legislation. In 1976, PTA members especially concerned with the education of the handicapped were urged to consult with their local superintendents and state divisions of special education to provide input into federal regulations. Convention delegates resolved that the National PTA urge its state PTAs, districts, councils, and local units to exhort school boards to meet their obligations to exceptional children and to support efforts to provide educational programs in settings as near to normal as possible, consonant with the provision of the specialized services exceptional children need.

A position statement adopted by the Board of Managers in 1975 pledged support to the needs of children involved in special education programs and continuing study of emerging concepts of bringing these children back into the mainstream of education.

This year, delegates approved a resolution on quality education which included a call for continued National PTA efforts to use its influence and resources toward achievement of equal opportunity for quality education for all children.

One of the issues identified as an important National PTA priority for 1977-79 is legislation on education for the handicapped and its implementation.
The education commission's information on the exceptional child, in the PTA Handbook, 1977-79, emphasizes that:

"The PTA is committed to the education and welfare of all children. Its responsibility to the exceptional child should not be overlooked. The committee on the exceptional child should work diligently with all other PTA members to see that the best possible special education is provided in the community.

"It is the responsibility of the committee on the exceptional child to provide PTA and PTSA members with current information on the needs of children who require special education, the availability of such education, and the means by which more adequate education can be provided. The term "special education" refers to the modifications of the school curriculum that may be necessary to facilitate maximum achievement in school by exceptional children.

"Special education is more expensive than classroom instruction -- the cost varying greatly according to the needs of the children. In most states, additional money is provided for special education, but the cost is so great that progress is slow. The PTA should give leadership in providing information on the necessity for adequate funding and should work actively in seeking such support."

Mrs. Jean Dye, vice-president for legislative activity, has recommended an Education U.S.A. Special Report "Educating All the Handicapped" as a must for all PTAs, individual parents, and teachers, concerned with how schools are implementing P.L. 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.
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THE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN SPECIAL SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Special education takes many forms and can be provided within a broad spectrum of administrative arrangements. Agreement is general that children with special educational needs should be served in regular classrooms and neighborhood schools insofar as these arrangements are conducive to good educational progress. It is necessary sometimes, however, to provide special supplementary services for exceptional children or to remove them from parts or all of regular programs. Sometimes it is even necessary to remove some children from their homes and communities for placement in residential schools, hospitals, or training centers. Even when residential school placements have been made, it is desirable that the children attend local community schools for parts of their schooling. Under such programs, it is essential that the local schools be fully willing to accept the children.

The continuum for regular to highly specialized schools (often residential) represents the broad range of educational programs that is available to meet the individual needs of exceptional children. It is not uncommon for children to be placed into one or another special education facility by processes of rejection or by simplistic testing-categorizing methods rather than by careful decisions that seek to optimize the benefits for the children. When no options exist, as often occurs in the planning for gifted children or those with severe handicaps, and when decisions are made poorly, the children are denied their fundamental rights to free public education and the education authorities violate the basic tenets of our democratic society.

Schools as a whole and in all their parts are a resource for children, and placements should be made among and within them only for valid educational reasons. In the process, the psycho-social needs of the children should not be overlooked. Like all children, exceptional children need environmental stability, emotional nurturance, and social acceptance.

Policy: Special education should be arranged for exceptional children whenever feasible to protect the stability of their home, school, and community relationships and to enhance their self concepts. Special education placements, particularly those involving separation from community, school, and home life, should be made only after careful study and for compelling reasons.

Within schools the placement of all children should maximize their opportunities for the best possible education. Specialized placements that are effected crudely and simply by the rejection of children from regular school situations are educationally and morally indefensible. Special education is not and should not be used as a residual operation or catch-all for children who are difficult to teach. Equally indefensible is the failure to develop needed differentiation of school programs that results in the confinement of pupils in inappropriate educational settings.
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