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CHILDREN

...Here and Now
The Bank Street College of Education has long made an outstanding contribution to the theory and practice of teacher education. It is one of the few places where modern knowledge regarding the learning process is applied in the preparation of teachers. Here student teachers are given opportunity to discover real needs and problems, to find solutions and test these solutions in practical situations. In studio and shop, student teachers work to their own satisfaction with materials with which children need to experiment. To develop the teacher as a person and as a citizen with a broad understanding of the culture and its relation to the education of children is one of the fine achievements of the Bank Street College of Education.

RUTH ANDRUS, Director of Cold Spring Institute, Walt Foundation, Cold-Spring-on-Hudson, N. Y.
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PAST TO HERE AND NOW

The underlying goal of Bank Street College of Education is the improvement of education for children of the nursery and elementary years and of their teachers. Our purpose is to make schools for children and for teachers places for all-round healthy growth of the students. And a school planned for growth is a good laboratory in which to study growth. From 1916 to 1954, research related to growth and learning of children or teachers has been continuous. To fulfill this underlying purpose, Bank Street has added areas of work through successive stages of growth:

1916 — organized as the Bureau of Educational Experiments with a staff of teachers, psychologist, doctor, social worker, to make a joint study of children and to develop a school for children.

1918 — a Nursery School with Harriet Johnson as Director, as our first “core of work” with children.

1930 — a School for Teachers, a Graduate Program as our “core of work” in teacher education, kept small to permit of intensive study by teaching and research staffs, from which have developed field service programs to large groups of teachers.

1937 — Writers Laboratory designed to produce high quality books for children; largely a group of professional writers.

1943 — Workshops for teachers in public schools, in cooperation with the Board of Education of New York City; intensive work with teachers and children in eight schools; district and city-wide programs with various Board Departments and Committees.

1946 — Evening Program in Teacher Education, attended each semester by some 250 students largely from Child Care Centers and public schools.

1950 — became the Bank Street College of Education with the right to grant the degree of Master of Science in Education.

1952 — February—Associates of Bank Street College organized. In two years the Associates have offered:

a program of meetings at 69 Bank Street.

February, 1953, a Conference, “The City Child Learns to Live” attended by over 700 people.

CHILDREN HERE AND NOW, Associates’ publication.


1953 — evaluation of College work by Trustees and College Staff.

Result—a College DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1954 — to an indefinite future—Associate members increase. Funds flow to Bank Street to carry through the Development Plan!
AND IN THE FUTURE

WHAT IS A DEVELOPMENT PLAN? It is an exhilarating flight into the future—it is a nailed-to-earth evaluation of the present. It begins with the temptation to dream—it ends with a sober whittling-down of many desirable directions of growth to the few that seem immediately feasible and most significant. A Development Plan, however, like life itself, has room for dreams. In order to live comfortably with its conscience, it calls its dreams “long-range goals.” At least that is a fairly accurate description of how, in the year 1953, the Bank Street Development Plan came into being.

This Plan covers reorganization of the College administrative structure and a closer integration of the whole College Program of education of children and of teachers, and research. Here, we shall describe only one outstanding feature—the Program for Children. THE BANK STREET SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN, opening in the fall of 1954, for children three to six, with a special program for two-year-olds and their parents, is designed, as all schools should be, to offer opportunities to each of its children to develop his own strengths and potentialities within the group. Our school is designed as a “family-centered school.” Schedules of attendance will be flexible enough to meet each family’s needs. The staff and parents will make a joint study of other ways in which the school can provide services and programs for parents such as: a counselling service to help them meet the problems of daily living with young children, workshops and special courses, a training program for baby-sitters and housekeepers. In a CHILD CARE CENTER, the program for the children will have the same educational aims as that in the College school. But both the programs for children and for parents will be adapted to the particular community in which the school is located.

College school and Child Care Center will serve actively as centers for advancing the field of education in our own work and in that of other workers with children. Both schools will be used for student-teaching placements. Both will afford opportunities for intensive studies of young children.

THE PROGRAM OF AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES with older children in schools other than our own will develop as needs of our own families and of the wider community indicate.

Again, we ask, What is a Development Plan? To Trustees and staff, and we hope, to Associates, ours is an imaginative adventure on an educational front that marks a new stage of growth for Bank Street.
Is Modern Education Anti-Intellectual?

In our concern for the education of the "whole" person, and in helping children to enjoy their learning, are modern educators truly vulnerable to the charge that their way of teaching is anti-intellectual?

Modern education, because it is primarily concerned with people, has sought to incorporate the insights of psychology and the knowledge about personality development in order to do a more effective teaching job. But this awareness of the roles of motivation and emotion by no means implies that it is anti-intellectual.

We modern educators agree whole-heartedly that the schools must offer intellectual fare, if by intellectuality our critics have in mind the Oxford dictionary definitions: "perceiving, discerning, understanding; faculty of knowing and reasoning; the power of thought and understanding; that which requires the exercise of understanding; possessing a high degree of understanding." These are the qualities which describe the essence of what we seek to achieve in our curriculum. But if our critics have in mind the definitions: "that which appeals or engages (nothing but) the intellect; or, given to pursuits that exercise (only) the intellect," then we find this view inappropriate for children because it is not sufficiently related to their way of learning.

There is no limit to the depth to which a teacher can probe for fuller understanding of the children he is teaching so as to do an effective job. The good teacher also constantly searches for better ways of developing skills. Precisely because he is a good teacher he realizes he cannot ignore motivating his charges. The good teacher can teach better any field, whether it be geometry, or philosophy, or typewriting, if he knows who his pupils are, what they are probably feeling and wanting, and what will engage their interests and attention. Motivation is rooted in an emotional context, and the teacher cannot begin to motivate unless he is in touch with the real, feeling and reacting pupils. Any learning unrelated to the goals and current life of the learner is a waste of time.

For in the search for deeper understanding we have learned that intellectual functioning is only a part of the rich life. Even our critics would certainly acknowledge that the cultivation and experiencing of emotions is healthy and enriching. These emotions do not disappear when one is curious, exploring, creating, questioning, solving problems—thinking. In our conviction about educating
the whole (the emotional, the social, the physical and the intellectual) child, we are convinced that we are more meaningfully cultivating his intellectual capacities.

Our critics maintain that modern education pays too little attention to the gifted child (the potential scholar) and ask that the teacher perform his primary job of transmitting subject matter skills, and reverse the “damage” that modern education has done in lowering its standards to meet the average. Modern methods are said to dampen the intellectual spark in many promising children.

Is this a valid criticism of modern education or is it a criticism of over-crowded classrooms, where the teacher is forced to hit at the average of the class or lower, because the more able manage pretty well without too much of her attention? Is this not the real reason why the needs of exceptional children are often ignored?

Modern education considers as one of its primary functions the educating of leaders, not in any snobbish or fascist sense, but as persons of marked capacity and talent who may serve as a focus for thought and action in a democratic community.

But we don’t consider that our only job. We see most children as potentially productive in our world and find the emphasis on the gifted child at the expense of the average grating to our democratic concept of recognizing the highest potential in all children. As Saroyan would say it, all people are beautiful.

Our critics appear to join with us in modern education’s concern for each individual. But they seem able to ignore the individuality of children who do not have exceptional skills and talents, particularly verbal ones. We, on the other hand, have never ignored the gifted child.

The problem for our critics—as well as for us—is to work toward the educational situation where classes are small enough so that the teacher can give attention to each individual in the class according to his needs and gifts. If we do not do this then we run the risk of alienating the majority of children from school and from learning. We run the risk of making the community itself “anti-intellectual.”

Our critics say that modern education is too life-like, and that really high intellectual aims are not developed in such an environment. Here we disagree violently about the desirability of separating learning from what is life-like. How do pupils shielded from the vulgarity and mediocrity of life come to learn about the nature of the problems they must deal with constructively to make life less vulgar and mediocre? Research in the transfer of training has proved that in order to speak good French it is more useful to study
French than Latin. Similarly, we think that a high school class, in order to understand vulgarity, must experience it. We think that the comparison of a good short story anthology with a pulp magazine is an effective demonstration of values, and that we run little risk of losing our classes to the pulps.

Modern education seeks to design its curriculum so that students deal with real problems and are motivated to learn skills and information to solve these problems. Obviously no one can gather all information at first-hand. But by seeing, feeling, watching, knowing and reacting, they are more aware of the pertinence of their growing knowledge and skills. A trip to the fish market evokes questions about geography and the division of labor. The cost of fish to the consumer raises questions about arithmetic know-how and the nature of the socio-economic system. Contrasting a slum tenement neighborhood with a public housing project and then visiting an exhibit of the designs of Frank Lloyd Wright raises questions about the content of the good life and the techniques, the knowledge—the subject matter, if you will—necessary to achieve it. Learning a foreign language takes on drama and pertinence with a visit to or from United Nations translators, listening to simultaneous translation through ear-phones, having meals in foreign restaurants, attending meetings or services conducted in the language studied—and best of all with long, stay-over trips to places where the language is spoken. Or, in mathematics—how much more meaningful is a complex problem when a very particular structure in a bridge demonstrates a representative solution.

Children are insatiably curious about their world; it is more the pity that so many schools and teachers, at least in the school setting, extinguish this intense desire to explore and to know. But good teaching uses this knowledge about the exploring nature of man by making the school the arena for hearing eager questions, searching for answers, creating question-arousing situations. And the good teacher does not stop there. He provides subject matter through source materials (in and out of books) that will help learners find answers. And he patiently encourages them to learn the skills they need, knowing that this phase of learning is slow and arduous.

We must here acknowledge, though certainly we do not approve, that some schools, in reacting to the heavy-handed rote memorizing kind of learning in the old-fashioned traditional school, went so all-out to make learning fun that they taught nothing. Some almost repudiated books. Good modern schools today offer firsthand experience. They also reach out to discover what nature and
brilliant minds of the past and present have to offer on a specific subject. Poor modern schools are as open to criticism as any other poor school, and we hold no brief for them.

We say that certainly skills and subject matter are an indispensable part of learning, and that they are a source of deep enjoyment and long-term satisfaction to every human being. But we say that the more real, the more acute, the more seriously complete and present the original perceiving, the greater the personal involvement in the search for knowledge, and therefore the more complete the absorption and retention.

Critics of modern education also criticize the education of teachers—and of course, the result. The college degree is seen as a passport to a better social position in the community rather than as a form of access to ideas. The diploma is granted at a small price in intellectual effort. The school has become an arena in which the student sells something, particularly himself.

Once again this criticism is true only of poor teacher-education. We are certainly not in favor of inexpensive intellectual demands on either teachers or students. This holds only for mediocre teacher education, and mediocre teachers.

Modern education continues its own probing for ways of increasing man’s capacities to deal with and enjoy his world. It seeks to train teachers who never stop probing for more effective understanding of their students, who never lose interest in the material they teach, who are earnestly desirous of helping all their students to gain in skill and information and maturity.

This constant probing and effort to understand more fully is hardly anti-intellectual. It is the core of intellectuality.
The Code for Snipers

Whether it concerns the mess in Washington, juvenile delinquency, traffic jams, or the price of coffee, we Americans are great finger-pointers. We love to lay the blame. It shows we are alert—alive—on our toes. Perhaps it is a symptom of our excess energy. (Do other cultures do as much of it, I wonder?) Or do we just have a national fondness for sniping?

A favorite target is the person who claims to have any kind of special knowledge about any subject. Not only the word, but even the idea “expert” is a clarion call to snipers. If furthermore that subject happens to be children, then the urge to take a few pot-shots is well-nigh irresistible. For deep in his heart, every man and woman in the United States apparently regards himself as an authority on children and how they should be brought up. Therefore anyone who has the temerity to claim any special knowledge on that subject is fair game for all snipers.

To be sure sniping has its uses. It focuses attention. It discourages smugness. It challenges assumptions. But so also does it have its abuses. When it only tears down, and does not build up, its value is debatable.

Recently a new form of sniping is becoming fashionable: the vogue for specialists in the children’s field to denounce themselves and each other. We cannot agree among ourselves, they proclaim; we have a long and miserable history of mistakes; we do not know what we are talking about; nothing we say should be taken seriously. Like other forms of sniping this self-flagellation has its healthy and its unhealthy aspects.

Insofar as its purpose is to stimulate honest self-examination, honest questioning of assumptions, it is good. The value of “opinion” as distinguished from a more solid type of evidence, is in lower repute than formerly.

But it is not good when the challenge is carried so far as to imply that anything which cannot be “proved” to be right or valuable is therefore wrong or worthless.

And it is not good if the chief result is to undermine everybody’s confidence in everybody else; the confidence of parents in educators, and of educators in themselves and each other. Parents are looking to specialists for help. It is no favor to parents merely to destroy their confidence and give them nothing in return.
One of the charges frequently leveled against educators is that "parents are confused." But why blame educators for this? Would parents be any less confused if there were no educators? This is an age of confusion. Any adult who is not confused today is either a moron or a schizophrenic. The same thing can be said of the specialists themselves. A lot of today's "new knowledge" is confusing; new ideas are very often confusing. Would it be better for that reason if there were no new ideas? Certainly not. Being confused is not to anyone's discredit. Claiming to know all the answers would be.

Which brings us to the matter of definition. To any expert worthy of the name, "expert" is an obnoxious word. "Authority" is only a little better. "Specialist" is convenient but not the same. "Psychologist" is too limited. "Educator" is good for our purposes here if used in the wide sense of anybody who is striving to pass on to others the things about children he has learned himself. "Student of the subject," though too cumbersome to use, is really the most accurate of all. In this discussion, all these terms are used synonymously. They refer to the people who have had both training and experience in child psychology and parent education. Whatever their limitations, they are as a whole, honest, sincere, conscientious, intelligent "students of the subject." They do not know everything, and do not pretend to, but they do know something, and they are doing the best they can. Sniping, whether from within or from without, is not going to increase their efficiency. The following aids to memory are therefore set down for those who feel a spell of sniping coming on:

1. There is a valuable body of knowledge about children today.

2. This body of knowledge should neither be glorified as if it were greater than it is, nor scorned because it is incomplete.

3. Similarly, educators (specialists, authorities, whatever they are called)—as purveyors of existing knowledge—should neither be held in awe as repositories of all wisdom, nor belittled as ignoramuses.

4. Educators are human. They make mistakes. Their most famous one within the memory of living psychologists was the Watsonian mechanism of the '20's. This is often cited as if it were just one of scores of similar egregious errors, and as if it were positive proof that because some people made those mistakes then, nobody knows any-
thing now. Actually it is hard to find another error as grave as this. Has this one perhaps been held against the poor psychologists long enough?

5. Among professionals, there are inevitably a few extremists. People with a new idea often go a little too far. They are reacting against an old idea, often a bad old idea. It is part of the swing of the pendulum, and perhaps mildly regrettable but not the worst thing that could happen. An example is to be found in some of the extremes of the “permissiveness” idea a few years back. But such extremes were not characteristic of all professional workers, and furthermore some of the constructive balance that is now being achieved is almost surely due at least in part to the fresh new ideas of the extremists of an earlier day.

6. Educators are constantly being misinterpreted. Some of this is merely unthinking, some of it is malicious. A familiar example is the frequently heard challenge “Do you mean to say you believe in letting him do anything he wants to?” (These challengers are usually first cousins to the proponents of the “hairbrush-in-the-woodshed” school of thought.)

7. Among authorities, there is far, far more agreement than disagreement. This fact is often lost sight of because disagreement makes the headlines, agreement rarely does.

8. The important task is to assess what we do and do not know, to keep refining our body of knowledge—and this is precisely what most specialists are conscientiously trying to do. Let us then devote ourselves to this, our big job, and leave off the flagellations, both of self and others.
Changing Concepts of Norms

The word and idea “norm” is currently in considerable disrepute. What is really needed, however, is development and clarification of the idea, rather than rejection of it altogether, since, no matter which way we turn theoretically or practically, no child can be understood, guided or educated completely in terms of himself. As much as he is an individual, he is also a member of a group, many groups in fact, and needs to be seen in these contexts, as a boy or as an eight-year-old or as a third-grader or as a city child, and so on.

In the past, intelligence quotient and age level norms have probably had most influence on teachers. The former have been and are useful when their use is well seasoned with understanding of how much an I.Q. cannot tell about an individual child, and how many life factors can seriously distort a child’s score so that what looks like basic capacity level may only be the total impact of circumstantial factors. The latter, the age level norms, are distinctly useful in supplying teachers and parents with a body of general expectations as to how children will act as they grow older. But they constitute a hazard in education and child-rearing whenever any particular child is expected to match, point by point, the behavior characteristics which have been derived and summarized from study of a whole group.

Insurance against misuse of norms such as these lies in constantly reminding ourselves that behavior, meaning not good or bad conduct, but the whole repertoire of responses available to a child at any stage in his development, is the end-product of a complex interplay of many factors. His capacity is not a point on a scale or a score. It is a range of potentiality, more or less fulfilled according to the circumstances of his growth. Among these circumstances his teachers as well as his parents play an important determining role. I do not wish to give the impression, even in passing, that constantly living up to top capacity is an ideal teachers’ or parents’ goal for children. Certainly not when we are concerned, as we are today, with emotional health and maturity.

Recently, when we think of norms, or to paraphrase that term, when we consider what are the important features of a given stage of development that most children have in common, we lay emphasis on another kind of normative concept. The application of theory from the field of dynamic psychology, the research studies in the field of motivation and personality, the accumulation of in-
sights from the clinical fields have accentuated our interest in the springs of behavior, in the growth purposes which this or that kind of behavior serves. We see as characteristic of successive stages of development, certain life-challenges to be met by all children, referred to in different terms by different people, sometimes called basic needs, sometimes developmental tasks. By this way of thinking, a child’s maturity may be evaluated as much in terms of what he is seeking and trying to resolve as in terms of his proficiency in accomplishment. A child’s resistance against being accompanied to school by a parent is as important a cue with respect to his total growth as his progress in acquiring new vocabulary.

The way and the rate at which each child meets these basic life challenges, such as the need to emerge from babyish dependence on parents, is affected by many factors—his temperament, his parents’ attitudes toward him, what is considered babyish by the children among whom he wishes to be accepted as a peer. Similarly his learning of a new vocabulary is affected by many factors such as his capacity, his interest, what inner satisfaction is potentially involved for him, and what his general attitudes toward learning are as related to his basic attitudes toward himself and the world in which he lives. Since, then, each child goes through a unique process in meeting the growth challenges which are common to all, we expect great variation in the resultant behavior of the individuals composing any group even where such factors as age, or I.Q. or home background may be quite homogeneous.

The evidence that this concept is being absorbed into our curriculum practices lies in the degree to which we are forsaking uniformity both in what we expect and what we offer. The programs of our schools today are being structured in terms of this variation.

Methods of teaching skill subjects through small groups working on different content are an example of adjustment to varying rates of learning within a single classroom. They also represent an effort to get away from the error of having the teacher present material aimed at and suitable for the average child in his group and in so much unsuited for the others who are a considerable number.

Ahead of us still lies the development of that kind of skillful teaching, on a broad scale, that sees and responds to each child in terms of the basic strivings that are intrinsic to the growth process and that he shares with all other children, teaching that takes into account the multiple influences that condition his particular pattern of development and personality and deals with his behavior as the end result of this complex process from which it cannot be separated.
Jimmy probably began to investigate how things work on the day he was born. It is hard to tell what goes on behind a wrinkled wee face with its blind eyes when tiny fingers begin to fumble around. It is hard to tell what Jimmy was thinking when later he tried for hours to pick up the spots of sunshine from the nursery floor. He was efficient by this time, creeping swiftly from one sunny spot to another, examining his empty hand after each attempted plucking. Certainly the blue eyes in his round pink face looked puzzled. Certainly the rising inflection of his high voice—"Hey-a?" sounded like his equivalent for, "How can a thing look solid and not let itself get picked up?"

Jimmy was never a verbal child. To be sure, he asked questions and listened to the answers with intent, averted face. But, on the whole, he preferred to conduct his own investigations and to voice his own discoveries to himself. At five years, he sat in the tub thoughtfully dipping and squeezing his sponge. Scrubbing time was over and the tight yellow curls were straightened and dark with streaming water. The knees were clean—or clean enough. The water showed he had done his duty energetically. Again he dipped the sponge and squeezed out the water. A slow smile spread until his face was luminous with a new thought. He muttered to himself, "Lucky I'm waterproof."

It was that same summer that he made a great discovery on the lake. Jimmy had always loved the little lake at his summer home. Before he could walk he had crept swiftly into the shallow water by the beach and dog-paddled vigorously while his mother, like the proverbial hen, plunged after her duckling. The summer he was five, he was proficient as a swimmer but still a belly-flop diver. As a rower, he could now manage both oars. He spread his legs wide and pressed his bare toes fan-wise on the rounded sides of the boat. But bodily activities no longer satisfied Jimmy. The day of his discovery, he and a grown-up rowed off shore where a light breeze had whipped up little waves. He seemed absorbed in the feel of the breeze on his face and body, and in listening to the slap, slap of the racing waves on the side of the boat. "They're going fast," he said.

Then the pucker appeared on his forehead that always meant deep thought. He still stared at the waves. "They can't really be going," he said slowly, "cause all the water would get piled up at one end of the lake."
It was that same summer that he and his younger brother Peter learned something more about the lake. This time there was a stiff wind blowing and even Father's arms had hard work to keep the boat moving in the right direction. Suddenly a whiff took the caps off both boys' heads and landed them in the water. Everyone stared more or less helplessly. The caps soaked up water. Then they slowly sank down, down, till they disappeared utterly. Both boys burst into wild tears. Peter may have been crying for his lost hat. But he may have felt, as Jimmy did, the terror of the depth of the water.

After that Jimmy often talked about how deep the lake was. Then, being Jimmy, his talk changed to wondering just how deep it was. The wondering led the next summer to an attempt to answer this question. He borrowed rope from everyone until he had 60 feet of it. He tied a knot at every five feet and fastened a heavy stone at one end. A grown-up helped him make a big brown-paper map of the end of the lake near his home. She also went along in the boat either to handle the oars or the rope, for soundings with a 60 foot rope are an elaborate performance for a six-year-old.

Day after day, Jimmy plumbed the depth of the water. After each sounding, he wrote down on the map the number of knots that disappeared before the stone rested on the bottom. He found that the shallow water by the beach extended out quite a way. The translated knot record read 1,3,5,8 feet. Then suddenly the stone sank to 15,20,25 feet. With dilated pupils, he entered his record on the map—a sandy shelf with a steep edge.

A fine rocky little point jutted out into the lake in front of his house. Grown-ups found the diving was good from the end. How good? In one spot not ten feet off the rocks, the stone sank 8 knots or 40 feet! But not everywhere. On the bottom lay big boulders. Carefully Jimmy plotted where they were with his sounding stone.

One calm day, he headed the sounding party for the middle of the lake and pulled up about where these caps had sunk to terrifying depth. He threw the stone over with a splash. The rope uncoiled slowly, held by his trembling hands. 40,45,50,55 feet. The last knot was reached. It was more than 60 feet deep. The wet rope was hauled up feverishly and in silence he rowed back home. There simply was no more rope on the place. A new 20 foot length was bought, added to the old and carefully knotted.

Again the sounding party set out. Again the stone was thrown overboard and the rope played out. 60,65,70,75 feet said the knots. More than 80 feet deep! Jimmy never did find out how far below the surface these two little caps rested on the bottom. An old man
told him that no one had ever found out how deep the lake was in the middle. Jimmy was satisfied.

The coil of rope lay unused in the boat house the rest of the summer. The summer he was eight, however, Jimmy found a new use for it. He constructed a terrifying swing. It was not an ordinary swing but was modelled on one he had seen somewhere. First he nailed cleats on a high tree to make climbing easy. High in the tree he nailed a board as a small platform. Around the tree he tied a rope with knots carefully tested by Father. The other end of the rope was then fastened low down on another tree some thirty feet distant, leaving a graceful sag. In the shop Jimmy built a small seat in which he bored two holes. He pulled short ropes through the holes with knots under the seat. Then again he climbed the high tree, this time with the seat. Soon the seat was slung over the long rope and again all knots tested by Father. Another long rope from seat to tree, held the seat to the tree so that it would not go swinging off by itself and could later be used to haul the seat back.

Below, the family waited as Jimmy carefully put one bare leg, then another over the seat and clutched the ropes on either side. There was fear, pride, and scientific wonder on his grave face as he released the holding rope. Boy and swing slipped down the slack rope faster and faster—slowed up as they passed the lowest point in the breath-taking journey. Jimmy sat for a moment, his legs dangling some five feet from the ground. Then he turned a triumphant face to the relieved on-lookers and remarked slowly, "It worked!"

It worked. Therein lay Jimmy’s chief satisfaction. The flight through the air must have been satisfying, exciting for itself. But Jimmy’s remark was that of an inventor, an investigator of how things work.
I WISH I WERE THE MOON

I wish I were the moon.
I could see people night and day
I could see them
Whispering and talking
Working or playing
Laughing and crying
Sleeping or waking
Sitting or walking,
If I were the moon.
If I were the moon,
I could see people night and day
Willing or not
Loving or hating
Gentle and cruel
Sympathetic or mean
Thieving and honest
Weak or strong
If I were the moon.
I wish I were the moon.
I could see people night and day
Rich or poor
Black or white
Living and dying
I could see them
Doing anything.
I could hear secrets
And see secrets.
Nothing could keep them from me.
I would know everything
If I were the moon.

By a thirteen-year-old girl

CITY AND COUNTRY

The differences are great between the city and the country. Even the things that are the same all over the world, like the sun, moon and stars, seem to change their appearance from in the city to the country.

I'm taking a walk in the country at night. The trees rustle in the fresh breeze, the moon shines crystal clear in the sky.

I'm taking a walk in the city at night. There's no rustling of trees, only the roaring of the cars and trucks. There's no fresh breeze, only the exhalation of the city. All the lights of the city dull the gleam of the moon and stars.

The city brightens man, but dulls nature.

By a twelve-year-old girl

THE CAT

Lithe and beautiful,
More dignified
Than any man could hope to be
Yet active.
Like other animals it has
Its problems
But it is one of the most
Independent.

By an eleven-year-old boy
THE WIND
The mischievous wind blows along the street
Carrying paper and dust with it.
People are walking along ziz-zaz.
Like sailboats tacking against the wind,
Holding on to their hats for dear life.
A man across the street disentangles his legs
From a stubborn piece of newspaper
Which has collided with them.
Here come two hats
With their owners a few feet behind,
Waving their arms wildly.
But I like the wind.

By an eleven-year-old girl

AT NIGHT
I hear bow-wow and it scares me.
I see the lights flashing in my room
From the other side of the street.
It makes the room look shining.
Everytime when I wake up I hear music
From where people dance.
Sometimes I hear rain.
It sounds like someone
Swishing off a fire hose.

By a five-year-old girl

THE HUNTER
His eyes were grey
his coat was red
he was out to kill
the animals.
A wrinkled face,
and wincing eyes,
he plowed through the snow,
while the bushes blew.
Sun and snow
and hunter too
all went together,
for a wonderful view.
He heard a rustle,
he turned to look,
and saw a tree,
but that was all.
He looked at me,
and with his cruel eyes,
pierced my heart.
I hope he dies.
Up on the hill
and over the top
he shot and shot
he did not stop,
the bird fell,
I felt my heart,
I thought again,
I hope he dies.

By a thirteen-year-old boy

TIME
Time is like a rubber band
It stretches and snaps back again
Seconds sometimes seem like hours
An hour seems shorter than a minute.
The hour between dinner and bedtime
Seems less than a minute long.
The minute before the three o'clock bell
Seems much longer than anything.

By a thirteen-year-old boy
Children's Reaction to a Teacher's Story

Last summer I was given an unwanted small kitten. A couple of young neighbors and I were fascinated by the kitten's behavior. Out of this experience I wanted to write a simple unplotted story about the actions and appeal of a kitten, for nursery age children. I wanted to use few words—those that would be right and natural, yet have some distinction and lightness. I improved on the rightness and naturalness as I was testing it out with children.

KITTEN CAN
Kitty can walk
Kitty can stalk
And run
And race
Hold her tail like a sail
And stare into your face
Kitty can stretch her back
And hump;
Twirl her whiskers
And do a high jump
Wash her face,
And brush her fur
Partly close eyes and purr.
Kitty cannot talk like you
But she hears you, and says, "Mew."
Come, Kitty-kitty. Quick!
Here is food you like to lick:
Fish to chew
And milk to lap
Then curl up
And have a nap.
Wake up! It's a sunny day!
Kitty dashes out to play,
She climbs a tree,
She bats a ball.
She watches
Shadows on the wall.
Kitty can be very friendly
With a child
Or a man,
Kitty can.
I read the plain manuscript, one sentence to a page, to children in my nursery school class, four-to-five year olds. I read slowly, allowing for response or interruption. I read to several groups of three or four children, prefacing my reading with, “This is a book that I made up, and it has no pictures.” I read it also on request to one child, and a few others joined in to listen.

At home I read the “book” to a visiting four-year-old niece, to a five-and-a-half year old neighbor, and gave it to the mother to try out on her three-year-old at bedtime. In addition I tried *Kitty Can* on a group of nursery school teachers in a Rutgers College class in Language Arts.

The responses from children were various.

1. Interesting and familiar dramatic action. A very distinct response on the part of all children was that of action upon hearing the various doings of the cat, including the humping and face washing. Older children did stalking with fingers and facial movements. All seemed ready to be jumpers and tree climbers (hand movement) on a par with a cat.

2. Listening and verbal response. All children listened with apparent enjoyment and amusement to the rhymed lines. Three, and four and five-year-olds said, “I can do it,” as they listened. The simplicity of content did not seem too young for the five-year-olds.

Walter, four-and-a-half, said, “Read me the *Kitty Can* book again, do it now.” I read three pages, and he stopped me, saying, “Now I want to tell you a poem about Jonathan.” He dictated carefully but unhesitatingly:

> “Jonathan likes to walk,
> Jonathan likes to stalk,
> But he *mostly* likes to talk!”

Walter was very thrilled with the achievement—a “poem” about his two-year-old brother. He took a deep breath and said, “Now I want to tell you a poem about the whole wide world—did you write that down?”

He leaned his elbow on the table and held his head in his hand. The poem apparently didn’t come as easily as the one about Jonathan, but finally he said, as I waited without prodding,

> “A world can’t fall
> And it can be cold.
> But we aren’t cold
> Because we have clothes.”
What a sweep of thinking! He started out with an abstract world, then came down to earth, and people that have clothes to protect themselves from the cold.

Apparently *Kitty Can* reminded Walter of the fascination of rhyming, for right after the World poem, he said, "I want to tell you another poem,

"A table can break,  
But it can't be raked!"

This amused him very much—in fact it made him feel giddy, for he made up "A Poem about Mrs. Rudolph!"

"Mrs. Rudolph likes to sing  
Although she stings  
She'd rather zing and bing . . ."  

Walter and the other children laughed and laughed at this. This is the most sustained and original creative language that Walter had dictated during the year. The fact that *Kitty Can* was "made up" by the teacher served as special challenge and stimulation.

The lines that seemed funny to the children were: "And look into your face" and "Twirl her whiskers."

The children’s interest in the language was indicated by their reactions in other ways. The three-year-old who heard the story alone repeated every line as it was read to her except "Kitty can stalk," to which she said, "What?" and was given an explanation. Several of the pages or words were anticipated by the four and five-year-olds, for instance, "Jump." "But she says 'mew.'" "And have a nap." "To play." There were various suggestions for what kitty watches: birds, children, trees.

Many of the children were eager to supply pictures. The three-year-old asked where the pictures were, and indicated the place for them. Most of the other children offered to supply pictures in a spirit of helpfulness to me. I was given drawings of:

1. Pussy-cat eating the fish.  
2. Pussy-cat licking her face.  
3. Pussy-cat meowing  
4. Pussy-cat climbing a tree  
5. Kitty humping  
6. Kitty stretching her back  

and other kitten drawings of various degrees of skill and complexity.
My niece Ann, aged four, was concerned with making pictures and decorations for the book. She wanted especially to make a picture of kitty eating fish (she herself is fond of fish). There was no time to make pictures while she visited me, and she asked me to read “Kitty” again, so she could think of which pictures she wanted to make for me at home. Next week, she arrived with the pictures and explained them very enthusiastically. Her mother wrote down the picture titles as Ann dictated them, and Ann herself wrote “CAT” on all of them, and cut them out, doing some decorations with a paper-puncher.

Susie, just five, was very anxious to make a picture for my book. “I don’t know how to make a kitty,” she kept saying, although her free spontaneous drawing and painting is always original and beautiful. She apparently wanted to make a proper illustration. “Show me how,” she demanded.

“Maybe I can help you?” I said. “What does a kitty have?”

At this point she was joined by Ivan, and the two of them gave the following anatomical account of the cat. “Body, whiskers, tail, eyes and nose, mouth, feet, legs, ears, teeth, nails.” Susie’s actual picture was a painful attempt at accuracy, including the soft body made of cotton pasted on the drawing. Joan, five years and two months, did her drawing perfectly freely. Scott, five years and ten months, wanted immediately to make a picture of “hump” which he did with care, and then labored at drawing a cat stretching her back; he wanted to make a kitty with spots, like the one he used to have.

The class of nursery school teachers to whom I read the manuscript and showed the pictures seemed to find the content appropriate and appealing, but were rather concerned about the missing pictures. I indicated how children’s response to the action content and language was even freer without ready-made pictures. One member of the class, however, who said she likes to draw, volunteered to illustrate the whole book!

Aside from the content of the composition, the children showed a definite response to the teacher’s creative effort on their level—the teacher making a book to suit them. One might say that Kitty Can, in the writing and testing, is an example of the language arts teaching-learning in nursery school that has value equally to children and teacher. The nursery school teacher has a great deal to learn about language and children. Writing a simple story is a good way to begin.
The little boy was building an airport with his blocks. The winter sun, coming through the nursery window, had that same pale white-gold sheen as the short fine hair that capped the little boy's head. There was a tranquility in both sun and child that made each seem isolated from yet strangely a part of the more turbulent group of surrounding children.

The little boy chose each block deliberately from the block shelf, unhurriedly yet in no sense lackadaisically. He laid the long blocks first, in a firm foundation, then built the side walls with a quick sure touch, neither throwing the building together nor lingering over-long to make sure that the alignment of block on block was true and steady. He had made a helicopter the previous day at the work bench. Now he put this plane in his partially finished building, then roofed it over with more long blocks.

His tempestuous friend, who had been playing on the other side of the room, joined the little boy, eyes sparkling and movements darting and sudden. The friend began to pile assorted sizes and shapes of blocks in a heterogeneous mass on the rooftop of the building. The little boy looked at his friend quietly. He got up and hitched up his pants, then knelt down again by his building and, without a word, settled himself to the task of creating order out of the newly introduced confusion. His friend now sat back on his haunches and watched the little boy with some surprise.

The little boy took the wedge blocks and with much careful balancing made a fan-shaped decoration over the hangar's doorway. He fashioned arches into a smokestack by placing them so that their semi-circular openings made an open chimney, round within and square without. The smaller oblongs he incorporated into a wall around the hangar roof.

The little boy smiled at his friend and the two children, still silent, walked hand in hand to the door.
A New Approach to Parent-Teacher Education

A group of teachers meeting in one of the workshops given by the Bank Street College of Education in the New York public schools, found themselves eager for help in practical classroom techniques in the “new curriculum.” As they began to investigate with their leader new ways of learning through activity, they made an interesting discovery: what they really needed was a greater knowledge of the nature of childhood itself. What are the characteristics of a six-year-old? How does he differ from a five-year-old or a seven? These teachers realized that there is today a substantial body of data on how children grow, how they learn, how they feel. A sound program of learning for young children must be based on this new knowledge.

Mothers in the same school, many of them working mothers, meeting regularly with the same workshop leader to talk over everyday problems, also came gradually to the conclusion that the handling of a concrete situation in the home demands a knowledge of child development. What can we expect of a five-year-old? And what makes a ten-year-old behave as he does?

Both groups had come to the same realization. They were ready to meet in joint sessions to discuss children’s growth, needs and interests. They realized that a school program is built in a vacuum unless it is related to children’s development. The children they were concerned with ranged in age from approximately five through eleven years old.

The first joint meetings were somewhat stiff and self-conscious, as might be expected. Teachers and parents had met only “socially” and briefly in that school before. But by the third session there was a new atmosphere, a new fusion. As one teacher said, “Attention of both parents and teachers was focussed on a common goal—the children—instead of on each other, and this gave the group a real sense of unity.”

Mothers’ questions soon revealed a major concern: “Will children learn as much by the new methods as they did by the old?” “He never has any homework,” said the mother of a nine-year-old. “He doesn’t know the alphabet,” was the comment of a mother whose child was in the first grade. And a sixth-grade parent asked, “Will this kind of education prepare my child for doing good work in junior high?”

Teachers were able to explain that in the early days of the new
curriculum they too had questioned the degree of freedom given
the children, and the emphasis on self-directed activity, the "effi­
ciency" of these ways of teaching, but that today they truly believed
that the children in their classes learned as much and more than
they had in the old days. A second-grade teacher related an incident
of taking a trip around the block, and how the children came back
and painted their impressions of the things they had seen. And in
the fourth grade room the parents saw a big plywood three-dimen­
sional map of New York. Toy boats lay on the water area of the
map and well-known buildings were indicated by miniatures made
of milk containers. The children often "played" with this, the leader
explained, and at the same time they learned to use it like a smaller
printed map. Maps were easy for these children to use and under­
stand after this experience, she said.

A second concern of parents was the problem of discipline, and
here too the teachers could be helpful. "My child says, 'You can't
boss me—even my teacher doesn't!'" At this the teachers laughed.
One of them explained that it was amusing to get this from the
parents because in school the children say, "You can't boss me.
Even my mother doesn't." Another teacher asked thoughtfully,
"What is bossing? Is it necessary, is it desirable? Aren't children
who are treated sympathetically, not pushed around, who are inter­
ested in their work, well behaved?" She said that she had found,
in spite of her early misgivings, that they usually are.

The teachers' and parents' workshop meetings were held every
week, the joint meetings once a month in the classrooms where
parents could see for themselves what the children were doing in
school, because the rooms were full of their work. All of this led
naturally to an interpretation of the new curriculum and the philos­
ophy behind it. The maps, the drawings, the puppet theatre in one
of the rooms all served as the springboard for lively discussions.
The workshop leader watched the parents in the first grade class­
room gravitate to the "housekeeping corner." She told them how
the children did exactly the same thing in the beginning of the
year—how dolls and toy beds and stoves bridge the gap between
school and home, why "play" about familiar things was encouraged.
Then she asked the parents to name the “subjects” they had studied
in school and as they did so she wrote on the blackboard the usual
array of three R's, geography, history, and the rest. “Of course you
want to know whether your children are learning these same
things,” she said. “They are, but in a different way—not so much
from books and teachers’ words as from the things they do, the
trips they take, the store they keep, the little charts they make out when they begin to write."

"And I can assure you," the workshop leader said, "That these activities do prepare the children for difficult academic work in the later years. Children in the fifth grade know how to go to the library and find the answers to their own questions." The parents could see that it was challenging and interesting to learn in this way.

One interesting and unplanned by-product of the workshop meetings of mothers and teachers was the lively inter-age nursery group that flourished in the room next door to the meetings. A first-grade teacher had volunteered to take care of youngsters during meeting time so that mothers with small children could participate. Not only did this arrangement relieve the mothers—it delighted the children. More than once a mother said that she was so busy she hadn’t seen how she could get to the meeting, but her pre-school child had insisted that they go! And it was amusing to everyone when an earnest discussion of five-year-oldness was interrupted by a child appearing at the door, making faces, and giving a spontaneous, unrehearsed demonstration of one aspect of five-year-oldness!

From an airing and sharing of problems, many parents discovered that they were not alone in facing difficulties, and the older parents’ smiling statement that, "You'll see, some day it will be all right," was often reassuring.

The teachers’ comments showed that they, too, had profited from this interchange of ideas. And since the teachers’ assignment was a written evaluation of the course, it was possible to get a clear picture of their questions and their thinking. One teacher wrote that the course had given her “perspective for seeing spilled milk, lost sweaters, sulkiness, whining, aggressiveness and tattling in the light of the natural place that these things have in the normal growth and development of children, as they learn how to live in the essentially complex society which we have created for them, and into which they are brought without choice.”

Another teacher stated, "In my conversations with parents I have been better able to explain and help them to see the high value which modern education places upon the child's play. I am quite sure that most of these parents now feel the importance of play as a way of growing up, since it builds the child physically, develops his skill of mind, adroitness of body, imagination and social awareness." She wrote further, "At least two parents have told me that they now have a clearer understanding of the physical, social and emotional development of their children and the relationship between these factors and reading ability."
A particularly discerning teacher made these observations, "In classroom experience with children, I can often tell when there is an expressed need for a parent who just isn't around enough. Many times such a child is awkward in showing affection to me as the teacher. That child may reach for my hand shyly and unpractised. Another child may reach for my hand too often because he cannot get enough of what he needs desperately. Or he may not bother at all to establish physical contact with me because he fears getting the same cold rebuff that he gets at home. On the other hand, there is no mistaking the affectionate bear hug, the warm curling fingers and sure, friendly grip of the child who has touched and enjoyed the vigor of his own family. This child feels what he has been given and has so much wonderful feeling stored inside that he carries it everywhere and can well afford to share it with all those who form another kind of family circle—friends and people who are to be loved even though they do not exactly belong to that very sacred and necessary circle of close relations."

As the school term drew to a close, feeling became so frank and friendly that the teachers decided to give a party for the parents—not just a tea, but something special. What they chose to do was a performance of the American Theater Wing's "Fresh and Variable Winds," a play about a ten-year-old boy written to stimulate discussion about varied reactions—good and bad—to a family situation. Here were teachers willing not only to learn roles and create scenery but to face a possible loss of prestige through acting like a bad boy or a silly mother. Yet the experiment came through successfully. The teachers, instead of losing, seemed to gain prestige—a new kind of prestige because they had established a new kind of relationship. "If the best learning occurs in a casual and relaxed atmosphere," one teacher wrote, "then using 'Fresh and Variable Winds' as a vehicle brought many more provocative ideas to both cast and audience than could be obtained through a lecture, article or pamphlet on a similar subject in so short a time. In no situation in my experience in which both parents and teachers participated have the bars been so let down. And that is because the audience felt themselves a part of the situation and not as if they were being talked at. This was a serious attempt by genuinely interested human beings, who happen also to be teachers and parents, to bring home problems and school problems together for better mutual understanding."
In June 1953, Bank Street College held a two-day conference at Vassar Alumnae House, Poughkeepsie, New York. Attending were twenty outstanding representatives from the fields of psychology, anthropology, psychiatry and medicine as well as eleven members of the Bank Street College teaching and research staff.

The discussions ranged around questions such as cultural values implicit in our child-rearing and educational practices, the overlap of teachers’ and therapists’ roles, the effect of increased and “expert” knowledge on the naturalness of relations between adults and children, the need for re-defining and re-thinking misused concepts of “creativity,” “permissiveness,” and “learning through play.”

Summaries of the conference discussions were written by Lois Barclay Murphy of the Menninger Clinic, and Dorothy Dinnerstein of the Bank Street College Research Staff. Mimeographed copies may be ordered from the Bank Street Bookshop for 50¢.

The second Associates’ Conference was built around the theme WHAT DO WE EXPECT OF OUR TEACHERS TODAY? Dr. Crane Brinton, historian, Harvard University, and Dr. David Riesman, sociologist, University of Chicago, opened up lively discussion of education for children by raising such questions as . . . Is modern education anti-intellectual? . . . Do teachers feel under pressure to assume omniscience? The main points centered around the school’s responsibilities today and the nature of the learning process, in particular whether children learn more and retain longer what they learn when their emotional interest is involved and when the content is related to life situations. A Bank Street panel closed the morning’s discussion.

The four afternoon speakers continued the discussion. Mary Frank, co-author of How To Help Your Child In School, spoke as a parent, Dr. John H. Niemeyer, director of Oak Lane Country Day School, as a director of an experimental school. Dr. Fritz Redl, Children’s Unit National Institutes of Health, described what children want from a teacher. And Dr. Viola Bernard outlined the psychiatrist’s approach. Dr. Barbara Biber then gave a summary of the day which had had an unusual unity of focus in matters discussed with a stimulating diversity of points of view. Complete proceedings will be published and sold at the Bank Street Bookshop. About $1.25.
Dorothy Canfield Fisher in her VERMONT TRADITION has added a new kind of book not only to her own long list of novels and non-fiction works but, so it seems to us, to the world's books. Her most recent book is history told not as an impersonal chronicle of events—though historical events are there—but in terms of the personality of a group of people called Vermonters—what certain events did to this group and what events this group brought about through their personality. It is also a new kind of autobiography. In the second sentence of her book, she offers her credentials for writing it, "I have lived in Vermont ever since 1763, as my father laughingly put it." Again, factual events in her own life and the lives of her forebears appear but all transmuted though a powerful Vermont lens that illuminates her own and Vermonters' philosophy of life. A wonderful book! By a wonderful woman long beloved by Americans, who reveals herself on every page.

We are proud that in 1952 Dorothy Canfield Fisher consented to become an Honorary Charter Associate of Bank Street College. We are now proud that she and her publishers, Little, Brown, have permitted us to quote one of the innumerable side-light flashes that delight us throughout VERMONT TRADITION.

We really don't know yet much that is accurate about the springs of adult behavior, human nature being so complex and many-sided. We are much more sure of our understanding of children's behavior . . . So if we look closely at destructive impulses in young children, we have more chance of seeing what causes them.

A little boy comes storming in from the street, sobbing, terrified and furiously angry. A big boy took his precious ball away from him and when he tried to get it back, slapped his face, and went away laughing. Once he is safely inside his own home, he has what psychiatrists gravely call a "destructive behavior explosion."

Anybody who has ever brought up children needs little description of what he does. He screams, he kicks the chair legs, in a passionate gesture he sweeps from the living room table the breakable knickknacks he knows his mother prizes, he flings himself face down on the floor, shrieking that he hates her, he hates everybody, that he wishes everybody were dead, that he were dead.

An inexperienced young caretaker might be alarmed. She might even think that he did wish he were dead. But his mother, especially if he is a second or third child, glances at the clock, sees that it is past his supper time, remembers that he did not have his usual

- DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER
Author of Novels and Non-fiction
Honorary Charter Associate, Bank Street College of Education
afternoon nap, knows that the loss of his ball is a tragedy for a four-year-old. She does not think that he wishes he were dead. She does not even think there is much of anything the matter with him. In a conversational tone she says to his convulsively agitated back, “Come along, and have your supper. I made custard today. And there are cookies.” She lifts him up, leads him to the table, talks cheerfully to him while he wolfs down his milk, custard and cookies (sobs still intermittently shaking him, as he eats.) She says, in a casual parenthesis as it were, “We’ll get Daddy to make a gate to our yard. When that’s shut, no big boy could come inside. You can play there till you’re bigger.” She tucks him up in bed, and as she kisses him good night, she remarks, “We’ll get you another ball, first thing in the morning.” He is not dead, he is only soundly and healingly asleep before she leaves the room.

She has seen that he has no desire to destroy himself, or even a definite desire to break the china; rather that he is hungry, tired, frightened, has lost a prized possession, that he has been shaken by a dreadful humiliation—helplessness in the face of aggression. She has met those simple, understandable, not at all unreasonable needs with food, rest, protection and hope.

The accident-prone truck driver does not look much like a frightened and angry four-year-old. But circumstances may have put him in very much the same situation. If it were made possible for him to arrange his life so that he had his fair share of what we know to be not unreasonable psychological needs, his hand on the steering wheel might be steady. This will not always be possible. But it will never be possible in a single case, so long as we go on thinking that he has accidents because of a basic will-to-die.
In our second year it is timely to look at one another and see who we are—to take stock of what we are doing—and to see where we are going.

Our numbers have almost doubled. So many more active friends of Bank Street associated to give the college more strength and support! Who are we—these friends, old and new?

MEMBERSHIP from California to Vermont, from Florida and Texas to Kansas, Missouri, Illinois—ALUMNI who are the real products of Bank Street—FOLKS who have learned of us through our publications and have chosen to become a part of what we do—PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE, doctors, psychologists, teachers, educators, social workers, who are alert to the interesting projects with which Bank Street is concerned in New York City, PARENTS of students, who are grateful for what Bank Street has done for their children in nursery school and in the graduate teachers' program—AND MANY MORE—BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL MEN and FRIENDS of friends who love Bank Street and have infectiously communicated this affection to others.

All of us are the Associates of Bank Street. Our program this year has been a full one—we are trying to be an integral part of the college by attempting first to know it better. So we have had an Open House, Educational Meetings with the Staff, a chance for a few of us to help as individuals working closely and inclusively for one special purpose or another. We again have been the recipients of materials specially written and gathered to keep the Associates abreast of the college research and literature.

As active participants we helped plan and carried through the challenging Conference on "What Do We Expect of Our Teachers Today?" In a framework set up by the Associates the college staff met with stimulating provocative speakers from the wide community to share ideas, knowledge, and wisdom.

Where are we going? Far, I am sure, but slowly. As our numbers grow and become increasingly active in the work, there is no limit to the mutual sharing of responsibilities the Associates can shoulder with the college. FROM it we will gain understanding and a broader vision. TO it we can bring support, new friends, a vital Associates' educational program, and financial help—all added together for Bank Street's continued progress.
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ASSOCIATES, BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
69 Bank Street, New York 14, N. Y. CH 3-5034

HONORARY CHARTER ASSOCIATES
Regina C. M. Burke
Dorothy Canfield Fisher
William Jansen
William H. Kilpatrick
Robert S. Woodworth

OFFICERS
Mrs. Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Honorary President
Mrs. Arthur W. Lamm, President
Mrs. Leonard S. Kandell, Vice-President
Mrs. Alexander Mossman, Vice-President
Mrs. Eliot D. Pratt, Vice-President
Miss Jessie Stanton, Vice-President
Mr. Schroeder Boulton, Treasurer
Mrs. Charles E. Richards, Executive Secretary

BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
TRUSTEES
Mrs. Mary Squire Abbot
Dr. Ruth Andrus
Mr. Basil N. Bass
Mr. Lawrence K. Frank
Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer
Mr. Leonard S. Kandell
Dr. Alice V. Keliher
Mr. Arthur W. Lamm
Mrs. Beatrice W. Lamm
Mrs. Lucy Sprague Mitchell
Mr. Arthur Rosenthal
Mrs. Elizabeth Healy Ross
Mrs. Max J. H. Rossbach
Miss Jessie Stanton

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS
Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Acting President
Sheila Emerson Sadler, Executive Secretary

PROGRAM CHAIRMEN
Barbara Biber, Research
Irma S. Black, Publications
Clara M. Coble, Evening Program
Elizabeth C. Gilkeson, Children’s Program
Charlotte B. Winsor, Graduate Program
KNOW YOUR CHILDREN IN SCHOOL
By Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Claudia Lewis, Dorothy Stell, Virginia Schonborg and Ruth A. Sonneborn
$3.00

This book presents real children in real school situations in sketches that illuminate and give insight into their personalities. The material was gathered by members of the Bank Street Workshops in the kindergartens, first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth grades of New York City public schools.

Here you will find Allen, whose middle name was trouble ... Christina, who never caused any trouble ... Georgie, who wanted the teacher to be like a mother ... Frank, walking encyclopedia ... Peter, who forgot what he wanted to say ... Carl, who had to get even ... and many other children who presented problems of understanding to their teachers. How the teachers handled them and how these children responded makes fascinating and revealing reading.

Here is a book that will interest parents and teachers equally and that will give all adults who work and live with children a new perspective on them.

WRITING FOR YOUNG CHILDREN
By Claudia Lewis
$3.00

"Writing for Young Children," says Lucy Sprague Mitchell in her Foreword, "is a book to enjoy and to learn from. It is a book about children and how their language reveals what is going on inside them; about language and how to make stories for children that will heighten and deepen their satisfactions. It is addressed primarily to writers and would-be writers for children. But in facing the problem of writing books that are satisfying to children, Claudia Lewis faces problems that concern all who enjoy or seek to understand children and all who enjoy or seek to understand the art of language. Readers of Writing for Young Children will, I believe, develop more sensitive, listening ears and an experimental attitude—be they teachers or parents, or writers or artists who deal with media other than language, or those who simply enjoy children or language. For the author has skillfully woven the strands—children and language—into a pattern that holds both meaning and charm.

TWO NEW BOOKS
APRIL 1954
COME AND BROWSE IN OUR BOOKSTORE
LOOK OVER OUR
PACKETS • ARTICLES
BOOKLETS • BOOKS
FOR TEACHERS AND PARENTS
and
Our Staff-Selected Books For Children

Additional copies of CHILDREN HERE AND NOW (No. 2)
MAY BE ORDERED FROM US ..................... 65¢
CHILDREN HERE AND NOW (No. 1) IS STILL AVAILABLE 50¢
CHILDREN HERE AND NOW (Nos. 1 and 2) BOTH FOR... $1.00

We will be happy to send you our recent catalogues upon request.
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A Story About the World

In the world there are many things.
There are many pretty trees and flowers
There are many people.
There are many houses, and many shops.
There are many nice schools.
There are many doctors and nurses.
There are many pretty churches.
When I think of the world, I think of God.
God made the world.
There are many people working in the world.
And many poor people.
There are many Christmas trees in the world, and many happy Christmases
And many, many happy Easter joys.
It snows, and then all the children play in the snow.
The snow melts. It rains and the snow melts.
It starts to get spring. It gets warmer and warmer, and flowers start to bloom—tulips and crocuses.
And then summer comes, and all the children go to the shore and swim, and to pools.
After summer comes, the leaves turn yellow and brown and they fall, and people begin to rake them up.

Then snow and sleet and ice come, and the children go out with sleds, and go out and ice-skate.

God makes the people. They are born in a hospital, then the mothers come and take them home. They are babies then and they can't talk so they have to cry and the mothers know there's something wrong. And the way the back of a baby's neck smells when its mother has fixed it up.

Then they start to grow up—do you think they stay little? I should say not. They grow up to be in high school and college. Then they are taught what they want to be. And some are cow-girls and some are movie stars.

Then the people get married, when they want to be mothers. If they're boys they grow up to be gentlemen, and if they're girls they grow up to be ladies.

Then they grow old, and they die.
And new people come, and the world is still very nice, and full of people.

"That's a real long story!"
"Well, the world is long!"

By a group of five-year-olds