

WELFARE

The Real Cost Of Bread And Circuses

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* — a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Mr. Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ DURING his successful quest for the Presidency, Republican candidate Richard Nixon told the National Alliance of Businessmen:

As we look through the ages — and welfare is not new — we have found that inevitably when such programs continue and escalate in any society, welfare tends to destroy those who have received it and to corrupt those who dispense it.

It was sixteen months later as President-elect that Mr. Nixon again addressed himself to the subject of "Welfare." This time he was speaking before an assembly of the nation's Governors at Colorado Springs:

We confronted the fact that in the past five years the Federal Government alone spent more than a quarter of a trillion dollars on social programs — more than \$250 billion. Yet far from solving our

problems, these expenditures had reaped a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration and bitter division.

Never in human history has so much been spent by so many for such a negative result . . .

Mr. Nixon was not exaggerating. U.S. News & World Report for January 13, 1969, reveals that the number of Americans receiving "Welfare" has jumped over fifty percent during the past decade of unparalleled prosperity and now totals nearly 10 million persons. In its issue of February 3, 1969, U.S. News adds:

In the past eight years, federal spending for education, old-age pensions, health, handouts to the poor and all other "social welfare" has jumped to 61 billions a year. Add the more than 51 billions spent by State and local governments for similar aid, and the bill exceeds 112 billions a year.

... It is 40 percent more than the U.S. spends annually for defense, including war in Vietnam.

In addition to the 112.4 billion spent by government at all levels for "social programs," private welfare outlays amount to another \$50.7 billion — a total of \$163.1 billion. This, says U.S. News & World Report, accounts for almost twenty percent of the entire U.S. output of goods and services. The same source informs us that thirty-six percent of all federal spending, and forty-four percent of all state spending, now falls within the category of "social welfare." This makes

expenditure for such handouts second only to that for national defense.

Yet, notes *U.S. News*, despite these absolutely staggering figures, "All ideas with official backing seem to point in only one direction: toward bigger, costlier relief experiments." At the federal level alone there are now 112 poverty aid programs, handled by eleven separate agencies; sixty-nine vocational programs, operated by eight different federal agencies; and, forty-three separate programs for children, administered by five different agencies.

In the nation's two most populous states, New York and California, the "Welfare" juggernaut is running wild. One person in twelve in the Golden State is now on "Welfare" and, according to State Senator John Harmer, "By 1970 the combined Medi-Cal, welfare grant total may well exceed three (3) billion dollars or 60% of the State's present total budget." Already ten percent of the population of New York City, and twenty percent of its children, are living on "Welfare" checks. According to economist Henry Hazlitt, Lindsayville is spending seven times as much on "Welfare" as it was a decade ago, and the handout rolls are swelling at the astronomical rate of twenty thousand per month. The *New York Times* notes that Jack Goldberg, Commissioner of Social Services for "Fun City," says there will be 1,222,000 persons on the "Welfare" rolls in the City of New York during the year 1969-1970.

While millions of jobs go begging, the number of those on "Welfare" is increasing nationally at an annual rate of ten percent compounded. Yet, the *Wall Street Journal* reported on April 24, 1969:

President Nixon has asked his top domestic policy experts to explore a deeply perplexing social phenomenon . . . In short, the Great Society enlarged the demand for welfare and also increased its supply.

"My main conclusion is that the increase in the caseload is a good thing. More eligible families are getting assistance, so the system is in this sense working better," sums up one White House welfare specialist. This judgment is shared by many other Nixon Administration officials . . .

There's something mighty wrong with an Administration whose policy is: The more on "Welfare" the better. Naturally, when people learn that they can make almost as much money doing nothing as they can through physical labor, more and more are tempted to join the ranks of the "Welfare" army. Mrs. Belva Detlof, who was for years employed as an admissions worker for the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Social Services, writes in her morbidly fascinating book, *Welfare Wonderland*:

. . . Welfare reciprocity has become a profession, a way of life. It is an established means of obtaining the kind of living to which many of this country's citizens have become accustomed . . . in fact, they demand it . . .

The trade, or profession, of welfare reciprocity is now being handed down from generation to generation as a family custom . . . a family tradition. From the moment of birth, children in homes supported by welfare funds are being subtly and continuously indoctrinated in welfare reciprocity by the skilled, experienced welfare recipients surrounding them. Mothers who learned the "tricks of the trade" from their mothers, grandmothers and even great-grandmothers, are now instructing a new generation.

Just how much this "Welfare class" costs the average working family in America is difficult to calculate. All

"social service" spending is not directly "Welfare," and "Welfare" funds come from all levels of government so that it is difficult if not impossible to get an accurate accounting. Some of what is actually "Welfare" spending is hidden away in other budgets, as in Los Angeles County where the welfare department's real-estate expenses (buildings and maintenance) are sequestered under other budgetary designations. An employee of Los Angeles County who has made a thorough study of the matter has calculated that, excluding schools, eighty to eighty-five percent of the County's spending now goes directly or indirectly for "Welfare."

Assuming that President Nixon's figure of \$50 billion per year for "Welfare" over the past five years is approximately accurate, the average American family pays about \$1,250 per year in direct and indirect taxes to support those who can't or won't support themselves. This means the average productive American has during the last half-decade shelled out \$6,250, and worked approximately three thousand hours, to support these programs. Yet, assuming that there are approximately 4 million families in America living in poverty, every one of these families could have had a tax-free income of \$12,500 per year with the amount of money *already* being spent. Somewhere around one-half to three-fourths of this money goes for overhead and salaries for the povertycrats, with probably less than twenty-five percent of "Welfare" expenditures ever reaching the hands of the poor. Even so, although figures vary from state to state and according to the size of the family and other circumstances, monthly direct cash payments to "Welfare" recipients in industrial states now average \$250 to \$300 per family unit — more in income than that provided by the Congress for many of our military families. Mrs. Detlof catalogs some of the payments in kind available to the professional "poverty" people:

In addition to outright cash grants provided for those on public assistance, there are many valuable "fringe benefits." These include hospitalization, medical and dental care, surgery, pharmaceuticals, psychiatric care, nursing care in the home, and even "home-makers," i.e., attendants or housekeepers.

All this extensive and costly care is provided at no cost or effort on the part of recipients and their families. Here, again, the taxpayer is forced by legislation of doubtful constitutionality to provide services for these strangers that often far exceed anything he can provide for himself.

In addition, according to *U.S. News & World Report* of April 28, 1969, a total of 3.8 million Americans each year now receive of the taxpayers some 24.7 pounds of free food per month — including flour, canned meat, raisins, butter, lard, and seventeen other staples.*

The federal Food Stamp Program (about to be greatly expanded) provides food at a discount of roughly thirty-three percent to 2.9 million Americans who have been enticed onto the dole. In addition, 2.3 million children receive free school lunches from the government and

*Federal food programs are in the process of great expansion after much propaganda about hunger. A great deal of this propaganda was simply faked, as in the case where C.B.S. showed a dying Negro baby. The child was premature, but C.B.S. represented the cause of death to a national television audience as starvation.

Much of the alleged hunger is said to exist in farming areas — an absurd situation akin to suffering from thirst in the middle of a lake. Most poor rural families grow their own vegetables and raise poultry and other animals sufficient for subsistence with a very small cash income. The bureaucrats apparently calculated only cash incomes and figured they weren't enough to buy food at prevailing supermarket prices. They seem to think all food comes from a can.

an additional 16.7 million get subsidized lunches, while 200,000 youngsters receive free breakfasts under a recently initiated program. Most of these giveaway schemes have received Congressional appropriations for expansions approximating twenty-five percent for the coming year.

It has been estimated by *U.S. News & World Report* that in order to equal the value of cash, food, and medical and recreational services available without charge and tax-free to those who find it convenient to live idly on "Welfare" at the expense of their working fellows, the average taxpayer would have to earn in excess of \$7,000 per year. The difference is the two thousand hours of toil which the working taxpayer must spend each year to earn a living while the "Welfare" people sit fatly on their government checks.

Much has been written during the past few years about "growing poverty" in America. Many of these screeds have been penned by Marxists like Michael Harrington, author of *The Other America*, which is credited with having launched the War on Poverty.* The equally euphoric Dwight McDonald even made the dazzling discovery that the problem with poverty in America is that it is "invisible." You know, like the Emperor's new clothes. Poverty is massive, he said, but somehow you can't see it. The poverty popularizers claim that as many as 50 million Americans are "hopelessly trapped" in poverty. Of course, these myopic muckrakers have been mighty short on proof, but the "Liberal" media have made up for that with ease by simply turning on the propaganda machine.

Professor John Parrish of the University of Illinois became interested in these "poverty" claims and instituted a scholar-

ly project to investigate them. His careful study confirmed the old saw that while figures don't lie, liars figure. Professor Parrish explained:

Data are available to apply this variable index with constant dollars since 1959. And what does it reveal? It reveals that poverty in the U.S. has continued to decline steadily since 1959, reaching an all-time low of 15 percent in 1966.

This still means that 29 million Americans are classified as in poverty. And that, of course, is 29 million too many. But let's keep perspective. This is still the smallest proportionate total number so classified in any country, anytime, anywhere, and it continues to decline.

Poverty, of course, is relative. A family on relief and considered poor in the United States would easily be the envy of nearly all families in, say, Romania or the U.S.S.R. John Steinbeck's novel, *The Grapes Of Wrath*, was a bitter indictment of depression America, yet when a film based on it was shown in Russia, it backfired as propaganda. The Soviets wanted to know where these people who were so poor and downtrodden had gotten their automobiles.

Dr. Parrish points out that many Americans who are for statistical purposes cited by the Left as being "poor" do not in fact belong in this category:

... there are a number of groups in that poverty class who probably don't belong there. For example, married college students living independently are apt to fall in this category. Are they hopelessly trapped? I doubt it. American college students have a rate of access to higher education greater than ever known in history. Apprentices

*The money spent on the misnamed War on Poverty is a miniscule part of the vast "Welfare" program, and most of its funds are spent on overhead, including the employment at one time or another of almost every big-name racial agitator in the country.

learning a trade are classified in poverty. Are they trapped in poverty? No, they are in preaffluent training, they are postponing earnings for a while, to learn a skill, confidently looking forward to the highest real wages craftsmen have ever earned.

A man who retires takes a sharp cut in income and may well fall into the poverty class measured by income. But if he has a \$20,000 home full of furnishings, refrigerators, washing machines, TV sets, an automobile, all paid for, is he really in poverty? No, he enjoys more years of retirement at a higher level of living than people in his age bracket have ever known.

In 1965, according to the study by Professor Parrish, ninety-five percent of all American families enjoyed an adequate minimum diet, or better; ninety-nine percent of all families had electric or gas stoves; ninety-nine percent had electric or gas refrigerators; ninety-six percent had television sets; eighty-eight percent of all American families living in metropolitan areas had telephones; eighty-eight percent had automobiles, and ninety-eight percent of all babies were born in hospitals (failure of the stork to announce his arrival with sufficient warning accounting for most who were not). These statistics lead Dr. Parrish to ask:

How can the "massive" group of America's "hopeless poor" buy so much with so little? Perhaps this basic question can be put another way: How could the poverty intellectuals be so wrong? The answer is actually very simple. The intellectuals have chosen to be wrong. Most members of the "new poverty" cult are quite well-trained in statistics. Some of them are acknowledged experts. They know better. But for the sake of the "new poverty" religion, they

have chosen to accept poverty fallacies. . . .

The poverty intellectuals say they are building a great new society. Perhaps they are. But phony statistics are hardly convincing proof. Perhaps they should take a second look. They may well be rushing us pell-mell toward social chaos. . . .

What are the real facts about poverty in America? According to Dr. Parrish:

Using the Social Security administration's variable poverty index we may note a total poverty population in 1966 of a little under 30 million. Out of this 30 million, about 15 million were children.

Of these 15 million about one-half were in large families with three or more children. . . .

Poverty is not massive. Measured by income statistics, only about 15 per cent of the population. . . . Measured by consumer goods and services, probably less than 5 per cent should be classified in poverty. No group should be designated as "hopelessly trapped."

The widely held belief that a majority of American Negroes are trapped in abject poverty is also disputed by the Parrish study. The Professor found that "the Negro in America is not being left behind in poverty. In fact, the rate of his movement into the middle class in recent years has been more rapid than that of whites." The Parrish study also shows some surprising facts about even those Negroes living in areas characterized as "ghettos":

Are a majority of families living in areas designated as "poverty ghetto areas," actually in poverty. No, they are not. A recent study made by the U.S. Bureau of Census for the Office of Economic Opportunity revealed

that of 1.8 million non-white families living in such areas, only about 30 per cent had incomes below the poverty level.

Undaunted by reality, the government povertycrats now maintain that a family must make at least \$9,000 a year (for a family of four) to live "moderately," and there is a concerted effort to set the figure for classification as "poor" at \$6,000 per annum as a base for some future federally guaranteed income. We are witnessing a carefully programmed escalation toward the Welfare State.

In his excellent new book, *The War On The Poor*, Professor Clarence Carson discusses the reasons for what poverty there is in America and points out that some Americans are poor because they *choose* to be poor. "They may prefer poverty to onerous toil, to moving to a new location, to the discipline involved in saving or in acquiring skills, or for other reasons," says this noted academician who was himself raised in poverty. And, he says, for those who are poor and truly want to conquer poverty, the government is an enemy disguised as a friend. "In the final analysis," Dr. Carson explains, "the War on Poverty is largely a war on the poor." Among the ways the government wages this war, he says, are:

The poor pay taxes too — often more taxes in relation to income than the rich.

Government red tape discourages enterprise — and the poor suffer.

High taxes soak up the investment capital that alone can make jobs for the poor.

Government spending sends prices soaring — but who feels the extra quarter for a loaf of bread more keenly, Chuck Percy or his babysitter?

In more ways than one, government intervention breeds unemployment.

While the Professor believes many of those who want to abolish poverty through government programs mean well, he says they are causing massive alienation and the disintegration of society by making it difficult for the poor to prove their worth by earning their own way. Dr. Carson maintains that "as they have become dependent upon government, the poor have had their dignity and much of the meaning of life stripped away."

Unfortunately, not everyone wants to earn his own way, and the easier it is made for a man to subsist on "Welfare," the more attractive relief becomes. As State Senator John Schmitz of California has noted:

Welfare assistance was originally justified as a way of helping potentially productive individuals over temporary emergencies, and of caring for the truly helpless. But it has now become a way of life to tens of thousands of people perfectly capable of earning their own living and supporting their own families. . . .

Many relievers come to believe that "Welfare" is not a privilege, but a right — a belief reinforced by the assurances of social workers. Mrs. Detlof observes from the vantage of her career as a social worker:

It is normal for welfare recipients to feel they have a God-given right to all the tax funds they deem necessary for themselves and their families. They have no intention of letting their right to these tax-funds be denied.

Far too typical of Mrs. Detlof's experience is this case:

Sarah [an unmarried mother of eleven] is socially secure. By the time the youngest child can no longer be used to obtain Aid for

Families with Dependent Children, Sarah will be eligible for an old age pension. She is well aware of this. Even if she were not, solicitous social workers would be quick to remind her of her rights.

Some of the more bizarre "Welfare" cases sometimes make the papers, providing a peek behind the Humanitarian Curtain. One such recent case was that of Mrs. Joan Chavers and her six children, ranging from two to ten years in age, who were being housed and fed at the expense of the taxpayers in a posh New York hotel at a cost of \$2,000 a month. When questioned about the matter, Robert Carroll, assistant to Gotham's "Welfare" commissioner, admitted that his department was picking up the tab for the Chavers family at the Hotel President in mid-Manhattan while the "Welfare" people were searching for "suitable housing" for them. Meanwhile, says United Press, "The family eats all its meals in restaurants with the food bill being paid for by a special allowance from the Welfare Department."

Then there is the case of Mrs. Gladys Washington of San Francisco, a "Welfare" recipient who recently told Superior Court Judge S. Lee Vavuris that she couldn't afford to pay \$118 worth of parking tickets on her Cadillac. The Judge asked the social worker assigned to her case, Mrs. Dianne Dodge, how a woman on "Welfare" could afford to drive a Cadillac. Mrs. Dodge explained that such payments can be used as the "Welfare" people see fit. When Judge Vavuris opined "That's a crazy law," the case worker explained that Mrs. Washington has a physical impediment that makes it "impossible" for her to use public transportation, although not "impossible" to drive a Cadillac. The Judge noted that while he was "very sympathetic" he was concerned that Mrs. Washington had no accident insurance on her limousine. Thereupon the "Welfare" recipient pro-

duced an insurance application and said she planned to pay the annual bill of \$133 in monthly installments out of her "Welfare" checks.

"That's ridiculous!" declared Vavuris, and proceeded to fine Mrs. Washington sixty dollars and sentence her to twelve days in jail, with both fine and sentence suspended. He then placed her on probation for a year and ordered her to surrender her driver's license until such time as she could prove financial responsibility.

"How am I going to get home?" Mrs. Washington demanded.

The Judge winced. "Your social worker can take you," he snapped.

On May 29, 1969, United Press carried this picture of life on "Welfare" in New York:

The city's Social Services Department gave one of its welfare clients special allowances for golf permits, greens fees and an air conditioner but balked at his demands for money to purchase a trotting horse, a second air conditioner, and other luxuries . . .

Attorneys for the department denied in state Supreme Court Tuesday that defendant David B. Davis, 31, had been given allowances to make up for gambling debts at the race track, as charged by Bronx District Attorney Burton B. Roberts . . .

Mrs. Lucille Webb, a social worker who has been with the Los Angeles County Welfare Department for twenty years, claims: "Welfare is the biggest racket you ever heard of. When I started this job, the eligibility requirements were such that only the really needy for the most part could get welfare. Now the eligibility requirements are a joke. They have virtually abolished them."

The change in eligibility has been reflected in the number of those applying

who are now accepted. As the *Wall Street Journal* reported on April 24, 1969:

The "acceptance rate" — the proportion of applicants who were actually granted relief — rose from 56% in 1960 to 74% in 1968. The "termination rate" of those already on the rolls also steadily declined. Along with these changes, applications for relief rose rapidly . . .

The acceptance rate will soon be near a hundred percent. The Nixon Administration has accepted a plan suggested by Wilbur Cohen, Lyndon Johnson's outgoing Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to make applicants eligible for handouts by a simple statement of "need." According to Associated Press: "The new approach would eliminate investigations that welfare officials conduct before admitting an applicant to welfare programs." And, says the *Wall Street Journal* of June 6, 1969, under Secretary Robert Finch "instant welfare" is to be available "in an attempt to reduce costly investigations." How DOES one satirize something like that?

The liberal "Welfare" benefits in our nation's cities have, of course, spurred the rural poor to migrate to impacted urban areas where they swell already bulging relief rolls. In the past this has been abated only by residence requirements. But in 1967 the A.C.L.U. and several poverty agencies, using tax monies, challenged state residence requirements in two states and the District of Columbia. On April 21, 1969, the Supreme Court declared that residence requirements to obtain "Welfare" violated a reliever's right to travel freely from one state to another. Although H.E.W. was not involved in the suits, and although the cases affected only two states, President Nixon's Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare ordered all states immediately to abolish "Welfare" residence requirements.

In a number of states Secretary Finch

was but ordering what was already established policy. The "instant relief" plan was inaugurated two years ago in New York City under John Lindsay and has proved a bonanza for freeloaders. This "come and get it" policy was soon thereafter instituted in California by Director of Welfare John Montgomery, an appointee of "Conservative" Governor Ronald Reagan. Montgomery was only codifying what had been California's policy in practice for several years. The idea is apparently to provide educationally broadening travel for the indolent — fly now, get paid later.

Yet, it is worth a social worker's job to speak out against such madness. Belva Detlof describes in her book how she was regularly tongue-lashed by her superiors for rejecting ineligible persons for medical care. Later she discovered that many of these people were reinstated by other caseworkers. Speaking from her own considerable experience, Mrs. Detlof told your correspondent: "I believe that approximately eighty-five percent of those people living on 'Welfare' are capable of supporting themselves."

California Senator John Harmer observes that we are rapidly devolving into a society in which the "wills" must support the "will nots." *U.S. News & World Report* quotes a Chicago social worker in its issue of September 22, 1969, as saying that only one out of every five of her "clients" works at all or is even training for a job. The others, she says, are apparently content to live for the rest of their lives from the sweat of someone else's brow. With the lax eligibility being introduced by the Nixon Administration, they can do just that.

Of course, such a "Welfare" system creates an enormous amount of fraud. Columnist Holmes Alexander writes:

By their guidelines you shall know them. There has popped out of the Health, Education and Welfare Department a set of directives

(Handbook Transmittal No. 77). It instructs the states on how to determine who among the poor are eligible for public assistance. The gist of it is that the poor themselves do the deciding. How better could a dictator make himself beloved than to issue a decree of "Come and Get It" to the poor?

Let us look closer. Number 77 tells the state agencies of public assistance that the principal source of information about eligibility for relief funds must come from the individual who desires the funds. Only if "reasonably necessary" (vague phrases are so convenient to bureaucrats) shall there be any verification that the receiver of aid is telling the truth.

The state agencies, that is, are discouraged from going to the public records to look for fraud, and there are warnings like this from Section 2230 of Number 77 which combines ordinary protection of a man's castle with extraordinary protection of suspected cheaters:

"... States must especially guard against violations of such areas as entering a home by force, or without permission, or under false pretenses, making home visits outside of working hours, and particularly making such visits during sleeping hours, and searching in the home, for example, in rooms, closets, drawers, or papers, to seek clues to possible deception."

It is considered demeaning to the "client" to look for fraud by doing anything like checking the closet of a "Welfare mother" to see if she is cohabitating with a man about to become the father of her next little income producer. By the same logic, do you suppose the Nixon Administration might soon decide that it is demeaning for the I.R.S. to check a taxpayer's return, and move to

abolish investigations by the I.R.S.? Not likely! Taxpayers are not considered to have the same status and rights as those being subsidized by the government to breed bastards.

Until recently, recipients of "Welfare" had to sign an oath that their statements in applying for the money of the taxpayers were true. Now the statement is merely "witnessed," so there is no opportunity to prosecute for perjury those who cheat.* Under normal circumstances "Welfare" departments do their own investigating for fraud, and therefore "clients" are very seldom prosecuted. At most, the "client" caught in fraud must forego "Welfare" for a few months, often actually being driven to the depths of work!

Since the "client" has everything to gain and practically nothing to lose through attempted fraud, cheating is the rule. Belva Detlof gave abundant testimony concerning such fraud before the Los Angeles County Grand Jury, but her exposé, though never refuted or even questioned, was never acted upon. Instead, Mrs. Detlof was forced by her superior to take a leave of absence. His parting shot was: "Do you realize, Mrs. Detlof, how embarrassing all this has been for the Department of Medical Social Service? You have made it twice as embarrassing for the Bureau of Public Assistance, I hope you fully understand this...!"

She did. A short time later Belva Detlof quit her job, explaining to a reporter: "I just couldn't keep on interviewing chiselers, crooks... and others who have no right to medical aid. They are looking for *everything* for *nothing*."

This is true throughout the country.

In 1962 an investigation in Washington, D.C., revealed that only 9.7 percent of the cases investigated were legally eligible for all the assistance they were receiving, and 59.8 percent were found to

*See Detlof, *Welfare Wonderland*, Pp.36-37.

be absolutely *ineligible* for aid. On September 27, 1969, United Press announced that an investigation into New York City's "Welfare" program found estimated overpayments of \$66 million a year. The report, based on an investigation conducted by the state and federal governments, revealed that from \$1 to \$200 in overpayments were found in 29.9 percent of cases studied. Commenting on this in its issue for October 4, 1969, *Human Events* noted:

In one program alone, the controversial Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), [Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur] Mills revealed that a minimum of 91,000 were on the rolls in New York City who should not have been there, thereby involving "expenditures running into hundreds of millions of dollars a year."

Furthermore, said Mills, "another 216,000 persons were in families that were receiving more than they should have under the law. Obviously, the law was not being properly administered."

Obviously! But who is *doing* anything about it?

The most fraud-ridden and expensive bog in this "Welfare" quagmire does involve A.F.D.C. (Aid to Families with Dependent Children). According to *U.S. News & World Report* for January 13, 1969, the spending of tax dollars for A.F.D.C. has been multiplied from \$500 million in 1950 to \$2.9 billion today, an increase of 480 percent. The *Wall Street Journal* for June 7, 1969, noted that "clients" accepting money from this agency now represent nearly three-fourths of the entire federal-state "Welfare" caseload. The *Journal* reports that "in 1968 the Aid to Dependent Children (AFDC) caseload was 6,080,000."

In 1940, forty-two percent of the fathers of A.F.D.C. children were de-

ceased and without sufficient estate to provide for their families; by 1963, this proportion had declined to a mere six percent. Most of the children now on A.F.D.C. have been abandoned or are illegitimate. In 1950, 3.9 percent of births in America were illegitimate; but with government subsidizing bastardy, the percentage has now increased to nearly ten percent, and in major cities the rate is much higher. According to the *New York Times*, three out of every four children now born on A.F.D.C. rolls in Gotham are illegitimate, and "... illegitimacy is so ingrained that last year 63 unwed mothers [in New York City] had their 10th, 11th and 12th child on relief."

"Liberals" are fond of denying that there is such a thing as a "Welfare mother" who produces progeny for fun and profit, but the facts speak otherwise. In many of our cities women can now receive nearly fifty dollars per month per child. Since clothes can be obtained for practically nothing from the Salvation Army and similar charitable groups, and a child can receive two free meals a day in school, a fecund and willing Miss can find considerable cash left over for "mother" to spend as she likes. Mrs. Detlof says:

... a significant number of women bear more and more illegitimate children in order to obtain a larger and larger welfare check, which they then spend upon themselves. There is specific evidence that this money goes for liquor, men friends, television sets, Princess telephones, taxi transportation and other purposes not even remotely related to child care.

An owner of a suburban liquor store, who sold a liquor business he had long run in Watts following the Communist-led insurrection there in 1965, told this reporter:

The week the "Welfare" checks came out, my business would jump

by one-third. I cashed many welfare checks in my store. They bought good stuff, too, the most expensive scotches and bourbons.

Conscientious "Welfare" workers emphasize again and again that most of these A.F.D.C. mothers have money not only for liquor, but color TV, wigs, fancy appliances, and other luxuries. Many also support husbands or boy-friends who do not officially live with the "Welfare mother."*

The lifetime cost to the taxpayers of these "Welfare" clans can be astronomical. Belva Detlof describes a far too typical case:

Anna Mae is an example of the devastation being wreaked upon our society by one prolific, promiscuous female. While her profession is welfare reciprocity, her avocation is prostitution. She has expertly trained and is still training her offspring along both lines. . . . Already some of her children are themselves heads of brood-groups supported by tax funds. Anna, herself, has a few fertile years ahead of her. In the past she has never failed to conceive and produce with automatic regularity. There is no reason to think that she will change this pattern now. This might, quite logically, bring her net human production total to approximately twenty individuals, all supported since conception by tax funds.

Counting the medical care, hospitalization, pharmaceuticals, etc., provided this family, the cost to the taxpayers can be conservatively estimated at six hundred dollars per month. Over a period of twenty years, that amounts to \$144,000. This figure does not include the costs accumulated by Anna's children who already are aid recipients. . . .

Can we estimate that at least half

of Anna's children will imitate their mother and go on welfare? (The average, actually, is a great deal higher.) During the next twenty years, should even half of Anna's children follow the family tradition of welfare reciprocity, and should they average the same amount in aid grants (records indicate that grants are being speedily increased), the cost to the taxpayers could be \$1,440,000, for merely one half of this woman's offspring.

California State Senator John Schmitz introduced a bill to end such subsidization of illegitimacy. After production of the first such child, under his plan, the "Welfare mother" would no longer receive tax funds for the support of additional illegitimate offspring.† The child could receive public assistance, but not as long as it remained in its mother's custody. Should the child be placed voluntarily in a foster home, "Welfare" funds would be promptly available for its care.

"Welfare" promoters describing themselves as humanitarians claimed that the proposal by Senator Schmitz was cruel, heartless, and even wicked. The truth of the matter is that encouraging the voluntary placement of such children in foster homes is probably their only chance to escape degradation and to live decent, worthwhile lives. As the Senator said, "This would rescue children from mothers whose only interest in babies is financial gain, while the loss of welfare benefits would discourage such mothers from having more illegitimate children."

*Many of the men playing this game make use of "unemployment insurance" while their wives or girlfriends draw "Welfare." In some states an individual can draw \$65 a week tax-free for thirty-six weeks before accepting a job to re-establish eligibility.

†\$65 million a year is now spent in California, alone, to support families with multiple illegitimates.

Incredibly, a representative of the N.A.A.C.P. claimed that the proposal would discriminate against Negroes. The A.C.L.U. declared the bill would violate the rights of "Welfare" recipients.

The Schmitz bill had overwhelming public support but was killed when the Department of Health, Education and Welfare announced that, if it passed, the federal government would withhold from California its entire fifty percent share of A.F.D.C. funds. Concerned about these youngsters, Senator Schmitz introduced an alternate bill to prevent mothers of illegitimate offspring from spending A.F.D.C. checks on themselves rather than on their children by requiring them to use the payments for genuine necessities. Again H.E.W. intervened and pointed to its *Handbook Of Public Assistance Administration*, which declares as a "basic principle" that "assistance comes to needy persons as a right." This "right," said the bureaucrats, means that the various states may not require that any welfare payment "be expended for certain designated goods or services."

The Senator's final try was a bill that would have required A.F.D.C. recipients to file affidavits stating that they had not spent any of their "Welfare" checks on "liquor, jewelry, color television sets, taxi rides, out-of-state travel and large monthly car payments." Again H.E.W. threatened to withhold funds. Schmitz concluded that for all practical purposes we now have a federal welfare system committed to handouts unlimited:

By these prohibitions, the federal government in effect denies the people of [the states] and their representatives any power to differentiate between those who save and those who waste, those truly in need and those who live as deliberate parasites on the productive. If such distinctions cannot be made and some reasonable controls imposed, the upward spiral of welfare

costs will have no end. The price of accepting federal matching funds in welfare payments is a blank check drawn upon California taxpayers by anyone who makes an unverified claim to be in need

Thus, under present conditions, California has no welfare program of its own; it is merely administering a federal program. We can only regain control of eligibility for welfare benefits by rejecting the federal aid, however painful the process may be.

One reason for proliferating illegitimacy is the permissive attitude of social workers who are careful never to inject morality into the "Welfare" issue. As Mrs. Detlof says: "Because the people-planners make no effort to correct such monstrous situations, it can only be inferred that they approve and condone." Social work seems to attract naive but sincere do-gooders and convinced socialists who see "Welfare" people as a tool for the establishment of the Welfare State. Many of those who sincerely want to help the disadvantaged become disillusioned and leave when they see how the "Welfare" system corrupts. The rapid turnover of "bleeding hearts" leaves the system in control of those who are dedicated collectivists. Veteran social worker Lucille Webb puts it this way:

A welfare worker is expected to be a welfare salesman. We are expected to get as many people involved with as many different programs as is possible. That is how you get promoted to supervisor. The more welfare recipients there are, the more social workers are hired and promoted. Nobody cares about the taxpayer.

After remarking to a colleague about the number of "Welfare" chiselers, social worker Detlof was reprimanded:

"Mrs. Detlof! How can you say such things! If it were not for these people, you wouldn't have a job!" She meant just what she said . . . she was absolutely serious.

"You are wrong," I told her, quickly. "If it weren't for these people, others like them and the overly permissive Bureau of Public Assistance, I wouldn't HAVE to work, at all. We could live on my husband's salary, alone!"

Scores of the "Welfare" workers with whom we talked confirmed that their colleagues often actually discourage "clients" from seeking employment because they have a vested interest in multiplication of the "Welfare" rolls. Meanwhile, however, American employers are crying for help. The *Wall Street Journal* of October 8, 1969, reported:

Amid persistent unemployment and rising welfare rolls, a Wall Street Journal survey indicates that an abundant and growing number of such low-skill jobs are going begging. These jobs are easy to find. A check with 60 employers in 10 cities indicates more than half are unable to fill such available jobs. Companies that do land workers for these spots say turnover is high.

But the situation, most employers say, is getting worse. Their gloomy and predictable conclusion: "People just don't want to work any more."

Why work when you can simply vote yourself a living?

The Sunday newspapers of our major cities contain as many as fifty pages of job opportunities, from aerospace worker to zoo attendant. The *St. Louis Globe Democrat* of September 9, 1969, revealed that Diversified Metals Corporation ran blockbuster ads offering up to \$150 a week for unskilled workers. Results were

nearly nil. A disgusted company spokesman remarked: "It is apparent from these results that too many people, both black and white, just do not give a damn about working."

It was radio commentator Paul Harvey who once recommended that the American taxpayer "fire the poor." That is exactly what it will take to end this "Welfare" disgrace! Many unskilled persons have been led to consider low-skill jobs beneath their dignity, yet they have been told that living off the taxes of working people is not only dignified but their right!

Far from seeking work, a number of government-certified "poverts" have now formed the world's most unusual union — a union whose members not only refuse to work but demand increased pay and privileges for doing nothing. This union of freeloaders is called the National Welfare Rights Organization (N.W.R.O.) and has an estimated thirty thousand card-carrying, dues-paying members in 250 chapters in a hundred American cities. Since the dues come from "Welfare" checks, taxpayers subsidize the union to the tune of \$60,000 per year. And, N.W.R.O. has a \$34,930 grant from the Department of Labor,* and a \$300,000 subsidy from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is pending.† According to the *Washington Star* of October 5, 1968, N.W.R.O. has also been heavily financed by I.F.C.O., the Inter-religious Foundation for Community Organizations, which is bankrolling the psychopathic James Forman and his revolutionaries of the National Black Economic Development Conference in their demands for \$500 million in "reparations" from U.S. churches. In fact, one feature of Forman's "Black Manifesto," says *Christianity Today* of May 23, 1969, calls for "\$10,000,000 for the already

*See *Congressional Record*, January 7, 1969, Page E-93.

†See *Boston Globe*, U.P.I. report, May 13, 1969.

existing National Welfare Rights Organizations."

The N.W.R.O. organization served its gestation period at Berkeley, California, being born in 1967 of an illegitimate union of various local Welfare Rights groups. The first Welfare Rights Organization was founded at Oakland-Berkeley in late 1963 under the guidance of Elly Harawitz and Virginia Proctor. Mrs. Harawitz, an activist in the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, is the wife of Howard Harawitz, a founder of the Communist W.E.B. DuBois Clubs and co-author with Communist Bettina Aptheker of a pamphlet supporting Communist Cuba. As Berkeley's *Tocsin* for September 12, 1964, noted:

Actually, the committee is being "guided" by Virginia Proctor, wife of Communist National Committee member Roscoe Quincy Proctor, of 1919 Oregon St., Berkeley. Proctor was one of 37 top Communists named in petitions from the U.S. Attorney General following the Supreme Court's upholding of registration provisions of the McCarran Internal Security Act in 1961.

The WRC, which also refers to itself as the Welfare Rights Organization (WRO), placed an ad in the Aug. 14 Oakland Tribune inviting the public to attend a rummage sale benefit Aug. 17 at the Proctor residence.

The Berkeley W.R.O. pioneered strategy for N.W.R.O. In the September 1965 issue of *Political Affairs*, official publication of the Communist Party and source of orders for all the Comrades of the Communist Party, U.S.A., the format of

the Berkeley W.R.O. was presented as a prototype for a nationwide movement to be supported by the Communists.

The Director of the National Welfare Rights Organization is dashiki-clad George A. Wiley, a former Associate Director of C.O.R.E. who told *U.S. News & World Report*:

Not much of the public has grasped the potential of this movement. It could have much greater power than the civil rights movement. There are eight and a half million welfare recipients with a common interest.

Welfare is a right. The Social Security Act states that. We look on the growth of welfare rolls as a healthy thing. Welfare costs would be from four to six times what they are today if the people who do not have enough income to live decently were properly taken care of.

The basic demand of this Communist-supported program is for a "guaranteed adequate income," which it sets at a minimum of \$5,500 annually. The bill for that little trinket would come to \$27 billion a year.* And, the members of N.W.R.O. are anything but restrained when expressing such demands. Congressman John Ashbrook recently visited a press conference of this group at a convention of social workers in Washington. According to Ashbrook:

They proudly proclaimed that they had between 11 and 21 children - children, I might add, that they wouldn't support. They proudly referred to themselves as the "brood-mare mothers." They, of course, want a guaranteed income. They made it clear that they were demanding - not asking - for these dollars. "We brood-mare mothers will begin to stomp

*N.W.R.O.'s demands are modest when compared with those of the National Association of Social Workers, whose spokesman Dr. Daniel Thursz maintains that a family of four must receive \$6,300 from the taxpayers. (U.P.I., October 19, 1969.)

if we don't get more money," one militant black woman said . . .

As five thousand gathered at the National Conference of Social Welfare, N.W.R.O. activists invaded the auditorium, jumped on the stage, and took over the microphones. The social workers were called "racist pigs" and attacked as members of the "white imperialistic oppressive society." Most of the other epithets were unprintable. Even the *New York Times* was shocked and called the government-financed N.W.R.O. a "revolutionary organization" which fans "the flames of race, or class, warfare." Of course, the *Times* did not demand that N.W.R.O.'s federal monies be suspended, or that those who made the grants be investigated.

While members of the National Welfare Rights Organization held the frightened social workers captive, Wiley demanded that the audience ante-up thousands of dollars so that more of the "poor" could attend the Conference. Plastic ice buckets were passed and the petrified social workers fumbled meekly for their wallets and purses.

As shocking as was the behavior of the "Welfare mothers," it was far exceeded by the craven attitude of the outgoing President of this conclave of bureaucrats, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, who is also President of the National Council of Churches and was President Eisenhower's Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Far from ordering removal of the "Welfare" harridans who shouted obscenities at the delegates, and against the advice of members of his board, Flemming threw the convention open to every screaming hag who came along. When the time came to turn over the presidential gavel to the incoming President, Dr. Flemming bragged: "I did not use this gavel once this week — I didn't think it was appropriate."

It is such Establishmentarians as Arthur Flemming who have opened the

door to N.W.R.O. Though, of course, not all of its demands have been made of the government. Columnist Andrew Tully describes one of the Organization's private con games:

Department stores in Hell City and Nut City, once known as Washington and New York, have crumbled under pressure and extended credit to welfare recipients.

The pressure came from a thing called the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) which is a union of the poor, with an estimated strength of 60,000 dues-paying members. . . . That means that at least \$120,000 a year of the taxpayers' dough is expended on lobbying by welfare recipients. . . .

At any rate, three stores in Nut City and one in Hell City now grant credit directly to applicants provided by "welfare rights" organizations, instead of channeling applications through credit bureaus. At this writing, Sears stores in Hell City have been periodically picketed by a local affiliate of NWRO for refusing to grant its members \$150 worth of credit. In Nut City, according to the New York Times, three stores were "compelled to grant the credit rights. . . ."

If, as the NWRO claims, those on the dole barely exist on their welfare checks, how in the name of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. can they be expected to meet their installment payments? . . .

Anyone who thinks N.W.R.O. is anything but a revolutionary operation is simply mad. The jargon and clamor is right out of the Communist Press. It would be hilarious if it were not so powerfully sinister. The grisly fact is that the Nixon Administration has been listening and reacting favorably.

Exactly one year from the day the

Republican Party nominated him for President, Richard Nixon summarily preempted national television time to spell out "his" revolutionary new "Welfare" program. The President damned the current system in the strongest terms and proposed that the variegated state welfare programs be replaced with a federal minimum floor for "Welfare" recipients in every state *plus* subsidies to the "working poor" and a gigantic job-training program. The President's scheme was described in *U.S. News & World Report* for August 25, 1969:

If enacted by Congress, the Nixon proposal would more than double the number of people on relief, triple the number of children receiving assistance and add almost 4 billion dollars to the federal costs of welfare in the first full year of operation. At that time, according to Administration estimates, there would be at least 22.4 million people receiving Government aid, or 1 out of every 9 Americans. . . .

*Relief recipients in the nation would then exceed the total population of such a large State as California — 19.3 million — or New York — 18.1 million. Total cost to taxpayers would run around 15 billion dollars a year in federal, State and local funds.**

According to Ted Lewis of the *New York Daily News*, much of the philosophy behind Nixon's proposals came from Lyndon Johnson's Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John Gardner — a key *Insider* and member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Ac-

*After presenting his "New Federalism" (the name apparently taken from a book by that title written by Nelson Rockefeller) to assembled Governors in Colorado Springs a month later, the Governors demanded that the federal government take over *all* "Welfare" financing. The lone dissenting voice was that of Lester Maddox of Georgia.

cording to Lewis, Mr. Nixon sent the following note to H.E.W. Secretary Finch:

John Gardner's Godkin lectures (attached) express better than anything I have yet read what I hope will serve as the basic philosophy of this administration. I commend them for your weekend reading. Sincerely, RMN.

Columnist Lewis continues:

The lectures referred to were delivered at Harvard College by LBJ's onetime HEW Secretary Gardner, who quit the Johnson cabinet in a dispute over welfare methods. . . .

None of the significant tasks can be accomplished said Gardner, "If we are unwilling to tax ourselves."

Presidential Assistant Daniel P. Moynihan, a "Liberal" Democrat and member of the board of directors of the socialist A.D.A. who was largely responsible for drafting the Nixon "Welfare" program, said of the thing:

What the President really has done is make an historic and fundamental assertion of national responsibility to provide minimum incomes to poor people, stop taxing them, start supplementing their incomes and help the states find enough resources to do this.

The response from the Left to the President's proposal was one of near unanimous approval. Republican *Battle Line* quotes a Democratic leader: "If this plan goes through, Richard Nixon will take over Hubert Humphrey's constituency and George Wallace's too." Writing in the *Chicago Tribune* for August 17, 1969, Walter Trohan quoted another top Democrat: "'I wish we had thought of it,' a top economic advisor for Lyndon B.

Johnson told this commentator. 'It's a marvelous vote catcher.' " The *New York Times'* James Reston, spokesman-apparent for the Establishment now that Walter Lippmann has hung-up his typewriter, was even more effusive:

.... He [Nixon] has been denouncing the "welfare state" for 20 years, but he is now saying that poverty in America in the midst of spectacular prosperity is intolerable and must be wiped out.

A republican president has condemned the word "welfare," emphasized "work" and "training" as conditions of public assistance, suggested that the states and the cities be given more federal money to deal with their social and economic problems, but still comes out in the end with a policy of spending more money for relief of more poor people than the welfare state Democrats ever dared to propose in the past.

This is beginning to be the story of American politics.

... And now on the most controversial question of domestic policy, he changes rhetoric, the philosophy and the administration, but proposes more welfare, more people on public assistance, which will take more federal funds than any other president in the history of the Republic.

Nevertheless, Nixon has taken a great step forward. He has cloaked a remarkably progressive [sic] welfare policy in conservative language.

... He has repudiated his own party's record on social policy at home and even his own hawkish attitudes abroad, and this tells us something both about the President and the country.

For he has obviously concluded that the American people are for

peace abroad and for a more decent distribution of wealth at home, and the chances are that this will prove to be both good policy and good politics.

A week later Reston crowed that Nixon was "zig-zagging to the left."

The *New Republic's* T.R.B. also formally welcomed Nixon into the Fabian underworld with a column titled "Nixon Outsmarting Democrats":

Most important, for the first time in U.S. history he accepted the idea of a national minimum income for all Americans. It would cover not merely the poor-who-get-aid but the previously excluded "working poor." We have waited for it all these years. This is a new ball game; it's here and it's irreversible.

... The disparity between the haves and have-nots is so great that no random plan can deal with it, we think, and it can only yield to a national, comprehensive plan. Mr. Nixon may not realize it, but that's what he has started.

... And the plan does provide a platform to build on. This is the first national minimum income program for all Americans. It's the start of systematic income maintenance. Every sign points to the direction in which the country will go.

The socialist *New Republic* was not shy about calling a shovel a shovel. It cheered that the President's proposals amount to "creeping socialism." One reads with a gasp: "It must have been quite a scene, the Camp David cabinet meeting at which President Nixon informed the Neanderthal men that he had accepted and would assert creeping socialism, the principle of the Federal Government guaranteeing a minimum income to all disadvantaged Americans."

The *Washington Post's* Roscoe Drummond went even further, commenting:

Whatever happened to conservative Richard Nixon?

Here he is in the lead for the most far-ranging, ground-breaking, daring, social-welfare reform since the early years of the New Deal....

Strange to contemplate but the time may come when people will think of Richard M. Nixon as the Republican Franklin D. Roosevelt of the 1970s!

Newsweek also called the plan "Nixon's New Deal" and quoted elated Leftists in praise of the proposals:

"I'm both amazed and pleased," applauded Walter Heller, John Kennedy's chief economic advisor and pioneer advocate of Federal welfare minimums.... Some Johnson Administration veterans stared enviously at plans thought too radical in their time. Campaign supporters of Robert Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy spotted causes that their own candidates had championed.... It was the finest hour in a much-buffed six months for Pat Moynihan and HEW Secretary Robert Finch.... Richard Nixon... confided to a friend his conviction that [referring to Disraeli] "Tory men with liberal principles are what has enlarged democracy in this world."

It is ironic that Richard Nixon should quote the man who started England on the road from Empire to mini-State, if less so that R.M.N. should be praised for his "Liberalism" and compared with F.D.R. I hope you will pardon my mentioning it, but I told you so in this space months and months ago.

Richard Nixon, the man who last year

was claiming that "Welfare" corrupted both dispenser and receiver, also once claimed to be an adamant foe of the socialism he now espouses. On August 21, 1952, he proclaimed:

There's one difference between the Reds and the Pinks. The Pinks want to socialize America. The Reds want to socialize the world and make Moscow the world capital. Their paths are similar; they have the same Bible — the teachings of Karl Marx.

So let's not kid ourselves. The President knows what he is doing. His role is now obvious to all who know how the game is played. Republican *Battle Line* comments:

One veteran liberal journalist who has supported the President in his Washington newspaper column has been privately telling his liberal friends that they are acting like "fools" when they oppose Nixon. "You don't seem to realize," he says, "that however surprising to us it may be, Richard Nixon precisely because he is a Republican President is doing more for the liberal cause with his policies than any Democrat could ever do."

Of course, it will be the "forgotten Americans" to whom Nixon appealed so successfully during his campaign who will have to pay for what will amount to 20 million additional drones on the "Welfare" rolls. In its issue of August 25, 1969, *U.S. News & World Report* noted:

Once on the books, programs are rarely, if ever, cut back....

Experts are already talking about 30 to 40 billion dollars a year as eventual cost for a fully developed system of minimum income for all.

Frank S. Meyer, the remaining hard-line "Conservative" on the staff of *National Review*, characterizes the President's plan in these words:

The Nixon welfare program is a program for progressive pauperization of an increasing section of the American people. It was just such pauperization that was one of the outstanding causes and symptoms of the decay of Rome. For "bread and circuses," substitute a federal dole and a television set in every welfare home

Marxists have long cherished dreams of a federal guaranteed annual income for America. Although the President explicitly and repeatedly opposed such a plan during his campaign, the American Conservative Union notes:

Despite his flat denial that he was proposing a guaranteed annual income, President Nixon's "family assistance plan" is just that. Numerous welfare experts noted that this principle is central to Nixon's plans, and conservatives fear this will open the door to even higher minimum incomes guaranteed for all. Public opinion polls have shown the great majority of Americans opposed to such a scheme because of what liberals sneeringly call "the Puritan Ethic," the popularly supported theory that every man should work for an income.

While the Nixon scheme would replace the much criticized A.F.D.C., it would only increase the incentive for relievers to produce more children. Let us inspect the consequences of Mr. Nixon's breed and feed program.

Suppose a man and a "Welfare mother," who may be absolute strangers, decide to spend the night together communing with their natures. For his mo-

ments with this Venus, the man may pay by spending two months with Mercury, but the taxpayers will pay for that evening of pleasure for at least the next twenty years and probably for the next seventy-five. In addition, the chances are great that the first illicit offspring will be the starting point for another geometric progression of "Welfare" recipients whose status will thereafter be "guaranteed."

What is the original father's responsibility? From a practical standpoint, none. To the mother, the child is a guaranteed annual meal ticket. What is your responsibility? We are told by Mr. Nixon that it is your responsibility over the lifetime of that child to labor thousands of hours, and to deny the fruits of your effort to your own children, in order to support the offspring of the brood-mothers. This is euphemistically called "having a social conscience." It has a more accurate name but, alas, it is one inappropriate for repetition in this family magazine.

We are told that birth control will be introduced into the Nixon program at some point, but of course birth control tablets and devices are readily available now. It is not because of ignorance or poverty that they are not used. While "brood-mothers" may be school drop-outs, they are graduates *cum laude* of the university of the street and are anything but ignorant when it comes to sex. They are simply in the baby business for fun and profit. And some of them are brazen enough to be proud of it.

In the best Orwellian fashion, Richard Nixon berated the centralization of power in Washington over the past thirty years, and then proposed to nationalize "Welfare" under Mr. Rockefeller's misnomer, "the New Federalism." Those already familiar with the result of federal intervention in public schools, labor disputes, legislative redistricting, and alleged job discrimination can hardly applaud now what they have opposed for so long.

Yet, even as Mr. Nixon was beguiling

the Governors with offers of federal money with "no strings attached," John Price, a former leader of the Leftist "Republican" Ripon Society, and now on the staff of Daniel P. Moynihan, was telling editors in Chicago on August twelfth that if the states refuse to go along with federal "Welfare" standards, the Administration would have "to black-jack the States" by withholding funds until they complied.

The part of Mr. Nixon's plan which was most appealing to the public was the tying of "Welfare" funds to jobs or job-training programs. Yet this idea has more holes than Alpine cheese. As *Human Events* pointed out:

The President himself left a large loophole for those who don't want to accept work by stressing that any job must be "suitable." Who will determine the "suitability" of a job? . . .

What assurances, moreover, does the taxpayer have that those eligible for work will actually be forced to find work or seek job training? Will the Administration set up some tough enforcement machinery or, as is likely, permit soft-hearted social agencies to monitor this most important task? . . .

Want to bet?

The President's "reform" invites even more cheating and fraud than is presently found in the "Welfare" system. *Human Events* reminds us:

Moreover, the entire program could become a bonanza for chiselers and loafers — just as have many welfare schemes in the past. Applicants for family allowances, for instance, would not be subject to much scrutiny. To receive a government check, all they would have to do would be to fill out a simple statement of need, saying what

they expect their income to be in the benefit year. Monthly amounts would be mailed directly to recipients from a central federal agency, without preliminary investigation. . . .

Most "Conservatives" have concluded that the President's proposed reforms are no reforms at all. As with the war in Vietnam, Americans are offered a choice between false alternatives. Everything Mr. Nixon has said in indicting the current "Welfare" system is true, but his proposals for reform originated with the same Fabian Socialists who put the country into the current "Welfare" quagmire. It's an escalation of more of the same.

Regardless of the good intentions of the many legislators, the only real solution to this nightmare — a salvation from the fate which befell Rome — is to take "Welfare" out of the hands of the politicians and social workers. After all, according to *U.S. News & World Report*, Americans voluntarily give \$55 billion a year in private charities, and would give much more to truly good causes if they were relieved of the enormous current tax burden.

The alternative to phasing our current system into a private one is to go the route of Rome and be swallowed by armies of the poor demanding bread and circuses while threatening revolution. As taxes go higher and higher to support ever higher and higher "Welfare" benefits, more and more Americans, either by choice or through circumstances, will desert to the ranks of the parasite class. Eventually the remnant of the American middle-class will be caught in a vise between the Fabians above and the proletarian army below. That army is already being organized by people like George Wiley and the leaders of the N.W.R.O., and financed fatly by the great Leftist foundations and the federal government. The American middle-class is surrounded. It must now attack or face ruin. ■ ■