

Chapter 1 : Welfare as We Knew It: A Political History of the American Welfare State by Charles Noble

Dec 26, 2014 · A welfare reform program with an emphasis on shunting the poor toward low-paying, start-up jobs is becoming increasingly pointless as the job market ossifies.

Ready to fight back? Sign up for Take Action Now and get three actions in your inbox every week. You can read our Privacy Policy here. Thank you for signing up. For more from The Nation, check out our latest issue. Support Progressive Journalism The Nation is reader supported: Travel With The Nation Be the first to hear about Nation Travels destinations, and explore the world with kindred spirits. Sign up for our Wine Club today. Did you know you can support The Nation by drinking wine? Ad Policy Since , politicians have bragged about passing welfare reform. But successful at what? If kicking low-income children and their families off welfare is the measure, then TANF was a huge success. States were given bonuses for reducing their caseloads rather than reducing poverty. Given the four goals of TANF—promoting low-wage work, encouraging marriage, reducing caseloads and curtailing out-of-wedlock births—these outcomes are no surprise. But if the measure of success is poverty reduction, TANF has failed. Even earning an associate degree is difficult. Investing in my education enabled me to break that cycle and earn a solid upper-middle-class income. I now pay three times more in taxes than I used to earn working full time in a low-wage, dead-end job. This trajectory is what motivated mothers like Rya Frontera and Melissa Johnson to pursue nursing degrees, despite being sanctioned: Similarly, Rya is now a full-time nurse with full benefits working for Kaiser. Not only are they off welfare permanently; both women are filling a crucial labor market need, as our nation faces a nursing shortage with no end in sight. It took me ten years to overcome a lifetime of physical, emotional and sexual abuse; depression; and post-traumatic stress disorder, one or more of which have been experienced by most mothers on welfare as girls or adults—or in my case, both. And this year, like many states, California shortened its lifetime limit to forty-eight months in response to budget shortfalls, despite having the second-highest unemployment rate in the country. As a result, 22,000 parents were permanently cut off the welfare rolls on July 1. Ashley Proctor, a young single mother in Oakland, was doing her thirty-two-hour weekly work requirement when she timed off. And in a cruel twist, while billions were spent on marriage promotion programs that were mandatory for the states, the Family Violence Option let states choose whether to provide domestic violence services in their TANF programs, including waivers of time limits and welfare-to-work rules. Furthermore, although research shows that women who receive welfare experience domestic violence at double the rate of all American women, not a dime in federal funding was provided for family violence services. Of these, less than 1 percent get family violence counseling and services, and less than one-quarter of 1 percent get waivers from welfare work requirements that could save their lives. While on the run, Felicia got a notice of a mandatory welfare-to-work appointment, which had been scheduled on the same day and time as the hearing for her restraining order. Despite my urging, Felicia was too afraid to request a state appeals hearing and later disappeared. Poverty is at its highest level in nearly twenty years. The number of children living in deep poverty—in families with income less than 50 percent of the poverty line—is at its highest level in thirty-five years. The unemployment rate for single mothers, who represent 90 percent of parents in the welfare system, has nearly doubled, to a twenty-five-year high. Welfare rolls are rising for the first time since TANF was passed, despite efforts by states to tighten time limits and make it harder for families to get help. Consequently, since Georgia increased TANF spending on child welfare-related services by percent. According to Clare Richie, a senior policy analyst with the Georgia Budget and Policy Institute, the state now spends more on adoption services and foster care 58 percent than it does on assistance to families. One has to wonder if this was the plan all along, given the proposal by Newt Gingrich, who was House speaker when TANF was created, to use orphanages to reduce the welfare rolls. The Great Recession was the first true test of welfare reform during an economic downturn, and TANF failed the grade miserably. The proof is in the numbers: Today TANF serves only two out of every ten poor children nationwide. Also in This Forum.

Chapter 2 : The End of Welfare as I Knew It | The Nation

In Welfare As We Knew It, Charles Noble offers a groundbreaking explanation of why America is so different. Drawing on research in comparative politics, history, and sociology, he demonstrates that deeply-rooted political factors, not public opinion, have limited what reformers have been able to accomplish.

To remind people what the actual record has been, I offer here the section on welfare from a book that I co-wrote. I have added up-dated information. Think tanks such as the Heritage Foundation, the Manhattan Institute, and the American Enterprise Institute put out a stream of books and magazines and flooded the press with news releases. State and local officials most often interviewed were Republican governors who ran punitive programs, such as Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin and John Engler of Michigan. Few of those reports included any dissenters from the get-tough approach. Welfare recipients were seldom interviewed, and when they were, they were given limited roles, and at worst they were attacked. Most of the money is going for defense. A study by sociologist Mike Males suggests that 50, teen pregnancies a year are caused by rape, and two-thirds of teen mothers have histories of sexual abuse by a perpetrator averaging 27 years of age. The only white woman pictured was described as clinically depressed, as if poverty only affects white people who are in some way handicapped. The acceptably innocent were children; the guilty were their moms. Although poor children certainly need defenders, poor children come from poor families. How could you ask a CEO to hire people whom you had previously described as lazy, undependable, and oversexed? It included corporate executives and aimed to persuade business leaders to hire welfare recipients. He argued that welfare should be abolished not simply because of the economic incentive it creates but because it encourages dysgenesis, the outbreeding of intelligent whites by genetically inferior blacks, Hispanics, and poor European Americans. The Catholic bishops, in their pastoral letter on the U. Not only would he deprive these individuals of AFDC grants, he would also deprive their children of child support from the father of the child. Children should receive support from the father only when the mother is married to him. Instead, it will help to restigmatize having babies without getting married, which is what the right wing quite clearly says it wants to do. The Personal Responsibility Act was particularly tough on teen parents, requiring unmarried parents under the age of 18 to live with an adult and stay in school in order to receive benefits. This law has resulted in many teenagers being dropped from the welfare rolls. Instead, he blamed the AFDC program for encouraging teen pregnancy. Welfare Reform and Racism When Aid to Dependent Children was begun as part of the Social Security Act in , the program was mainly for white widows, and it excluded most people of color. This was particularly true in the South. Legal service lawyers challenged exclusionary rules and won many victories. As a result, the number of African-American women in the program increased by about 15 percent between and . In fact, most welfare fraud is done by vendors—pharmacies, doctors, dentists, nursing homes, hospitals, and sellers of medical equipment. They face discrimination from prospective employers and landlords, and Hispanic recipients face the problem of learning English when there are not enough English as a Second Language ESL programs. The time limits imposed at the federal level and in many states are especially hard on African-American and Hispanic recipients. A study in Wisconsin found that despite having higher education levels and higher job training completion rates, black welfare recipients did not fare any better than Caucasians in terms of employment. Conservative views about the proper place of women being in the home might still apply to white women, but black women have always been expected to work outside the home, predominantly as domestic and agricultural workers. The amendments to the Social Security Act placed mandatory work requirements on AFDC recipients for the first time, and subsequent laws such as the Talmadge Amendment of and the Family Support Act of stiffened the requirements, culminating in the current draconian work requirements of the Personal Responsibility Act. The restrictions placed on teen parents were also directed against minority teenagers, who are disproportionately represented in the teen parent population. The War against Women Welfare is one of the battlegrounds of the war on women. The National Organization for Women says that not only does the Personal Responsibility Act inflict suffering on poor women and their children, it also heralds a broader effort to pressure all women into a repressive sexuality, limited reproductive

choices, and conventional family arrangements. By withdrawing federal assistance for women without male support and also by attacking affirmative action, Title IX, and college financing, by branding welfare mothers with demeaning racial stereotypes, and by pauperizing them and questioning their fitness as mothers, the right is forcing every woman to depend economically on a man within a traditional marriage whether or not she wants to and whether or not the man is dependable. The economic alternative is made so harsh that women may find themselves unable to provide for their families and may have to give up their children to foster care or adoption. Conservatives are worried about the decline of two-parent families. The census showed that the number of families headed by women who have children, which are typically poorer than two-parent families, grew nearly five times faster in the 1980s than the number of married couples with children. For the first time, nuclear families accounted for less than 25 percent of all households in the United States. States have enacted a variety of programs to get this bonus. Mississippi established an abstinence unit of the state government, even though numerous studies have shown that abstinence education alone is unsuccessful in lowering birthrates. President Nixon vetoed a bill providing for universal day care. The double standard for middle-class mothers and welfare mothers was revealed when Congress soon after it passed the Personal Responsibility Act passed a law in giving tax deductions to middle-class women who choose to stay home to care for their children. All these policies limit the choices of poor women and further deepen the rift between poor women who have no choices and affluent women who do. These reproductive issues affect only poor women now, but they are related to the drive to limit reproductive choice for all women. The conservative talk about putting poor children into orphanages is not really about orphanages but about women: It is about reinforcing the sexual double standard. Yet all the talk about taking their children away and putting them in orphanages serves to terrorize welfare recipients still further. Shortly before Christmas, Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich championed a bill that would have let states use federal welfare money for orphanages. Gingrich was protesting that he had been misunderstood. Much larger welfare grants go to the middle class and rich. Welfare provides a good example of the cycles of reform. Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward[31], two of the leading proponents of opportunity theory, believe that welfare expands and contracts in response to changes in the economy and the political climate. The leading architects of the welfare rights movement, they believe passionately in political activism as a way to empower the poor. Piven and Cloward argue that government officials expand welfare public assistance in times of civil turmoil. When the turmoil dies down, they cut back on welfare and use it to enforce work norms. They document the following cycles of expansion and contraction in welfare: Beginning of large-scale federal relief programs during the Great Depression as a response to civil turmoil. Cutbacks during the 1930s and 1940s after the turmoil of the 1930s subsided. Welfare was often withheld from people in order to force them into low-paid agricultural and factory work. Expansion during the 1960s as a response to civil turmoil and as an attempt to build a new urban base for the Democratic party. Cutbacks from the 1970s to the present, after the turmoil of the 1960s subsided. During this period, welfare has been withheld to force women into the low-wage labor market. As welfare and other safety net programs were cut back, the criminal justice system expanded. By 1980, there were about 2 million inmates. Senator Jim Webb introduced the National Criminal Justice Act in 1980 to study the criminal justice system and make recommendations for reform. Expenditures then took a downward turn for the first time in three decades, beginning with the Ford and Carter administrations, moving down and even picking up roller-coaster speed during the 1980s. Congress and the Reagan administration conducted a massive assault on all entitlement programs for the poor and near-poor. Programs for the middle class suffered also. Some states replaced the lost federal funds with state funds, but during the recession of the late 1980s and early 1990s, states raced to cut social welfare and implement punitive measures. Across the nation, state legislators and governors slashed benefits for low-income people more drastically than they had done since the 1960s. Fourteen of the thirty states with supplemental welfare programs, known as General Assistance, cut those budgets, affecting nearly half a million people. At the same time that corporations were being restructured, social welfare programs were also being restructured. As wages went down, so did welfare payments—no coincidence. According to a principle known in welfare circles as the principle of less eligibility, welfare payments in the United States are almost always kept below the lowest wages in order to encourage people to take any low-wage job rather than go on welfare. Many people assumed that the welfare

state would expand forever. But, as Mimi Abramovitz pointed out, As long as investment in social reproduction meshed with the needs of profitable production and political control, social welfare programs remained intact and grew. But in the mids, changing economic and political conditions rendered the postwar social policies less conducive to the needs of business and the state, which then began to turn them around. Now we see how farsighted Nader was. When people can be stopped from thinking that the government owes them anything, the safety net of the welfare state, never very strong, can be shredded entirely. Then there is no buffer to protect people from having to take any low-wage job, or to protect women from having to stay in a bad marriage, or even to protect people from homelessness. It seems that we have returned full cycle to the nineteenth century in welfare reform. It has been more of a politically hot issue in the United States than in any other industrialized country. Some Europeans say that following the welfare scene of the United States is like reading the musty historical pages of the development of European welfare. It is a program that provides income to families with dependent children, generally headed by a single parent but also available on a limited basis to two-parent families. About 95 percent of the single parents are women. By ending the entitlement status of AFDC, the federal government, for the first time in sixty years, no longer guaranteed that it would help families in need. Bush in and resigned in In this program, women are required to work when their children reach 12 weeks of age and there is a two-year time limit for supported work or community service. A study found that there were significant racial disparities in sanction rates for alleged failures to comply with program requirements. Latino and African-American program participants both were sanctioned at a higher rate than white program participants. The settlement of the lawsuit required administrators of the W-2 program to ensure that qualified individuals with disabilities receive reasonable accommodations, which may include job training and supports for a longer time period than what is typically afforded, sign language interpreters, or in-depth services from the Wisconsin Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Some states set shorter time limits than the federal limit. The latest state to do this was Michigan. The new month time limit was expected to cause more than 11, people to lost benefits. The law does not require that assistance be in the form of cash. It can be in the form of vouchers. Some states even turned over the program to counties. Workfare After two months of being on welfare, recipients are required to find a community service job if they have not found paid employment.

Chapter 3 : Ambition, Impatience and Sloth

*Welfare As We Knew It: A Political History of the American Welfare State [Charles Noble] on racedaydvl.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Compared to other rich Western democracies, the U.S. does less to help its citizens adapt to the uncertainties of life in a market economy.*

Welfare As We Knew It: Established by the Social Security Act of 1935 as the first federal program of direct monetary assistance to poor families, AFDC sought to provide financial security for the most vulnerable Americans. By the 1980s, it had become clear to liberals and conservatives alike that the AFDC system had failed profoundly in its mission to keep single-parent families out of poverty. Poverty had become multigenerational, and so had AFDC dependence. Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton first seized the national spotlight in 1988 through his advocacy of increased experimentation with alternative welfare approaches. When Clinton ran for President in 1992, welfare reform became a major plank of his domestic agenda. I joined the HHS staff in early 1993 after working as a campaign aide the year before, knowing little about welfare reform beyond this election-year sloganeering. I quickly learned that the new president had recruited an all-star team to turn his welfare reform commitments into reality. Prominent welfare scholars Mary Jo Bane and David Ellwood had been recruited from Harvard to lead the policymaking and program administration of a reformed welfare program. The academics who had advocated for moderate forms of workfare in their scholarly publications were unnerved by calls from some of their new colleagues for more restrictive and hard-line approaches to welfare reform, including time limits and cutting off health and child care benefits. Meanwhile, governors who were frustrated by inefficient welfare bureaucracies and caseload costs pressured the Administration to allow them to enact welfare reform without waiting for Congress to act. The former governor in the White House tended to side with those wanting rapid, cost-effective, solutions. By 1994, Republican conservatives had begun to regroup from their election defeat of two years before and focus their energies on winning Congressional seats in the mid-term elections. Republicans swept to victory in the fall of 1994, gaining control of Congress and winning gubernatorial and state legislative races across the country. The Republican sweep pushed the welfare reform debate further to the right. New Speaker of the House, Gingrich invoked the pastoral orphanage of the Hollywood film *Boys Town* as an example of a positive alternative to the current system, although he quickly had to backtrack when observers on the right as well as the left reacted in horror to the idea that fixing welfare involved separating children from their parents. A shell-shocked and humbled Clinton Administration recognized that it no longer had control of the debate. By 1995, Clinton was running for reelection and comprehensive welfare reform legislation was moving through in Congress. It instituted work requirements and limited the number of years parents could receive welfare over their lifetimes. As the legislation was debated on Capitol Hill, the simmering tensions between the welfare experts Clinton had appointed to HHS and the political veterans on the White House staff exploded into public view. HHS Secretary Donna Shalala pleaded with Clinton not to sign the bill into law, warning of cataclysmic effects if the millions of poor families on the welfare rolls were cut off by time limits and work requirements. White House advisors, on the other hand, urged the president to sign and ensure his campaign promise was fulfilled by Election Day. Clinton was a political pragmatist, but he also truly believed in the necessity of fundamental reform of the system. A child of a single working mother, Clinton understood the daily struggles faced by families on welfare better than many of his Washington counterparts. Although not everything in the bill was what he might have desired, he believed it was a better alternative than the status quo. President Clinton signed welfare reform into law on August 22, 1995. David Ellwood had already left the Administration in frustration. Freed from political pressure to restrict and limit welfare benefits, staffers of both parties tried to knit together the frayed remainders of the social safety net. A booming national economy meant that fewer families needed to resort to welfare in the first place, and women coming off the welfare rolls had more job opportunities than usual. Conservatives hailed the large numbers of people moving from welfare to work as evidence that the tough-love approach of TANF was effective. Yet poor families headed by single parents continued to struggle to make ends meet, and now had to navigate an employment market where jobs were often located in areas far

from their neighborhoods and ill-served by public transportation. They had to find reliable and safe child care, adequate health care, and affordable housing. The modern American economy was a particularly challenging place for women of color who had a high school education or less. Many found work, but this work was transient, low-paying, and often part-time. Welfare has been reformed, but the poverty it sought to remedy remains with us. Jason DeParle, *American Dream*: The Brookings Institution, We welcome your suggestions. It has no affiliation with the University of Washington.

Chapter 4 : Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act - Wikipedia

By the numbers, welfare reform was a success. More than 13 million people received cash assistance from the government in , before the law was passed.

History[edit] s to s[edit] AFDC caseloads increased dramatically from the s to the s as restrictions on the availability of cash support to poor families especially single-parent, female-headed households were reduced. Court rulings during the Civil Rights Movement struck down many of these regulations, creating new categories of people eligible for relief. Community organizations, such as the National Welfare Rights Organization , also distributed informational packets informing citizens of their ability to receive government assistance. Please help improve it or discuss these issues on the talk page. This section possibly contains original research. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. October This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. Please help improve it by rewriting it in an encyclopedic style. October Learn how and when to remove this template message The legislation was designed to increase labor market participation among public assistance recipients. This represented a major departure from the protectionist legacy institutionalized in U. Concern about dependency[edit] The idea that the welfare-receiving poor had become too dependent upon public assistance also encouraged the act. The idea was that those who were on welfare for many years lost any initiative to find jobs. Those on welfare realized that taking up a job would mean not only losing benefits but also incur child care, transportation and clothing costs. Their new jobs probably would not pay well or include health insurance, whereas on welfare they would have been covered by Medicaid. Therefore, there are many reasons welfare recipients would be discouraged from working. While acknowledging the need for a social safety net, Democrats often invoked the culture of poverty argument. In lobbying the federal government to grant states wider latitude for implementing welfare, Thompson wanted a system where "pregnant teen-aged girls from Milwaukee , no matter what their background is or where they live, can pursue careers and chase their dreams. Research was used by both sides to make their points, with each side often using the same piece of research to support the opposite view. However, by , the Clinton Administration appeared to be more concerned with universal health care , and no details or a plan had emerged on welfare reform. Newt Gingrich accused the President of stalling on welfare and proclaimed that Congress could pass a welfare reform bill in as little as 90 days. Gingrich promised that the Republican Party would continue to apply political pressure to the President to approve welfare legislation. It started the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families program, which placed time limits on welfare assistance and replaced the longstanding Aid to Families with Dependent Children program. Other changes to the welfare system included stricter conditions for food stamps eligibility, reductions in immigrant welfare assistance, and recipient work requirements. Previously, Clinton had quietly spoken with Senate Majority Whip Trent Lott for months about the bill, but a compromise on a more acceptable bill for the President could not be reached. It gives structure, meaning and dignity to most of our lives". In his book *Lessons Learned the Hard Way*, Gingrich outlined a multi-step plan to improve economic opportunities for the poor. The plan called for encouraging volunteerism and spiritual renewal, placing more importance on families, creating tax incentives and reducing regulations for businesses in poor neighborhoods, and increasing property ownership for low-income families. Gingrich cited his volunteer work with Habitat for Humanity as an example of where he observed that it was more rewarding for people to be actively involved in improving their lives“by building their own homes“than by receiving welfare payments from the government. The Congressional findings in PRWORA highlighted dependency, out-of-wedlock birth, and intergenerational poverty as the main contributors to a faulty system. Ending welfare as an entitlement program ; Requiring recipients to begin working after two years of receiving benefits; Placing a lifetime limit of five years on benefits paid by federal funds; Aiming to encourage two-parent families and discouraging out-of-wedlock births; Enhancing enforcement of child support; and Requiring state professional and occupational licenses to be withheld from illegal immigrants. Although the

law placed a time limit for benefits supported by federal funds of no more than two consecutive years and no more than a collective total of five years over a lifetime, some states have enacted briefer limits. All states, however, allowed exceptions to avoid punishing children because their parents have gone over their respective time limits. Certain states more actively encourage education; others use the money to help fund private enterprises helping job seekers. The legislation also greatly limited funds available for unmarried parents under 18 and restricted any funding to all immigrants. According to the Conference Report. The reformed child support program attacks this problem by pursuing five major goals: The law envisions a child support system in which all States have similar child support laws, all States share information through the Federal child support office, mass processing of information is routine, and interstate cases are handled expeditiously. Those provisions were upheld in *Weinstein v. Walker*, *Dept of Revenue v Nesbitt*, *Risenhoover v. Washington*, *Borracchini v. Jones*, and *Dewald v.* In light of the restrictions to federal funding under the law, states were allowed to grant aid out of their own funds to address the welfare needs of immigrants. Oftentimes, these policies have had discriminatory effects towards minorities. Race has a strong negative correlation for TANF assistance granted to immigrants. In addition, the immigrant population has a positive correlation with the inclusion of Medicaid coverage considering the positive correlation between higher poverty and inclusion. Research shows that a larger percentage of African-American recipients leads to stricter rules governing initial eligibility, less flexibility in welfare work requirements, and lower cash benefits to welfare recipients. There is also a negative relationship between cash benefit levels and percentage of welfare recipients. These states, however, face challenges in allocating funds due to a larger minority population and cut individual benefit levels per recipient. Moreover, these states assess the costs for inclusion based on racial compositions in the state. For example, California has seen a States with lower immigrant populations have negative and significant marginal effects on the native-foreign inequality in Medicaid coverage. Immigration brings states with exclusive Medicaid policies and a small immigrant population increases in the participation gap between native and foreign populations. In states with inclusive Medicaid policies and small immigrant population, immigration does not affect the participation gap. In states with a large immigrant population, immigration decreases social inequality regardless of the Medicaid policy. Addressing concerns[edit] Increases in descriptive representation for Latinos offsets the negative effects of Latino population size on social welfare policy. A minority voice in representative bodies acts a mechanism for interest representation and mitigates the effects of racial resentment. Regardless of incorporation, welfare effort and TANF benefits decline as the Latino population grows from a nominal size to 10 percent of the population. After that point, incorporation influences policy in a distinct manner. While incorporation is a function of population, it is not perfectly responsive considering the populations that would perceive benefits i. The remaining states exhibited negative relationships between Latino population and welfare generosity with legislative incorporation not overcoming this phenomenon. The bill reauthorized federal funds for TANF and healthcare services. The House, however, failed to authorize the bill. Although it applied to all 50 states by default, states were also given the option to opt out of the ban. Logically, but not in the heated and vitriolic politics created by the attack on welfare, a concern with the relationship of welfare to dependency should have directed attention to the deteriorating conditions of the low-wage labor market. After all, if there were jobs that paid living wages, and if health care and child care were available, a great many women on AFDC would leap at the chance of a better income and a little social respect. Edelman, and Wendell E. Primus, resigned to protest the law. It increased poverty, lowered income for single mothers, put people from welfare into homeless shelters, and left states free to eliminate welfare entirely. It moved mothers and children from welfare to work, but many of them are not making enough to survive. PRWORA assumed that out-of-wedlock births were "illegitimate" and that only a male could confer respectability on a child, said Ehrenreich. PRWORA dismissed the value of the unpaid work of raising a family, and insisted that mothers get paid work, "no matter how dangerous, abusive, or poorly paid". It affects them because the single mothers enrolled in TANF tend to have lower rates of literacy, and therefore finding employment that within the time frame of the "workfare" component becomes more difficult, or leads to underemployment. The scholars who make this point also relate the underemployment to lower income rates among single-mothers enrolled in TANF, defeating the purpose of the transition to work

provisions.

Chapter 5 : Welfare As We Knew It Has Changed - CBS News

Welfare as We Knew It has 5 ratings and 1 review. Adam said: Poses, and attempts to answer, the question of why there is not a larger welfare state in th.

Chapter 6 : The End of Welfare As We Knew It | New Politics

Sep 26, Â· The bill was designed to fulfill a campaign pledge to "end welfare as we know it," [p. 4] a then-startling repudiation of Democratic party dogma. The president went so far as to admit that "the.

Chapter 7 : racedaydvl.com | Welfare as We Knew It, Charles Noble | | Boeken

Named the "Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act," the bill truly ended welfare as we knew it. Although Gingrich's orphanages were nowhere to be seen, the legislation ended the welfare entitlement, a heretofore sixty-year federal guarantee that all poor people who qualified would receive the benefit.

Chapter 8 : Welfare Reform as We Knew It - Ways and Means

Which piece of federal social welfare legislation ended welfare as we knew it? Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of Which former federal social welfare entitlement program is now the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) block grant program?

Chapter 9 : Welfare as we knew it : a political history of the American welfare state in SearchWorks catalog

The End of Welfare as I Knew It Congress and Bill Clinton made good on their promise to "end welfare as we know it." It's time to end welfare reform as we know it instead.