

Chapter 1 : Welfare's effect on poverty - Wikipedia

Welfare of the Poor reviews the explanatory models used to predict the relation of the poor to major institutions such as the labor market, the family, the health care system, and the educational system; and the impact these relations have on the status of the poor.

Little help for the poor with food, health care, and housing—and more poverty, disease, homelessness, and hunger. This would be achieved not only by limiting who is eligible for assistance, but by altering the most basic part of the program, which allows low-income families to purchase food using an Electronic Benefit Transfer card similar to a debit card. Instead, the government would deliver Blue Apron-style, according to budget director Mick Mulvaney, who was actually serious boxes of government commodity food to most SNAP recipients for the value of about half of their benefits. The housing voucher program is already stretched thin, with long waiting lists that span years. The plan also allows for work requirements to be imposed on housing assistance recipients. The health of the poor is targeted too. The remaining federal funds would partly be distributed to states via block grants. Accordingly, states would no longer be restricted by federal rules on what services they must provide recipients. Medicaid care would also be capped per individual. The federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services already has green-lighted state programs that tie work requirements to Medicaid. These cuts and changes to the program would diminish the effects of Medicaid expansion, which enabled many low-income people to finally access health care, especially preventative care and care for chronic conditions like diabetes. The budget implies that only certain people can—and deserve to—enjoy food, shelter, and health. Such changes would not only materially increase poverty, homelessness, and hunger, but they would make even more suffocating a welfare system that already functions to control the daily lives of the poor. But that is perhaps the point. To create these obligations, they must be made less free in certain senses rather than more. And unpaid labor, like caregiving for children or the elderly, is not considered. If the goal is to reduce poverty, work requirements do not work. If the goal is to have fewer people on the public dole, then work requirements work very well. Using Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—the paltry cash welfare program to which welfare was whittled down in the welfare reform bill—as a model for public benefits only makes sense if one hopes for a similar outcome: Before welfare reform, 68 percent of people living under the poverty line received welfare assistance. And since, deep poverty—family income below half the poverty line—has worsened. The principles of this anti-welfare worldview get dicey when one considers that the wealthy, too, receive public money in the form of tax deductions: The top 1 percent of households received more money from federal tax spending in than the bottom 80 percent combined. Keeping this in mind, what to do? In , Martin Luther King Jr. The National Welfare Rights Movement, begun in , was already demanding a right to welfare for the poor, particularly poor black mothers. This spring, cities across the country will host a series of direct actions, culminating in a massive demonstration in Washington, D. Tax Cuts for the rich. Deregulation for the powerful. Wage suppression for everyone else. Rather, they are made because they are the most effective way elites have found to bully, confuse and intimidate middle- and working-class voters. Trickle-down claims are not real economics. They are negotiating strategies. Here at the Prospect, we hope to help you win that negotiation.

Chapter 2 : List of 80+ Federal Welfare Programs in America

Welfare is a government support for the citizens and residents of society. Welfare may be provided to people of any income level, as with social security (and is then often called a social safety net), but it is usually intended to ensure that the poor can meet their basic human needs such as food and shelter.

Ohio Food Assistance Program Welfare in the United States commonly refers to the federal government welfare programs that have been put in place to assist the unemployed or underemployed. The history of welfare in the U. These laws made a distinction between those who were unable to work due to their age or physical health and those who were able-bodied but unemployed. The former group was assisted with cash or alternative forms of help from the government. The latter group was given public service employment in workhouses. Some changes tried to help the poor move to work rather than continuing to need assistance. Social casework, consisting of caseworkers visiting the poor and training them in morals and a work ethic was advocated by reformers in the s and s. Prior to the Great Depression, the United States Congress supported various programs to assist the poor. When the Great Depression hit, many families suffered. It is estimated that one-fourth of the labor force was unemployed during the worst part of the depression. With many families suffering financial difficulties, the government stepped in to solve the problem and that is where the history of welfare as we know it really began. Under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Social Security Act was enacted in . The act, which was amended in , established a number of programs designed to provide aid to various segments of the population. A number of government agencies were created to oversee the welfare programs. Under the act, the federal government gives annual lump sums to the states to use to assist the poor. In turn the states must adhere to certain criteria to ensure that those receiving aid are being encouraged to move from welfare to work. Though some have criticized the program, many acknowledge it has been successful. Those who seek welfare information can find such information on the Internet or by looking under United States Government in their local phone book. Programs are available to those who qualify to provide welfare help in the areas of health, housing, tax relief, and cash assistance.

Chapter 3 : BRIA 14 3 a How Welfare Began in the United States - Constitutional Rights Foundation

When we think of "welfare," we assume it means supportive income for poor families, particularly those with children. That certainly is its meaning in Senate Bill , which won unanimous, bipartisan approval in the state Senate late last month.

Share via Email Refuse collectors, like many gig economy workers, are essential to society but pay and conditions push them to the margins. Christopher Thomond for the Guardian It will mean fewer jobs. That was the chorus from many on the right, from Tej Parikh of the Institute of Directors to the chancellor, Philip Hammond, in response to proposals from the shadow chancellor, John McDonnell , to improve conditions for gig economy workers. Such workers, he insisted, should be given similar rights to those in permanent work, including eligibility for sick pay, maternity pay and similar benefits. So what does it mean for Parikh and Hammond to insist that if gig workers are given decent benefits, jobs will be lost? Unpacked, what that suggests is that employers are willing, or able, to provide jobs only if workers accept low pay and poor conditions. But it is rarely put like that. We take for granted that businesses create jobs and so have the right to dictate on what conditions jobs are created. They are cleaners and call centre workers , waiters and shelf stackers, childminders and rubbish collectors, workers whose labour is essential to society but whose pay and conditions push them to the margins. Poverty is often seen as a problem of worklessness. Today, though, it is a problem of being in work. The answer is almost certainly: Instead, the question is: By and large, the answer is: We take for granted that businesses create jobs, and so have the right to dictate on what conditions jobs are created There has been a growing casualisation of work in recent years. While the nature of jobs has changed, real wages have fallen. Nor is it just work and pay that are the issue. The changing of the structure of the housing market has also exacerbated in-work poverty – those in the private rented sector are far more likely to be in the working poor. As are those with fewer educational qualifications. From the mids, governments have tried to offset rising in-work poverty through the benefit system. Since then, they have been cut as part of the austerity programme. The impact of these cuts, together with the rolling out of universal credit, could be devastating for the working poor. Labour promises to restore boss-worker balance Read more Tax credits may be essential for allowing many in work to keep their heads above water. They also expose the reality of the benefits system. Welfare is largely discussed from the perspective of the recipient. In reality, the welfare system is an acknowledgement and an indictment of the inadequacies of the market system. Nothing reveals this more forcefully than the existence of the working poor and the creation of a welfare system to support them. The state is, in effect, subsidising employers so as to allow them to get away with paying indecent wages and unacceptable benefits.

Chapter 4 : Let's keep welfare for the poor

The effect of social welfare on poverty is controversial in the United States. The goal of welfare programs is to reduce poverty, it has been debated whether or not welfare programs achieve this goal.

A friend of mine asked a question on Facebook, I responded, and he asked me to elaborate. What is the difference between Poor Welfare and Corporate Welfare? I responded that one was the receiving of tax dollars while the other was use of tax loopholes. The issue of tax revenue is, after all, hopelessly complex. I am a conservative, the guy who asked the question is a liberal. I think that, in general, there is a common belief that one party the Democrats are completely in support of social welfare and the other party the Republicans are hopelessly in love with tax breaks on big businesses. However, a closer look at the votes on both sides of the aisle show these are generally true, but many elements of either side cross over on it. The same Democrats who decried the Export-Import Bank years ago when it was up for renewal are now saying it will do irreparable harm to shut it down. The Ex-Im Bank, however, is most noteworthy, however, of giving cash to big businesses while the little businesses struggle. You also see many politicians on both sides carving out money and tax loopholes for pet projects in their districts and their friends in the business industry. The battle over the Affordable Care Act is one that usually pits Democrats vs. Republicans, with Republicans howling that it will ruin insurance. However, how much talk on that do you hear now that the Republican party is in control of both Houses of Congress? What is the difference between social welfare and corporate welfare? Those who need financial assistance from month to month at the lower end of the income ladder receive social welfare. It is meant to help those who struggle, but it is money that is derived from already collected tax revenue. Those who wish for perks to promote business growth look for corporate welfare, however. Like social welfare, it is not inherently evil – businesses create jobs, jobs offer money to workers, and workers spend that money to stimulate the economy – but it does carry certain risks. Some businesses have taken so much advantage of their perks that they have the money to send lobbyists to Congress to pass laws that help them and hurt competition. The biggest businesses so influence the political arena, that they keep benefiting from K Street, while folks on Main Street suffer. As a result of both of these types of welfare, however, there is a problem: More money is inevitably requested by those who have become entirely dependent on them.

Chapter 5 : History Of United States Welfare Programs

The National Welfare Rights Movement, begun in , was already demanding a right to welfare for the poor, particularly poor black mothers. King's assassination contributed to the dissolution of the Poor People's Campaign.

Social security in Australia Prior to in Australia, charitable assistance from benevolent societies, sometimes with financial contributions from the authorities, was the primary means of relief for people not able to support themselves. Queensland legislated a similar system in before the Australian labor Commonwealth government led by Andrew Fisher introduced a national aged pension under the Invalid and Old-Aged Pensions Act A national invalid disability pension was started in , and a national maternity allowance was introduced in Social programs in Canada Canada has a welfare state in the European tradition; however, it is not referred to as "welfare", but rather as "social programs". In Canada, "welfare" usually refers specifically to direct payments to poor individuals as in the American usage and not to healthcare and education spending as in the European usage. Generally speaking, before the Great Depression , most social services were provided by religious charities and other private groups. Changing government policy between the s and s saw the emergence of a welfare state, similar to many Western European countries. Most programs from that era are still in use, although many were scaled back during the s as government priorities shifted towards reducing debt and deficits. Denmark[edit] Danish welfare is handled by the state through a series of policies and the like that seeks to provide welfare services to citizens, hence the term welfare state. This refers not only to social benefits, but also tax-funded education, public child care, medical care, etc. A number of these services are not provided by the state directly, but administered by municipalities , regions or private providers through outsourcing. This sometimes gives a source of tension between the state and municipalities , as there is not always consistency between the promises of welfare provided by the state i. The first article of the French Code of Social Security describes the principle of solidarity. Solidarity is commonly comprehended in relations of similar work, shared responsibility and common risks. Existing solidarities in France caused the expansion of health and social security. Under Adolf Hitler , the National Socialist Program stated "We demand an expansion on a large scale of old age welfare". Today, the social protection of all its citizens is considered a central pillar of German national policy. ALG II can also be paid partially to supplement a low work income. In , a universalistic welfare model was introduced in Italy, offering a number of universal and free services such as a National Health Fund. Welfare in Japan Social welfare, assistance for the ill or otherwise disabled and for the old, has long been provided in Japan by both the government and private companies. Beginning in the s, the government enacted a series of welfare programs, based mainly on European models, to provide medical care and financial support. During the postwar period, a comprehensive system of social security was gradually established. Social protection embraces three major areas: The s had a significant effect on social protection policies. Prior to the s, most Latin American countries focused on social insurance policies involving formal sector workers, assuming that the informal sector would disappear with economic development. The economic crisis of the s and the liberalization of the labor market led to a growing informal sector and a rapid increase in poverty and inequality. Latin American countries did not have the institutions and funds to properly handle such a crisis, both due to the structure of the social security system, and to the previously implemented structural adjustment policies SAPs that had decreased the size of the state. New Welfare programs have integrated the multidimensional, social risk management , and capabilities approaches into poverty alleviation. They focus on income transfers and service provisions while aiming to alleviate both long- and short-term poverty through, among other things, education, health, security, and housing. Unlike previous programs that targeted the working class, new programs have successfully focused on locating and targeting the very poorest. The impacts of social assistance programs vary between countries, and many programs have yet to be fully evaluated. According to Barrientos and Santibanez, the programs have been more successful in increasing investment in human capital than in bringing households above the poverty line. Challenges still exist, including the extreme inequality levels and the mass scale of poverty; locating a financial basis for programs; and deciding on exit strategies or on the long-term establishment of programs.

New, mostly short-term programs emerged.

Chapter 6 : Economics, The Welfare of The Poor And Middle Class OR The Numbers Game – Points an

These days, among very poor, unmarried mothers, welfare is far less important to the average family budget. Instead, these households rely more on food stamps and disability than in the past.

It was the inaugural talk on public policy, a new thing they will be doing. You can follow the conversation on Twitter at [policied](#). Economist Russ Roberts gave the presentation. Does growth reduce poverty? How is the middle class really doing over the last 40 years? There is a lot of discourse in our mainstream lives about how the poor and middle class are doing. Many of the US public policies enacted as far back as The New Deal were designed to help people get out of poverty. Roberts produced two videos which are great to view. They will help you get over your confirmation biases. He is going to be producing more videos for this series that include topics like race, immigration, and technology development. Those two topics alone can muddle the numbers. Each video is about 8 minutes long. You might have to watch them more than once, or pause them to think about the data that is presented. When you see data presented by economists, understanding how it is presented and what they are including in the data and what they are excluding is as important as the conclusions they come up with. Nobel Prize winner Paul Krugman presenting average income data and presenting it with a conclusion that people are essentially worse off in than they were in is simply fallacious and not good economics. However, for followers of Krugman and people with confirmation biases that seek out information to confirm those biases the data and conclusion are great. They solidify positions that they already have. If we are being honest, answers are significantly more nuanced. The numbers are super hard to measure. However, some iron laws of economics always apply. For example, if you subsidize something the price of it will eventually go up. If we look at a public policy like minimum wage and basic income that has big effects. Subsidizing a minimum wage causes ALL wages to go up and just raises the bar on what the minimum should be. Subsidizing basic income would cause all income thresholds for everything to go up. Policies like this are government mandates injecting themselves into activities that probably should be market driven. If we look around the entire economy, we subsidize lots and lots of things. Education, housing, food, medicine, employment, retirement and some units of production all have subsidies. That causes market disruption. The subsidies can also lead to crony capitalism which leads to a total distrust in market systems. It should focus on making sure there is the opportunity. I am spending a month in the San Francisco Bay Area. Housing prices are through the roof here. Zoning laws and regulations on building for sure. However, because the entire region is fueled by entrepreneurship people will pay that price to chase an opportunity. Costs and opportunity costs matter. Sort of like why people will drop everything in a country in order to come to America.

Chapter 7 : Welfare of the Poor: Mary Bryna Sanger: racedaydvl.com: Books

Poor people, by and large, are not lazy, but they also aren't stupid. If they can't earn more through work than from welfare, many will choose to remain on welfare.

Welfare for Everyone How Welfare Began in the United States During the Great Depression of the s, local and state governments as well as private charities were overwhelmed by needy families seeking food, clothing, and shelter. In , welfare for poor children and other dependent persons became a federal government responsibility, which it remained for 60 years. MINNEAPOLISâ€”Several hundred men and women in an unemployed demonstration today stormed a grocery store and meat market in the Gateway district, smashed plate glass windows and helped themselves to bacon and ham, fruit and canned goods. Construction boomed, business flourished, and the stock market soared. Then on October 29, , the stock market crashed. The crash sent shockwaves throughout the economy. Millions found themselves out of work. The Great Depression, which would last through the s, had begun. When the Great Depression began, about 18 million elderly, disabled, and single mothers with children already lived at a bare subsistence level in the United States. State and local governments together with private charities helped these people. By , another 13 million Americans had been thrown out of work. Suddenly, state and local governments and charities could no longer provide even minimum assistance for all those in need. Food riots broke out. Desertions by husbands and fathers increased. Homeless families in cities lived in public parks and shanty towns. Desperate times began to put into question the old American notion that if a man worked hard enough, he could always take care of himself and his family. The effect of the Depression on poor children was particularly severe. School budgets were cut and in some cases schools were shut down for lack of money to pay teachers. An estimated , boys left home to wander the streets and beg because of the poor economic condition of their families. Most elderly Americans did not have personal savings or retirement pensions to support them in normal times, let alone during a national economic crisis. Those few able to set aside money for retirement often found that their savings and investments had been wiped out by the financial crash in Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois made this observation in The impact of all these forces increasingly convinced the majority of the American people that individuals could not by themselves provide adequately for their old age, and that some form of greater security should be provided by society. Even skilled workers, business owners, successful farmers, and professionals of all kinds found themselves in severe economic difficulty as one out of four in the labor force lost their jobs. Words like "bewildered," "shocked," and "humiliated," were often used at the time to describe increasing numbers of Americans as the Depression deepened. Although President Franklin D. Roosevelt focused mainly on creating jobs for the masses of unemployed workers, he also backed the idea of federal aid for poor children and other dependent persons. By , a national welfare system had been established for the first time in American history. Welfare Before the Depression A federal welfare system was a radical break from the past. Americans had always prided themselves on having a strong sense of individualism and self-reliance. During the 19th century, local and state governments as well as charities established institutions such as poorhouses and orphanages for destitute individuals and families. Conditions in these institutions were often deliberately harsh so that only the truly desperate would apply. Local governments usually counties also provided relief in the form of food, fuel, and sometimes cash to poor residents. Those capable were required to work for the town or county, often at hard labor such as chopping wood and maintaining roads. But most on general relief were poor dependent persons not capable of working: Local officials decided who went to the poorhouse or orphanage and who would receive relief at home. Cash relief to the poor depended on local property taxes, which were limited. Also, not only did a general prejudice exist against the poor on relief, but local officials commonly discriminated against individuals applying for aid because of their race, nationality, or religion. Single mothers often found themselves in an impossible situation. If they applied for relief, they were frequently branded as morally unfit by the community. If they worked, they were criticized for neglecting their children. In , President Theodore Roosevelt called a White House conference on how to best deal with the problem of poor single mothers and their children. The conference declared that preserving the

family in the home was preferable to placing the poor in institutions, which were widely criticized as costly failures. In effect, poor single mothers would be excused from working outside the home. Welfare reformers argued that the state pensions would also prevent juvenile delinquency since mothers would be able to supervise their children full-time. They varied greatly from state to state and even from county to county within a state. These programs excluded large numbers of divorced, deserted, and minority mothers and their children. Few private and government retirement pensions existed in the United States before the Great Depression. The prevailing view was that individuals should save for their old age or be supported by their children. About 30 states provided some welfare aid to poor elderly persons without any source of income. Local officials generally decided who deserved old-age assistance in their community. Federal money flowed to the states to pay for public works projects, which employed the jobless. Some federal aid also directly assisted needy victims of the Depression. The states, however, remained mainly responsible for taking care of the so-called "unemployables" widows, poor children, the elderly poor, and the disabled. But states and private charities, too, were unable to keep up the support of these people at a time when tax collections and personal giving were declining steeply. In his State of the Union Address before Congress on January 4, 1938, President Roosevelt declared, "the time has come for action by the national government" to provide "security against the major hazards and vicissitudes [uncertainties] of life. He also called for guaranteed benefits for poor single mothers and their children along with other dependent persons. By permanently expanding federal responsibility for the security of all Americans, Roosevelt believed that the necessity for government make-work employment and other forms of Depression relief would disappear. In his address before Congress, Roosevelt argued that the continuation of government relief programs was a bad thing for the country: The lessons of history, confirmed by the evidence immediately before me, show conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. It set up a federal retirement program for persons over 65, which was financed by a payroll tax paid jointly by employers and their workers. FDR believed that federal old-age pensions together with employer-paid unemployment insurance also a part of the Social Security Act would provide the economic security people needed during both good and bad times. In addition to old-age pensions and unemployment insurance, the Social Security Act established a national welfare system. The federal government guaranteed one-third of the total amount spent by states for assistance to needy and dependent children under age 16 but not their mothers. Additional federal welfare aid was provided to destitute old people, the needy blind, and crippled children. Although financed partly by federal tax money, the states could still set their own eligibility requirements and benefit levels. This part of the law was pushed by Southern states so they could control the coverage made available to their African-American population. This is how welfare began as a federal government responsibility. Roosevelt and the members of Congress who wrote the welfare provisions into the Social Security Act thought that the need for federal aid to dependent children and poor old people would gradually wither away as employment improved and those over 65 began to collect Social Security pensions. But many Americans, such as farm laborers and domestic servants, were never included in the Social Security old-age retirement program. Also, since 1970, increasing divorce and father desertion rates have dramatically multiplied the number of poor single mothers with dependent children. Since the Great Depression, the national welfare system expanded both in coverage and federal regulations. From its inception, the system drew critics. Some complained that the system did not do enough to get people to work. Others simply believed the federal government should not administer a welfare system. In 1992, candidate Bill Clinton, a Democrat, ran for president promising to "end welfare as we know it. For Discussion and Writing 1. How did needy Americans get help before ? In what ways were these pensions sometimes administered unfairly? Did President Franklin D. Facts on File, The Moral Construction of Poverty.

Chapter 8 : Welfare for the poor vs. welfare for corporations | Joe P. Cunningham

The old welfare strategy Mr. Murray blamed for so many social ills died long ago. Its replacement is tiny by comparison,

providing cash to only about a quarter of poor families and typically only.

Chapter 9 : Welfare - Wikipedia

The third legislative initiative was the passage in of the child and dependent care tax credit, which provides a tax credit to low- and middle-income workers for child care racedaydvl.com credit.