



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 8
Issue 1 *March*

Article 8

March 1981

Welfare Reform and the Possible Demise of White Paternalism and Black Flight in Mississippi

Lewis Walker
Western Michigan University

Chester L. Hunt
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Race and Ethnicity Commons, and the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Walker, Lewis and Hunt, Chester L. (1981) "Welfare Reform and the Possible Demise of White Paternalism and Black Flight in Mississippi," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 8 : Iss. 1 , Article 8.
Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol8/iss1/8>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



WELFARE REFORM AND THE POSSIBLE DEMISE OF WHITE
PATERNALISM AND BLACK FLIGHT IN MISSISSIPPI*

Lewis Walker and Chester L. Hunt

Western Michigan University

ABSTRACT

This article makes an assessment of the possible impact of welfare reform on families currently receiving AFDC payments. An analysis of the data on variations in AFDC monthly payments, the per capital income and AFDC grants, and other selected factors for Mississippi, Nebraska, and New York suggests that the effects of federalization on welfare would indeed be far-reaching. For example, it would increase the economic level of Black mothers and children living in Mississippi (state with the lowest monthly payment), and possibly at the same time decrease the flow of Black emigration from that state.

Early in his term President Carter proposed a plan for welfare reform which would shift the major responsibility from the states to the federal government and lessen, if not eliminate, present state inequalities in benefits. This program has little chance of enactment in the immediate future but it does address some of the perennial problems of a welfare system almost universally assumed to be faulty and it is likely that some day a similar program will be enacted. In the debate over the program one thing often overlooked is the variation in regional impact. In the northeastern states it is unlikely that welfare reform would lead to increased benefits for welfare recipients and conceivably it could lower them. In the deep South and especially in the poorest state in the nation, Mississippi, its effects would be revolutionary. The obvious or manifest effect would be a major increase in Mississippi welfare grants, the latent effects involve significant change in social and familial relationships.

The Carter Plan

According to President Carter, his Program for Better Jobs and Incomes would "transform the manner in which the federal government deals with the income needs of the poor and begin to break the welfare cycle." His plans calls for the elimination of three key components of the present system: 1) Supplementary Security Income (SSI) for the blind, aged and disabled; 2) Food Stamp Program; and 3) Aid to Families with Dependent Children. These benefits would be replaced by cash grants to lower income people, determined on a national basis and paid by the federal government. Moreover, the plan proposes to provide "jobs for those who need work, dispensing fairer and more uniform cash benefits, promoting family stability and

*Revision of a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Welfare section of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, San Francisco, September 3, 1978.

improving the self-respect of recipients."² According to a succinct statement in the Editorial Research Reports:

Carter explained that his welfare proposal consists of a "job-oriented program for those able to work and a simplified, uniform, equitable cash assistance program for those in need who are unable to work by virtue of disability, are or family circumstances." Cash benefits for Americans able but unwilling to work would be reduced. Up to 1.4 million full and part-time public service jobs would be created to persons unable to find employment elsewhere. These jobs would pay the federal minimum wage and recipients would be required to spend five weeks each year looking for non-subsidized employment. The Program for Better Jobs and Income, Carter said, "will ensure that work will always be more profitable than welfare and that a private or non-subsidized public job will always be more profitable than a special federally funding public service job."³

CHART 1
WELFARE REFORM CHANGES

	PRESENT SYSTEM	PROPOSED CHANGES
Format	3 Categories	1 Category (Low Income People)
Benefits	Determined by State	Determined by Federal Government
Cost	Shared by State and Federal Government	Entirely borne by Federal Government
Employment	Reliance on existing jobs	Provision of Public Service jobs

Critics of the Carter Proposal usually operate from a northern perspective. They are afraid it might encourage a lower level of payment to the needy and they doubt that the work incentive aspect of the program would be effective in a period of high unemployment or needed in a time of prosperity. They also charge that the public service jobs would be of the meaningless dead-end variety.

Such criticisms may have merit but in the deep South they fall into insignificance compared to the changes that bringing this part of the country under a national welfare umbrella would involve. To explore this point let us look at the impact of welfare reform on families now covered by the AFDC program. While the Carter welfare reform proposal would eliminate the AFDC label, the type of families

comprising the AFDC caseload would still be receiving welfare payments. AFDC is the largest form of categorical assistance. Hence, an analysis of the effect of federalization on this type of family will clarify the probable effect of the welfare reform proposals.

Mississippi, Nebraska, New York: A Comparison

Variations in AFDC Monthly Payments

The program for Aid to Families of Dependent Children is currently operated on a matching basis in which the contribution of the Federal Government is related to the payment by the individual states. A rather complicated federal formula provides more assistance to poor states than to wealthy ones but it is still true that the state's payment may be a considerable burden and there is a tendency for the low income states to have smaller AFDC grants. This is indicated by the variation in the monthly payments for AFDC families and is illustrated in Table 1. To analyze the effect of this variation, let us look closely at three states, using the detailed information available in a 1973 HEW survey.⁴ New York is taken as an example of a high grant state, Mississippi the state with the lowest average grant payment and Nebraska is about midway between New York and Mississippi.

Table 1

AFDC Payments, December 1977

State	Monthly Payment Per		State	Monthly Payment Per	
	Family	Individual		Family	Individual
	LOW			HIGH	
Mississippi	\$ 47	\$15	Hawaii	\$369	\$115
South Carolina	84	29	New York	366	114
Georgia	103	37	Rhode Island	311	103
Tennessee	104	37	Massachusetts	310	99
Texas	104	33	Connecticut	310	102
Alabama	112	37	Michigan	310	99

Source: World Almanac, p. 217, 1979

If we look at various aspects of the AFDC families there are rather sharp differences between Mississippi and New York with Nebraska, as expected, occupying an intermediate type of position.

First looking at the matter of the unmet monthly need in the family budget. In New York, at only 81 cents per family, the unmet monthly need was practically nonexistent. In Nebraska it was \$48.08 and in Mississippi \$128.56. Not only was the unmet need greater in the other two states but the theoretical "budgetary need"

was lower. This was calculated at \$300.61 per month in New York, at \$265.11 in Nebraska and at \$223.00 in Mississippi. Most of the variation in the estimates of budgetary need was apparently accounted for by a differential treatment of assumed expenses for shelter, fuel, and utilities. These amounted to \$27.34 in Mississippi and \$116.75 in New York or a difference between the two of nearly \$90 per month as contrasted to a difference of the estimated budgetary need of \$77.00 per month. In Nebraska the figure was \$96.00, a difference with New York of about \$20.00 per month while the difference in total budgetary need was \$35.00. These figures are accentuated when it is mentioned that nearly a third (30.3%) of Mississippi recipients receive nothing at all for fuel, shelter and utilities as contrasted to under six percent for both New York and Nebraska. It should be added that Mississippi in 1973 was not the most extreme state since Louisiana and West Virginia budgeted nothing at all for these items.

AFDC has been used disproportionately by Black families; the national percentage in 1973 being 45.8 percent Black while in Mississippi it was 87.4, in Nebraska 28.3, and in New York 39.3 percent. In New York the race of approximately 30 percent of the recipients was listed as Spanish origin descent, which in most cases presumably referred to the Puerto Rican population. Thus in New York the minority group representation was about 70 percent of the population. In Nebraska it was around 30 percent, but in Mississippi AFDC was overwhelmingly a program for Black families.

Although Mississippi's AFDC recipients are a comparatively high percent of its total population, the proportion of either Whites or Blacks receiving AFDC is lower than in the other two states. The high total of AFDC in Mississippi is related to the higher proportion of Blacks living in that state (see Table 2).

Table 2

1973 Proportion of Blacks and Whites Receiving AFDC in
New York, Nebraska, and Mississippi

State	% of Blacks in State Populations	% Black Population on AFDC	% White Population on AFDC	Total Percent on AFDC
New York	13.0	24.4	2.1	5.30
Nebraska	3.4	22.2	1.3	2.00
Mississippi	37.2	14.6	1.1	6.10

Sources:

Table 11, Public Assistance Statistics 1976, U.S. Department of HEW, Social and Reh Services, Office of Information Systems, National Center for Social Statistics

Table 9, Part 1, Demographic and Program Characteristics, Findings of AFDC Study. Also, Table 3, Part II and Financial Circumstances, Findings of the 1973 AFDC Study.

The three states clearly illustrate the usual relationship between rural population composition, percent black and size grant (See Tables 2 and 3). New York typifies the large urban industrial state with a high minority AFDC proportion and high monthly payments, Nebraska represents the more rural state with a largely White AFDC population and medium payments, and Mississippi is the extreme example of a rural state with a largely Black AFDC population and low monthly grants.

States with a large Black rural population tend to have lower grants and this is most pronounced in southern states which have both a substantial rural AFDC population and more than 50 percent Black AFDC recipients. In all the states in which the AFDC population was 13 percent or more rural and 54 percent or more Black, except Virginia, grants were under \$131 per month. In states with a largely white AFDC population but 13 percent or more rural, the grants ranged from \$149 to \$306. In states with fewer than 13 percent of the AFDC population in rural areas the proportion of Blacks on AFDC was not related to the size of the payment. Thus, the impact of low AFDC payments falls mainly on rural Blacks. It may be significant that these rural Blacks live in states where, at least until recently, blatant racism was openly proclaimed as well as practiced. They also live in states where the welfare rights movement has never been an effective force.

Per Capita Income and AFDC Grants

Variation in AFDC grants has only a slight relation to either per capita income or living costs. Mississippi per capita income is 63 percent of New York but the AFDC payment is only 19 percent of the New York average.

Table 3

Per Capita Income, Unmet Need, Average Grant, Family Budget and Percent Minority for Three Selected States

State	% AFDC Minority**	Family Budget	Average Monthly AFDC Grant	Unmet Need*	Per Capita State Income 1973
New York	70.8	\$300.61	\$269.99	.81	\$5,657
Nebraska	36.5	265.11	151.46	40.08	5,251
Mississippi	87.7	223.00	52.61	128.56	3,579

*Since family resources are considered when making the grant, the unmet need is smaller than the gap between the grant and the budget.

**30 percent of the New York AFDC are listed as Spanish origin descent.

Sources:

Table 9, Part I, Demographic and Program Characteristics, Findings of the 1973 AFDC Study. Also Table 3, Part II B, Financial Circumstances, Findings of the 1973 AFDC Study.

AFDC grants do show some relation to Black female per capita income. In New York in 1970 the average AFDC grant was \$3,252 and the per capita income for Black females was \$3,319, indicating that the AFDC family grant was 98 percent of the average Black female income. In Mississippi the Black female income in 1970 was \$964 and the average AFDC family grant was \$560 or 58 percent of the average Black female per capita income. In 1970, 51.2 percent of the Black female workers in Mississippi were either service or household workers compared to 32.6 percent in New York State.

Let us assume that there is a federalization of AFDC grants. In 1973 it would have required a grant of \$181 per month or \$2,180.90 per year to meet (with other family resources) the estimated needs of the Mississippi AFDC family. This would have meant an AFDC grant equaling 226 percent of the per capita 1970 Black female income.

It is also worthy of note that the 1970 per capita Black male income in Mississippi was \$2,237 or about the same as an AFDC grant which would have met "recognized needs." The high rate of illegitimacy in Mississippi indicates a certain resistance to marriage and it is doubtful that a welfare grant as large as the average black male income would make matrimony more attractive.⁵ Indeed the evidence from income subsidies elsewhere indicates that a higher welfare income is associated with increased divorce rates.⁶ An adverse effect on the formation and stability of the two-parent family does not necessarily justify rejection of an adequate welfare program. It could indeed be argued that it is a net gain when families are no longer held in matrimony by sheer poverty. However, it is intellectually dishonest for welfare reform advocates to ignore the evidence that higher welfare payments may be accompanied by higher divorce rates.

Table 4

Black Male and Female Per Capita
Income and Annual AFDC Grants

State	Black Male Per Capita Income (1970)	Black Female Per Capita Income (1980)	Annual AFDC Grant (1970) ²
New York	\$5,710	\$3,416	\$3,252
Nebraska	4,425	2,124	1,818
Mississippi	2,237	964	560

1. 1970 Census, Characteristics of Population, Table 47 for Mississippi and New York.

2. Social Security Bulletin, Volume 34, January 1971, Table M-26.

Some AFDC Patterns in New York, Nebraska and Mississippi

The Mississippi AFDC program emerged in a state in which family life is still linked to developments of an earlier era. One aspect of this is the strength of the extended family. Nearly half of the AFDC children are illegitimate and more than half are cared for in extended family households. More than four-fifths of the mothers were born in this state. Almost a third of the mothers are employed but wages - even with AFDC grants - are inadequate for family needs. The survival of the plantation pattern of white paternalism is seen in the fact that over 30 percent of the mothers live in houses which are rent free. Over half of the families live in rural areas and nearly ninety percent of the caseload is Black.

The New York AFDC family contrasts with the Mississippi AFDC family in almost every respect. In terms of joint residence, the extended family is infrequent and most AFDC mothers and children live in separate households. Illegitimacy is slightly lower than in Mississippi. Only a third of the mothers were born in New York state. Grants meet the budgetary definition of adequacy and less than ten percent of the mothers are employed. Nearly 99 percent of the AFDC families live in urban areas. The caseload is three fifths minority and the percentage of the total families receiving AFDC, both majority and minority, is nearly twice that in Mississippi. In brief, the AFDC system in New York state fairly well reflects the sentiment that the one-parent family is expected to maintain an independent household and to be entitled to the adequate public support in time of need.

Nebraska, as might be expected, is somewhat different from either of the other states. A majority of the caseload is White although the proportion of Whites receiving AFDC is lower than in New York and only slightly higher than in Mississippi. The proportion of Blacks receiving AFDC is greater than in Mississippi and nearly as high as in New York. Slightly more than half the AFDC recipients were born in the state. The proportion of illegitimate children is the lowest of any of the three states and the proportion of children living in a non-maternal home is halfway between New York and Mississippi. Approximately a fourth of the mothers are employed and grants averaged fifty dollars a month below budgetary needs. The Nebraska situation is influenced by the survival of rural attitudes in a legislature dominated by farming interests. There are, however, few Blacks living in rural areas and the Black proportion of the caseload is overwhelmingly urban as is the White as well. Grants are larger than in Mississippi but not enough to meet family needs and the proportion of mothers working, while slightly lower than in Mississippi, is two and a half times as high as in New York. Nebraska AFDC seems to be influenced by possible differences in the situation and attitudes of White and non-White AFDC families as well as by resistance to the idea that the independent one-parent family should be entitled to complete maintenance by public funds. However, Nebraska AFDC policies are definitely closer to New York than to Mississippi.

Most AFDC families are one-parent families. This was true of approximately 87 percent of the families in New York and in Nebraska and 80 percent of those in the United States as a whole. For Mississippi it was true of only 74 percent. New York and Nebraska have the AFDC-U provisions which allow for the inclusion of an unemployed male parent but Mississippi does not. On the other hand, in 24 percent of the households in Mississippi there was no adult recipient of AFDC, meaning that

the child lived with someone other than a parent. This was true in ten percent of the families in Nebraska and in only about four percent of the families in the state of New York.

Table 5
The Status of AFDC Families in Three States on Six
Selected Variables

	Percent Rent Free	Percent in None-Maternal Home	Born in State	Percent Illegitimate	Percent Mothers Employed	Percent Rural
New York	5.8	15.9	33.2	36.7	9.5	1.2
Nebraska	3.3	22.9	56.3	26.4	24.6	13.0
Mississippi	30.3	53.8	86.5	44.5	31.2	53.7

Source: Table 12, p. 29, Findings of the 1973 AFDC Study, Part II-A and Table 10, Findings of the 1973 AFDC Study, Part 1.

The same pattern was born out in the classification of AFDC families by head of household. In the United States as a whole 69.1 percent were headed by a mother. In New York this was true of 84 percent of such families and in Nebraska of 77 percent but in Mississippi only 46.2 percent of the families were headed by a mother. In Mississippi the families were more apt to be headed by a male relative, this being true of 17.4 percent as contrasted to a United States average of 7.1 percent; approximately 5 percent in Nebraska and only 1.5 percent in New York. Other family relatives, presumably grandparents, were also important in Mississippi where approximately 15 percent of the AFDC families were constituted in this fashion as against a United States average of 6.5; about 6 percent in Nebraska and about 3 percent in New York state.

The figures on illegitimacy indicate that this was highest in Mississippi where over 44 percent of the AFDC families had illegitimate children as contrasted to a United States percentage of 31.5 percent; 36.7 percent in New York and only 26.4 in Nebraska. The number of illegitimate children per family was also greatest in Mississippi where 18.5 percent of the AFDC families had three or more illegitimate children. This contrasts with a figure around eight percent for the United States as a whole; about 12 percent in New York and about six percent in Nebraska. Thus AFDC families in Mississippi were more likely to have illegitimate children, to have a larger number of illegitimate children and to have someone other than the mother as head of the household.

The Mississippi AFDC program seems to have supported an older pattern of family life. This is one in which the working mother is a common phenomenon, although her wages may be low; in which illegitimacy is high, and in which relatives other than the mother frequently manifest a willingness to care for needy children. In fact, Mississippi is unique in that less than half of the AFDC families are headed by mothers living in a separate household.

Possible Results of Welfare Reform

Even though there might be a regional differential, perhaps one as great as the differences between states' budgets (\$300 in New York and \$223 in Mississippi in 1973), it is likely that federalization would reduce migration from south to north. More than 70 percent of the New York recipients in 1969 were born outside of the state and a third were born in a southern state. By contrast nearly 87 percent of the Mississippi AFDC mothers were born in the state and most migrants had come from other southern states.⁷

This does not mean that northern welfare problems are primarily caused by a migrant population or that southern Blacks usually are unsuccessful in adjusting to northern urban environment. Indeed, available research indicates that southern Blacks have higher average income levels than those born in the north⁸ and are less likely to be receiving welfare payments, although migrants since 1965 do have slightly high AFDC rate.⁹

The impact of welfare payments on interstate migration is a sensitive issue on which it is impossible to obtain absolute proof. Sometimes an assumption is made that Blacks are fleeing from southern racism and that the size of welfare payments does not constitute a migration incentive. Racism, of course, is not a monopoly of the South and the northern variety may be even more irritating. Further, Blacks like Whites, are attracted by the sun belt. Undoubtedly the prospect of better paid employment is a major factor in migration. Employment, however, is likely to fluctuate and a welfare pattern in which the New York payment is seven times that of Mississippi would certainly discourage a return to the South when unemployment occurs.¹⁰

Although the migrant flow is already greater from North to South than vice versa,¹¹ it seems plausible that a system in which Mississippi welfare payments were approximately equal to those elsewhere would have some effect on deterring migration northward. In spite of the success of migrant adaptation to New York, the migrants do comprise a significant part of the welfare caseload and they do face traumatic adjustments. A further diminution of the migration flow would restrict the New York labor supply, but it might also decrease the number of welfare clients. On the other hand, if Mississippi women find that they can get either remunerative jobs or adequate welfare in their home state they are likely to remain in Mississippi and to find fewer difficulties than they would encounter as migrants.

Any federalized program, including the Carter proposal, will raise substantially the incomes of poor families in states at all similar to Mississippi and in the process wipe out the last remnants of white paternalism still found in rural areas (see Table 5). With higher cash grants both the extended family and white planters would be less inclined to assist actual or potential AFDC families. The extended family pattern in which AFDC recipients live with other relatives is also likely to diminish. The AFDC family would be more likely to approximate the New York family in which the typical household consists only of mother and children living in rented quarters, with the mother not working. Although with the rise in grants there would probably be more demand to pay for housing and less assistance from extended family, it is also probably that the level of living in AFDC households would rise to a significant extent.

There is a strong presumption that a significant rise in payments to Mississippi AFDC families would result in a reluctance of women to accept available jobs.

As a matter of fact, this was one of the findings in the Wilkinson and Ross assessment of a demonstration project involving higher grants for AFDC recipients in two rural Mississippi counties,¹² and was also the result in similar experiments in other states where the increase in welfare payments was smaller than would be true in Mississippi and where the available jobs were more remunerative.¹³

Most welfare reform proposals include administrative provisions to force welfare recipients to work. Such provisions may satisfy the moral conviction that idleness should be penalized but they have proved ineffective whenever they have been utilized. This would undoubtedly also be true in Mississippi where the ratio of welfare payments to earned income is higher than in most states. Mary Sanger has summarized studies dealing with the effect of the size of welfare payments on work effort and concluded that the disincentive to work has more effect on the lowest income households and more effect on women than on men.¹⁴ Since Mississippi has the lowest income in the country the disincentive effect of increased welfare payments would be expected to be even stronger there than elsewhere. Larger AFDC payments would probably attract a large number of both Black and White mothers. If the proportion of both races receiving AFDC approximated the New York percentages, this would nearly double the Mississippi total (see Table 2).

CHART 2

Current and Predicted Status of AFDC Families in Mississippi

Current AFDC Program in Mississippi	Predicted Effects of Carter's Program in Mississippi
Grants far below the "needs" level.	Grants will approximate the "needs" level.
Majority of AFDC children live in extended family households.	Majority of AFDC children will live in mother-headed households.
30% of AFDC families get free rent.	Free rent will diminish along with other types of white paternalism.
31.2% of the AFDC mothers employed.	Employment of AFDC mothers will decrease.
Substantial tendency to move to northern states.	Low income population will stabilize in Mississippi and some may return from northern states.
Only 14.6% of the Black population are receiving AFDC compared to 24.4% in New York	Proportion of population on welfare will increase.
44% of AFDC children are illegitimate.	Illegitimacy will remain the same or increase.

Conclusions

The involvement of Mississippi in a national welfare reform which would bring approximately uniform payments across the nation with no more than cost of living variation, would have striking effects. It would raise the economic level of Black mothers and children, and it would diminish the flow of Black emigration from Mississippi to industrial states. Among Blacks it would also raise the economic position of the unmarried or separated mother in relation to either the married woman or employed man. At the same time it would probably weaken the cohesiveness of the extended family since mothers and children would now have the resources to maintain a separate household. Evidence from both Mississippi and other states indicates that a higher level of welfare payment reduces the willingness to seek and accept employment, thus decreasing the economic productivity of both the individuals involved and the state as a whole.

Reaction to these changes will vary according to value premises and there are some who will not see higher living levels for welfare recipients as a clear gain. Piven and Cloward maintain that welfare payments which are kept low or made difficult to secure, tend to depress the wages of the bottom strata of workers.¹⁵ Certainly the level of welfare payments in Mississippi is consistent with its reputation as a state with low labor costs. Presumably housewives who profit from cheap domestic help and farmers or industrialists seeking lower labor costs would be disturbed by any effort to raise welfare payments. However, most others would applaud the effect of increased welfare in raising lower income Mississippians above the level of extreme poverty.

While the lineup on this issue is fairly clear, the reaction to some of the latent changes involved in welfare reform is likely to be more confused. These changes would result from the degree of economic independence which higher welfare payments would give the Black woman of Mississippi. The Black woman would no longer be dependent on the extended family, the labor market, White paternalism or a husband. In an era which has a general emphasis on women's rights, such increased female independence is likely to be seen as a social gain. In at least one respect it might even be seen as strengthening family life since women who reject low paid employment will be able to stay home and care for their children. In this case increased protection for children would be balanced against the loss of productivity due to a decreased labor force and whatever harm is felt to result from greater dependence on welfare.

Even more difficult to evaluate are the changes which might come about in the position of the welfare recipient compared to either the working woman or the Black male. Unless the work ethic is totally discounted, it is hard to be enthusiastic about a system which would enable the welfare recipient to get more than twice as much as the average working woman. Likewise, it is disturbing to the male parent's sense of responsibility when welfare payments equal his own earnings. These factors also operate in New York and Nebraska but to a much lesser degree than they would in Mississippi, given welfare reform.

Mississippi is the poorest state in the Union with a per capita income more than 30 percent below the national average. What we are considering is the extension to Mississippi of welfare standards similar to those of the rest of the nation while leaving the rest of the Mississippi economy essentially changed. Such a move may be preferable to a continuation of the present pattern in which much of the

Mississippi population live in dire poverty. However, placing the welfare recipient in an economic position greatly superior to many of the fully employed would alter relationships with resultant strains on family functioning.

An alternative plan of action might concentrate on general economic development in Mississippi rather than focusing primarily on welfare reform. Such economic development would raise living levels across the board and by increasing the demand for labor would be especially helpful to the lowest income strata. Further, if economic growth were greatly increased, then welfare payments similar to the national standard would be seen as giving normal care to welfare recipients rather than setting them apart as a privileged group. In the context of rapid economic development an approximation of national welfare standards by Mississippi would be a logical step. In the absence of a generally improved state economy, the introduction of higher welfare levels in Mississippi would have a tendency to weaken or at least modify the extended family, to weaken the work ethic, to work against the formation and preservation of two-parent families, and to increase the stigma of inferiority already endured by many Black males.

In summary, while the application of nationwide welfare standards to Mississippi would raise the economic level of those now covered by AFDC it might also stimulate other changes more controversial in nature. A general pattern of economic development which would bring the Black population of the state closer to the national level would be less socially disruptive. However, it is far more difficult to bring about a diffused economic growth than to simply raise welfare payments. Hence, there is reason to believe that eventually, and probably in the fairly near future, the dissonance caused by a 7 to 1 variation of AFDC grants between Mississippi and the most prosperous states will be ended by legislation bringing a greater degree of uniformity in welfare payments.

Footnotes

1. "Welfare in America and Europe," Editorial Research Reports, p. 936, Volume 11, No. 22, 1977. Published by Congressional Quarterly, Inc.
2. Ibid., p. 936.
3. Ibid., p. 936.
4. Findings of the 1973 ADC Study, DHEW Publications No. (SRS) 74-03764, NCSS Report ADCC-1 (73), Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201.

This study provides far more detailed data than is usually available and is a principal source in this article. The grants have moved up a bit in recent years but the relationship between states is still about the same. Since most data are from the 1973 study, they will not be comparable to the 1977 data in Table 1.

5. Janowitz, Barbara, "The Impact of AFDC on the Illegitimate Birth Rate," Journal of Marriage and the Family 38:485-494, August 1976.
6. "Welfare a Surprising Test," Time, November 27, 1978, pp. 33-34.
7. Statement on migration is based on data in Table 34, Findings of the 1969 AFDC Study, Part 1, Demographic and Program Characteristics.
8. Long, Larry H. and Lynne R. Heltema, "Migration and Income Differences Between Blacks and White Men in the North," American Journal of Sociology 80:1395, May 1975.
9. Long, Larry H. "Poverty Status and the Receipt of Welfare among Migrants and Non-Migrants in Large Cities," American Sociological Review 39:47-53, February 1974.
10. Cebula, R.J., "Migration and Welfare," Kyklos, 30:691-698, No. 4, 1977.
11. Hansen, Niles, "Does the South Have a Stake in Northern Urban Poverty?" Southern Economic Journal, 45:1220-4, April 1979.
12. Wilkinson, Kenneth P. and Ross, Peggy J., "Evaluation of the Mississippi AFDC Experiment," Social Service Review, September 1973, pp. 363-77.
13. B. Cogan, "Negative Income Taxation and Labor Supply: New Evidence from the New Jersey-Pennsylvania Experiment." Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation, R-2155-HEW, February 1978.

D. Keeley, M.C.; Robins, P.K.; West, R.W.; The Labor Supply Effects and Costs of Alternative Negative Income Tax Programs: Evidence from the Seattle and Denver Income Maintenance Experiments. Part I and Part II, Menlo Park, Calif.: Center for the Study of Welfare Policy, Stanford Research Institute, May 1977.
14. Sanger, Mary Bryna, Welfare of the Poor, Academic Press, New York, 1979, pp. 40-47.
15. Cloward, Richard A. and Frances Fox Piven, "Reaffirming the Regulation of the Poor," Social Service Review, 16:31-35, November 1968.