

## Motherhood and Agency

---

### American Welfare Rights Activists' Resistance to State Control over Sexuality and Reproduction

*This paper explores ways that mothers who were active in the Welfare Rights Movement in the United States during the 1960s and 1970s, used their activism to resist state and local efforts to control reproductive choice and sexuality. Oral history and archival analysis are utilized to examine the ways that mother-activists resisted state attempts at defining proper motherhood and sexuality for poor mothers on welfare. Sources include twelve oral history interviews conducted with black and white women who were involved in welfare rights activism in the United States, and who were either poverty class recipients of welfare benefits or middle class supporters. Other sources include historical documents and collections at four separate archives in the United States. Results indicate that while race and class intersected in state and local policy, mothers—both black and white, and poverty and middle class—resisted this control. This paper outlines examples of state attempts at control, paying close attention to how race and class intersected gender in these attempts, and also examines the ways that women activists both acquiesced to and resisted these constructions of proper motherhood and sexuality in varying ways, depending on their own social locations.*

The American Welfare Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s was a movement that emphasized the rights of poor mothers. Although the movement was focused on mothers who were receiving public welfare benefits, it also involved the participation of middle class women. This paper presents the experiences of mothers who participated in this movement in the city of Detroit and in Southeast Michigan during the 1960s and 1970s. It examines their attempts to actively resist state control over their own sexuality and reproductive lives as mothers, and to protest against stereotypical assumptions about race, class,

and proper mothering in the United States. Although all women during this time period were exposed to certain societal assumptions about proper women, mothers, and their sexuality, mother-activists in this movement who were receiving welfare benefits were under more intense levels of surveillance and thus their sexuality was scrutinized in a different way. I argue that race and class intersected gender in both the policies that were designed to control women's reproduction and in the ways that women in the welfare rights movement responded to these attempts.

## The Study

Oral histories were conducted with twelve women who participated in the welfare rights movement between 1964 and 1972. African American and white women who were poor, middle class or working class at the time of their participation were included. A snowball sampling method was used to locate participants, using information obtained from key informants chosen for their leadership roles in the movement. Initially, a former legal-aid attorney for local welfare rights groups was contacted. He provided several names of those who were active members of welfare rights groups in the 1960s and 1970s. These individuals were contacted, and subsequently gave the names of other women. Names of women who had been leaders in the movement were also located in the organizational documents from the various historic archives visited, and contacts were made with these women. The mothers in the study were either receiving welfare at the time of their activism (thus referred to as "recipient" welfare rights members) or were not receiving public benefits at the time (referred to as "friends" of welfare rights). A basic description of oral history participants is listed in Table 1.

Most of the participants interviewed first became involved in welfare rights organizing in the middle to late 1960s and all continued their involvement throughout the 1970s. Most were in their thirties and 40s when they were involved, and all were mothers with an average of 3.83 children each. None of the women who were receiving welfare benefits at the time of their activism had a husband or partner living with them, and all of the women who were non-recipient "friends" of welfare rights members had husbands living with them at the time.

## The National Welfare Rights Movement

Jocelyn Hubbard, a leader in the state level Welfare Rights Organization for Michigan, provides an example of the mindset of the mother-activists in the Welfare Rights Movement in her testimony at a local hearing in 1972:

I am an expert on poverty. I have been poor all my life. I was born poor and black and unless things change a lot in this country I'm going to die the same way. Every day I live with this knowledge. Every day I see, feel, taste, smell and touch the poverty of my people and my community, Every day I live with the knowledge that you want us poor—just in case you need your bedpans emptied, your shirts ironed, your yards mowed, your houses cleaned and your children tended—and just in case General Motors should need some cheap and temporary help. You brought my people to this country to use our men for labor and our women for housework and pleasure, and little has changed. Today my caseworker denies me help with my college expenses because she says that I have a job skill and need no more education. I understand that—after all who will empty the bedpans when I become a nurse? I understand what you are, I understand what you think of me and my people and I know how you intend to continue to use us.<sup>1</sup>

The National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) was the official umbrella organization for the welfare rights movement in the United States. It was most active from 1964–1972, and was established by George Wiley, who was a professor at Syracuse University (Kotz and Kotz). In May of 1966 Wiley left his faculty position and founded the Poverty/Rights Action Center (P/RAC) in Washington, DC, the organization that would later develop into the National Welfare Rights Organization or NWRO (West).

In June of 1966 Wiley worked with welfare rights groups in the state of Ohio to implement a 155 mile “Walk for Adequate Welfare.” The media attention that this march garnered helped support the growth of the National Welfare Rights movement, with more local and state level groups across the U.S. affiliating with NWRO afterward (Gilbert). Although this officially marked the beginning of a national movement for welfare rights, many welfare recipients had already been informally gathering and organizing in various cities across the United States (Abramovitz).

### **Poor Peoples’ or Mothers’ Movement?**

While some scholars have referred to the welfare rights movement as a poor people’s movement (Kotz and Kotz; Piven and Cloward) more recent scholarship has acknowledged that it was very much a movement focused on poor mothers (Abramovitz; Nadasen; Kornbluh). Although the NWRO’s leader was an African American male, the welfare rights movement was very much a movement made up of mothers on public assistance. In August of 1967,

**Table 1. Oral History Participants**

Pseudonym	Welfare Rights Member Type	Race	Class	Gender
Anita	friend	white	middle class	female
Delores	recipient	black	poverty class	female
Patricia	friend	white	middle class	female
Anna	friend	white	middle class	female
Martha	friend	white	u. middle class	female
Ruth	friend	white	middle class	female
June	friend	black	working class	female
Victoria	recipient	white	poverty class	female
Evelyn	friend	black	middle class	female
Gladys	recipient	black	poverty class	female
Vivian	recipient	black	poverty class	female
Helen	recipient	black	poverty class	female

NWRO held its first national convention in Washington, DC, with 300 delegates attending, from 26 states. During that first convention there was much discussion and debate about the appropriate rules for the organization, as well as voting on delegates. Throughout much of this debate George Wiley was heard very little, only offering occasional suggestions about procedures. At one point, Johnnie Tillmon, an African American mother receiving welfare, from California, who would eventually be elected chair of the NWRO, addressed the

group. She spoke in a commanding voice, telling the group of mothers who were questioning Wiley's role that,

*George Wiley does not run this organization, we run the organization, George has to do what we say.*<sup>2</sup>

The internal struggle for control that occurred both within the NWRO and the movement as a whole was primarily between the non-recipient activists who were involved, and the mothers on welfare who were the core focus of the movement (Nadasen). Because the movement was particularly interested in AFDC policy (aid to families with dependent children), most of the women recipients involved were mothers who were raising their children alone. They referred to themselves as “the mothers,” and even in cases where men—or women without children—were involved in organizing attempts, they would still refer to their group as “the mothers.”<sup>3</sup> Thus, much of the rhetoric that was used to promote their cause emphasized mothering and the needs of their children. Sociologist Nancy A. Naples has called the drive to social action that comes from one's mothering experiences *activist mothering* (Naples). This activist mothering was very much utilized within the welfare rights movement. Most of the non-recipient women who joined the movement as “friends” of welfare rights were themselves mothers—coming to the movement in many cases through their own experiences of mothering.

This was clear in my oral history interview with Anna, a 73-year-old white, middle-class woman who had been a member of a “friends” group in Detroit, Michigan during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Anna told me a story about how she had first become involved in helping mothers on welfare after she realized that in her own children's school gym classes there were many children not allowed to participate because they could not afford to buy gym shoes. She was shocked that such a thing could be occurring in her own community, and admitted to never having thought about this need before it was brought to her attention by one of her own children. She claimed that she then felt driven to help the mothers of these children, as she could not imagine how difficult it must be to go through such poverty herself. Although both middle class and poverty class women were drawn to the movement through their mothering work, there were differences in the ways that race and class intersected in the policies designed to control mothering and reproduction for poor women on welfare.

### **Welfare Policy, Mothers, and Sexuality**

During the post World War II years white women in the United States were

warned not to enter the paid work force, since it was believed that working outside the home would cause problems for their children (Solinger 1999). Popular magazines of the day as well as many psychiatrists, presented negative views of work and self-sufficiency for white middle class women, and advocated dependency on men. The strength of racial assumptions led to a different belief about black women in the workforce. African American and poor women's children were not portrayed as being psychologically damaged by their mother's necessity of working outside the home. In fact, African American and poor women were not given the same opportunity for dependency as white middle class women (Solinger 1999). The issue of dependency was seen in a positive light for middle class white women, and viewed negatively for poor African American women in the United States.

Mothers' employment was also treated quite contradictorily within the welfare program known as AFDC (Abramovitz). The stated purpose of AFDC was to allow mothers without male support to stay home to care for their children. The reality was quite the opposite as work incentives were built into the policy as poor women, particularly poor women of color, on AFDC became more stigmatized (Gordon). Welfare rights members resisted work incentives most of the time. A NWRO document from 1969 called for the elimination of a work incentive program because it "forced mothers to work when they were needed full time to care for their children."<sup>4</sup> The message of the mother-activists in the welfare rights movement was that mothers on welfare should be able to stay home and care for their children just as white middle class mothers had been encouraged to do for decades. In response to the question of whether women worked outside the home during that time period, a white middle class "friend" in this study, Patricia, replied,

*Mothering was considered something you should do. That was your first job.*

Indeed, the ability to be a mother, and to be entitled to support to care for your child, was at the core of the movement's goals. Control over mothering choices underpinned the demands for economic support. When welfare rights participants went into the streets to protest, it was for basic necessities for their children, such as school clothing, kitchen stoves, and refrigerators. For women on welfare, the choice to have and support their children was just as salient as the choice not to have children. However, "recipients" also had much at stake in how the public viewed their mothering. The process of receiving public assistance meant that they were under more surveillance than their middle class supporters, and were subjected to intrusive policies designed to assert control over their own sexuality.

During the 1960s and 1970s, AFDC welfare policy in the United States

contained harsh sanctions. “Man in the House” rules and “Suitable Homes” policies allowed public welfare officials to terminate assistance for women suspecting of having a man in the house, or for women who had children out of wedlock (Neubeck and Cazenave). Welfare recipients involved in welfare rights organizing were put on the defensive by these sanctions, and had to actively resist negative portrayals of their mothering.

### Activism and Resistance

Recipients in the welfare rights movement were motivated in part by the need to combat the stigma and poor treatment they received as welfare mothers. Gladys, an African American “recipient” in the study explained,

*I heard about it [welfare rights], I had heard about the organization, so one day I decided to go to the meeting. And ... I liked it, and that's how I got involved. It was ... teachin' us about how bad the [welfare] workers were. And how they were treating us. You know? And that we had a right to live just like anybody else. (Gladys)*

Detroit based welfare rights mother-activists engaged in many demonstrations and protests within the city, as well as at the state capitol. Welfare rights members occupied the county level Department of Social Services headquarters in order to protest the small school clothing allowance for their children (\$22, U.S., a year, as opposed to the women's demands for \$75 yearly) leading to more than 59 arrests and the temporary closing of the Department of Social Services office.<sup>5</sup> The fact that poor children weren't getting what middle class children were getting, was something they deemed worth fighting for.

Although Detroit was seen as a leader in the development of anti-poverty initiatives during this time period,<sup>6</sup> with much of the programs aimed at job training, services for youth, and structural issues, an early program aimed at poor mothers, focused instead on helping them become better homemakers. A 1965 article in the *Detroit News* spoke glowingly about a program that trained middle class women to go into poor women's homes and assist them in learning how to cook, make curtains, restore furniture, do better grooming, and learn about money management. The article stated that the program “...is based on the belief that poor home environment helps perpetuate poverty in succeeding generations.”<sup>7</sup> This program, which reflected the general public's perception of bad parenting and homemaking skills amongst the poor, contributed to the ideology that permitted welfare policy to contain mechanisms for surveillance of women's personal lives and choices.

## Welfare and Reproductive Control

Assumptions about poor mothers' sexuality were routinely involved in denials of welfare benefits or in termination of cases. Before welfare rights groups and their demands for fair hearings were an established force in Detroit, many of the letters to the mayor's office and subsequently forwarded on to the City of Detroit Department of Public Welfare complained of having cases terminated or denied based on allegations of illegitimacy.<sup>8</sup> A 1964 letter states that a woman was denied assistance because she had a "continued pattern of promiscuity" and "continued intimacy" with the father of two of her children (whom she was not married to). The communication from both the mayor's office and the Department of Public Welfare in this case pointed out her possible support from the man she was currently involved with as a reason for termination.<sup>9</sup>

In another letter from 1964, the explanation for case termination was the woman's illegal co-habitation, since she had re-married without properly divorcing her first husband.<sup>10</sup> Another case termination was explained by a woman having five illegitimate children and a man found in her house.<sup>11</sup> All were seen as legitimate reasons for termination of welfare benefits. A letter written by an African American woman complained that her welfare benefits were terminated because her sister's caseworker had seen her with the white man that she had been dating, who was also the father of her child. In this woman's view she had been reported not only because she was seeing a man, but because she was seeing a white man. Her case was eventually reinstated, but only after the State of Michigan's Department of Social Welfare was certain that she was cooperating with eligibility requirements and no longer seeing the man in question.<sup>12</sup> The fact that she had to submit to the state's perception of what a "good" single mother was (one who does not date men—and certainly not men of a different race) illustrates the attempts at control of poor mothers' sexuality.

When oral contraceptives first became available in 1960, there was much discussion by policy makers and service providers about whether or not their distribution to poor women should be supported (Solinger 2000). Much of this debate reflected fears that supporting the distribution of oral contraceptives would give an impression of approval of promiscuity or, that lack of support would lead to an increase in illegitimate births to African American poor women. A fear of African American illegitimacy and a view of African American women as sexually promiscuous pervaded the ambivalence around contraception.

Letters to the Detroit mayor's office during 1964 discussed the provision of birth control advice to welfare recipients. Letter writers often identified themselves as "taxpayers" and most were actually in support of providing advice on



birth control to poor women. One stated that although he was Catholic he still felt that “something had to be done” and that birth control should be given to women on welfare.<sup>13</sup> It is unlikely that this “taxpayer” represented a liberated view of women and their ability to have control over their reproductive choices, but rather his fear of poor black women on welfare having more children.

The issue of birth control for welfare recipients was a point of contention between the state of Michigan and the city of Detroit during the mid 1960s. A February 16, 1965, article in the *Detroit News* indicated that the Michigan Catholic Conference was requesting that the state level birth control policy be limited so that social workers would be forbidden from initiating conversations about birth control or making referrals for women on welfare to receive birth control.<sup>14</sup> In Detroit, the city welfare commission had adopted a liberal policy that allowed case workers to initiate conversations about birth control and family planning with welfare recipients. However, in spite of this policy, it was noted that in working with *single* women, “...it should be recognized that family planning or limitation should not in itself be viewed as resolving the basic problem.”<sup>15</sup> The “problem” for unmarried women on welfare was not defined by policymakers and the general public as a lack of birth control, but rather as promiscuity and illegitimate children—which they saw as connected to poverty.

Although the Detroit policy was seen as liberal by the press and public since it allowed for a discussion of birth control, and although many of the letters to the Mayor’s office took a stance that birth control should be offered to women on welfare, it is important to examine the racialized and sexualized assumptions of these positions. According to a February 1965 study of low-income households in Detroit conducted by Greenleigh Associates, 83.7 percent of those on public assistance at the time were black, and 15.9 percent were white (0.4 percent indicated “other”).<sup>16</sup> The definition of the real “problem” for women on welfare occurred through the intersection of racist, sexist, and classist stereotypes of poor black women as promiscuous. A compromise on birth control was reached during the summer of 1965 when the Michigan state level Department of Social Services allowed caseworkers to inform recipients of the availability of birth control only when requested by recipients themselves. It also mandated that all city and county policies be revised in order to conform to the new requirements.<sup>17</sup> The birth control controversy in Detroit strongly illustrates the way state policies impacted women’s everyday lives, attempting to assert control over poor women of color in particular.

## The Complexities of Resistance

Although the “friends” worked alongside “recipients” in the welfare rights

movement to fight for certain rights to equality and access to a decent standard of living for welfare mothers and their children; race, class, and sexuality intersected in their activism. While the “friends” in this study indicated that poor mothers (as well as all women) should have the right to control their own sexuality, they also evidenced conflicted beliefs and assumptions about women on welfare. When pointing out stereotypes about welfare mothers’ sexuality, they also indicated their own assumptions. Anna, a white middle class “friend,” talked about the abolishment of the “man in the house” rule and the intersection of sexuality,

*I remember when there was litigation around that. I think it is subtle, but it has always been there. Like, the very people that would rage against contraception ... would say, “Why are you havin’ these kids anyway?” Or there was a certain view that you were dealing with promiscuous women.... [After a pause she continued] I also think that women worked the streets a little bit, because they didn’t have food for their kids. And I don’t just believe that because, it’s sort of dramatic or something. I believe that it happened. Exactly how is it, if you have no car, and no skills, you’re supposed to survive? You either attach yourself to some male who can help you, or you are on the streets essentially. So, I think that sexuality has ALWAYS been in there. I think that it has been a way of controlling women. I think that our really ... difficult and impressive [public] assistance systems, indeed have been a way to control women and their sexuality, which is a threat to a lotta people. (Anna)*

Although Anna stated that public assistance programs in general had always contained egregious attempts to control women’s sexuality, she also indicated her belief that poor women on welfare may be more likely to prostitute themselves for basic necessities. Thus she simultaneously resisted and reinforced the negative ideology about poor mothers. As a white, middle class, mother, Anna, did indicate the belief that all women were being controlled through a lack of access to birth control; but she also reinforced the stereotypes about poor black mothers on welfare as promiscuous.

Evelyn, an African American middle-class “friend,” talked about gender and sexuality within the movement, indicating her own ambivalence about black women on welfare. Although she claimed to be opposed to the common stereotypes that even she herself had to battle to some extent based on her own social location as an African American woman, she was also conflicted,

*And then there were some people, just because of the bias or the stupidity ... that thought they had ... you know, “They all have boyfriends.” And*

*I told somebody, I said 'You know, if they do have [boy] friends ... then they aren't the ones that are in the group.' And that's the truth. The ones that came to the welfare movement, the ones that were working with us—there weren't boyfriends waitin' in the car to take them someplace. There weren't boyfriends at the homes when we called. I said, "There are people on welfare that have boyfriends, because the system won't let 'em be together and still get support for their children..." but the ones that were doin' that, weren't coming to the group. (Evelyn)*

Evelyn's views provide an example of how women in the movement both actively resisted the ideology around proper motherhood, but also simultaneously succumbed to it. The pervasive representation of poor black welfare recipients as needing to have their sexuality controlled was something that all women were exposed to.

In contrast, Martha, a white upper middle-class "friend," saw her work on behalf of poor mothers as only connected to women's need for reproductive choice.

*Because I saw so MANY poor women just dragged down by having these GIGANTIC families to take care of ... I became a BIG advocate for abortion rights.... I just can't see a poor mother being forced to have another BABY just because her husband is amorous or something. I just ... I just think it's wrong....*

Martha felt that her role as a mother-activist within this movement was to promote the ability of poor women to control the number of children they had, not necessarily to prevent them from having any children, and that this would prevent further poverty. She herself had a large family, but acknowledged that the material safety provided by her own upper middle class status was what allowed her to have this choice, and that poor women had much less choice. She clearly viewed the problem of poverty for mothers as connected to access to birth control and abortion, not necessarily portraying poor women as more promiscuous. However, while Martha did acknowledge her class status as connected to her own choices to have a large family, she did not admit to her own racial privilege. As a white mother with a large family she was not subjected to the same societal assumptions and levels of criticism as a black mother with a large family would have been, regardless of class.

As these examples illustrate, in some cases the middle class mothers in the welfare rights movement succumbed to the same stereotypes they were simultaneously fighting against. Even as they fought alongside poor mothers

to resist the negative images of welfare mothers, race and class impacted the ways that “friend” and “recipient” activism differed.

Gladys, an African American “recipient” in the study, provides an example of the different forms that women’s resistance to state control over their sexuality encompassed. It was sometimes not as simple as claiming the right to planned motherhood through birth control access. Here she spoke about her difficulty finding and securing birth control and her subsequent involuntary sterilization,

*And the minute I got here.... The stuff that I was usin' in the South to keep me from getting pregnant, when I got here, I couldn't find it! So I got pregnant! But after I had my child, the doctor came in, and he said ... I was too weak to have the baby, because they had to do a Cesarean and correct a hernia.... So ... he came in that evening, after he did the surgery. And he asked me, you know, how many children I had. I said, “Well I got three now.” He said, “You want any more?” I said, “No, I didn't want the last one.” And he said, “Well, I'm gonna tell you somethin'; I let myself be allowed to—you can sue me—I tied your tubes.” He said, “Because if you have another child it's gonna kill you.” I said, “You know what? If I could I would get up and hug your neck. Cause that was the best thing in the world you EVER could've done to me was tie my tubes.” (Gladys)*

Gladys relayed this experience as having a positive outcome, since her fear of a future unplanned pregnancy was solved through her sterilization. However, the reality is that her consent for the sterilization was never obtained. The fact that she struggled to find access to birth control on a regular basis before she became pregnant with her third child, and that the sterilization was done without her knowledge or consent, illustrates the ways that her own race and class status intersected with gender in her access to birth control and power over her own sexuality. Gladys represents the real life struggles of welfare mothers during this time period, whose lives existed within a broader public debate about their “rights” to have control over their own sexuality.

## Conclusion

The activist-mothers involved in the welfare rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s fought against raced, classed, and gendered assumptions about their daily lives and particularly their mothering. Although both the middle class mothers of the movement and the poor mothers receiving welfare benefits resisted these assumptions, both groups also succumbed to negative ideology on occasion. The reality that poor mother’s lives existed within high levels of surveillance from the welfare system, meant that at times they had no choice

but to accept services that were presented within this context. Examples include a lack of access to birth control that may result in an unauthorized sterilization viewed positively, and the need to follow welfare department guidelines about “men in the house” in order to continue to receive needed benefits to support your children. Mothers in the welfare rights movement actively resisted attempts at state control over their own sexuality by taking to the streets in activist strategies. However, they also simultaneously acquiesced to hegemonic assumptions by claiming titles such as “Mrs.”—even if they were divorced, separated, or single—in an effort to fit current images of legitimate mothers.

Middle class mothers who participated in the movement as “friends” of welfare rights also both resisted and succumbed to state efforts at control. They engaged in activism for poor mothers’ rights to economic support, and many also connected their efforts to broader reproductive rights issues. However, they too were susceptible to egregious images of poor women, and particularly poor women of color. As Evelyn’s statement about the distinctions between the appropriate type of welfare mother and the “ones with boyfriends” indicates, perceptions about poor mother’s sexuality were fraught, even within the movement itself.

The women of the welfare rights movement provide an example of mothers from differing social locations coming together to actively resist the state’s attempt at control over their lives, their mothering, and their sexuality, while fighting for economic rights. It also provides an example of how complicated that resistance was, as it was conducted within a strong ideological framework regarding proper mothers, race, class, and gender in the United States. Victoria, a white “recipient” in the study, explained why poor mothers risked further public scrutiny by becoming highly visible as activists in this movement,

*Well other-wise, nothing changes. If nobody knows, nothing changes.*

<sup>1</sup>Joycelyn Hubbard, testimony given at a hearing on federal welfare reform legislation at the city-county building, Detroit, sponsored by the Leadership Conference for Welfare Reform, January 17, 1972, Oakland County-Michigan Welfare Rights Organization, organizational files from 1968-1972, Private Collection, Farmington, Michigan.

<sup>2</sup>National Welfare Rights Organization, “First Convention”, tape recording of National Welfare Rights Organization’s first convention held August 26-27 of 1967 in Washington, D.C, afternoon plenary session of August 26, 1967, George A. Wiley Papers, reel 22-part I of side one, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

<sup>3</sup>Interview with Ruth, white, middle class leader of a “friends of welfare rights” group in Detroit, Michigan. Oral history interview conducted on September 9, 2005, in Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>4</sup>NWRO, “Help Fight Workfare,” newsletter, September, 1969, Welfare Fighter, vertical files, Labadie Collection, The University of Michigan-Ann Arbor.

<sup>5</sup>Commission on Community Relations, “Demonstrations by National Welfare Rights Organization,” memo to field staff, Sept. 15, 1969, Detroit Commission on Community Relations- Human Rights Dept. Collection: Part 3, 1940-1984 box 78, folder 28, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>6</sup>Mayor of Fort Worth, Texas, letter to Mayor Cavanaugh congratulating him on city-wide initiatives and asking for a model of how he developed these programs, December 4, 1964, Cavanaugh Collection, box 178, folder 16, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>7</sup>Judy Rose, “Fight the Cycle of Poverty: Train to Help Homemakers,” article in the *Detroit News*, Wednesday, March 24, 1965, Cavanaugh Collection, box 264, folder 10, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>8</sup>Complaints by individual citizens of Detroit, various letters to Mayor Cavanaugh’s Office, 1964, Cavanaugh Collection, box 151, folders 7, and 15-28, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>9</sup>Mayor Cavanaugh’s Office and Detroit Department of Public Welfare, correspondence between offices regarding a citizen denied public assistance, 1964, Cavanaugh Collection, box 151, folder 21, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>10</sup>Detroit Department of Public Welfare, letter to citizen whose welfare benefits were terminated, 1964, Cavanaugh Collection, box 151, folder 28, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>11</sup>Detroit Department of Public Welfare, letter to Mayor’s Office explaining why a citizen’s welfare benefits were terminated, 1964, Cavanaugh Collection, box 151, folder 28, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>12</sup>A Detroit citizen, letter to Mayor Cavanaugh’s Office complaining of termination of welfare benefits, 1965, Cavanaugh Collection, box 230, folder 5, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>13</sup>A Detroit citizen, letter to Mayor Cavanaugh’s Office in support of giving birth control to welfare recipients, 1964, Cavanaugh Collection, box 151, folder 13, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>14</sup>Jo Ann Hardee, article in the *Detroit News*, February 16, 1965, Detroit Commission on Community Relations – Human Rights Dept. Collection: Part 3, 1940-1984, box 78, folder 27, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>15</sup>The City-County Bureau, article in the *Detroit News*, Wednesday, June 16, 1965, Detroit Commission on Community Relations – Human Rights Dept. Collection: Part 3, 1940-1984, box 78, folder 27, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>16</sup>Greenleigh Associates, New York/Chicago, “Home Interview Study of Low-Income Households in Detroit, Michigan,” report, February, 1965, Cavanaugh Collection, box 249, folder 11, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

<sup>17</sup>Robert L. Pisor, “Welfare Board OK’s Birth Control Policy,” article in the *Detroit News*, August 31, 1965, Detroit Commission on Community Relations – Human Rights Dept. Collection: Part 3, 1940-1984, box 78, folder 27, W.P. Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

## References

- Abramovitz, Mimi. *Under Attack, Fighting Back: Women and Welfare in the United States*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1996. Print.
- Gordon, Linda. *Pitied But Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare 1890- 1935*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1994. Print.
- Gilbert, Melissa R. “From the ‘Walk for Adequate Welfare’ to the ‘March for our Lives’: Welfare Rights Organizing in the 1960s and 1990s.” *Urban Geography* 22.5 (2001): 440-56. Print.
- Kotz, Nick, and Mary Lynn Kotz. 1977. *A Passion for Equality: George Wiley and the Movement*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1977. Print.
- Kornbluh, Felicia. *The Battle for Welfare Rights: Politics and Poverty in Modern America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Print.
- Nadasen, Premilla. 2005. *Welfare Warriors: The Welfare Rights Movement in the United States*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.
- Naples, Nancy A. 1998. *Grassroots Warriors: Activist Mothering, Community Work, and the War on Poverty*. New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.
- Neubeck, Kenneth J., and Noel A. Cazenave. *Welfare Racism: Playing the Race Card Against America’s Poor*. New York: Routledge, 2001. Print.
- Piven, Francis Fox, and Richard Cloward. “The Welfare Rights Movement.” *Poor People’s Movements: Why They Succeed, How they Fail*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979. 264-361. Print.

- Solinger, Rickie. "Dependency and Choice: The Two Faces of Eve." *Unequal Sisters: A Multicultural Reader in U.S. Women's History*. Eds. Vicki L. Ruiz and Ellen Carol DuBois. New York: Routledge, 1999. 607-626. Print.
- Solinger, Rickie. *Wake Up Little Susie: Single Pregnancy Before Roe V. Wade*. New York: Routledge, 2000. Print.
- West, Guida. *The National Welfare Rights Movement: The Social Protest of Poor Women*. New York: Praeger, 1981. Print.