

WELFARE WONDERLAND

The "INSIDE" Story of Welfare Abuses by Belva Detlof (1968)

- [FOREWARD](#)
- [INTRODUCTION](#)
- [CHAPTER 1 - FRAUD: UNPUNISHED AND PROTECTED](#)
- [CHAPTER 2 - PUZZLES, PUZZLES](#)
- [CHAPTER 3 - SUCCESS...OF A SORT](#)
- [CHAPTER 4 - IN THE BEGINNING](#)
- [CHAPTER 5 - PICKPOCKETS FROM MARS](#)
- [CHAPTER 6 - THE FRUIT OF THEIR LOINS](#)
- [CHAPTER 7 - A FAMILY TRADITION](#)
- [CHAPTER 8 - THE GOOD LIFE](#)
- [CHAPTER 9 - MASQUERADE PARTY](#)
- [CHAPTER 10 - THE PROMISED LAND](#)
- [CHAPTER 11 - IT'S MAGIC](#)
- [CHAPTER 12 - A SICK SOCIETY](#)
- [CHAPTER 13 - ANOTHER RAT HOLE](#)
- [CHAPTER 14 - ANYTHING GOES](#)
- [CHAPTER 15 - THE DISADVANTAGED](#)
- [CHAPTER 16 - WELFARE, A WEAPON](#)
- [APPENDIX A - A LITTLE TALK](#)
- [APPENDIX B - "HAVING THE POWER ..."](#)
- [APPENDIX C - COMMENTS BY SENATOR SCHMITZ](#)

Belva Detlof is descended from a long line of American pioneers — some here even before the Revolutionary War. One great-grandfather was killed in the Civil War and a grandfather located his homestead when Indians still were a real and constant danger in Nebraska. This maternal grandfather was a true progressive liberal (now more properly called Libertarian) and he named his daughter (Mrs. Detlof's mother) for Belva Ann Lockwood, twice the Liberal Party candidate for President of the United States in the 1880's. Mrs. Detlof and her husband now live on a secluded 40 acre "ranch" at the intersection of a gully and an old abandoned (very *abandoned*) stage coach road in the Southern foothills of Apple Valley, California.

A position with the Department of Medical Social Services appeared to offer Mrs. Detlof an opportunity to be "helpful to those in need" but she soon learned of far different implications. This book gives the highlights of her experiences and some are real shockers. State Senator John G. Schmitz and his staff have investigated her subject thoroughly over the past year and he states: "The best, most reliable, most unbiased and objective source of information we ever found was Mrs. Belva Detlof...I recommend her book unreservedly to every American who does not want to see a nation of pioneers turn into a nation of parasites."

FOREWARD [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

JOHN G. SCHMITZ
California State Senator

Welfare has become a way of life for millions of Americans. In my own state of California - largest, fastest-growing and most prosperous in the nation — one person in every twelve will be on welfare during 1968.

If one and a half million people in California alone cannot support themselves, or be supported if truly in need by family and relatives, then the human stock which tamed a wilderness has fallen into a sick decay which will make them ripe for plucking by any conqueror, foreign or domestic.

But we have not actually sunk this low. It is not true that one and a half million Californians *cannot* support themselves, or find help from sources other than the taxpayer. The ugly fact is that a large proportion of them *will* not help themselves, because they have found they can get along on what is taken from their fellow citizens by the tax collector and given to them by the welfare bureaucrats without any effort whatsoever on their part.

All the welfare recipient has to do is take his check out of the mail and walk down to the nearest liquor store to cash it. It is an established fact that thousands of welfare checks are cashed in exactly this way.

The bulging welfare rolls in America today do not mean that vast numbers of our people have suddenly become physically and mentally incapable of self-support. They mean that our governments — local, state and federal, but especially federal — have not only tempted people with a life of idleness at the taxpayer's expense, but actually recommended and encouraged that way of life. Welfare bureaucrats and "social workers" have actually acted as *salesmen* of life on the public dole.

The majority of Americans would still indignantly reject life on the dole, by choice, for themselves. But many of them do not want to believe that a significant and growing proportion of their fellow citizens *are* willing to live by choice on public assistance — especially if they can keep it secret from their neighbors.

I introduced a bill in the California legislature in the spring of 1967 to make welfare payment records open to public inspection (only payments, not any personal or confidential information). One of the chief witnesses against it during committee hearings cried melodramatically that she and other welfare recipients, who had formed an organization and hired their own lobbyist, would "rather die than let it be known that they were on welfare." I reminded her that when I was a boy in Wisconsin not so very long ago, people said they would rather die than *go* on welfare. Now they object only to anyone else knowing about it. Their own consciences have ceased to bother them.

It is this attitude which is creating the spiralling growth of welfare in these United States — aided and abetted by the bureaucrats whose jobs depend on the size of their welfare "caseloads," and the professional "bleeding hearts" who profit from evoking the ancient image of the homeless, helpless, friendless waif who stands before us with pleading eyes.

But the days of Charles Dickens the novelist, and his characters like Oliver Twist, are long gone. And it is not needy children who cash those state welfare checks at local liquor stores.

Welfare is one of the biggest businesses in the United States today. It is the second largest category of spending by the State of California — second only to education in a \$5 billion annual budget. It supports an army of tens of thousands of government employees along with the millions who get the welfare checks. It has become so big a business that it is now being unionized. Welfare recipients are actually forming their own unions to demand bigger and more frequent checks and even less supervision by government welfare workers than there is now.

These are the only unions in the country whose members do not work at all, yet demand and get more and more pay and privileges for doing nothing.

The situation may seem incredible, but it is true. My staff and I have investigated it thoroughly over the past year. The best, most reliable, most unbiased and objective source of information we ever found was Mrs. Belva Detlof, formerly on the Staff of the Los Angeles County Welfare Department. She has forgotten more about this "can of worms" than most people have yet learned. I recommend her book unreservedly to every American who does not want to see a nation of pioneers turn into a nation of parasites.

JOHN G. SCHMITZ

Tustin, Calif.

December 22, 1967

INTRODUCTION [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

This inside story of "Welfare" deals with cases in Southern California; but since the guidelines for such operations are fixed in Washington, D.C., all cities and towns in America can point to similar cases, varying only slightly according to the locality. The increasing crime, immorality and corruption associated with these programs might be checked somewhat by better laws, more strictly enforced; but it is doubtful if much permanent decrease can be expected, without a curtailment of governmental welfare programs.

More than a century ago Frederic Bastiat outlined the essential role of government. He showed that organized society is plagued by two grave dangers: *stupid greed* and *false philanthropy*. The true purpose of law, he noted, is to protect all the people; but when law is perverted into legal plunder, either by stupid greed or false philanthropy, the social system is headed for serious trouble. His essay, *The Law* (1), which shows the inevitable consequences of allowing government to develop beyond its proper sphere, should be read thoughtfully by every citizen, and especially by every legislator. Workers in any field, from mining and manufacturing to sales and service, can be classified according to their primary aim. All such groups have two basic types: a) The few who truly aspire to do a job to the best of their ability, and b) The many who seek the most pay for the least work. Certain occupations, especially "welfare service" with its millions of "clients" and its multi-billion dollar budgets, are highly attractive to two other classifications: c) Naive do-gooders, who have the urge to help almost anyone, and are prepared to spend any amount of money (not their own) in the process; and d) Convinced socialists, whose underlying purpose is to change our economic and political system from free-enterprise capitalism under a constitutional ~~democracy~~ republic to a socialistic planned economy.

The socialists can be reclassified according to their tactics or their understanding. Tactically they range from Fabian (2) style socialists, who work gradually, but with stealth and guile, and keep more or less within the law (though they seek diligently to change the laws and the accepted meaning of laws to their advantage); to the Peking type communists who want *revolution now*. The understanding grouping ranges from the few naive idealists who imagine that socialism can eliminate the evils of capitalism and bring forth plenty for all humanity, to the cynical and knowledgeable who fully understand that socialism will reduce both economic wealth and general happiness — but who are so dedicated to the struggle for power that they care little for others, or even for civilization itself. The official communist plan for the U.S.A. has been summarized in Senate Document No. 46 (87th Congress — 1st Session) as:

1. The traditional goal of communism, the conquest of the entire world, is not only reaffirmed but is held far more strongly and hopefully than in the past. It is "unthinkable" that the communists will abandon their goal of world domination, regardless of the price they have to pay. They are willing to pay any price to attain their objective.
 2. The communists probably are honestly convinced that they are invincible.
 - a. because of the alleged predetermination of history,
 - b. because of their combined military-political strength
 - c. because of their anticipated military superiority, and
 - d. because of the anticipated demoralization of the free world.
 3. Communist strategy has become more sophisticated than it was under Stalin.
 4. The communists believe that the final decision in the world struggle, and specifically the victory of world communism, will be attained in the present era of history. (In their conception, this era seems to extend to 1975, approximately.)
 5. Armed struggle is inevitable. Such specific forms of armed struggle as liberation wars, uprisings, and "pressure from below" are also inevitable.
- (6-12 omitted as not directly pertinent to this study)
13. The achievement of a military, political and [psychological paralysis of the free world is a para mount objective of Soviet strategy.
 14. This objective can be attained by such as peace propaganda, Pavlovian conditioning, infiltration, threats and diplomatic negotiations.
 15. Propaganda on disarmament, specifically nuclear disarmament and disarmament negotiations, are an

integral part of the Soviet strategy aimed at paralyzing the free world and strengthening the power of communism.

16. Soviet strategy is based, on the one hand, on achieving optimal military power and building and strengthening communist political armies throughout the free world. On the other hand, Soviet strategy utilizes massive deception to bring about, through

- a. the unilateral military weakening of the free world,
- b. the moral paralysis of free world governments, and
- c. the demoralization of public opinion, the capitulation of the United States.

17. Failing in this strategy, the Soviet intends to destroy the United States by nuclear weapons...

Our tremendous prosperity is based on an extensive division of labor — skilled workers using high production tooling — with practically nobody able to alone supply his own basic needs. This system requires a high general degree of personal integrity. Personal integrity is developed by continued acceptance of individual responsibility (3) and decays where there is no such acceptance of responsibility. Thus it seems likely that our rapidly expanding welfare programs, which relieve more and more people of basic responsibility, are heading us toward a rapid reduction of personal integrity and therefore toward a collapse of our vaunted national prosperity.

It is hoped that readers, mindful of such dangers, can complete this book without blowing a fuse — and by the time they finish will firmly resolve to roll up their sleeves and *do something* to help save our civilization.

-
1. *The Law* was translated and published by the Foundation for Economic Education in 1950 and was republished along with 42 Clichés of Socialism by CAI in 1964. A condensation of *The Law* along with condensations of four other basic books is included in *The Modern Conservative*, the "who", "what" and "why" book of conservatism, published by CAI in 1967. (See pages 249 and 255.)
 2. Fabian socialism is exposed in four recent books: *The Democrat's Dilemma*, by Phillip Crane; *Keynes at Harvard* and *The Great Deceit*, by the Veritas Foundation; and the comprehensive work, *Fabian Freeway*, by Rose L. Martin.
 3. The inherent relationship of Liberty — Responsibility and Integrity is discussed in detail in the two CAI books mentioned in 1.

CHAPTER 1 - FRAUD: UNPUNISHED AND PROTECTED [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

The morning of June 8, 1964, seemed as if it were to be just as ordinary and routine as the many preceding it. At 8:30, however, when I was called into the office of the Medical Director, it became apparent that this day would see many changes.

Even before I was seated, my superior pushed a social case history across her desk at me, and burst out angrily that I had caused a man to lose his job. Her dark eyes were accusing and hostile.

Quickly I glanced at the papers. On top was a routine departmental request form, used to obtain financial information from the employer of a person applying for *free* (1) medical care.

Looking closer, I saw it was attached to the case history of a family that for the past three and a half years had been receiving *free* medical care through our medical aid office. The woman's husband, during all this time, was employed by a well known construction firm.

The details began falling into place for me. Before my first interview with this woman, whom I will call Mrs. Howard (2), I had, as usual, read through the previous entries in the case carefully, including all "statements of resources".

Every time Mrs. Howard applied for *free* medical care, she had stated that her husband earned approximately \$260 net per month, and that the family had no prepaid medical insurance.

It seemed odd that Mr. Howard received such low pay in a usually well paid trade, and was not covered by medical insurance, either through his union or his employer. Because of this, I had questioned Mrs. Howard

more closely. Her story was always the same. Mr. Howard, she insisted, earned only \$260 a month. There was no medical insurance.

Because of the unusual aspects of this story, I decided to call her husband's employer for verification. I explained to Mrs. Howard this was frequently done, but she said it had never happened before in her case. In fact, she seemed surprised and somewhat upset.

When I telephoned Mr. Howard's company, I was referred to an official whom I will call "Mr. Roberts". He was astonished that an employee's wife should have applied for public assistance, representing herself as indigent. I was informed that Mr. Howard earned between \$9,000 and \$10,000 a year and had been earning approximately that amount during every year his family had been provided with tax-paid medical care. Moreover, Mr. Roberts stated that there was excellent prepaid group medical insurance and that both Mr. Howard and his dependents were so covered.

I asked Mr. Roberts if he would be willing to give us this information in writing. He said he'd be glad to fill out one of our inquiry forms.

After talking to Mr. Roberts, I turned to Mrs. Howard and relayed the information to her. It was apparent that she had known the facts all along.

As kindly as possible, I explained that she and her family were not eligible for *free* medical care from the Department of Charities, and that such assistance would have to be discontinued.

Mrs. Howard insisted, however, that she was in urgent need of medical care that very day, and claimed she had absolutely no money to pay for it. The medical insurance, she said, covered out-patient care for Mr. Howard, but not for his family.

Under departmental policy, medical care CANNOT be abruptly discontinued unless an alternate plan is available. Since Mrs. Howard claimed to have no money and no insurance coverage for out-patient care, she would still have to be cared for at county expense, at least temporarily — until proof of income and insurance coverage were obtained in writing.

In the past I had been repeatedly cautioned by supervisors that one day I might "refer someone out" (3) by mistake, and thereby get myself (as they phrased it) "into a lot of trouble."

I knew that the Medical Director would countermand any attempt I might make to "refer this woman out," in spite of the family's ineligibility, so I extended *free* medical care to Mrs. Howard for two weeks, while awaiting a written statement from the company on Mr. Howard's true earnings and medical insurance coverage.

Now, the Howard's case history, with employer's verification of earnings and insurance attached, was angrily thrust at me by the Medical Director!

I read the form received from the construction company. After confirming the man's earnings and full family insurance coverage, Mr. Roberts had added by way of comment: "This man has been ordered to reimburse the County of Los Angeles for all money spent on him and his family for medical care, or he will be terminated."

I then asked my supervisor if she had, indeed, confirmed that Mr. Howard had lost his job. She replied that she had not; but that the "threat" noted on the form was sufficient evidence so far as she was concerned. (Months later, in talking with Mr. Roberts, I learned that Mr. Howard did *not* lose his job and was still employed by the firm!)

In angry and hostile tones, my supervisor stated that I must be "*very, very sick*," to have caused a man to lose his job. I was ordered to take a medical leave of absence...at once.

She paused a moment and shook her head in apparent disbelief. "How *could* you ever do such a thing?", she hissed.

"Furthermore...when or if...*if* you return to work here or in this department, Mrs. Detlof," she continued wrathfully, "there *must not* be more of this *disgraceful* type of activity! When or *if* you return...you will be expected to conform to our policies. We will *never again*, allow you to act in such a distressing manner!"

As my supervisor continued, I thought: "How typical of the Department of Charities in the County of Los Angeles! Because I discover down right *fraud*, my supervisor tells me I am contemptible and penalizes me with a forced leave of absence. Moreover, she warns that if I am unable to overlook such fraud there is no place for me in the department.

"According to my supervisor, I will be a desirable employee *only* if I enter into the social case histories the flimsy, silly, little myths so often spun by applicants (ably assisted by the case workers). The important thing is to be sure to certify *every one* as eligible for medical assistance. I am being explicitly *warned not* to doubt or question anything.

"Nothing...*absolutely nothing*...is being said (or will be said or done) about the couple we know has committed fraud against the county and the taxpayers!"

At my supervisor's insistence, I hastily completed the cases still unfinished on my desk, and left the office at eleven o'clock that morning to consult my own private physician to find a legitimate basis for the required leave of absence.

When I finally reached home, the telephone was ringing. It was the Medical Director calling. "Have you seen your doctor?" she inquired abruptly. When I said I had, she asked, "What did he say?" My answer seemed to distress her, and her disappointment regarding the reason given by my physician for my leave of absence was clearly evident.

"Will you get your doctor's statement and read it to me?" she demanded. I took the physician's report from my purse and read: 'Mrs. Detlof is to refrain from working until after July 4, 1964, while she is being treated for fibrosis and arthritis....

Evidently disappointed, the Medical Director asked in an annoyed tone: "Is that *all* he has written?"

"Yes," I replied. "That is all the doctor has written except his name. What reason would you have preferred him to give, in confirming my request for a leave?"

There was no response from the Medical Director.

At that point the situation struck me as almost hilariously funny. A Los Angeles County employee discovers theft of the people's tax money. Her supervisor hopes desperately to obtain "proof" that the employee is emotionally disturbed. Have standards in California sunk so low that to uncover fraud is to be guilty of incompetence, insubordination and mental derangement? The theft itself is held to be entirely reasonable, justifiable and permissible. It is condoned by persons engaged to administer and enforce welfare laws and codes. From other sources, I have learned this sort of thing is not confined to California, but also occurs in many other parts of the country today....

When I went to see my personal physician, I found he had gone out to lunch. To fill the time until he returned, I wandered into a nearby book store to browse. There, I happened to meet several young interns and residents from - - - Hospital, where I had been stationed for some two and a half years. When they heard why I was not at work that day, they insisted there was one thing I de finitely *must* do. Though I would never have thought of doing such a thing myself, the wisdom of their suggestion was clear.

The young doctors told me that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors was holding hearings on appropriations and finances, and that one of the more controversial items was a request by the Department of Charities for an additional one half million dollars to expand its operations.

The young men urged me to appear before the Board and tell what had just happened to me, and what I knew about the connived and protected fraud flourishing in the Department of Charities.

Once I had made my decision, the next step was to obtain time to speak before the Board of Supervisors. This proved to be no problem. Living in Huntington Park was Mrs. Mary Frisina, a civic-minded lady who has spent much of her time and personal funds on a crusade for honesty and efficiency in the use of tax-monies. I had heard of Mrs. Frisina, and I turned to her now for help.

As might have been supposed, she had already requested and been granted a period of time to speak before the Board of Supervisors, and luckily it was for the following day, June 9. When I told her what the resident physicians of - - - Hospital had urged me to do, she said at once, "You can have the time reserved for me. I will ask the Supervisors to let you talk in my place!" (4)

-
1. Free as here used means without cost to the welfare recipient but certainly it is very costly to the taxpayers.
 2. Fictitious names are used in all case histories.
 3. "Refer out" is departmental terminology, meaning to be declared ineligible for *free* medical care.
 4. See Appendix A for the complete transcript.

CHAPTER 2 - PUZZLES, PUZZLES [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

After my appearance before the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, it seemed as if a genuine investigation would materialize. The Board placed the matter in the hands of Frank Bonelli, Supervisor of the First District. He referred it to the District Attorney's office. Two members of the Los Angeles County Grand Jury had been present at the Supervisors' meeting and they requested full details on my findings.

Several meetings with investigators scheduled to work on the probe were held soon afterwards at the District Attorney's office. They had obtained files of the cases I had described before the Board of Supervisors. As we discussed these cases, I felt sure the investigators knew that my statements were well-founded.

At one of those meetings the group spoke of having me "loaned" by the Department of Medical Social Services to the District Attorney's office, so that I might devote full time to the investigation. I was shown the desk where I would work while "on loan."

I even met the man designated to be my supervisor. It had been decided to assign at least ten of the best investigators to this project. Several persons present said it looked as if this would be as "big or bigger" than the recent Department of Motor Vehicles fraud cases.

At our first meeting I furnished the investigators with additional cases, replete with details. Even they, accustomed as they were to seeing all sorts of irregularities, were appalled. Several more appointments were made with me, and enthusiasm for the project ran high. The investigators assured me we were "hitting pay-dirt."

Suddenly, the handling of the cases was transferred to two men, one of whom I never met. Nothing further was said about my being "loaned" to their department, so that I could assist them full time. Still I continued for some time, perhaps naively, to take material on various other cases to the District Attorney's office, and attempted to work with the lone investigator. We went over material which his office had collected at my suggestion from the Department of Medical Social Service and the Bureau of Public Welfare. But the original atmosphere of keen enthusiasm had been replaced by a mood of defeatism.

Each meeting at the District Attorney's office would find the investigator telling me something like this: "It sickens me to read these cases. The welfare program is wrong...*all* wrong. *But*...what can you and I do about the mess?" Or perhaps the earnest-faced young investigator would say: "Mrs. Detlof, your statements have been found correct in every case we have investigated but this does not mean we can prosecute the persons involved. The laws are very lax with regard to welfare recipients. Those people can get away with murder, and little can be done about it."

Sometimes the conversation would run: "It's such an uphill battle. There's absolutely *no* chance of winning. Something should be done about the complete lack of justice...this inequality in the laws. But...how? Who? Public opinion," the investigator would say to me, "is against people who think as you and I do. We are being swept into a socialistic Welfare State, whether or not it is what we or the majority of the people want."

I knew that other counties had prosecuted and obtained convictions in cases where much less was involved. It was my understanding that the same laws cover welfare in every county. If other counties could act to curb such criminal behavior, why couldn't the County of Los Angeles?

I kept on bringing in cases and working with the solitary investigator, because the important thing to me was that the cases *were* being investigated and I was being proved correct. I felt certain something good would come of it somehow.

Nevertheless, it often seemed to me as if some one on high had said: "You...there in the District Attorney's office...just keep sitting on that nasty mess until Mrs. Detlof gets tired and goes away." The investigators in the District Attorney's office were not happy either about the strange turn of events. But they seemed to feel completely helpless, in the face of what may have been overwhelming "odds."

All their fine plans had been abandoned. The change was so sudden as to suggest it could only have come from a very powerful source. It could not have been merely a cooling of interest.

When I first started working with the District Attorney's office, both Supervisor Bonelli and the D.A.'s investigators had advised me to return to work in the Department of Medical Social Service when my leave ended. They informed me that my personnel records were in the hands of the District Attorney's office, and that there was nothing in them to indicate grounds for my dismissal or for any disciplinary action against me. Wishing to cooperate with everyone as far as possible, I returned to work at the end of my leave and was immediately transferred to - - - Hospital.

At - - - Hospital, I found it more difficult than ever to verify statements made by applicants. It seemed as if a strong effort was being made to insure that frauds would neither be discovered nor verified. At first, I wrote the usual number of letters checking out earnings and employment of the persons I interviewed. Very soon I was called into the office of my new supervisor and ordered to discontinue this practice. I was told that it was completely unnecessary!

Medical insurance seemed almost impossible either to verify or clarify at - - - Hospital. Admissions workers were expressly forbidden to take steps to obtain the information themselves. A separate department had been set up for the sole purpose of obtaining medical insurance information for all admissions workers and medical social workers. The clerks there appeared to have been instructed to obtain only the most meager and inconclusive details. Usually they simply stated that an individual was not covered by insurance. Details on benefits (which are of great importance in determining an applicant's eligibility for free medical care) were seldom provided.

It took many, many calls to this insurance division, before the benefit picture was clear. Most of the clerks in that section (with a few notable exceptions) openly resented my insistence upon complete information. They usually stated they were *not* in the habit of providing detailed information...since no one else ever requested it.

How much easier it would have been for an admissions worker to call the employer or the union welfare office, while the applicant remained at the worker's desk ready to provide any additional information.

It is really amazing to listen to interviews as they are conducted today or to read entries made in the case histories by social workers, medical social workers and/or admissions workers. An applicant will state plainly that the husband or wife is employed by a firm generally known to provide medical insurance for its employees. Yet I found the workers accepting, without investigation or inquiry of any kind, applicants' statements that no medical insurance was available to them. This neglect or carelessness on the part of County employees costs the taxpayers millions of dollars annually, and should not be tolerated.

Once I interviewed an applicant whose husband worked for a large aircraft company which carries excellent insurance. This plan pays part of the cost for office or clinic visits...even for dependents...after a certain deductible amount is paid by the employee. Under the arrangement I made for this woman, she was to pay that small sum to - - - Hospital for each clinic visit.

The patient did not wish to be annoyed with such trifles, so she simply returned to the hospital later and found a more lenient admissions worker, who reinstated the *free* care this woman had always enjoyed in the past. When I called the case to the attention of my fellow-admissions worker, I was told it was "just too hard for this woman to get the money from the insurance office."

For the first two weeks after my return to work, nothing was said to me, although the Department was obviously surprised that I had dared to return after the testimony I had given before the Board of Supervisors. Had there been any excuse for firing me, probably they would have done so.

During the third week, I was suddenly ordered to report to a top official in the Department of Medical Social Service. For obvious reasons, I will not identify the official, but will merely refer to her as "X."

The first question she asked me was: "Mrs. Detlof, why have you done this *thing*?" Then "X" proceeded to tell me, quite falsely, that the District Attorney's office had reported there was no truth to any of my statements. According to "X," the District Attorney's office said its investigators had *already* checked on *all* my documented evidence and that none of my charges could be substantiated.

I replied that the exact reverse was true. So far just 21 cases had been presented to the District Attorney's investigators and to date, they had investigated only eleven of them. Any sensible person should have known that 1000 to 1200 cases of alleged welfare fraud could not be properly investigated in a matter of a few weeks. (A letter from the District Attorney's office, dated November 13, 1964, states that during the entire period I worked with them, there was time to provide them with only 38 cases.)

While talking to "X" in her office, I explained that the District Attorney's men had told me that my charges proved to be true in every case investigated. To this "X" replied lightly, "Oh, I never believe what I read in the newspapers!" If her source of information had been one of Los Angeles' largest newspapers, she might have been understandably confused. The *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner* and several smaller community newspapers, however, had carried accurate stories.

Attempting to present my side of the situation, I began reciting items from the various cases well known to me. In every instance "X" was frank to admit that the cases "appeared" to have been in correctly handled. It was encouraging to find that "X" seemed to agree with me as to what should have been done in those cases. I was beginning to feel better, when "X" remarked suddenly: "*Do you realize, Mrs. Detlof, how embarrassing all this has been for the Department of Medical Social Service? You have made it twice as embarrassing for the Bureau of Public Assistance. I hope you fully understand this, Mrs. Detlof!*"

Momentarily, I was speechless. *Embarrassment* appeared to be "X's" *only* concern! Nothing what ever was said, then or later, about correcting the abuses we had discussed. There was no request that I give additional details regarding the cases I had documented. In fact, there was a total lack of interest on the part of this administrator in changing the policies that had caused these abuses. The only real objection was to any idea of reform. And the only problem, as far as "X" was concerned, was *embarrassment!*

Perceiving all this, I had to repress a smile each time "X" reiterated: "But *why* didn't you come to me first, Mrs. Detlof?" By now I was fully aware how little good that would have done.

At the conclusion of this interview, I was coolly told that as soon as the Grand Jury was through with the matter, "legal" action would be taken against me personally for (of all things!) *conduct unbecoming a County employee.*

Once more it was difficult to suppress amusement at this absurd turn of events. A county employee discovers persons fraudulently obtaining *free* medical assistance...the very job for which this employee was supposedly hired! The medical aid recipients in question obtained *free* medical care by deliberate and outright falsification! When the County employee finds evidence of the fraud, her immediate supervisor disciplines her for *uncovering* it! Then, when the employee insists on exposing that same fraudulent act and others like it, the Administrator of the Department proposes to take "legal action"...*not against the persons who committed the fraudulent acts...but against the employee who exposed them!*

During this interview, I could not help feeling sorry for the overburdened taxpayers who so often must deny themselves necessities in order that the ineligible and untruthful aid recipients may be supported in the style to which they have, by now, become accustomed.

As "X" mentioned repeatedly how "embarrassing" my exposures had been to the departments involved, I wondered if the whole tax situation had not been much more than merely embarrassing to the majority of the taxpayers.

The taxpayers are becoming more and more exhausted supporting socialistic schemes to their own detriment...schemes about which they are permitted to know little...schemes that undermine our entire form of government. To take from the diligent and give to the unscrupulous and shiftless, the immoral and unprincipled, cannot be justified on "humanitarian" grounds. What is this other than a form of legalized extortion and robbery?

After meeting with "X," I promptly forwarded a report of the interview to Supervisor Frank Bonelli and to the District Attorney's office, as I had been instructed. A meeting was called by the County Supervisors, where they made public the threat of legal action against me. They ordered that no further disciplinary action was to be taken against me. When "X" was questioned by the Supervisors about her talk with me, I am told the Administrator denied having said anything to me about unbecoming conduct.

That I was being kept under rather close surveillance at - - - - Hospital was obvious. It was all the more amusing because I had been assigned to a male supervisor, whom I personally liked. He was a pleasant, chubby little man who did his best under trying circumstances. His problem was that...even at - - - - Hospital...a man cannot go into the women's restrooms, where I could make notes unobserved.

CHAPTER 3 - SUCCESS...OF A SORT [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

Inadvertently I learned that on September twenty-second, Manley Bowler, Assistant District Attorney for the County of Los Angeles, would appear before the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to report on his department's investigation of the cases I had unearthed. Certain that Mr. Bowler would verify my statements, I sent my resignation to the Department of Medical Social Services, so that I would be free to attend the meeting.

On reaching the Board hearing room, I picked up a bulletin listing the day's agenda. Glancing through it, I was startled to find that Mr. Bowler's topic had been thoroughly disguised. Few could have guessed the real contents of his talk. The report was described in the agenda as "Presentation of Recommendations by the Chief Deputy District Attorney Manley J. Bowler to Regulate Charity Solicitations." What a perfect example of governmental gobbledygook and deception. That title remains the understatement of the year...perhaps of many years.

There was nothing to indicate that Bowler's report had to do with charges of *fraud*. It might have been a review of the yearly Community Chest drive, or almost anything quiet and respectable. Certainly it did not suggest a report on fraud investigations. To stress the real importance of his report, however, Bowler was accompanied by the duly elected District Attorney, William B. McKesson.

Probably the best way to summarize the results of the investigation, as outlined by Bowler, is to quote an article that appeared on September 27, 1964, in the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, under the by-line of Henry Frank. It read:

After a three-month campaign against the County Bureau of Public Assistance, which she accused of permitting fraud, Mrs. Belva Detlof has quit her job with the Bureau to continue her war against 'welfare chiseling' as a private citizen.

Spurred by a measure of success - orders for investigations and some prosecutions - Mrs. Detlof said she will write a book, *Beggars Are Choosers*, which will relate her experience as a medical admissions worker in the Bureau of Public Assistance. The title (1), she said, frames her contention that cheats and chiselers often are treated better than self-supporting taxpayers.

Mrs. Detlof is the woman who rocked budget hearings of the County Board of Supervisors last July (Correction...June

9, 1964...Author's) when she recited numerous case numbers where she said chiseling not only was encouraged but immorality and illegitimacy were being fostered by the welfare setup.

She appeared again before the board last week with support from Deputy District Attorney Manley Bowler.

But when she started a new series of revelations reminiscent of those of last July (correction...June), members of the Board cut her off after a brief meeting.

She launched into a discussion of a case in which a man was being treated with medical aid funds so that he could live with another aid recipient as his common-law wife.

'Have you taken this and other cases up with your supervisors?' asked Supervisor Debs.

'I have,' Mrs. Detlof replied firmly. 'They only told me, 'Don't let your morals show.'

Earlier, Bowler told the board that four of eighteen cases she had referred to his office following her July (correction...June) revelations had been listed for prosecution.

Another eighteen, he said, were being investigated and more might be forthcoming.

Bowler supported Mrs. Detlof again when he said there seemed among medical aid workers an 'eagerness to provide free medical care for people with good incomes' and that he thought there was laxity in Bureau of Public Assistance operations.

Bowler supported her again when he took one of the cases she had cited as a feature of his report to the board. This was a woman who had five children by five different men, none of them her husband.

'I'll just add it to the budget,' the woman was quoted as saying when she was asked how she would support the latest child.

In such cases, Bowler added, the county merely is subsidizing immorality and freeing such mothers from responsibility. 'They add illegitimate child after illegitimate child to the relief rolls,' he added.

When the board members asked Mrs. Detlof why workers would be lax, she had an answer: 'The employees really don't care. They know they'll get their checks whether or not they follow the law and are careful.'

Mrs. Detlof explained her reasons for quitting her job: 'I just couldn't keep on interviewing chiselers, crooks, aliens and others who have no right to medical aid. They are just looking for *everything* for *nothing*.'

'Medical social service workers ignore insurance and seldom check on whether applicants have insurance which could care for them,' she told the board. And she cited Bowler's statement that there never has been prosecution for a medical admissions case.

But she did get some results. The board ordered the Chief Administrative officer, L. S. Hollinger, and William Barr, head of the Charities Department to investigate 'laxness and carelessness' in the Bureau of Public Assistance.

And the board also turned a similar investigation over to the new County Commission on *Governmental Economy and Efficiency*.

One point on which I differ with Mr. Frank is that anything can be gained by turning an investigation over to the same department which caused the mess in the first place. A real investigation can be conducted only by non-political and wholly disinterested persons or groups.

In the three years since this investigation was tossed back to the Charities Department itself, nothing of value has resulted. If anything, the welfare procedures are even more lax today than they were in 1964.

In his report to the Board of Supervisors, Bowler mentioned one very important fact not included in Frank's article and it should be noted carefully by citizens who are paying for the huge welfare budgets. The big reason why more welfare cases investigated by the District Attorney's office could not be prosecuted, was the looseness and lack of legal validity in the wording of the forms provided by the Department of Charities for medical aid applicants to fill out and sign.

Up to August, 1963, an applicant for medical aid was required to sign a statement, under oath) setting forth

his complete financial assets. Just below the statement, in a prominently black-rimmed box, were the words PLEASE READ, CAREFULLY BEFORE SIGNING:

Either a wilfully false statement in this affidavit, or an unqualified statement of that which one does not know to be true, is perjury. Perjury is punishable as provided by Section 126 of the Penal Code by imprisonment in the State Prison not less than one year or more than fourteen years.

Thus every applicant for medical assistance was required to give a full statement of financial assets, and to sign this statement after being warned of the penalty for perjury. His signature was witnessed by the admissions worker, after the applicant had sworn that the items in the affidavit were, indeed, *true statements*.

While this procedure could not prevent an applicant from lying, at least it gave the District Attorney grounds for prosecution if false statements were made.

To make such prosecution legally impossible, about August, 1963 another form was introduced in place of the earlier "affidavit." It was simply a "statement of resources for the applicant for medical aid." The new form requires no sworn statement, and is merely "witnessed" by the admissions worker or medical social worker. It is *carefully not* to be "sworn to." There is nothing on the form concerning the possibility of, or the penalty for perjury.

When the new form was introduced, and admissions workers asked the reason for the change, the following explanation was offered: "A person signing a sworn financial statement, falsely, with full awareness of the falseness of his claim can always swear that he was an emergency case, desperate to obtain medical care, and was forced under duress to sign such a statement to obtain the needed care."

Really, the administrators and the supervisors of our many government agencies come up with some interesting samples of false logic. This is as one of the the most absurd I have heard to date. It is if to say: "Oh, yes, we know that a great many recipients of medical aid are not eligible for such assistance. So, to make it *easier* for everyone concerned we will *happily* solve the entire problem. We will just remove any legal danger that might arise from such falsification!"

As any caseworker knows, the "theory" that an emergency applicant might be forced to lie, in order to get medical attention, is *not based on fact!* Such a case is given care at any County medical facility, whether the patient is a tramp or a millionaire. Wealth does not preclude *emergency care!*

So, the excuse given for "liberalizing" the affidavit, by changing it from a sworn statement to a mere scrap of paper without legal standing, is wholly unfounded!

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Assistance and the Department of Charities sometimes give the impression of trying to compete furiously with all the more efficient private medical facilities. The greater the number of "clients" (this is the term they use for charity recipients!) they can bring into the capacious and ever-expanding welfare fold - away from private, and privately supported, agencies - the greater the "success" they attribute to themselves.

Does the taxpaying public appreciate such dubious "success"? Anybody can be successful at giving away someone else's money...as long as the victim remains deaf, dumb and blind. That presents no challenge at all. Of course, there are always people on the receiving end who believe they can get "something for nothing." As far as tax funds and public assistance programs are concerned, that is true for awhile. Eventually, however, there comes a time for payment; in loss of self-respect, self-reliance and personal pride, and this payment is probably the heaviest loss Society has to bear.

I shall never forget the glow I once saw on the face of one Director, when, after tabulating the activities of her office, she discovered that we had processed *one thousand more recipients* during January, 1964 than during the previous January, 1963. And this was *progress?*

Everyone in the office was expected to be properly pleased and gratified about it. The general mood of satisfaction, inspired by the Director's proud announcement, was only slightly dimmed by the obviously crude,

vulgar and ill-timed remark of one employee (me!) who wondered what the poor taxpayers would think of such an achievement. Would they, too, consider it a howling success?

Most of our citizens would rather see the Department of Public Welfare adhere to the purpose of the department, as described in the California *Welfare and Institutions Code*, Section XIX:

The purpose of this code is to provide for protection, care, and assistance to people of the State in need thereof, and to promote the welfare and happiness of all of the people of the State by providing appropriate public assistance and services to all of its *needy and distressed*. It is the legislative intent that assistance shall be administered and services provided promptly and humanely, and *with due regard for the preservation of family life*, and without discrimination on account of race, religion, or political affiliation; and that *assistance shall be so administered and services so provided as to encourage self-respect, self-reliance, and the desire to be a good citizen, useful to society*. (Italics added).

It is also the purpose of this code, in establishing programs and services which are designed to provide protective services to the fullest extent deemed necessary by the juvenile court, probation department or other public agencies designated by the Board of Supervisors to perform the duties prescribed by this code to insure that the rights or physical, mental or moral welfare of children are not violated or threatened by their present circumstances or environment....

As the following chapters are read, keep in mind Section Nineteen of the California *Welfare and Institutions Code*. See for yourselves how flagrantly the humane and clearly expressed purposes of this act are violated or ignored...*by the very persons entrusted with fair and legal administration of the code*.

Many *not* in need or distress receive assistance at the total expense of the taxpayers. Immorality is subsidized, and thereby encouraged. Every perversion is supported and perpetuated. Children remain unprotected (with the full knowledge of the social workers) in the homes of immoral, sadistic and perverted adults. All this is provided by the blood, sweat and tears of those weary beasts of burden...*the TAXPAYERS* of the United States and California.

Before detailing some actual case histories, let us review the development of welfarism in California.

1. The title of her book has been changed to *Welfare Wonderland*.

CHAPTER 4 - IN THE BEGINNING [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

The present-day social monstrosity known as "public assistance," like most malignancies, had a very simple beginning. In California the year was 1855.

Section XXIII of the California State Constitution of 1848 provided:

No money shall be drawn from the treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law. An accurate statement of the receipts and expenditures of the public moneys shall be attached to and published with the laws at every regular session of the legislature.

This comprised the "legal" basis used to first provide California tax funds for indigent care. By special enactment, under Section XXIII, the 1855 California Legislature (for the first time in the State's history) appropriated tax funds for public assistance. Then, as now, the legal basis for such action was a tenuous one.

It is doubtful, however, that those first advocates of "taking from the 'haves' to give to the 'have nots' " had little, if any, insight into what the future was to bring in connection with this type of social philosophy.

Actually, private agencies had already achieved considerable success in caring for the indigent. The newspaper, *Alta California* reports:

January 28, 1851:

The growth of our city has brought within its limits all the usual variety of social conditions found in larger communities of our land. It is a cause of wonder that hitherto the distinction of rich and poor, the independent and the helpless, have been to a great extent unknown. Such a favorable state of things could not, however, be expected long to continue. Already a demand for an organized, systematic method of charity exists and among the objects calling for

friendly and benevolent care are not a few left in the State of infantile orphans thrown by an act of providence upon the attention of a benevolent public. Measures, however, to meet this demand, we are happy to say, are in progress, and the better to promote the end in view, the ladies of this city will hold a meeting in the Presbyterian Church, Stockton Street, next Saturday at 2:00 P.M. at which time the plan of an association for the care of orphans will be presented.

February 1, 1851:

Reverend Albert Williams, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of San Francisco, presided at the meeting composed of his parishioners and representatives of other Protestant denominations to determine what steps should be taken to provide shelter, food and clothing for some ten or twelve children who had been deprived of parental care. The meeting culminated in the organization of San Francisco Orphans' Society and plans were laid for the establishment of the Howard Home in Happy Valley as a haven for these dependent children.

December, 1851:

Plans are completed for the erection of the Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum for Girls in San Francisco, the first Catholic institution of its kind to be established in the State. The Sisters of Mercy have been called from the Ernmetsburg Convent in Maryland to take charge.

1853:

The home in Happy Valley is now caring for twenty children and the capacity of the home has been overtaxed. A campaign for funds for a new building is being enthusiastically supported. Two blocks of land belonging to the City of San Francisco were bought at public auction for \$100. The Spring Valley Water Company will donate stone from the quarry adjacent to this property. The cost is estimated at approximately \$23,000. The institution will be known as the San Francisco Protestant Orphanage.

There was nothing to indicate a need for government involvement in private charitable work. People were giving voluntarily, not only of their worldly goods but of themselves as well. Then as now, however, there were politicians who seemed chronically unable to mind the business of the State and leave private matters in the hands of private citizens.

In September, 1878 a convention was held in Sacramento for the purpose of preparing a new constitution to replace California's Constitution of 1849. One newspaper of the day reported:

Delegates to the convention are giving careful consideration to the State's responsibility for children. Some members do not favor continuing the present system of granting State appropriations to private orphanages for the reason that the State as a whole is being taxed for the grants thus extended to institutions, whereas the institutions do not service all areas of the State. This faction does not have in mind restricting the State's authority to care for orphans but is attacking the policy of granting State funds for 'miscellaneous purposes outside the essentials of good government.' In the words of one member: 'a great principle was aimed at' although there is recognition of the problem of caring for the orphans.

One delegate (Mr. Stedman) had this to say: 'In this age and in the light of our present civilization and enlightenment, I think I may be safe in assuming that no gentleman in this committee will deny or resist the acknowledgment of this duty as one which the State must discharge as he would exercise any fostering care for the well-being of her future citizens, a duty which is equally as obligatory as that other one of providing educational facilities for all of her children'.

The founding fathers of the United States of America had never obligated this nation or these states to provide free schooling. It was Karl Marx, in his *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, who specified that the establishment of free public education was one of ten preliminary steps required to achieve social revolution.

Therefore, when Mr. Stedman based his statement about the State's obligation to care for the indigent on an alleged obligation to provide free public education, his argument did not stem from anything said or implied by the wise men who framed our Federal Constitution.

If the religious institutions were already providing care for the orphans and the needy, why must government enter into the proceedings? There appeared to be no great public demand for government interference. Rather, the demand to control and direct came only from *governmental sources*.

From 1855, when the first government contributions were made to private charitable organizations, many more orphan asylums had been built. Twenty two years later, the list included:

1. Grass Valley Orphan Asylum (1863) near Sacramento.
2. Ladies Protective and Relief Society of San Francisco.
3. Pacific Hebrew (Homewood Terrace) Orphan Asylum, San Francisco.
4. Los Angeles Orphan Asylum (1869).
5. Los Angeles Home for Orphans.
6. Sacramento Orphanage and Children's Home (1867).
7. St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum (1855), in Mann County.
8. St. Vincent's Institution (1858), in Santa Barbara.
9. Santa Cruz Female Orphan Asylum (1862).
10. Pajaro Valley Male Orphan Asylum (later called St. Francis School)...(1869), Watsonville.

By 1878 sixteen privately operated orphanages had been established. As far as can be determined, they provided good and adequate care for the State's needy children. All were aided in their operations by per capita contributions from tax funds.

In 1870 an act was approved by the legislature, providing specified allotments by the State to these institutions. For a "whole" orphan the State made a contribution of fifty dollars per year. For a "half" orphan, the State allowed only twenty-five dollars. In 1875 the contributions were increased by an other twenty-five dollars per person per year.

It is unlikely that the exuberant politicians in the California of that day foresaw the social trend they were helping to launch. They could hardly have anticipated that their modest legislation would eventually result in the literal creation of hordes of "half" orphans (most illegitimate) foisted upon the taxpaying citizenry before another century had passed.

These early lawmakers could never have supposed that in a future day thousands of women would make illegitimacy, promiscuity and welfare reciprocity an accepted "way of life"...a means of "earning a living." It might have been even more difficult for these legislators to realize that this illegitimacy, promiscuity and welfare reciprocity was to become a "profession," passed down from mother to daughter, from grandmother to granddaughter.

If the legislators of September, 1878 had suspected the moral chaos to which their seemingly benevolent act would lead eventually, surely they would have left charity where it was doing quite well and where it belongs...in the hands of private individuals, private organizations and religious institutions.

The original sum contributed by the State for charitable purposes in 1855 amounted to \$10,000, divided equally between two San Francisco orphanages. This was the total amount contributed for public assistance in the year 1855.

By June, 1965, in Los Angeles County alone, 146,531 children were receiving *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*. The cost in one month, for that type of "aid" alone in the County of Los Angeles, was \$9,127,815. Of this, the Federal Government contributed \$3,214,746 and the State Government contributed \$3,530,120. The remainder came from taxpayers in the County of Los Angeles, who had also paid their share of the tax-funds provided by Federal and State agencies...

In 1879 the new California State Constitution was adopted. Instead of using the "catch-all" section XXIII of the previous constitution as a basis for their "authority" to deal in public welfare, the legislators now had a new Section XXII which gave them power to grant financial assistance to institutions organized for the support and maintenance of children who were both indigent and orphaned. It also included financial assistance to "half" orphans and/or abandoned children. Moreover, it empowered the legislators to support, from tax funds, indigent aged persons according to a uniform rule and in proportion to the number of such persons residing in each institution.

At the same time, the legislators reserved the right to inquire into the management of institutions for the indigent that were aided by tax money. They further provided that any county (or city and county) would receive a similar grant if public agencies arranged to care for the indigent persons in a manner formerly done

only by private organizations.

At the time, there was quite a debate between those legislators who preferred to contribute to private charitable groups, and those who were eager for government to become directly involved in the administration and control of charity. The former referred often and bitterly to an institution at Marysville, which had been built and operated by the State as a pilot project in government administration of charity.

The Marysville project was an abysmal failure, with excessive per capita costs. It cost the tax payers \$25,567.68 to care for thirty persons for one year, or about \$822 per person, at a time when privately operated institutions were providing better care for no more than \$100 per person a year. Even in those bygone days, a government-operated enterprise proved far more costly to the taxpayers than similar undertakings handled by private groups.

Despite the obvious inefficiency of that State-operated institution, the Legislature approved the bill allowing counties (or cities and counties combined) to establish institutions for indigent care...with financial assistance from State tax funds. These institutions were limited to orphaned children and to the aged, and the sums appropriated for them seem trivial by comparison with the vast amounts spent on alleged indigents today. Of course, a dollar went a great deal further then than now!

Encouraged by the new legislation, many California counties took steps toward dispensing "public charity" with funds collected from taxpayers. In 1888 a State Supreme Court decision allowed aged indigent persons, orphans and abandoned children to be supported by tax funds *outside* of "asylums" and in medical institutions.

This revision of an act of the legislature, by a ruling of the State Supreme Court, was the first of many instances where courts have revised the law to suit their own philosophies.

In 1887, so the story goes, Yolo County filed a claim for funds for the maintenance of seven aged indigent persons, who had spent the year in the Yolo County Hospital, and for five others who had been cared for *outside* of institutions. The total claim was \$841.31.

The State Treasurer refused to draw the warrant. His refusal was based on the fact that Yolo did not have ten indigent aged persons *in institutions* during the period for which the claim was made. The treasurer said, that, as he understood the law, it was *not* intended to aid persons living outside of institutions.

A year later, the State Supreme Court held that the requirement to maintain indigent persons in institutions, in order to qualify for tax funds, referred *only* to *private* institutions. The Court ruled such a restriction did not apply to the Counties, because they might "unless otherwise prevented, be tempted to go out into the highways and byways to increase their inmates to ten in order to claim aid from the state."

Apparently, even back in 1887 and 1888, the administration of charity by local politicians and their employees was suspect.

After this Court decision, although no specific law existed at the time to justify it, the Counties began claiming and receiving tax funds from the State for the support of indigent aged persons, orphans, "half" orphans and abandoned children who lived *outside* of institutions, usually in private homes.

For the fiscal year July 1, 1893 to June 30, 1894, State aid was granted for 1,459 aged persons in County hospitals and 1,283 aged persons outside of institutions, a total of 2,741, at a cost of \$79,999.93 paid by the State to the Counties, for the care of indigent aged in institutions. *This was for the entire State of California.*

In 1895 the act granting State aid to the aged was repealed, after having been in effect for 12 years.

In 1913 the State law regarding indigent children was revised so that more children could be supported in private homes, rather than in institutions. Usually the child remained in the home of the mother. Thus the practice began of using tax funds to pay mothers to take care of their own children, a practice that has continued to the present day. The Counties were permitted by the State to pay to the mother and/or caretaker an additional sum equal to the amount paid by the State.

In 1911 a Board of Control was established to "visit homes and institutions which received State aid in order to regulate the care received by the children."

From then on it was smooth sailing for the "people planners" and social engineers. 1917 saw new amendments to the welfare laws. Among other things, they provided that:

1. A child might receive public assistance up to and including his fifteenth year of age.
2. A child could be excluded from receiving public assistance only if he were already receiving \$20 per month support from some other source.
3. A child not born in California must have lived here at least two years in order to be eligible for assistance.

1919 brought further changes:

1. Aid for a "whole" orphan was increased to \$120 per year. "Half" orphans and abandoned children were to receive the same amount of assistance as "whole" orphans.
2. Dependent illegitimate and foundling children were to receive \$12.50 per month up to eighteen months of age. Then the monthly stipend would be reduced to \$10 per month. (Already the practice of rewarding the fruits of irresponsibility had begun.)

From 1920 to 1935 the laws relating to indigents were amended, "supplemented" and "implemented" many times. Invariably the effect of these changes was to assure more and more persons of financial support from tax monies paid to the government by self-supporting citizenry.

By 1935 the practice of providing tax funds for support of children living with their own parents in their own homes had become firmly established throughout California.

In June, 1956 the California Department of Public Welfare came up with a brand-new dream entitled "Plan for Child Welfare Services." Its announced goal was to initiate a "well rounded program for children, in order to promote the welfare of children in relation to *their individual lives and their home and community lives*, as well as to assist them with early handicaps."

At the same time this delightfully idealistic "program" for children was drafted, the sole means of enforcing any agency ruling was simultaneously taken away from the social workers. Virtually all restrictions on the spending of welfare money, *after it reached the hands of the recipients*, were removed.

It is strange that the State should assume that the welfare recipient (whose inability to manage his own affairs may be inferred from the very fact that he is a recipient of welfare) is the only individual entitled to the unrestricted use of tax money.

From that day on, gross mismanagement of funds by aid recipients was no longer an "allowable" reason for withholding or discontinuing welfare checks. The unsuitability of the home; morally, spiritually and physically, was no longer considered an appropriate reason for denying aid.

In other words, tax funds are carefully accounted for...*until* they are placed in the hands of welfare recipients. Then they may be spent as foolishly or wickedly as the recipient desires. Welfare recipients can and often do spend the taxpayers' hard-earned money on liquor, wild parties, male "friends", narcotics, etc. None of this, however, can be considered bonafide grounds for disqualifying such persons from aid.

Mothers (and fathers) can and often do live in open adultery and bigamy, supported by Government funds. They can and often do openly neglect the children for whom the money is intended, seeing these children only as the means by which they obtain tax funds for their own indiscriminate ends .

So, at one fell blow, social case workers were reduced to being mere application-takers and budget-clerks. They might talk themselves hoarse, trying to influence an aid recipient towards rehabilitation but the recipient could coolly ignore a worker's effort to be of real, human assistance.

With the caseworkers rendered ineffective and futile, the social-dreamers at the top came up with another "plan" still further removed from reality. It was known as "General Standards of Adequate Care" and listed:

1. An adequate budget which will *insure*:
 - a. clothing and food of adequate (quantity and quality, including special diets when ordered by a physician.
 - b. housing which allows adequate sleeping space, reasonable privacy and complies with sanitary and housing regulations.
 - c. attendance at school during legal school age for every child who is capable of benefiting by formal education; vocational training or an opportunity to obtain a higher education when indicated.
 - d. normal recreational activities and participation in community life.
 - e. proper supervision in the absence of the mother or caretaker.
2. Provision for adequate health care. This includes routine physical examinations, preventive measures, correction of defects, hospital and out patient services, periodic examinations of contacts with tuberculosis and other infectious diseases.
3. For the child receiving foster care, a boarding home or institution meeting approved standards.
4. Case work service which *insures* to each family and child the highest possible morale and security and the best adjustment to family and community life, and which will obtain for them the maximum benefit from community resources for their health, education, recreation and general welfare...(Italics added.)

Perhaps the California Department of Social Welfare should explain to the social caseworker how to *insure* "normal recreational activities and participation in community life" for the illegitimate progeny of the many promiscuous mothers now supported by tax funds. How can a caseworker *insure* proper supervision in the "absence of the mother", when the mother herself is quite in capable of properly supervising the children supported in her home by taxpayers' funds?

The caseworker has no power to accomplish these goals, or others more logical and realistic. There is little that can be done beyond expressing disapproval, and that is usually frowned upon as "punitive".

Experience soon teaches the caseworker that the really important thing is to make sure that recipients of public welfare are maintained as satisfied and get all possible financial assistance with minimum regard for legal restrictions.

CHAPTER 5 - PICKPOCKETS FROM MARS [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

"SITUATION WANTED:

Male, applying for position as 'incapacitated stepfather' to children whose mother is currently receiving *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*. Well-established welfare family, second or third generation preferred. None other need reply. Applicant has excellent references from local and not-so-local pubs and bars. Qualifications: no record of ever having done an honest day's work, no integrity, no ambition, past history of various and sundry illegitimate offspring scattered across the United States, all presently being supported by tax funds. Satisfaction guaranteed to any mother, married or unmarried, with a secure future as a welfare recipient. Reply to Joey Blow, Room 1 Skid Row Avenue, Anytown, Any State, U.S.A."

No, that advertisement did not appear in the Classified column of any newspaper; but every item it records exists in these United States today. Welfare reciprocity has become a profession, a way of life. It is an established means of obtaining the kind of living to which many of this country's citizens have become accustomed...in fact, they demand it.

In many instances, a third generation of welfare recipients is busily producing a fourth generation of indolents for the children of responsible individuals to support.

Welfare recipiency has become a spreading social cancer, usually transmitted through the female of the species to successive generations.

If a girl or young woman has an illegitimate child and seeks honest employment to supplement her welfare grant, it may be inferred that she is not seriously considering welfare as a permanent source of income. In due time, she might even become independent and self-supporting. Her child has a fair chance of growing up to be a worthwhile citizen.

But when the human (the temptation to put quotation marks around the word, "human" is almost too great)...the human female produces a whole brood of illegitimate children, sired by various casual males over the greater part of her fertile years, it can only be assumed that she is well aware of what she is doing and is satisfied with her role in life...If such a woman were genuinely disturbed or unhappy about her position, she would attempt to make a change. There are always tender, solicitous social workers standing by to assist her in any project she might wish to undertake.

The fact that such women continue year after year, like automatic human incubators, to spew out upon the hapless taxpaying public, one illegitimate child after another indicates quite plainly that they have no desire or intention of making any effort to provide themselves and their motley offspring with a decent way of life.

Such women inevitably receive far more from public assistance grants than they could possibly earn by decent, legitimate *work* (a dirty word in their opinion!). The fact that they receive more in "aid" than they could get by working hardens their determination to continue in their chosen profession of "welfare recipient." They are fully in accord with President Johnson's deathless words: "We are going to take from the 'haves' and give to the 'have-nots'."

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

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

Medical care is no trifling item for welfare recipients. Among them, can be found some of the most fervent and dedicated chronic hypochondriacs on earth. Since total care is entirely *free* (so far as the recipients are concerned) they make continual use of all available medical facilities. Do they have a slight headache...a little dan druff...athlete's foot...a splinter in a toe...a feeling of depression (they should feel depressed!)...nervousness...*impotency*...a hangover?...Off they rush to their favorite hospital, private or public, or to their own *private* physician who will bill the tax payers for their care. Expense is no concern of theirs. They don't have to pay the bills. That is the role of the taxpayer!

While the taxpayers who must pay for this prolonged medical spree can seldom afford such elaborate care for themselves or their dependents, there is no limit to medical care "indigents" and "medical-indigents" may demand and receive.

This outrageously swollen financial package has been handed to the taxpayers...and they have been forced "by law" to pay. Yet they receive no detailed accounting of the disposition of their tax funds. All that is secret and confidential!

It seems only reasonable that if taxpayers are bright enough to earn and provide the money to support this unconscionable procedure, they are also bright enough to grasp the various details involved and be given some voice in the matter. They have the RIGHT TO KNOW!

Evidently those who administer the whole monstrous mess realize that giving such information to the taxpayers might mean the end of their own tenure. Therefore, they cloak their activities in formal secrecy...saying piously that to divulge the facts would be a violation of the welfare recipients' privacy.

What about the violation of the taxpayers' privacy? Is it not a violation of privacy to have their every financial outlay scrutinized and questioned? Is it not a violation of privacy to have a big percentage of their earnings deducted from their pay checks, before they are even allowed to touch such earned income?

Why is the right of privacy sacred only where it concerns the welfare recipient? Why is the very opposite true when it concerns the responsible citizen?

Under current welfare procedure in California, up to \$300 per month is available for house keepers and/or attendants of aid recipients. Wives, daughters, and daughters-in-law often receive "allowances" as housekeepers for their own husbands or relatives. How many taxpayers would appreciate a \$300 monthly allowance for a housekeeper in their own families? They are paying for the luxury, whether or not they can afford to provide such items for themselves and whether or not they approve of such use of their money.

From the foregoing, it can be deduced that a person choosing public assistance as a lifetime profession is not necessarily impractical. What other trade or profession requires so little in the way of training, schooling, or ability? What other situation this side of the grave offers such complete and unlimited, indeed perpetual, security? What other line of endeavor provides total medical coverage without payment? How else can one so easily get up to \$300 a month for a housekeeper? In other words, what other vocation *guarantees* so much with so little effort on the part of the recipient?

Do you wonder that the experienced welfare recipients, who have learned the "tricks of the trade" from parents and grandparents, are now handing this knowledge on to their offspring and supplying the expert instruction that will enable their children in turn, to become life-long practitioners of the *art of welfare recipiency*.

Relatively few Americans are snoopy, holier than-thou individuals who enjoy meddling in other peoples' affairs. Most of us couldn't care less what others do with their own private lives as long as their behavior does not create unbearable burdens for the responsible citizens. At the same time, very few American citizens want to punish themselves by assuming the lifelong burden of deliberately shiftless neighbors who refuse to take any responsibility for themselves.

From the moment such irresponsible characters present themselves to the taxpayers for support, the situation changes. When they apply to tax-supported agencies for permanent financial aid and *free* medical care, in flagrant disregard of the rights of self-supporting citizens, then the behavior of these dependent individuals becomes the concern of each and every taxpayer in the United States of America.

When administrators of a public welfare plan feel themselves divinely ordained to *redistribute the wealth*, strange attitudes are engendered. One such attitude is that the working, earning, taxpayer citizen is so stupid that he *cannot be allowed* to spend or dispose of his own earnings *as he him self deems fitting and proper*. As much loot as possible, the authorities seem to feel, must be instantly removed from the pockets of the responsible citizen and placed in the hands of others who are so irresponsible they do not even try to be self-supporting. Detailed regulations govern the handling of this money *until* it reaches the *irresponsibles*. *Thereafter, NOTHING is allowed to interfere with the use of the money by these same irresponsibles*....In effect, more and more funds are being removed *by force* from the pockets of the nation's worthier citizens and distributed to irresponsible elements for their own unrestricted, capricious use.

Let us visit briefly and informally some typical welfare recipients mostly in Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties in California, U.S.A.

Actual names will *not* be used. This is done not to protect the innocent, since there is no suspicion of innocence among most of the welfare devotees cited. It is done because to provide the names would be in violation of the law.

Yes, it is illegal to provide the taxpayers the real names of persons being supported by these same taxpayers' hard-earned funds!...

Here we must digress for a few necessary explanations. The State of California does not grant legal status to

"common-law marriages", unless such marriages were previously legally established in a state which recognizes such unions.

Yet the California *Welfare and Institutions Code* (in outright disregard of Section XIX of the same Code) disposes of the non-legal status of "common-law marriages" as follows:

Section 1508: Where a needy child as defined in this chapter lives with his mother and a step father or an adult male person assuming the role of spouse to the mother although not legally married to her...

The Code then proceeds, like a drunken guest at a party who wants to make sure that everyone joins the fun and shares the grabs, to declare that such "male person assuming the role of spouse" shall be treated exactly as if he were legally married to the mother, when the welfare money is being paid out. As for responsibility, well...*that* is another thing...(only taxpayers are forced to take responsibility!).

In 1963-64, this provision was interpreted to mean that a woman receiving public assistance must have had at least one child sired by the "man assuming the role of spouse", *or be pregnant* as the result of her association with this man. Under such ruling, if the man was not the father or father-to-be of any of the woman's children, he could no longer receive part of the aid money. He could remain in the home, as long as he earned sufficient to "supply his own needs". He was not required or expected to assist the woman to whom he was "assuming the role of spouse"...that remained the duty of the taxpayers. The amount technically required to "supply his own needs" was extremely low. Furthermore, as soon as the happy illicit couple could furnish the welfare department with a physician's statement that the woman was pregnant, then the man was eligible for full welfare benefits — his official reward for contributing to illegitimacy, and often to the delinquency of minors.

Sometimes we are treated to the spectacle of public officials crying out in dismay and wringing their collective and flexible hands about the evils of illegitimacy and its attendant malpractices. Later, in the privacy of their legislative and/or administrative offices, they grind out the codes and rulings which encourage and subsidize the very "domestic" arrangements they publicly deplore.

The average citizen, weary from trying to earn the pittance Government allows him to retain for his own family's needs, usually believes the protestations of the legislator and/or governmental administrator. He is unaware that the same official is busily allotting his hard earned tax-money to persons who continue to thrive and in crease on this tax-supported perversion of the law.

In California, "Man Assuming the Role of Spouse" cases are called MARS cases. Every so often, interested taxpayers become outraged at this type of immorality, governmentally subsidized by tax-funds, and create a little disturbance. The welfare authorities console such distressed taxpayers with the assurance that "There are so very, very few of these cases!" In a manner of speaking, they are telling the truth, but suppressing a significant detail. It does not take long for a man "assuming the role of spouse" to make a fertile welfare mother pregnant. Then, magically, it is no longer a MARS case! The conception of the illegitimate offspring, in some distorted manner, instantly "legalizes" the union. There are many, many men assuming the role of spouse to welfare mothers, to whom have been born many, many illegitimate infants. But this information is not released for public consumption.

Such living arrangements are definitely not approved by the Welfare and Institutions Code, which the Welfare Department is supposed to be enforcing. The illegality of this type of arrangement was pointed out to authorities and officials at the state level a few years ago by a Deputy District Attorney from San Bernardino County.

His comments caused considerable consternation. It looked as if the welfare departments might lose some of their "clients", or that some of the child-victims of public tax-funded charity might finally be provided with decent homes. Deep and searching study of the situation appeared to be going on in Sacramento. When a decision was finally reached, it proved to be the same old malarkey...in defiance of the law.

If the couple cohabiting illicitly were the parents of a *mutual* child...one belonging to both of them...then theirs could no longer be considered a MARS case. The man might still be "assuming the role of spouse to the

mother", but their relationship had produced an illegitimate offspring. For that they were to be rewarded by beneficent approval from the Welfare Department. *But the case was no longer considered a MARS case.*

This decision has had important consequences. It allows the agencies to deny that they have many cases of illicit cohabitation, or that they are supporting couples busily increasing the tax burden with ever increasing numbers of illegitimate children. It allows many cases to remain "legally" on welfare when otherwise they would have to be removed. It rapidly increases the number of recipients, since individuals of this type are among the most prolific producers of human infants.

A MARS case (according to the definition handed down from Sacramento) seldom remains in that category very long. Within a month or two the woman becomes pregnant. This automatically removes the case from the MARS category. If the woman doesn't conceive promptly, she is often found to be searching for a more fertile male partner.

Nevertheless, the Sacramento definition of a MARS case has some advantages, so far as the Welfare Departments are concerned. It permits the directors and their subordinates to cross their bleeding hearts and swear on their Bibles to indignant taxpayers that there are very *few* MARS cases in their district. Meanwhile, numerous men in the district are "assuming the role of spouse" to an Aid to Families with Dependent Children mother. They have a MUTUAL child or children as proof. But PROOF is seldom required where secrecy is the rule. As long as the taxpayers cannot see through the trick, everything will be just dandy.

If you imagine that welfare authorities are being strictly honest with the taxpayers, in this and many other areas...you are very much mistaken!

CHAPTER 6 - THE FRUIT OF THEIR LOINS [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

Lily Charles, born in Arkansas in 1922, brought herself and her peculiar brand of citizenship to Los Angeles in 1945. She "thinks" she married one Cliff Charles in 1949. Somehow, she cannot remember the date or the place of the "marriage." Regardless of this, she took Mr. Charles' surname and in 1950, the two produced a female infant. In 1953, Cliff Charles, Jr., was presented to the taxpayers of Los Angeles County and the United States of America to support. The most interesting aspect here is that Mr. Charles had departed from the home early in 1952. This did not preclude Lily from giving a third child his name, when it was born in 1955, three years after Mr. Charles had officially left the nest.

About this time, Lily took up a more permanent, although no more legal, relationship with Ivan Davies and set about producing for Mr. Davies...and, of course, the taxpayers...in quick succession a good-sized family of infants, all illegitimate and all supported by the taxpaying public.

This is another "incapacitated stepfather" case. Mr. Davies, although not married to Lily, is supported under this classification. One thing of which the taxpayers can be most certain...Mr. Davies' reproductive organs are not incapacitated.

Now, this family of illegitimates is actively producing other illegitimates for the taxpayers to continue supporting.

* * *

Rosie Alvarez, born in 1935, is classified as an unmarried mother in medical social case records. At the age of seventeen she brought forth her first illegitimate infant. She has not been idle in the ensuing period, producing in rapid succession six more illegitimate children for whom she designates five different fathers.

Rosie was overjoyed at the birth of the last infant...even though the taxpayers may not have been. Her delight, as she confided to me, was due to the fact that her "dear, wonderful social caseworker" from the Bureau of Public Assistance had promised her that as soon as the baby was born, her most recent paramour would be added to the family welfare budget. Rosie reasoned this was only proper. After all, she had formally named this particular man as the father of this child. She had been a little less certain of the sires of some of its

predecessors.

With this splendid increase in her "aid" budget, brought about by the birth of the newly misbegotten offspring and the new shiftless male ensconced in her home, Rosie feels that she has it "made". She has! The revised budget brings in considerably more than she or the infant's male parent could possibly earn by their own efforts. (Since that time, Rosie has presumably added at least two or three more illegitimate infants to her aid budget...time, nature and the taxpayers' money permitting.)

Rosie felt that since her new "man" was now *officially* a member of the family by grace of the Bureau of Public Assistance, she might be able to hold him *permanently*...perhaps. Rosie had not had much success in holding the other men who previously graced her home for short periods. Now, however, with the taxpayers so kindly picking up the whole tab for this illegitimate brood and this illicitly cohabitating couple, she felt that the "alliance" might be more substantial. She would be very happy if it allowed her to provide the taxpayers with several more illegitimate infants. It would be nice to move into the better than \$100 per week class...net, of course.

Rosie has never worked. She never needed to. She has been supported all her life by tax-monies. Without the shadow of a doubt, Rosie will raise every one of her many children to follow closely in her own relaxed, "successful" footsteps as a welfare recipient.

* * *

Merta Bass was born in 1938 in Mississippi, and came to California, the land of golden opportunity, about 1959. She had already launched herself on a career of welfare reciprocity prior to her arrival in California, by producing two illegitimate children. Being the Unmarried Mother of illegitimate children was the magic formula that provided her with the *right* to almost instantaneous welfare allotments in California. Although there was at that time a waiting period before an applicant was allowed to dip light-hearted fingers into the local welfare fund, Merta easily surmounted this obstacle.

Secure in her knowledge that the taxpayers would be obliged to foot the bills, Merta added to her illegitimate family with light-hearted rapidity. She, too, never needed to work...in California.

Merta has approximately twenty fertile years ahead of her, during which time she will, without doubt, continue to burden the taxpayers with a still larger brood of ill-begotten, illegitimate offspring. They, in turn, will follow her lead down the path of welfare reciprocity.

* * *

The usually commendable quality of perseverance is demonstrated in the next case. It might, of course, be asked: "What could this couple have accomplished for themselves, had they directed their energy and persistence towards a worthier goal than welfare reciprocity?"

Willard Blake and his family arrived in Los Angeles in August, 1960. Before thirty days had passed, the Blakes applied for aid at the nearest office of the Bureau of Public Assistance. As the Code read at that time, they were not yet eligible. Apparently, they could find no witnesses who would lie for them as to their length of residence in California. Aid was refused.

To be refused aid, made the Blakes more than unhappy; they were furious. Unaccustomed to being denied, they meant to get that money (which they considered their just *right*) - if it was the last thing they did. It is normal for welfare recipients to feel they have a God-given *right* to all the tax funds *they* deem *necessary* for themselves and their families. They have no intention of letting their *right* to these tax-funds be denied.

When the Blakes applied for aid in September, 1960, they were told that they must have resided in California for at least a year, before they could be considered eligible for welfare. So in September, 1961, they promptly applied again for Aid to Needy Children. To their amazement, they were once more refused.

During that year of waiting, Mr. Blake had been reduced to the almost unthinkable expedient of going to

work. No more painful decision could have been forced upon him by a cruel fate. Go to work he did, however, complaining bitterly all the while. Meanwhile, the Blakes' busy minds began to work out a plan which they felt certain would make further denial of welfare aid impossible. The most recent grounds for denial had been Mr. Blake's employment, and "lack of deprivation by the children of the father". All this was carefully explained to the Blakes by kind and obliging caseworkers. What they must do to assure eligibility was also explained by the same kind, obliging and addlebrained workers.

In October, 1962, just a month after the last refusal, Mr. Blake officially "left home." In December, 1962, after waiting the required three months in order to establish "deprivation of the children," Mrs. Blake applied for public assistance. As they had planned and hoped, the Blake family promptly became the proud and happy recipients of a monthly welfare grant of \$376 a month, free and clear. Now, five years later, they probably are receiving a grant of nearly \$500 per month.

In addition to the cash grant, the family receives all the usual fringe benefits, such as 100% medical care and the potential of an added \$300 per month, should Mrs. Blake, with her usual perseverance, succeed in proving that she needs a house keeper to help her in caring for her brood.

The welfare check is about twice the amount Mr. Blake was earning, during his enforced but temporary employment. Moreover, though the job had provided him with partial medical coverage, it did not offer the free and complete medical care since enjoyed by the entire family.

That the taxpayers might derive less enjoyment from the situation matters not at all to this scheming couple...nor to the Bureau of Public Assistance. After a few years in golden California, the Blakes receive gratis more than twice their usual earned income, and happily anticipate continued care and support from tax funds for the rest of their natural lives.

* * *

Alma Mary Andrews averages well over \$500 a month, plus all the medical expenses she deems necessary for herself and her fifteen children. At the moment she is again pregnant. She can identify the fathers of only five of her children. One father she actually married...but briefly. Monogamy is not for Alma Mary. The rest of the children were sired by parties unknown.

For her contribution to a masochistic society (which obviously caters to her particular type of bad citizenship) she receives a far greater financial *reward* than she could possibly get if she attempted to provide for herself by more conventional methods.

Of course, Alma Mary's grant would be still larger, had not her older children already embarked on their own careers in illegitimacy and crime, which are now being separately financed out of public funds.

What Alma Mary and her children have and will cost the defenseless taxpayer is beyond calculation. To date — apart from delivery costs and other medical charges, and apart from those children who qualify for aid grants of their own — Alma Mary and her family averages from \$500 to \$600 per month. This does not make Alma Mary feel guilty. It does not worry the male partners who provide her with practically uninterrupted pregnancies. Nor does it seem to disturb the social workers who continue serenely to pass out aid funds and to shelter Alma Mary and her kind under such a cloak of protective care and secrecy.

* * *

Sarah Ensenada has been receiving welfare checks since 1949 and even earlier. There are indications that she was included in her mother's aid grant before she herself became an active *unmarried mother*. Now in her forties, Sarah has borne eleven children, all supported by the taxpayers. Only one child has even a faint claim to legitimacy.

Sarah "thinks" she was married to the father of her first four illegitimate children, some time before the birth of a fifth child. The shock of fathering a legitimate infant seemed to have been too much for him, or else he

preferred a more carefree life. At any rate, he disappeared.

A new male promptly turned up, and assisted Sarah in the production of four more illegitimate babies. At present she is living in so-called "common-law" relationship with still another man. Do you wonder who sired Sarah's two remaining children?

Don't give it a thought. Sarah hasn't. Neither have the fathers. It is just another case of beget and forget...except for the taxpayers who must assume the burden of support.

Sarah is socially secure. By the time the youngest child can no longer be used to obtain *Aid for Families with Dependent Children*, Sarah will be eligible for an old age pension. She is well aware of this. Even if she were not, solicitous social workers would be quick to remind her of her rights!

* * *

Esther Herrera was born in Mexico. At fifteen she came to California to confer upon the United States taxpayers, in due time, the full burden of her seventeen children. She began her successful career as a welfare recipient at the ripe age of sixteen, with the birth of her first child. Strangely, she claims only one father for all these children. She even claims to be legally married. Moreover, the family was a frugal one, and able in a comparatively short time, to buy and pay for the home in which they live...all this, supposedly, from welfare funds.

Several questions, however, remain unanswered: a) where was the elusive but ever-loving spouse all these years? b) if he was working, why did the family receive total public assistance? c) why should the taxpayers have supported this family, and assisted them in their purchase of a home under the circumstances?

Many of the taxpayers who were forced to assist this family, while it bought and paid for a home, do not hold title free and clear to a home of their own .

* * *

Marilyn Houser was born in Oklahoma in 1925. About 1944 she decided to make her home in Los Angeles. Some time before this she married Samuel Houser, but the marriage was of brief duration. To Marilyn's knowledge, there had been no divorce. This was no deterrent to the almost annual pregnancies whereby she has added six more infants to the five allegedly fathered by Samuel. Four different men are named as the fathers.

From her profession as welfare recipient Marilyn collects a tidy monthly income. One of the children was fathered by a man who conveniently admitted paternity before dying. This made the child eligible for Old Age and Survivor's Benefits from the Department of the Federal Government. Also, the child was a beneficiary of a Veteran Survivor's Pension. These sums, added to her Aid to Families with Dependent Children welfare check run to more than \$600, free and clear, each month. Naturally, she also receives free obstetrical and medical care for her self and the children.

This matriarch of the welfare rolls is blooming and self-assured. At the time I interviewed her, she had just been delivered of her eleventh child. Lying there in a hospital bed, Marilyn appeared to be a personage of some importance in her own right. One got the impression she was accustomed to giving orders and of having those orders obeyed.

I was struck by her air of authority and exquisite disdain. Her long, slender hands were soft and beautifully manicured...not the hands one expects of a woman on public assistance, just delivered of her eleventh child. Her make-up was impeccable. The overnight bag beside her bed was an expensive one. Her gown, with matching negligé casually draped over the foot of the bed, was simple, elegant and costly.

Marilyn's amusement at the questions I asked her was unconcealed, as if such inquiries were beneath her. She reminded me of some sleek cat stretching and then dozing in the sun, expecting the entire bottle of cream to be poured out for her delectation.

It occurred to me that the men who visited this handsome creature probably paid very well for her favors. Her glowing self-confidence suggested they must have felt the money well-spent. One could almost hear her purr: "How can a simple minded social worker, with all those years of college behind her, possibly understand that there are many difficult-to-verify sources of income. I'm the *intelligent* one. I haven't had all the sense educated out of me, and I know what it's worth to be a woman."

Yes, without a doubt, the woman who lounged there...relaxed, complacent and quite unconfused...was by her own standards, a complete success.

* * *

Mercedes Howard was brought to - - - Hospital with the following diagnosis: 'Ill with exhaustion...her baby-sitter had to leave and she just cannot cope with her young family". On interviewing Mercedes, I found her to be a rather attractive young woman in her late twenties.

At the moment, however, her disposition left much to be desired. In fact, she was acting the part of a shrew. At twenty-seven years of age she had been pregnant ten times. As the result, she had delivered eight living infants, had one abortion, and was now pregnant again.

When Mercedes came from her native Arizona, she left three of her children behind. She was quick to say that she did not know what had happened to them and that she couldn't care less. After arriving in California, she produced — with the kind and considerate help of the Bureau of Public Assistance and the medical staff at - - - Hospital — five more children, all illegitimate.

Mercedes said that she thought she *might* have been married at one time, but was unable to provide any pertinent details. She claimed the present whereabouts of this "possible" spouse was unknown to her, and had been for more than three years. In spite of this, the last few infants she had conceived and delivered were credited to the prowess of this same elusive male.

Mercedes told me she was demanding that the Bureau of Public Assistance provide her with a *full-time* housekeeper, instead of a mere baby-sitter, to help take care of the five children in the home while she was going through this tenth pregnancy. She said crossly that she intended to remain in the hospital, until said full-time house-keeper was provided. Her most fervent hope was that her "worker" (social caseworker from the Bureau of Public Assistance) was having "one hell of a time taking care of those five brats!"

* * *

Bill and Barbara Lister were both born in Texas and may have been married there sometime in 1951, after Barbara had already produced her first illegitimate child by another man. For Bill, in less than a year, Barbara swiftly produced two more infants.

By this time Barbara had heard of Los Angeles, California...city of golden opportunity for fertile and promiscuous women. So she hurried off (without Bill) to that place of lazy, golden days. There, with the assistance of three different males and, of course, the always obliging taxpayers, she quickly gave birth to four more illegitimate offspring.

Barbara is leaving nothing to chance. In her eagerness to add to the welfare rolls, she produced *three* children — illegitimate, of course — in a single year! One was delivered in March, 1962. The twins were born prematurely in November of the same year. The twins, according to Barbara, did not have the same father as the child born only eight months before. She must have conceived the twins within moments after leaving - - - Hospital following her March confinement!

Formerly men and women lived by the fruits of their labor; now individuals gain a livelihood from the fruits of their loins. This is the very reverse of progress, civilization, human dignity, a return to the state of barnyard animals.

Turn again to that portion of the California Welfare and Institutions Code (Section XIX), which states:

It is also the purpose of this code...to insure that the rights or *physical, mental or moral welfare of children are not violated or threatened by their present circumstances or environment...*(Italics added.)

In every one of the cases cited the women concerned could have been penalized for their irresponsible behavior. Their children could have been removed by law from such degrading and immoral surroundings. Instead, these children have been allowed to emulate and repeat *ad-infinitum* the anti-social activities practiced by their mothers and rewarded by the government.

WHY?

CHAPTER 7 - A FAMILY TRADITION [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

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

These instructors receive signal assistance from the permissive, undemanding social workers, who aid and abet the welfare recipient in bypassing (and even violating) the few remaining laws that can be used to protect innocent children and harried, over-burdened taxpayers.

Anna Mae is an example of the devastation being wreaked upon our society by one prolific, promiscuous female. While her profession is welfare recipiency, her avocation is prostitution. She has expertly trained and is still training her off spring along both lines. Anna Mae was born in Oklahoma in 1926. In the process of traveling towards California and the Los Angeles County pot of welfare gold, she "thinks" she was married twice. She has no records to substantiate her vague memories and the two possible husbands have long since disappeared. Their disappearance failed to halt or even slow down Anna's reproductive activities.

Anna Mae's welfare case was opened in Los Angeles County in 1949. It has never been closed. Already some of her children are themselves heads of brood-groups supported by tax funds. Anna, herself, has a few fertile years ahead of her. In the past she has never failed to conceive and produce with automatic regularity. There is no reason to think that she will change this pattern now. This might, quite logically, bring her net human production total to approximately twenty individuals, all supported since conception by tax funds. Counting the medical care, hospitalization, pharmaceuticals, etc., provided this family, the cost to the taxpayers can be conservatively estimated at \$600 per month. Over a period of twenty years, that amounts to \$144,000. This figure does not include the costs accumulated by Anna's children who already are aid recipients.

Can we estimate that at least half of Anna's children will imitate their mother and go on welfare? (The average, actually, is a great deal higher.) During the next twenty years, should even half of Anna's children follow the family tradition of welfare recipiency, and should they average the same amount in aid grants (records indicate that grants are being speedily increased), the cost to the taxpayers could be \$1,440,000, for merely one half of this woman's offspring. This is a very large sum for the taxpayers to pay, in order to support the products of the womb of just *one* promiscuously fertile and irresponsible female.

And there are thousands and thousands of women today like Anna Mae!

* * *

Bertha Gonzales, born in Mexico, was brought to the United States by her parents when still an infant. Her father began receiving public assistance almost immediately via the federal Works Projects Administration (WPA). Bertha and her children began receiving public assistance prior to 1950. There was a brief period of six weeks in 1954 when aid was temporarily withheld and a fraud action was contemplated. Nothing came of it, however, and the whole crew was back on assistance at the end of one and one-half months. This incident only strengthened the feeling of complete and absolute security this family feels concerning its cash grants from public tax funds. Its members realize that welfare recipiency is the easiest, surest and most permanent way of obtaining an income today.

The reason for the contemplated fraud charge seemed to be that Bertha, during these many years, had lived in so-called (but illegal) "common-law relationship" with one Perez Ferrera. In fact, she claimed that all of her children were fathered by him. Perez was owner and operator of a fairly prosperous barber shop in East Los Angeles until his death late in 1963. Yet, all that time his natural family and the mother of his children were supported by tax funds and provided with *free* medical care. Yes...I know it was not legally permissible; but it was done, nevertheless! Bertha, as a second generation welfare recipient has been an excellent, effective instructor in the gentle art of welfare reciprocity. Her two oldest daughters both receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Her only son is presently in a penal institution; his wife receives Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Now, if Bertha's youngest daughter would just conceive and produce, Bertha could boast a 100% record of success as a welfare recipient.

With Perez dead and the youngest child at home about to reach an age where Aid to Families with Dependent Children would no longer be available to Bertha, she soberly asked me for suggestions and help on her problem. She wanted to know if she could qualify for general relief when the children's aid was discontinued. I replied that she would have to inquire at the Bureau of Public Assistance, since it was not within the jurisdiction of the Department of Medical Social Service to provide such information. While we were discussing her "problem," however, I volunteered the suggestion that she might consult the "*help wanted*" section of the local newspapers. There were always many people advertising for house keepers, mothers-helpers, maids, etc. I suggested this might provide a much more satisfying solution than continued public assistance.

Bertha was most unhappy at my suggestion. She immediately withdrew into herself. Her warm, confiding manner changed abruptly. She coldly demanded the medical service orders that had been the original reason for her call, and left. The advertisements for domestic help interested her not at all. She was only open to suggestions that would help her to obtain an income from tax funds, with no effort or work whatever on her part. Obviously, she had no intention of going to work. A professional public assistance recipient since infancy, who had tapped tax funds to support her own children and now saw her grandchildren (the fourth generation) being handsomely cared for by the taxpayers, she had no patience with anyone who might suggest at this late date that she try to support herself.

* * *

In 1964, the District Attorney's office in Los Angeles County was informed that social workers had actually reached out into several Eastern and Southern states, and *recruited* welfare recipients! If this was a fact, Mittie Henry showed every sign of being such a recruit. She appeared to have been well-coached on local public assistance practices, though at the time of my first interview with her she had been in California less than thirty days. She knew precisely where to go, what to demand, and what answers to give.

Mittie had reached Los Angeles County just in time for her eldest daughter, a child of seventeen years, to deliver her second illegitimate child. With Mittie, also, came her other twelve children (only three of whom had even the slightest claim to legitimacy); the eldest daughter's first illegitimate child; and Mittie's own eighty-six-year-old grandmother.

Any normally intelligent bystander could infer that Mittie had no idea of attempting to support this crowd through her own endeavors. Her target was the pockets of the taxpayers (local and national) with assistance from the local welfare officials. Thanks to her thorough knowledge of the welfare practices in Los Angeles County, Mittie realized that she and her family had nothing to fear.

Mittie's eldest daughter, on delivering her second illegitimate infant, immediately became eligible for public assistance in Los Angeles County, including all the usual fringe benefits.

Mittie herself promptly arranged to be hospitalized for extensive surgery at taxpayers expense. The rest of the family was supplied with *free* medical care even though they were residentially ineligible for it.

Today, some five years later, this group is eligible for more than \$1,000 per month in cash grants, plus 100% medical care including medicines.

In the state from which this "family" group came, Mittie told me she had earned \$15 a week as a domestic helper, *when she cared to work*. Otherwise, she received approximately the same amount in public assistance for not working. She had been reared on public aid, as had her mother and grandmother before her. Now she had merely brought her family to an area which guaranteed a higher rate of welfare cash grants — and a greater *reward* for illegitimacy. It did not occur to Mittie or to her children to look for other means of support. Public assistance being so easy to obtain, what incentive is there to attempt self-sufficiency?

* * *

Wilma Roberts knows how to play it smart...very smart! A few years ago, using her excess welfare funds, she bought a lot with two houses. Here she maintains an establishment for herself, her four minor illegitimate offspring, her three illegitimate adult daughters and *their* illegitimate children. She and the older daughters all work diligently at the dual professions *unmarried mother* and prostitute. The welfare cash grant for this active little group is far in excess of \$1000 per month. Add it to all the medical care required by these productive females, and you can see that they cost the taxpaying public quite a sum of money. Of course, Wilma is a taxpayer, too. She pays taxes on the two homes she owns free and clear...paid for from welfare grants. Wilma's fourth daughter was soon to be launched on the remunerative career of unmarried mother and prostitute. That, of course, would increase the loot collected by this lively family.

Since Wilma and her daughters all live cosily together, there is always someone at home in case of a visit from one of their social workers, while the females not currently excessively pregnant are away "working".

* * *

Gloria Graves knows how to commercialize motherhood and make it pay. From 1924 she has capitalized on the fact that she was a producer of infants. She was only fifteen years old when she first received public assistance in her own name, in her home town of Denver, Colorado. As soon as her daughters were physically able, they adopted their mother's profession, which might be called "*Pregnancies, Unlimited*". Before Gloria left Colorado for the more golden welfare valleys of California in 1959, she had bred and trained both children and grandchildren in the family tradition of welfare reciprocity.

Once in California, Gloria was quickly welcomed to the local public assistance rolls. In due time, she guided other daughters into unmarried motherhood and Aid to Families with Dependent Children. By the time Gloria ran out of minor children as a pretext for obtaining public assistance for herself, one of her sons had joined the Armed Forces, and she began receiving an allotment as his dependent. Gloria is a shining example of a woman who has obtained and still obtains all her income from the products of her womb. Her influence lives on even after her own procreativity has ceased. The history of her daughters, granddaughters, and daughters-in-law, testifies to her potent contribution to the ever-increasing welfare burden carried by the responsible taxpaying citizens.

A most interesting facet of my interviews with Gloria, however, had little to do with her proven ability to make a living as a professional mother. It related to her application for *free* medical care at the medical aid office where I was working.

As a serviceman's dependent, Gloria was eligible for full and *free* medical care at any of the Armed Service facilities, the nearest of which was in San Pedro, about fifteen miles away. In case of emergency, she was covered by the Blue Cross Medical Insurance plan and could go to any private physician anywhere.

The *free* medical care dispensed through the medical aid office where I worked was meant only for persons who had no other medical resources available, or for persons considered to be "medical indigents." Gloria qualified as neither. In fact, she appeared to be a prime example of total ineligibility.

Apparently because I too often discovered ineligible applicants, I had been ordered to clear all "possible ineligibles" with the Medical Director, before referring such persons to another source of medical care.

Though I could see no logical reason for providing Gloria with *free* medical care through the County, I

underrated our Medical Director's in genuinity.

"Why, Mrs. Detlof, *of course* you must consider this woman eligible!" cried our Medical Director in unfeigned dismay. "You don't really think we can expect her to go all the way to San Pedro from - - - do you? Why!!! *Of course not!* Issue proper medical service orders to her at once!"

I said that I certainly did expect Gloria to go to the Armed Services facilities at Fort MacArthur, where she could get medical care at no cost to herself, or the local taxpayers. She was accustomed to taking trips to Colorado every month or so, to visit her children and relatives back there. I didn't see why she could not make the much shorter trip to San Pedro, California.

The Director was adamant. She insisted that Gloria be given medical service orders for *free* care by a private panel-physician, to be paid by the local taxpayers.

"I *do* hope," the Director remarked tartly, "that you have *not* allowed *our client* to become aware of your attitude, Mrs. Detlof!"

As far as I could discover, the Director's view was that Gloria has been (and still is) a *valuable* "client", who has performed continuously and well as a permanent, self-perpetuating welfare recipient. Such persons are *necessary* and must be *encouraged*, in order to assure continual, ever-expanding welfare rolls...and jobs for the people-planners and social workers!

Yes, looking at it from the Director's angle, I could see why she felt that Gloria must be treated with extreme deference and almost servile consideration. After all, there was an old and rather ugly formula: "You scratch my back...*I'll scratch yours.*" In this case, however, the scratching was done with tax funds. My stubborn, Scots-Irish mind still kept asking: *Why? Why? Why?*

* * *

Grandmother Conchita Queens, professional aid recipient and unmarried mother (in fact still actively procreating), had oriented her daughter, Reba Lorenz, in the same professions with great success. A few years ago, Reba initiated *her* oldest daughter, a mere child, into the same professional intricacies. Quite obviously, unless something un expected happens, a fourth generation will continue the pattern.

In fact, the social workers will be so encouraging and so tenderly solicitous that it will seem not only the *wise*, but the *right* thing to do in the eyes of Conchita Queen's great-granddaughters.

In only three generations this particular "family" group has been a costly burden for the unsuspecting taxpayers. But, of course, it is such a pleasant and satisfactory arrangement for the Conchitas, the Rebas and their numerous descendants.

* * *

Frances Jones started her oldest daughter in the lucrative family "trade" of unmarried mother at the age of thirteen years. When barely fourteen, the child was delivered of twins. Frances Jones has never married. Her own mother appears to never have married. The family history is one of illegitimacy and dependency. Therefore, it is only natural that Frances' oldest daughter, Ina, should have been completely unconcerned about such a superfluous formality as marriage and its accompanying obligations.

Instead of removing Ina from the criminally negligent supervision of her mother, the case worker from the Bureau of Public Assistance *rewarded* Frances Jones by increasing her welfare grant. The law provides that such children as Ina shall be given a chance to live a decent, honest and worthwhile life. The caseworkers ignore the laws designed to protect such children. Instead, they enforce only those sections of the Code which provide for increased grants. Thus children are literally *forced* to continue a way of life that is not only degrading to them and the decent individuals supporting them...but is downright *illegal*...

* * *

Laura Eden is not quite thirty years of age. To date, she has produced twelve illegitimate infants. Ever since the family arrived in California in 1945, Laura's mother and the large family she brought with her have all been supported by tax funds. Laura (like other nubile members of the same brood group) proved an exemplary pupil in the profession of welfare reciprocity. She was *rewarded* by the Los Angeles County Bureau of Public Assistance when she produced her first illegitimate offspring...by being given her own aid case, her own monthly income, her own kind and permissive caseworker.

Thus encouraged, Laura has been busy producing illegitimate infants *each year* for the taxpayers to support excepting only the years 1951, 1957 and 1962. Laura's mother is still an active recipient of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Over half the other members of the "family" are also recipients...supported under the "plan" facetiously known as Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

* * *

Patty Long was only sixteen when she became pregnant. But pregnancy is nothing new in Patty's young life. Her mother is usually pregnant, producing a new infant almost automatically at two year intervals. Patty joined her mother in this quite profitable activity at the earliest opportunity. When Patty's first illegitimate child was born, the social worker was somewhat puzzled. Her question was: "Should the new infant merely be added to the grandmother's welfare budget requirements (because of Patty's extreme youth) or should an entirely new, independent budget, case, and so forth, be set up for Patty and her infant?"

The question more properly should have been: "How can we deter Patty from following in her mother's footsteps and continuing this vicious chain of irresponsible procreation? How can we best help Patty towards a better, more constructive and worthwhile life?"

The conclusion (or so-called "solution") *finally* reached was to supply Patty with her very own case, her own cash grant, and perhaps her own caseworker. The reasoning behind this quite illegal solution was as follows: By setting up a new case for Patty, with her own budget and her own grant, the social worker was able to provide *more* money for this "family". *In other words, it had the effect of REWARDING this child for giving birth to an illegitimate baby and of REWARDING the child's mother for contributing to the delinquency of a minor!*

Perhaps the most alarming feature of the whole nightmare sequence of events is that there is no end in sight. Welfare departments grind out their budgets rewarding illicit acts. With every cash award for *bad* citizenship, more individuals are seduced into this kind of life.

It is most discouraging for decent citizens, who struggle, sacrifice, and work hard to care for them selves and their own dependents, to be obliged to shoulder the burden of all those irresponsible characters.

There is another cost to the nation that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. It is the return to a primitive, sub-civilized level of existence by an ever-increasing horde of people. It is an insidious, pervasive malignancy that affects and infects every fiber of our national life. Prompt treatment for this disease is indicated. Otherwise our culture, as we have known it, and as it was meant by our Founding Fathers to be, may be entering the terminal stage of its existence.

A partial remedy is contained in legal prescriptions already on the books. For example, the California *Welfare and Institutions Code* (Section XIX) states:

It shall be the purpose of this code, in establishing programs and services which are designed to provide protection, support or care of children, to provide protective services to the fullest extent deemed necessary by the juvenile court, probation department or other public agencies designated by the board of supervisors to perform the duties prescribed by this code to insure that the rights or physical, mental, or moral welfare of children are not violated or threatened by their present circumstances or environment...

Article Nine, Section 726, stipulates that a minor child may be removed from the custody of parent or caretaker and made a ward of the court if:

(a)...the parent or guardian is incapable of providing or has failed or neglected to provide proper maintenance, training and education for the minor...

and,

(c)...the welfare of the minor requires that his custody be taken from his parent or guardian...

Instead of obeying the law, social workers *reward* the parents and guardians of delinquent minors for their criminal acts.

These laws, and many others, have been legislated in order to provide helpless children with governmental protection...if it is needed. Such laws are studiously and continuously ignored and evaded (perhaps "violated" might be a more appropriate word) by the very individuals employed by the people to enforce them. Such action or inaction on the part of such governmental employees increases the welfare load with astonishing rapidity. And by such acts these governmental employees are themselves *guilty of contributing to the delinquency of minors*.

What great benefits might have been provided these girls (and in most cases their mothers before them) if instead of being *rewarded* for their behavior, they had been made wards of the court, placed in good foster homes or institutions, impressed with the knowledge that to obtain income by frequent and illegitimate pregnancies is not good citizenship and will be neither tolerated nor supported by the taxpaying public? Probably, today, these girls would be living happy, decent, worthwhile lives. As it is, they have been deprived of that opportunity by the very governmental agencies entrusted with their protection.

Please do not bring out the old saying, "A child is better off with its mother." In the actual cases described, and in the many similar cases, this is definitely *not* the truth. These children are not better for being left with their maternal parent...they are much worse off. And *so is the illegally bilked taxpaying public!*

Why do welfare departments and their various sub-agencies handle problems in such a way? *Is it a grim determination to expand their influence?...or its work load?...or to guarantee work for increasing numbers of social workers?...to enlarge their own little empires?*

Are caseworkers ordered (or guided...there is no difference) towards violations of the laws? If so...why?

The taxpayers of the United States of America have a right to ask these and many other pertinent questions. Furthermore, they have a RIGHT to explicit and detailed answers.

A girl who has lived her entire life surrounded by promiscuity, immorality and illegitimacy finds the obstacle almost insurmountable even though she may yearn for decency and self-sufficiency. The child's mother may be only permissively acquiescent in guiding her daughter into the role of unmarried mother; or she may be openly aggressive about it. The final blow, the proof of official, governmental approval, is the *reward* paid in the form of increased welfare checks as soon as the caseworkers receive the physician's statement verifying the girl's pregnancy.

In cases in which the girl is quite young, the additional cash grant may go to the mother of the child. Thus, the child's misfortunes benefit the mother.

Once, while in the medical aid office, when I was (in, I fear, my usual blunt way) stressing my points about this type of thing, a girl from the clerical staff reprimanded me with: "Mrs. Detlof! How can you say such things! If it were not for these people, you wouldn't have a job!" She meant just what she said...she was absolutely serious.

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

Let the taxpayers consider this clerk's statement carefully. Could it be the basis for much of the fundamental problem involved in the vast illegal, unethical and unnecessary scope of public assistance?

But what of the innocent victims...the children who are NOT protected? Are they of less importance than

jobs?

WHY?

CHAPTER 8 - THE GOOD LIFE [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

Eddie Ramirez, twenty-two years of age, six feet tall, about two hundred and twenty pounds of indolent, arrogant and slack-jawed young man hood, lounged in the chair beside my desk. His attitude seemed to combine relaxed good-natured condescension with absolute certainty as to the results of the interview. His air of luxury matched his expensive car-coat, excellent tailored slacks and shirt. He was wearing gloves, an unusual thing for a man at that particular season in California...unless he was driving an open sports car.

Since Eddie was unmarried and living in the home of his mother, his social history was still carried in his mother's case. However, because this young man appeared to be capable of self-support, I ignored his mother's case history and began the interview regarding his personal finances.

"Where do you work?" was my first question after the usual opening preliminaries.

Eddie Ramirez threw back his head and laughed. Surprised, I repeated the question.

"Lady," answered Eddie with evident disdain at the mere idea of his working, "I DON'T WORK!" His great and very visible amusement indicated that the thought that HE could be even suspected of WORKING was entirely too much for his sense of the appropriate.

"Well," I asked weakly, trying again, "Where did you last work?"

Back again went the handsome young head and out came the hoot of arrogant laughter. "Lady, I NEVER have WORKED!" His accompanying stare was a challenge and a taunt. He meant it to be just that.

Momentarily I just sat there, confounded, and gazed at the smug, self-satisfied young face. Then I picked up his mother's case history and began reading it to myself in an effort to discover a profitable question to ask this young man.

It was a typical welfare case. His mother had been a recipient of public assistance most (if not all) of her life. All her eight children were illegitimate, although she claimed to have married the father of the last child several years after its birth. Three other men were named as sires of this woman's brood. The young man, Eddie, sitting beside my desk, was the oldest child.

The receptionist had written on the interview slip that the disability for which Eddie was seeking tax-paid medical care was "nervousness." Since the young man appeared quite calm and self-possessed, and thinking that perhaps there was something more urgently needed, I asked him if this was his only problem requiring medical assistance. With a flippant grin he stated that, so far as he knew, nothing else was the matter with him.

(There were several things I could find wrong with him, I was thinking to myself...but then, who was I to evaluate this privileged young superman.)

"If you do not work, then where do you obtain the money to buy your clothing, provide your living expenses...." I finally managed.

The young man gave me again his smug condescending smile. "I live with my mother. My mother gives me money. My mother receives Aid to Families with Dependent Children." He recited the words in a rhyming sing-song manner as if he had used this little routine many, many times previously and apparently with certain success...like a magic wand to open all doors at his command.

"You mean," I began slowly, softly, "That you are twenty-two years of age and you are still depending upon your mother's welfare check?"

The young man smiled and nodded approvingly as if I had suddenly become a good idiot...who was FINALLY learning to cooperate with him.

"There is nothing physically wrong with you...other than what you term 'nervousness', yet you do not and you never have worked?" I heard myself mumbling the words in amazement.

The young man nodded his head again. His smile, somehow, seemed a little less brilliant and smug.

"And do you come in here often to request *free* medical care from the taxpayers of the County of Los Angeles I heard myself continuing.

"Sure...why not?" Eddie's smile had almost disappeared.

For a long moment I just sat there, truly amazed and looked at this individual with consternation. Then, almost without thinking, I asked: "And how much longer do you think these taxpayers can continue to provide you with all of this when there is no reason, whatsoever, that you cannot provide it for yourself?"

Consternation and amazement were written starkly across the young man's countenance. Perhaps for the first time in his obviously useless life, this individual had been provided with a new and different picture of himself. Eddie Ramirez twisted around in his chair as if poised for flight.

"Lady," he whispered hoarsely, "if you plan to give me any trouble, just forget about your old medical service papers...I don't need them, anyway..." As he got up to leave, his foot caught in the rung of the chair. He stumbled, quickly regained his balance and left with celerity.

A further reading of the mother's case history showed that Eddie Ramirez, supported since BEFORE his birth by tax-funds, without one single responsibility in the world, had been a frequent patient at - - - Hospital. Do you want to know the diagnosis for his frequent admissions? It is ATTEMPTED SUICIDE.

Let us pretend that, from the very beginning, a very different kind of social philosophy had been followed in guiding Eddie Ramirez. Let us say that he was encouraged to strive for self-improvement, self-sufficiency and personal responsibility. What, now, might have been his personal situation? He might have become a great educator, a scientist or a statesman before he ended his days of accomplishment and self-renewal. At any rate by the time he was twenty two years of age he would have been happily and gainfully employed meeting each day's challenge with confidence, courage, fortitude and vigor.

Obviously today's social philosophy of personal irresponsibility and of "getting everything for nothing" is not sufficient to meet Eddie's emotional needs. When his emotional pressures of resentment against his non-striving existence become too intense, he attempts to remove himself from his vegetable-like existence...the very existence into which he has been expertly guided by the people-planners.

By encouraging and guiding Eddie to believe that personal irresponsibility and parasitism is the essence of THE GOOD LIFE, they have perpetrated upon him a gigantic swindle. And what malicious and deliberate deceit it embodies. What a devastating fraud has been played upon welfare recipients and taxpayers alike! The so-called beneficiaries of these socialistically planned governmental gimmicks (New Deal, New Frontier, Great Society, or whatever) are as tragically caught up in this horrendous hoax as are the slave-taxpayers who must finance these experiments upon the human animal.

Today, if his latest attempt at ending his stagnant existence was again unsuccessful, Eddie Ramirez is probably still riding around in the sports car he dares not admit owning, on money supplied him by his mother from her public assistance grant and from whatever funds he may be able to extract from unsuspecting victims. Probably the medical aid office at which I interviewed Eddie has issued to him at least a six months supply of unrestricted medical service orders, so that he may go to his private physician as long as and as often as his spoiled little heart may desire...all at the expense of the taxpayers.

And Eddie Ramirez probably still hates himself just as much as ever...if not more...without really knowing why!

* * *

For some the story takes a different twist. James and Maria Rosas were thirty and twenty-eight years old, respectively, at the time of our interview. In the ten years of their marriage they had produced seven children and momentarily expected their eighth.

From July, 1959, until November, 1963, James had worked for a company in - - - -, California. He was paid seventeen dollars per day, five days a week for a total gross of about \$370 per month. From this amount, there were a few deductions. The net income averaged approximately \$350.

In November, 1963, James and Maria Rosas applied for Aid to Families with Dependent Children. The very first welfare check they received was for \$348...just two dollars less than the amount James had netted when he was working full time. More than compensating for the small amount of two dollars is the fact that now this family is on public assistance and they need to assume personal responsibility for practically nothing. In addition to their cash grant, their every medical expense will be paid, without limitation, without question...by the taxpayers.

With the expected arrival of the eighth infant in a matter of a few weeks, this family was budgeted to receive considerably more via their welfare grant than James had netted at his job.

Had James continued working, his earnings might have increased to a much greater amount than welfare funds affords him, but will he have the courage to give up a sure and easy income for one that demands so much more of him personally? Or will he vegetate more and more, and become only a food-consuming, procreating human turnip?

* * *

When interviewed at - - - - Hospital in 1964, Alice Wilson stated she was receiving approximately \$300 per month from Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Although, according to Alice, her spouse was working at two jobs and earning in excess of \$500 per month, he was not contributing to the family. (Actually a little telephonic investigation revealed the man was netting considerably more than \$500 per month.)

Alice stated that she was too "proud" to go to her husband and beg him for support money. Since public assistance was so easy to obtain she had chosen that route.

Had public assistance been less simple and easy to obtain, this marriage and many more like it might have been, out of sheer necessity, salvaged and eventually restored. Instead, a home is destroyed as a social entity, children are deprived of a father, a woman gives up too easily as a wife. The husband and father, knowing the taxpayers will provide sufficiently for his family, evades completely his responsibilities and also foregoes the joy of rearing his children.

* * *

Priscilla Wales divorced her first husband in 1961. Although there had been medical insurance coverage for the family through her husband's employment as a railway brakeman, the entire family had always received *free* and complete medical care through the Los Angeles County medical facilities.

In 1963, Priscilla decided that perhaps she would remarry. But...first...she contacted the Department of Medical Social Services at - - - - Hospital with her big problem. The deciding factor was...would Priscilla still be able to obtain *free* medical care for herself and her family, and could she still be allowed to receive her cash grant from the Bureau of Public Assistance?

She stated her case clearly and emphatically. If her cash grant and the family's *free* medical care were to be discontinued, there would simply be no marriage.

This was a reversal...welfare standing in the way of romance. Usually it seemed to be a contributing force by providing leisure time, funds and the accompanying boredom.

As so often happens, there were other aspects of Priscilla's problem that created an ambiguous answer to her question. The man Priscilla was considering marrying was a carpenter and a member of the carpenters' union. This union provides excellent medical insurance for members and dependents. If this couple did marry, I would wager that, in spite of the eligibility for medical care through private/union medical insurance, this entire family is still obtaining all their medical care at the expense of the taxpayers. To Priscilla, welfare reciprocity represented THE GOOD LIFE.

* * *

Robert Simmons and Jean (the girl he presented as his wife) received Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Yet, together, they do not have even one child. None is living with them nor dependent upon them. They are not yet the parents of a child; but Jean is pregnant.

Their expected infant has already been "put to work" to support its parents-to-be.

An embryo is being made to support the two agents of its creation.

Actually the couple is not legally married. They went through some type of ceremony (they say) in Tecate, Mexico. Such a ceremony would not constitute a legal marriage in California unless it was legal in Tecate and unless it was properly registered here in the state of California. There had been no California registration. (Perhaps there had been no ceremony in Tecate, either!)

The instant these two were certain that a physician could verify Jean's pregnancy, they hurried to the nearest office of the Department of Public Assistance and applied for (and obtained) Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

Robert Simmons made no attempt to hide his happiness and pleasure in THE GOOD LIFE of welfare reciprocity. He is most enthusiastic about such a future. He hopes, he explained to me, to have many, many children. On and on he gushed about the terrible suspense involved in waiting to see this his "first" child. Oh, according to Robert Simmons, it was nearly unbearable. But *such a thrill!* Perhaps, he said, he and Jean might have fifteen children...maybe even more...kids were such fun. Rattle! Rattle!

What Robert Simmons apparently did not know was that in his social case history there was a note pointing out that he had already admitted paternity of the child of another unmarried mother who also...along with that child...was being supported by the taxpayers under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children "program".

Yes, welfare reciprocity does provide THE GOOD LIFE to such irresponsible males as Robert Simmons and the many like him. Their apparent goal is to sire as many children as possible, then to evade all responsibilities for their own children. Such a perversion is rampant among the fathers of the many, many illegitimate children. That it is a perversion should be recognized. That it must be dealt with sternly must, also, be recognized. The United States taxpayers cannot continue to ignore the criminality of this type of activity and its prevalence, the irresponsibility of the males involved. These same taxpayers cannot be expected to be constantly and continually held financially responsible for such creatures and the results of their activities when these men are never forced to do so.

Taxpayers need to be provided some control, some check, in the area of wholesale fertilization of welfare mothers and the production of illegitimate infants in whom the male parents have no interest and whom they immediately abandon to the care of the taxpaying public.

Oh, yes, Robert Simmons and his momentary-wife are enjoying the Good Life at the expense of the taxpaying public...for whom life often is not quite so good.

CHAPTER 9 - MASQUERADE PARTY [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

The man is a fairly reasonable facsimile of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Sr. He appears to make an almost conscious effort to mimic the late president. As a carbon copy he is complete as to booming voice, always jovial

appearance and wheel chair. Let us call him Samuel Downs, which will suffice for our purpose.

Mr. Downs was ranking very, very big in a little resort area (*NOT* in Los Angeles County). He was the "unpaid" field representative of the United States Congressman in that area. He was the chairman of the local Democratic Committee. Continually active in local political affairs, he was always busy arranging luncheons, conferences, meetings, big dinners with top-ranking Democrat politicians, mayors of the county's cities (including the largest).

Every medium felt the weight of Mr. Downs' influence. Many were the "letters to the editor" published in widely separated locations signed by Samuel and Sallie Downs. These were biting, caustic and acrimonious in regards to the Republican party and/or the conservative movement in general. Letters with Mr. Downs' name attached appeared attacking Ronald Reagan, then candidate for Governor, and included in the denunciation "others of his ilk".

Mr. Downs claims to have been graduated from one of the highest ranking, best known Eastern private universities. He is suave, polished, articulate. At this particular time this man lived in a three-bedroom, two-bath home with its own private swimming pool. His rent was in excess of \$150,000 per month. He drove (drives) a nearly new model car of expensive make.

Yet, Mr. Downs was (and probably still is) a welfare recipient. According to the case record in the local welfare office, this man is a recipient of Aid to the Totally Disabled. The woman he continually introduced publicly as his "wife" is listed in the case record as a tax-paid "attendant." The congressman who had appointed Mr. Downs as his "unpaid" field representative was well aware of this fact, because there were several letters from the congressman urging that this man be paid a greater amount of tax-funds for his "attendant." Yet, the congressman always referred to the woman as Mr. Downs' wife in public. (This congressman was also well known for his piety, church activities and great religious principles.)

Not long before the last election, the candidate running against this particular congressman learned, somehow, of Mr. Down's *high living* on taxpayers hard earned money. The candidate apparently learned also that the congressman, himself, had written numerous pleas to the welfare department on behalf of Mr. Downs and the woman attendant, trying to get more money for him. Here was a man living on money collected from both Republican and Democratic party members. This man was using his leisure time and that of his attendant...leisure time made possible by Republicans as well as Democrats...to fight the Republican candidates with all the vigor of which he was capable. Yet government employees are forbidden even a semblance of political activity.

The candidate obtained a few minutes of radio time and placed the matter before the voters.

Next day there was a rebuttal from Mr. Downs...done in the *grand manner*. He had been invalided fighting for his country, defending the nation. Surely his people could do the very small thing of supporting him in his invalidism. He had received the purple heart, he said, as the result of his wartime activities. He felt that the small amount of federal funds he receives was only due him for his sacrifices. All this was well and good. However, in the local welfare department case there was no indication that he was receiving veteran's benefits. In the case the claim was made that he had *no other income other than that from the welfare department!* If he were, in fact, receiving veteran's benefits they most probably would have precluded his being eligible for public assistance.

With tremendous pomposity and monumental bluff, Mr. Downs threatened to sue the county welfare department. Naturally, he did nothing of the kind. Too much in the way of fraud would have been quickly evident.

Inevitably, it would have been discovered that at the same time he was receiving the full quota of Aid to the Totally Disabled, Mr. Downs was also receiving veteran's benefits for his disability plus another allowance for the attendant who publicly posed as his wife.

Naturally, the welfare department poised in all of its might to crush the creature who may have violated the

State's rule of secrecy regarding welfare recipients. More than thirty States consider the names, grants, etc., of welfare recipients to be merely "public papers", available to the citizens. Not so the State of California.

Once, during the ensuing investigation a timid suggestion was made that perhaps the man really was the recipient of veteran's benefits and therefore ineligible for Aid to the Totally Disabled. At the same time, it was suggested that an investigation regarding this might prove fruitful. Immediately the supervisor of the office interposed: "Oh, that has already been done, with a negative answer." Yet, when this man's case left this supervisor's desk to go back to the case worker, this same supervisor had clipped, on the outside of the case, a little note which read: "*Check for veteran's benefits.*" It had *not* been done before. And *one and one-half months later this case still lay on the caseworker's desk with the revealing note clipped to it and no action whatsoever taken as to verification of veteran's benefits.*

The only *investigation* regarding Mr. Downs' income from other sources had been to merely ask him if he had such income. His "sworn statement" had been accepted as PROOF! He had sworn that he had no income other than that from the Welfare Department.

This case, also, is a classic example and points out with startling clarity the complete lack of competent, thorough and sufficient medical examinations for those who apply for Aid to the Totally Disabled. The physician who had examined Mr. Downs, and thereby had provided the medical basis enabling him to qualify for this type of public assistance, had stated that the onset of this man's illness was in the early 1940's, and that the disability had been continuous since that time. Naturally, this would seem to preclude Mr. Downs' being able to serve in the Armed Forces. However, in a statement made by one of Mr. Downs' friends in providing proof of this man's residence, legally, in the state of California, that friend had stated that he and Mr. Downs had both been discharged from the United States Marine Corps in San Diego in 1959.

The question, then, is *since when does the Marine Corps induct totally incapacitated men into their branch of the service?* Either that, or *how much income does this man receive from veteran's benefits? Is he eligible to receive aid to the totally disabled, also?* That would be extremely doubtful.

If the social worker, his supervisor, or persons in even greater authority had taken the time it required to read the case, they might easily have discovered the answer.

Many are the masquerades perpetuated under California's secrecy-shield.

* * *

Helen Larsen and her children (all Aid to Families with Dependent Children recipients) played with gusto at welfare reciprocity and their "marvelous" masquerade party. Helen was assigned to a "work project" in the local welfare office. Her coffee breaks often consumed much of an entire hour, her lunch hours also were double the allotted time. During these little social activities, Helen's beer-parlor hoots and yelling permeated the entire building. Her time involved in private telephone conversations on the office telephones was unlimited. (This is the manner in which she was being introduced to "work".)

Helen's children spent a great deal of their hours out of school crowding into the welfare office, often in wet swim trunks, accompanied by their gangs. Nothing was "off limits" so far as they were concerned, including the office telephones which they often used for long personal conversations.

Helen and her children told everyone that she was a bonafide employee of the County Welfare Department. To the public they disclaimed public assistance reciprocity. In fact, her daughters refused even to apply for the jobs available at the school through the Economic Opportunity Act because they "were above such a level." The same girls bragged about their twenty-dollar boots, which they displayed for the office employees' approval, and often displayed expensive colored photographs of themselves in their latest evening dresses.

Helen seemed to be the only person in the office able to afford both a brand new automatic washing machine and dryer. The regular employees had to pay the taxes that helped to support her...they couldn't afford such items.

The entire situation became a complete farce when Helen's oldest daughter was graduated from high school. As a graduation gift, Helen's parents gave the girl a trip through most of the United States...*in their private four-place airplane*. Every day during her tour, the daughter would call Helen at work via long distance, and give her lengthy accounts of the latest leg of her flight. Then Helen would breathlessly relay the details to the Welfare staff. None of them seemed to think such luxuries were a bit out of place for a family supported by tax funds...a family, supposedly, of poverty.

Nothing was ever said about the fact that very few of the taxpayers who work to support this woman and her family can afford such costly graduation gifts for their children.

When I became so presumptuous as to make a somewhat sarcastic remark to one of my fellow-employees, I was rebuked and told we should be happy that Helen and her daughter were so blessed since they had so much less than the rest of us. "Such as?," I inquired. "Why," was the answer, "Helen doesn't own her own home!" I put my hand to my head and groaned, "Oh, so now we have to buy homes for them, too!" My attitude was not appreciated. In fact, it was wholly unacceptable.

Here, too, it appeared that welfare reciprocity was a family tradition. Helen's grandmother, who resides with Helen's mother (the one who, with her husband, is owner of the four-place airplane) is also on public assistance. Though records of this type are carefully handled so that such facts cannot easily be ascertained, it is quite probable that both Helen and her mother received public assistance before Helen commenced her own welfare family.

* * *

The secrecy-shield afforded welfare recipients hides many peculiar things. William John is known in his community as the responsible and respected owner of two separate active businesses. His attractive wife, who attends many festivities and social affairs, is always beautifully groomed and gowned.

Yet, William John's mother lives in a local boarding home and receives Aid to the Totally Disabled. It appears she is already old enough to receive Old Age Security. This, however, would entail Mr. John's making known his income to the local welfare agency. It also would result in his having to pay for part, if not all, of his mother's living expenses. Thus the old lady is retained on Aid to the Totally Disabled, so that Mr. John has no responsibility.

When application was first made for public assistance to Mr. John's mother, the social worker in the case submitted a statement more or less as follows: "Unless something is done in this case, Mr. and Mrs. John appear headed for divorce. The younger Mrs. John states that because of her husband's support for her mother-in-law, she must work in one of the couple's stores in order to make 'ends meet'. This she will no longer do. Social workers feel that only if this man is relieved of support of his mother will his marriage survive. Therefore, the man's mother became a recipient of local tax funds, as a beneficiary of the "program" entitled Aid to the Totally Disabled. She is in no sense totally, or even partially disabled.

Later there was another entry in the case suggesting that, though the mother would become eligible for Old Age Security at 65, for the sake of the young couple's marriage it was better to keep her on Aid to the Totally Disabled, since the younger Mrs. John could not bear to see *any* of her husband's income go to the support of his mother.

Search as I might, I could find no such grounds for obtaining public assistance. I thought of the many instances where other husbands and wives are working to help support this recipient. They are allowed no choice in the matter, however.

CHAPTER 10 - THE PROMISED LAND [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

The United States of America is indeed the "promised land"...for aliens. All they need to do (if they are so inclined) is to hold out their hands and manna from the United States Treasury pours into them.

For the newcomers to our shores, the main requirement is to know how to shrug their shoulders and mutter "No English." This seems almost automatically to justify the payment of a monthly income from tax funds. Often the amount per month is more than the newcomer earned in a year in his own country. If the arriving immigrant was originally desirous of being self-supporting, it soon becomes obvious to him that such an attitude of little value.

These things happen in spite of the fact that it is *directly contrary* to Federal Immigration Laws to apply for public assistance or to become a public charge for *at least five years* after legal entry into this country. The newcomer, often aided by the native-born citizens, soon begins to feel that our laws are made to be broken and that violators are seldom, if ever, punished.

The arrogance of a good many aliens verges on the fantastic. They will arrive in this country one week. The next week finds them DEMANDING public assistance. They know they have been allowed to enter the country on the understanding that they will not become public charges for at least five years. They know that deportation is the prescribed punishment for such violations. Yet so often, when I began discussing this part of their entry agreement with newly arrived aliens, they suddenly forgot all the English they had previously seemed to know. With sly smiles they would shrug their shoulders and murmur, "No English."

The Elenas family, consisting of a young, hand some and able-bodied father, a healthy young mother and two infants, arrived in the United States from Venezuela in September, 1960. They were of Cuban origin, but had left Cuba several years before coming to the United States, and did not enter under the Cuban Refugee Act.

They seemed a most personable young couple, very well-dressed in a sophisticated "high-style" manner. Even the two children were wearing the kind of garments found only in the most exclusive children's wear shops. In fact, their clothes were far more fashionable and costly than those worn by most of the taxpayers and their children, from whom this family was now demanding excessive assistance.

It had taken the Elenas three years to reach Los Angeles; but it took them only a couple of months to arrive at the medical aid office after getting to California. Their interview with me did not represent their first demand for tax-funds. They had previously applied at Los Angeles - - - - Hospital and been given referrals to private "part-pay" clinics.

Mrs. Elenas haughtily refused to answer the usual questions, although I explained to her that everyone applying for the *free* medical assistance (even the eligible native-born citizen) was expected to answer the same questions. Finally, after her refusal to answer questions, I suggested that she use the referrals she had been given at the hospital. This she indignantly declined to do, stating that she did not care to mingle with the type of individual found in clinics. She wanted tax-paid *free* care with a PRIVATE physician.

When asked how she handled the medical problems for which the original referrals had been given her, she said her husband had placed her in a private hospital...and even in a private room.

She told me indignantly that she had no intention of being placed in a semi-private room, much less a ward. Her husband had paid for everything, despite the fact that they originally attempted to get it *free* from a County facility. Because of this, I suggested that since her husband had been able to get enough money to cover her care, at that time, perhaps he could do so again. At any rate, she was not eligible for *free* medical care from our County. This infuriated her.

Next day she was back, with her husband. This time they were interviewed by the Medical Director. It seemed many jobs had been found for Mr. Elenas by the church group which sponsored the family's coming to the United States. Each time, however, he had quickly terminated his employment. He refused to work unless his net earnings exceeded \$100 per week. Once, when his take-home pay was \$98 dollars, he still quit the job.

After a few moments' discussion with the Medical Director, medical service orders to a private physician were given them at taxpayers' expense.

By way of thanks, their final arrogant statement was that they would be glad when Castro took over the United

States. They seemed to feel he would not be long in coming.

Legally this couple should have been deported for applying for and obtaining public assistance before they had completed five years of residence in the United States. Certainly, it is the only logical and honest thing to do.

* * *

Francisco Escavera was born in Mexico in 1936. He declined to divulge the date or dates of his various entries into the United States. None of them, including the last one, has been legal. In 1962, he was deported to Mexico for having entered the United States illegally. Within six months he returned to this country...again without legal sanction.

Francisco moved in with Esther Moreno, a promiscuous unmarried mother of six illegitimate offspring, all supported by tax-funds under Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Within a short time, Francisco was involved in an auto accident while driving his employer's truck. Hoping to "cash in" on this incident, Francisco promptly filed a claim for Workmen's Compensation.

It is most interesting to note the alacrity with which an alien, living in this country illegally, hastens to take advantage of any of our laws that might be useful to him, but completely ignores the ones that are not.

As the result of filing a claim for Workmen's Compensation, Francisco became known again as an illegal alien to the Immigration Service which had previously deported him. Because of his pending Workman's Compensation suit, according to Francisco, the Department of Immigration *kindly* gave him permission to remain in the United States until the suit was settled.

Meanwhile, the social worker who was handling Esther Moreno's welfare case had a brilliant idea. According to Francisco, the caseworker suggested that Francisco marry Esther (instead of just living with her). This clever move would prevent Francisco's pending deportation. Francisco said the social worker told him that by marrying Esther he was practically assured of a permanent residence in the United States.

At the same time, Francisco guaranteed himself a neat little income, as a legal but unemployed member of Esther's family. The group was receiving in excess of \$400 a month free and clear, plus their medical expenses.

All this, in spite of the fact that Francisco is an illegal alien, who according to law should be deported or jailed.

* * *

Ferdinand Hernandez was born in Mexico in 1915. He is not certain about the date of his arrival in the United States, but he does appear to understand that his entry was illegal. For this reason, he has never attempted to become naturalized.

During his many years in this country, where he long ago married one Lillian Saenz, he has fathered a dozen children. In all those years, the family has received (and still receives) full and *free* medical care through the medical aid facilities of Los Angeles County. Most of the couple's adult children are presently being supported by Aid to Families with Dependent Children. One adult daughter is an unmarried mother, who with her four illegitimate children still lives at home with her parents.

For many years Mr. Hernandez has been employed by a well-known manufacturing firm and has earned a net wage of \$425 to \$450 per month. All that time he has been covered by a prepaid medical insurance policy and the entire family could have been covered by this insurance for a little over two dollars a month extra. But, the Hernandez family could see absolutely no advantage in availing themselves of such medical insurance coverage. Why should they? The tax payers were providing them with all the medical care that they decided they needed without the \$2 charge.

* * *

Carlos Aprilla came from Puerto Rico to the United States in 1955. Since he came from Puerto Rico, he was not considered an alien. He was not immediately eligible, however, for all of the *free* medical care he and his family requested and received.

Mr. Aprilla is not a lazy man, nor does he lack the enterprising spirit so valuable to this country. In the 10 years he and his wife have been in California they have been able to buy and pay for six houses. From these, they have collected considerable amounts in rent.

One reason this couple has been able to buy and pay for so much real estate was that they obtained all of their medical care *free* of charge (to them) through the tax-supported medical facilities of the County of Los Angeles. For real frosting on this cake, he and his family during most of these years, had been fully covered by medical insurance through Mr. Aprilla's place of employment!

Yet, until I interviewed Mrs. Aprilla, no admissions worker had questioned or discovered their considerable investment in real estate, the income from the rentals, or the medical insurance. The taxpayers were (and probably still are) being forced to provide *free* medical care for a family that can very well afford to pay for its own. Comparatively few taxpayers own six houses, free and clear!

* * *

Anne Alexi was born in Hungary. Between 1944 and 1962 she lived in Austria, Germany, Venezuela and Mexico. She came to California in December, 1962, accompanied by seven minor children. Her husband remained in Mexico where, she stated, he had his own business. Less than nine months after her arrival in this country, Mrs. Alexi applied at - - - Hospital for *free* medical care.

Strangely enough, Mrs. Alexi had sufficient funds to dress well. She paid high rent in a rather expensive residential district. She was "unable" to tell us the size of her husband's income, or even the amount he sent her. She was "unable" to provide any information regarding her financial affairs. Of one thing only she was certain. She had no money to pay for her medical expenses!

Lessons in "How to Cheat Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer" are speedily learned. With a mere nine months' residence in the United States, this family had already discovered how to cost the tax payers thousands of dollars.

By all legal rights, this woman should have been returned to Mexico. She had, within a few short months, violated her oath to the United States government and the citizens of this country that she would not become a public charge.

* * *

Henry and Josepha Buren arrived in the United States from Holland in February, 1962. A month later one of their sons became ill and commenced receiving *free* medical care through the Los Angeles County medical facilities. In August, 1962, eight months after arrival in this country, this boy entered - - - Medical Facility as a PERMANENT patient, at no cost, whatsoever, to his parents.

Since it was evident to Mrs. Buren that there was no punishment for violating the federal immigration laws and that there appeared to be little (if any) enforcement of the ban on becoming a "public charge", she began to make extensive use of the County medical facilities for a series of expensive surgeries. Before the family had been in the United States two years, its members...contrary to the oath they had taken prior to their entry...had cost the United States citizens and taxpayers many thousands of dollars.

More amazing still, was the fact that Mr. Buren had a job which paid fairly well. The entire family was covered by prepaid, comprehensive medical insurance through the Southern California - - - - - Association. The coverage was excellent. Yet, so far as I could discover, before I was handed the case, no one had attempted to collect from the insurance company for the expensive medical care extended to this family. Also, so far as I have been able to determine, nothing was done about deporting them for their violation of their oaths to the Federal Department of Immigration.

Legally, this couple should have been deported immediately to their native Holland. They violated, not once, but continuously, their oaths to the United States and became objects of public assistance (medical) within the first month of their residence in this country. Moreover, they were guided and protected by public employees in their evasion of the law. These employees also could have been prosecuted under the Federal Immigration laws.

* * *

Elsa and Simeon Dante were both born in Mexico. They came to the United States when they were in their early twenties. From the time of their arrival in Los Angeles County until I last saw the case (and most likely until the present day) they have been, almost continually, supported by tax funds as recipients of public assistance. During this time they produced fifteen children for the taxpayers to support.

While receiving public assistance, this couple bought and completely paid for the home in which they reside. Thus, besides furnishing this couple and their children practically continuous financial support and assistance, plus 100% medical care for an entire family of seventeen persons, the taxpayers have provided them with a fully paid-for piece of real estate.

Now, the adult children of this couple are demanding from the taxpayers the same support and assistance provided for their parents, and some are already on the welfare rolls, with their own brood-groups.

Had this couple been deported, *as the law provides*, the taxpayers would have been saved an enormous amount of money. *By not complying with* the law, public employees have burdened the taxpayers with a group that will probably always be a burden...in fact, an ever-increasing one. Welfare is a way of life for this family. Government employees have been instrumental in making it so.

* * *

Daniel Guerrero arrived from Peru in June, 1961. His wife, Ursula, had preceded him by two months. By August 1, 1964, they were already on the relief rolls, receiving *general relief* from the local tax funds of Los Angeles County, plus 100% medical care from the local medical tax-supported facilities.

Yet no attempt was made to *obey the law* and deport this couple. Instead, they were apparently welcomed with enthusiasm. No consideration was given to the native born citizens who must now support this speedily increasing family.

* * *

Mary Lorenz Gomez was born in Mexico in 1938. August 28, 1964, she brought her two children, both illegitimate, to Los Angeles County. On September 5, 1964, she applied for *free* medical care. It was swiftly provided for her and this nation gained another illegal alien burden...in fact, three of them.

* * *

Nicolas Paul Louan was only seventeen years of age when he came to the United States of America and almost directly to Los Angeles County. He claimed to me that he had not been required to have a sponsor and that he had not been required to deposit a bond that would assure against his becoming a public charge. His parents, he said, were not with him; his father was deceased, his widowed mother had remained in their native country, Colombia.

Nicholas was a glazier. He belongs to the - - - - Union which provides full prepaid medical insurance coverage. His earnings are more than sufficient for one person. They are the usual union rate.

Yet, eight months after his arrival in this country, Nicolas Louan applied for free medical care through the Los Angeles County medical facilities. He could (and should) have been instantly deported to his native Colombia and allowed to return only when he became truly cognizant of the responsibilities of living in this country, and could prove that he was capable of becoming a more responsible citizen than he has demonstrated to date.

* * *

Theodore Kannodos was born in Hungary. He had been in Los Angeles only seven months when he applied for free medical assistance. A single man, he was earning (by his own statement) \$455 per month, and had prepaid group medical insurance through the - - - - Union. This insurance covered out-patient medical care as well as hospital care.

When asked why he felt he should be given free medical care, he explained that he had just gone into debt some \$600 for new furniture for his apartment. Such a debt made him feel quite nervous and insecure. He could not conveniently repay the money he had borrowed for the furniture and at the same time pay for medical attention.

Kannodos knew his insurance would almost entirely cover his medical care since it was the result of an accident; but he did not want to have to pay out a single penny of his own.

This alien preferred to have the native-born citizens provide him with medical care!

Kannodos carried no alien registration card, as required by the Federal Government and the Immigration Department. He claimed that he never had done so, and did not intend to do so.

* * *

Mr. and Mrs. Kline arrived from Indonesia through Holland on August 23, 1964. On August 28, 1964...*just five days later...*they applied for and received *free* medical care at Los Angeles County - - - - Hospital.

The couple had been able to pay for airplane tickets to *fly* to the United States. They reported that they had no money left to pay for needed medical care. This was incomplete violation of the oath they had taken before the Immigration authorities. Legally, they should have been deported. But instead, they were assisted in violating and evading Federal laws.

* * *

Fifteen years ago, in his native Mexico, Horatio Lunas injured his knee. During all that time the injury apparently gave him little, if any, trouble. At least he did not appear to have sought aid in Mexico during the interval. Yet, within a couple of months after arriving in the United States, he applied at - - - - Hospital for complete medical care. This, too, in spite of the fact that he was earning excellent wages and had first-rate medical coverage through the union to which he belonged.

This young man could and should have been deported and made to understand that our country's laws apply to aliens no less than to native citizens.

* * *

Otto Niemaus was born in Germany. He seemed to have considerable difficulty remembering just when he had entered the United States. Actually, he still considered Germany his home, and an address in Germany as his "home address." This man was a glider enthusiast and had been injured in an accident while pursuing his, hobby. At the time of his injury, he was (so he said) unemployed and receiving \$55 weekly unemployment compensation. His wife was employed, however. There were no children dependent upon the couple. After his injury, he began receiving \$75 per week disability compensation in lieu of the unemployment compensation.

Until a few days before the accident, he had been employed as an engineer earning \$206 a week. His medical insurance from that position still covered this accident and the care for the injury.

Yet, after the accident, he applied for medical care at - - - - Hospital and was admitted for extensive, difficult orthopedic surgery...*free* to him at the taxpayers' expense.

* * *

Florencia Martinez was born in Mexico in 1933. According to the records she has been receiving public assistance since 1947. Since 1951, however, she has literally been commuting back and forth between her home in Mexico and the home of friends in Los Angeles County.

To me she stated that she spent much more of her time in Mexico than in the United States, but she had to appear up here occasionally in order to assure that her check from the Bureau of Public Assistance would continue to arrive at the home of her friends on the appointed date. These friends received the checks and forwarded them to her in Mexico. Occasionally they cashed the checks locally and sent her the money.

Florencia was an unmarried woman with five illegitimate offspring, according to her first report. In 1964, she suddenly discovered that she had two additional children supposedly born to her in 1951 and 1952. She insisted these children were hers, although they had always stayed with her mother in Mexico. Now she wanted additional public assistance for them.

This woman already received in one month considerably more than the average Mexican family in Mexico earns in a year. At the time of my interview with her she seemed even then to be receiving a larger grant than usual for a family of that size.

The most interesting thing about her was that she was completely candid about the fact that she ACTUALLY resided in Mexico, rather than in the United States, and that she had never lived in this country for more than a few months at a time. Because of this, she was totally ineligible for public assistance, and should have been permanently deported years before.

* * *

Guadalupe Morales is another alien who has never resided in the United States and makes no pretense of having done so. The date of my interview with her was November 1963. Frequent back-tracking in her conversation indicated she had more probably arrived from Mexico only a few days before the interview. Her husband remained in Mexico. Her children had all been born in Mexico. She and her husband owned a home in Zacatecas, to which she always returned from her forays into the United States.

Even when the fact of her ineligibility was spelled out for her in minute detail, this woman not only expected, but demanded that she be given *free* medical care at the expense of the citizens of Los Angeles County. Although I continued to refuse her demand, I understand that she did finally obtain medical service orders to a private physician for *free* medical care.

Here is another alien eligible, not for public assistance, but for deportation. She should be permanently excluded from entry into the United States of America.

* * *

Mr. and Mrs. Moreno had arrived in the United States, California and Los Angeles County just five months (so they stated) before they applied for public assistance. Neither admitted to having alien registration cards. As the interview progressed, it developed that they had been here only a couple of days. On the advice of friends, also Mexican nationals, they had applied at once for *free* care, since, it was "so easy to get".

Finally the man admitted they were *on vacation*. He was actually employed as a carpenter by the Government of Mexico.

In providing such aid in California, several federal laws were violated, all with the aid and connivance of public employees in this country.

* * *

Mr. and Mrs. Marcus A. Madrina arrived in the United States from Ecuador in June, 1963. In October of that year they applied for public assistance. It was granted to them. Legally, they should have been deported to their native country or their sponsor should have been forced to provide for them. Apparently neither

alternative was even contemplated by the Government employees involved.

It seemed to be just another case of "let the taxpayers pay...they never know where the money goes, anyway!"

* * *

Edmundo Rosas arrived in Los Angeles on September 15, 1964. Three days later he applied at Los Angeles County - - - Hospital for *free* medical care for an injury that had occurred eight years before...in his native Mexico.

Innumerable cases of this type can be cited. They prove several points. Among others, the fact that laws are violated with impunity by aliens, often with the knowledgeable and overt help of government employees. As a result the legitimate citizen is burdened far beyond necessity by taxes he should never have to pay. Moreover, it is all kept so secret from the taxpayers that they are helpless to combat the evil.

The taxpayers, both local and national, are paying...paying and paying...with compound interest, for neglect by government employees in the proper discharge of their duties. Nothing seems too good for aliens who have contributed so little and whose demands are so excessive. Flagrant violations of our immigration laws go unpunished, while the decent, taxpaying, law-abiding citizen pays penalties for the slightest infraction of any tax law or ruling.

CHAPTER 11 - IT'S MAGIC [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

Or...how to make the ineligible applicant become (magically) eligible.

The various Welfare Departments and Agencies usually frown sternly on any employee who allows possible "clients" (welfare recipients) to slip from the grasp of the agency, by finding them ineligible for whatever aid they may have requested. If the job is important or necessary enough to the worker, he soon learns to be adept at the required task of certifying ineligibles as eligible. The ability to do this is hailed as the sign of a *good* worker. In reality, the employee MUST eventually reach this point or find himself in almost continuous trouble.

At - - - Hospital, for example, it was determined that I found far too many applicants ineligible for tax-supported medical care. As a result, I was ordered NOT to refer *anyone* out to private care or to a part-pay clinic unless I first obtained permission from my supervisor to do so. This was not required of the other admissions workers. They already had learned that it was quite proper (and easier) simply to certify that ineligibles WERE ELIGIBLE for whatever medical care they might desire.

There was an incident at the medical aid office that I shall long remember. Early one morning I heard the Medical Director complaining loudly and bitterly to her secretary. "Refer out...refer out...refer out....All the time! Why it's IMPOSSIBLE! It will HAVE to STOP! I'll put a stop to this."

Soon afterwards the telephone on my desk rang. It was the Medical Director asking me to come in to her office and explain how I "could possibly refer out" so many persons to non-tax-supported plans. In the future, she ordered crossly, each case I referred out must be indicated by case number on my daily report sheet. To make certain these referrals would always be easy to notice, the case numbers must be written in red ink.

Much later I would learn that the Medical Director often recalled the individuals I had referred to private or part-pay plans, and provided them with the requested *free* care. The fact that I was not reprimanded for originally referring them elsewhere seems proof POSITIVE that they were definitely ineligible. To refer out someone who was eligible, I had often been warned, would bring drastic disciplinary action.

Do you wonder how workers make certain that an applicant is "eligible," regardless of the facts in the case? Really, it is not very difficult. There was one admissions worker who was expert in this maneuver. In fact, she was so skilled that she was in constant demand by those supervisors who were aware of her good work.

For some time this particular admissions worker was assigned the job of interviewing, via telephone, patients

who had gone home before a hospital interview had been arranged. Her interviews ran, almost word for word, as follows:

You don't own any real property, do you? Good. You don't own an automobile, do you? Fine! You don't have any money, do you? Excellent! Of course, you have no bank accounts, savings accounts, or anything like that, do you? Good! You aren't working, and haven't been, I'm sure. Fine. You have no cash, have you? Good! You are eligible for *free* medical care. If a bill should accidentally be mailed to you, just ignore it. Your care here will cost you nothing.

The person being "interviewed" hardly had time to say one word from start to finish. Often I wondered if the admissions worker really had someone on the other end of the line or was just pretending.

This gal was considered to be a good admissions worker! By now she probably has been advanced to supervisors' supervisor. This is the kind of individual it takes..."on the ball," sharp, smart, "with-it!" She knew exactly how to make absolutely certain that anyone who applied for *free* medical care was found eligible for almost unlimited access to tax funds.

Another way to assure eligibility is simply to certify individuals as eligible without interviewing them. This, of course, is contrary to law, but it is highly approved by some supervisors. One day, at one of the County hospitals, my supervisor began praising a certain admissions worker for the large number of cases he could "process" in a day.

"Do you know," she gushed, "J - - - handled more than sixty cases yesterday? Isn't he simply marvelous?"

I looked at her in amazement. Nobody, in one eight-hour day, can properly interview and legally certify so many people as eligible for any type of tax-supported care. Moreover, I was then working in the same clinic as this admissions worker. I was well aware of how he "interviewed" applicants. His method usually consisted of walking out into the waiting room, giving everyone a *free* clinic appointment for that day, and then leaving for a one-hour coffee break. When the individuals returned to be interviewed by me, I found at least one third of them totally ineligible.

Yet that worker was rated an excellent admissions worker. He was given credit for the great number of cases he "interviewed" and the fact that he found none of them ineligible. I was often reprimanded for having interviews that were both "too thorough" and proved too many applicants ineligible.

A couple we will call Mr. and Mrs. Hansen are a typical example of an ineligible couple that has been considered "eligible," merely because of inefficiency and lack of thoroughness during the interview.

Mr. Hansen described himself as an electrical analyst at a large aviation firm. He stated that his net income was in excess of \$500 a month. At the time of the auto accident, for which Mrs. Hansen received full and *free* medical care, she was employed full time on the night shift at - - - and worked as a traffic guard during the daytime. They had only one child dependent on them.

At the time of the accident, she was covered by at least five insurance plans. One was her husband's medical group plan at his place of employment. One was her own medical group plan with her night-time employer. A third was medical insurance coverage through her daytime employer. A fourth was the insurance on her car and on her husband's car. A fifth was on the courtesy car she was driving at the time of her accident (her own being in the repair shop). Possibly there was also insurance coverage via the company which carried the insurance on the car involved in the collision. On some of these the coverage was one hundred percent, in spite of duplication.

Yet, with all that medical insurance coverage, the woman was provided with months of *free* in-patient and out-patient care at - - - Hospital...paid for by the taxpayers, of course.

It was not until I interviewed the couple that any information concerning their assets had been requested by the Department of Medical Social Service of the hospital involved.

In addition to their income (far exceeding the limits of eligibility) , this couple owned considerable real estate,

and had substantial cash balances in their bank accounts.

This was not at all an unusual case. There were many like it, just as today, with Federal Medicare and California medical aid (also subsidized by the taxpayers of the entire nation), there appear to be many similar cases.

For some time I shared an office with an interviewer who was more than willing to give the shirts off the backs of the taxpayers, to assure happiness for any and all comers who appeared at her desk applying for aid from tax funds. Many of these interviews (which I could not help over hearing) , and their results, seemed to me utterly disgusting.

One applicant was a man, about sixty-six years of age, who had arrived from Europe at the Los Angeles International Airport the day before (according to his own statements). Ten years before, he had retired with two annuities. A native of one of the Eastern sections of the United States, he had always longed to live in Europe. So he cashed in the two annuities and went off to spend his summers in Norway, his winters in Spain.

He waited (so he said) until he had just enough money left to buy a one-way plane ticket to Los Angeles. Then he left Europe and came to California. The day after his arrival, he applied at - - - Hospital for *free* medical aid.

AND HE RECEIVED IT...in spite of the fact that he lacked legal residence. He claimed never to have even visited California before.

How many taxpayers would enjoy spending their money for summers in Norway and winters in Spain, instead of having it taken to support such irresponsible freeloaders as this man and the many like him.

* * *

Another interview concerned an alien couple who had been in this country only a year. Recently they had purchased a home on which the monthly payments, they admitted, were \$200 a month. Because of this costly housing deal the couple felt "compelled" to request public assistance for their medical needs. The interviewer suggested that surely this couple could have found satisfactory housing at a lower cost, but the applicants insisted otherwise.

Regardless of the fact that applying for and receiving this *free* medical care made this couple eligible for deportation, everything the couple asked was given them. As far as I could learn, nothing was ever done about deportation proceedings. Their *free* medical care was paid for by taxpayers who often have to live in lodging costing much less than two hundred dollars per month.

* * *

The fertility clinic at - - - Hospital is a flourishing department...at the expense of the taxpayers.

One day I interviewed a woman who was applying at this particular clinic for artificial insemination. She had already seen the physician who was to perform the task. Everything had been arranged except clearance with the Department of Medical Social Services.

Reviewing the woman's case, I discovered that the woman and her children (both legitimate and illegitimate) had been supported for many, many years on the Aid to Needy Children "program." In fact, when talking to me she said that she was unmarried, but was supported by a "friend." She was not employed.

I explained to her that under the circumstances it appeared doubtful that she could be approved for artificial insemination and asked her to wait in the lobby until I had clarified some details.

It seemed grotesque to me that the taxpayers should be expected to pay for artificial insemination so that a woman could add one more illegitimate infant to the tax rolls.

As she left to return to the waiting room, she told me urgently that there was little time to "waste." The man

who had promised to donate his sperm was a sailor due to ship out the very next day.

After she left, I called the physician who had referred the woman to our department. I explained that this woman, according to her own statement, was not even married. I also explained that for most of her life she had been supported by tax funds. Then I pointed out that certainly it seemed inadvisable to create another pregnancy (at taxpayers' expense) so that another child could be added to the relief rolls.

The doctor retorted with a torrent of abuse. He was so enraged as to be almost incoherent. It was NOT because of the woman's marital status, nor because of her long record of continuous support from tax funds, nor because she might have misrepresented facts to him in order to obtain artificial insemination. He was angry at my statement that she ought not to be approved by our department.

In no uncertain terms, he told me he didn't care what I thought. *The woman was going to be artificially inseminated, and that was that!* He didn't care if she was unmarried. He didn't care that she had no apparent means of support for the possible child. He couldn't care less that she was a chronic welfare recipient!

When he had finished frothing at the mouth, I called my supervisor and explained the situation to her. She requested that the woman be sent to her for further interviewing.

Later, I was told that the woman finally admitted to the supervisor that she was "passing herself off as married" to a sailor in the United States Navy. Actually, she may really have been married to him. As proof of this "marriage" she showed to the supervisor a currently effective medical identification card indicating that she was a dependent of the sailor.

As such a dependent, she was not eligible for care at the County medical facility. *This* was the point that released my supervisor from an un comfortable situation...not the other reasons I thought much more pertinent.

The case caused a minor crisis in the Department of Medical Social Service at - - - Hospital. All admissions workers and medical social workers were told to refer all future applicants for treatment in the fertility clinic either to our supervisor or to the Medical Director.

We were never provided with information as to the final determination on the proper procedure for such applicants. Later, however, I was told that the supervisor and the Medical Director had "solved" the problem in their usual manner. They no longer required such applicants to comply with the eligibility standards. Applicants were simply told, my informant stated, to go ahead and receive artificial insemination regardless of possible ineligibility, or regardless of the social aspects of the case.

In other words, if my source was correctly informed (and usually he was), applicants for treatment in the fertility clinic were no longer screened for eligibility. Anyone could obtain this type of "care" at the total expense of the taxpayers! A striking contrast to the way in which the problem of artificial insemination was handled, was the attitude towards dispensing information on family planning and birth control methods.

A woman whom I interviewed timidly asked me if I could give her some information about birth control methods. I explained that admissions workers did not have such material to dispense, but that I would speak to my supervisor and try to obtain the appropriate referral from her.

When I raised the subject with my supervisor, I received a cold look and the curt answer, "We do not dispense such information!"

"Oh," I explained quickly. "I wasn't suggesting that I wanted to provide the information. I was only trying to find out where to send her for the information."

"Mrs. Detlof," the supervisor's voice was like a lash, "We do NOT make such referrals!"

"Do you mean that we cannot even refer people to a place where they can obtain such information?" I persisted.

"THAT is EXACTLY what I mean," was the supervisor's retort.

Later, another admissions worker, who had been referring individuals with questions regarding family planning and birth control to one of the medical social workers for the information requested was severely reprimanded and warned to discontinue the practice. The medical social worker was also warned NOT to provide such information to anyone in the future.

But the fertility clinic continued to operate unabated, unrestricted.

So...the ineligible becomes eligible by sleight of hand. The eligible are refused assistance. Even more important, is the fact that this often occurs at the instigation, and even with the connivance and assistance, of persons who are hired to enforce the laws. Theirs is not the assigned duty of redistributing the wealth, although that is the final result of their activities.

In the Bureau of Public Assistance, the picture was very much the same. It was extremely difficult for me to understand how and why the case histories obtained by that agency's social workers always seemed to differ in so many respects from the material I was able to obtain.

In 1961 and 1962, in the District of Columbia, a thorough investigation was made of welfare practices there by investigators from the United States Comptroller's office. This same contradiction had been strikingly apparent to those investigators. Their reports indicated that social workers appear to be more than just permissive and naive in dealing with aid recipients. They often seem to be positively helping recipients evade compliance with the laws.

For example, there was a young woman with two children who received Aid to Needy Children, while her husband was in prison for a misdemeanor conviction. This is not hard to understand and approve.

However, three months after this man had been released and reinstated at his old job, earning over \$500 a month, his family was still receiving the welfare grant.

* * *

There was also Amelia Marcus, who received more than \$500 monthly in combined Social Security benefit payments and Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

On one occasion Miss Marcus collected \$6,000 in settlement of her claim to Social Security survivors' benefits for seven of her twelve illegitimate children. By the time she received this settlement arising from the death of the children's "father," Miss Marcus had already delivered two more illegitimate infants sired by two different men. The elapsed time was two and one-half years. Amelia Marcus has never been married.

When she received her settlement, she and the man currently "assuming the role of spouse" bought a four bedroom house, making a down payment of \$3,000. Then, they bought a new kitchen stove and a refrigerator for more than \$1,000, and a new living room suite costing \$500.

This abrupt disposal of her settlement funds resulted in little, if any, change in her welfare grant. When a welfare recipient obtains any assets, somehow ways usually are found to make sure such assets are never used for self-support.

Furthermore, during the years 1956, 1960 and 1961, this promiscuous, unmarried mother was furnished a housekeeper at the expense of the taxpaying public.

(NOTE: - This family is a part of a larger family group which provides a classic example of three generations, all currently and simultaneously receiving public assistance. At various times, others of this group have been as ineligible as Amelia has often been. But there has never been the slightest suggestion of discontinuing their income from tax funds.)

* * *

In a certain social case history in the files of the Department of Medical Social Services, County of Los

Angeles, there appeared the following statement, placed there by a medical social worker, that would seem to condone complete and chaotic immorality:

6-30-60 - Mrs. L - - - , a very pretty plump woman came to the worker's office. The benefits of the Physically Handicapped Children's Program were explained to her. She is evidently living in common-law relationship with Mr. D - - - , as she has never gotten a divorce from Mr. L - - - who left the State. Evidently she and Mr. D - - - are very happy and he is glad to take on the support of all the children...Mrs. L - - - indicated he had a legal family he supports also...

If this man is "assuming support of all of the children", then how does it happen that Mrs. L - - - is on Aid to Families with Dependent Children? It looks as if the taxpayers are the ones who are still supporting the family. If all the facts were known, those same taxpayers probably are also supporting Mr. D - - -'s "legal" family. What an entry for a supposedly educated person to place in a case history. Here we find an immoral, bigamous and illicit relationship being benignly approved by a permissive government employee. There is every legal reason to remove these children from the demoralizing influence of this illegally co-habiting couple and place them, *according to law*, in a better environment. The laws made to protect such children are completely ignored.

But to place the children in a healthier environment would deprive this man and woman of their most secure and substantial source of income. It might even remove them from the relief rolls. In fact, in time, it might even allow the children to grow up into respectable, respected and responsible citizens. This is something that CANNOT be permitted.

So, as usual, ineligible become "eligible." It just takes magic...secretive, hidden GOVERNMENTAL magic.

As the investigators of welfare cases found in Washington, D.C., only *nine percent* of the cases investigated proved to be legally completely eligible for the grants they were receiving. This is probably par for welfare reciprocity throughout the United States.

Even with this effective governmental magic, looser laws are constantly being contrived, to make it easier to become and to remain a recipient of one of the many types of public assistance now available. In the same way, it becomes easier and simpler for ineligible to be certified as "eligible." All this is of great importance to the goals and techniques of our people-planners.

CHAPTER 12 - A SICK SOCIETY [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

The year...1961

The place...Newark, New Jersey, U.S.A.

The headline...*Fifteen Illegitimate Children Draw \$949 Each Month in Welfare Payments.*

The story....

Newark, N.J., August 9 - A New Jersey family with twenty-three children - fifteen of them illegitimate - is receiving \$949 a month in relief and payments, State Senator Anthony J. Grossi reported yesterday.

Another woman, who had fourteen illegitimate children from February 1, 1943 to the early part of this year (1961...eighteen years) has received \$61,525 in relief, Senator Grossi said after his legislative committee completed a closed hearing into the relief situation in Essex County.

Grover C. Richman, former State Attorney General and counsel to Senator Grossi's committee, said there appeared to be a "disproportionate percentage" of illegitimacy among recipients of the relief program.

Senator Grossi estimated more than thirty percent of the children being supported by public welfare funds are illegitimate.

He said the mother of the fourteen illegitimate children, ironically, blamed the relief agencies for her plight.

She told us she wasn't getting enough relief money so she was forced to cohabit, " Senator Grossi said.

\$949 a month equals \$11,388 per year net income for the family with fifteen illegitimate offspring. \$11,388 net EACH YEAR for just one relief family! What additional sums this woman may have collected from the men

with whom she was "forced" to cohabitate, of course, cannot be estimated. The amount mentioned does not include all the free medical care the taxpayers were *forced* to provide this huge family. Everything has been tax-free to this brood group!

It may very well require \$11,388 per year to support so large a family. That, however, does not in any way alter the fact that immorality, irresponsibility and criminally bad citizenship has been, and will continue to be, REWARDED at a devastating cost to the decent, worthwhile, law-abiding citizen.

The only reward the good citizen gets is a *heavier and continuously heavier burden!* The irresponsible citizen's REWARD is a bigger and bigger monthly income.

The *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, on Thursday, August 20, 1964, carried the following news article:

A Municipal Court judge today attacked county officials who, he said, are condoning or tolerating parents in their failure to provide for their children.

"There appears to me a growing toleration or permissiveness on the part of public agencies," said Judge Joseph A. Sprankle, Jr. of Pasadena in a letter to the County Board of Supervisors.

"I am appalled and alarmed as to the potential consequences to our society if our citizens are permitted or encouraged to shirk or ignore their obligations.

"I am increasingly concerned that society may be slowly eliminating Section 270, the Failure to Provide Section from the Penal Code."

Judge Sprankle made his accusations against the District Attorney, the Probation Department, the Welfare Department and the Courts. As, "only one example of the many cases which flow through this court," Judge Sprankle cited John Franklin Heller, who now lives in Santa Barbara.

The county has been supporting Heller's three minor children for two years in a foster home at the cost of \$309.32 a month, Judge Sprankle reported.

But he adds, "If the probation report submitted to me is correct, it appears reasonable that Mr. Heller should have been taking care of his children in his own home since February 2, 1963, when he was earning \$525 a month."

Judge Sprankle reports that Heller has earned \$3,000 so far this year and is drawing \$300 per month plus commissions. His wife earns \$60 a week, and the two live in a two-bedroom house.

In addition, the judge said, Heller is driving a 1964 Chevrolet and paying \$75 monthly on it. (Remember, this item was published in 1964...so the automobile was a current model.)

Thus, Judge Sprankle has provided us with an other example of an individual who, with the assistance of public employees, has obtained approximately \$7,440 cash assistance for child care (from tax funds) when he could very well have handled and paid for the care of the children himself. The sum, of course, does not include such incidentals as medical care, etc., that were provided out of tax funds.

A gem of truth appeared in the *Victor Press*, Victorville, California, on September 30, 1964. The editorial, in which this small jewel lay buried, began as follows:

Roscoe Lyda, Welfare Director for San Bernardino County is quoted as having stated many times that..."once the typical wage-earner has been unemployed and has been drawing any sort of welfare aid for six months or more, the chances of ever getting that individual off the welfare rolls and back at full-time employment have shrunk to close to nil."

The editorial concluded with a few words of wisdom that should be noted and taken to heart in Washington, D.C., and in all State capitals:

"Like any other form of life on this earth, man gets awfully lazy when he finds he does not have to work to live."

California State Assemblyman John G. Veneman of Modesto, California, in statements printed Sunday, November 24, 1963, in the *Los Angeles Times* came up with some very pertinent statements and questions. Part of the article follows:

He (Mr. Veneman) has noted the recent salary increase and new allowances for U.S. servicemen would result in a married private with five children receiving a total of \$218 monthly, a portion of which would be taxable.

At the same time, Veneman pointed out, an unemployed married civilian father with five children would receive \$308 that is tax free after February 1, 1964.

"Is it morally right to make it more profitable to be unemployed than to defend our nation?" he asked.

On March 6, 1962, the Chairman of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia requested the Comptroller General of the United States to make an investigation into cases serviced by the District of Columbia Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare under the Aid to Dependent Children "program".

Of 236 cases investigated, only twenty-three were found to be completely eligible, with no infractions of eligibility requirements. This means that only 9.7% of the cases investigated were legally eligible for all the welfare assistance they were receiving. 59.8% were found to be ABSOLUTELY INELIGIBLE for any financial assistance, *i.e., more than half the cases*. In other words, almost 60% of the persons receiving financial assistance under the so-called Aid to Dependent Children "plan" were NOT ELIGIBLE *in any way* for such assistance.

This report, which was submitted to Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, contains some very important and thought-provoking statements. One of them is: "We believe that the foregoing instances evidence that Aid to Dependent Children mothers are obtaining and attempting to continue to obtain financial assistance when they are aware that disclosure of actual living conditions or circumstances to the Public Assistance Department would reveal that they are not entitled to receive further financial assistance."

The report also stated, "The investigation definitely disclosed that reliance cannot be placed on the Aid to Dependent Children mothers to reveal the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance."

And further: "The fact that the investigation disclosed no irregularities in only 23 cases, or in only 9.7% of the cases investigated, is most significant and indicates a very serious weakness in the administration of the Aid to Dependent Children Program."

Reading these statements coming from the Comptroller's Office of the Federal Government recalls to me vividly the answers I always received, when I voiced my doubts as to the truthfulness of the applicants I interviewed.

"Why, Mrs. Detlof," I was invariably told (with obvious HORROR at my stupidity), "Of course, the applicants always tell the truth. At any rate, we are NOT here to doubt the veracity of their statements. We are here only to determine what kind of medical plan is in their best interests and then to assist them in making that plan."

The total percentage of cases PROVED to be ineligible for financial assistance in the District of Columbia was 59.8%. This is only .2% less than the amount I estimated for the County of Los Angeles from documented sources available to me while employed by the County Department of Medical Social Services.

In this Federal Government report, the section headed "*Conclusions*" should be read again and again. It states:

The high incidence of ineligibility of the recipients for financial assistance in the 236 Aid to Dependent Children cases as disclosed by the investigation and confirmed by the Public Assistance Department, leads to the conclusion 1) that PAD (the Public Assistance Department), in its determinations and redeterminations of the recipients' eligibility either had not completely verified facts represented by the recipients as entitling them to financial assistance or had not maintained sufficiently close contact with the recipients to be aware of changes in their conditions or circumstances affecting their continued entitlement to financial assistance, 2) that reliance cannot be placed on the care-taker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship) to inform the Public Assistance Department of the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance, and 3) that the Aid to Dependent Children cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving.

Then the investigators offered a suggestion that could save the taxpayers many millions of dollars:

We believe that a continuing field investigation program should be instituted with the objective of investigating Aid to Dependent Children cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the Public Assistance Department's prior verification of representations by the recipients.

We believe also that such a continuing field investigation program should be conducted by an investigative unit organizationally placed *outside* the Public Assistance Department with a reporting responsibility not only to the Public Assistance Department, but also to the Director, Department of Public Welfare. We believe further that procedures should be adopted to insure that the investigative findings are given adequate and proper consideration by the Public Assistance Department in making its eligibility determinations.

From my own experience, I would add: "This special investigative group should report to and be under the jurisdiction of the ELECTED County Auditor-Comptroller who must answer directly to the voters. He should have authority to initiate prosecution proceedings through the District Attorney's office of not only the recipient who has received public assistance illegally but of any or all public EMPLOYEES who have assisted such actions."

CHAPTER 13 - ANOTHER RAT HOLE [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

"Some of the most flagrant cases of fraud and misuse of welfare funds can be found in the cases classified as 'Aid to the Totally Disabled.'" The speaker was a social work supervisor. Years of working in public assistance had not hardened her to the prevalent injustice and illegality. Lately she had become increasingly concerned about the trend towards still greater "liberalization" of practices governing the public assistance programs.

The following case, in particular, distressed her. A man applied at the Welfare office, where she served as supervisor, and requested information on how he might receive *free* medical care through the California Medical Aid Program.

To be eligible for such *free* medical care, the applicant must be "linked" with some type of public assistance program. Furthermore, according to "guidelines" laid down by the Federal Government, it must be determined if the applicant might not also be eligible for other aid under the public assistance program to which his medical care plan "linked" him.

The man in question was not yet sixty-five, so he could not be "linked" to Old Age Security programs. He had no minor children, so he could not be "linked" to Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Still, he *was* seeking medical care. Possibly he could be "linked" to Aid to the Totally Disabled.

All the proper forms, papers, etc., according to the "guidelines", were filled out and forwarded to the State Medical Review Team for final dispensation. The office workers felt reasonably certain that their recommendation of "not eligible" would be accepted by the Team.

There was considerable legal basis for believing the man to be ineligible. The California Welfare and Institutions Code defines a person who qualifies as a recipient of this type of public assistance as follows:

4000. (effective January 1, 1965)

(a) "Needy disabled person" means a person who meets the eligibility requirements set forth in this chapter and who is both permanently impaired and totally disabled.

(b) "Permanently impaired" means that the individual has a major physical or a major mental impairment or a combination of both which is verified by medical findings and appears reasonably certain to continue throughout the lifetime of the individual without substantial improvement.

(c) "Totally disabled" means that the impairment substantially precludes the individual from engaging in useful occupations within his competence, such as holding a job or homemaking.

This man's medical problem was curable. It was a prostrate condition that could be corrected. In fact, the medical care he originally inquired about was intended to alleviate his condition.

He was not only employable; he was employed. It was a petty job, but it supplied him with rent and spending money. He also had some income from another source. After figuring his "needs" under the Aid to the Totally

Disabled schedule, he would receive a small sum should he qualify for aid.

Regardless of all this, the case was returned to the welfare office bearing the stamp of approval of the State Medical Review Team. Strangely enough, the diagnosis had been changed entirely. The new diagnosis appearing on the case was "arteriosclerosis," yet the original papers, including those submitted by the examining physician, gave no hint of any such ailment.

The Welfare office (backed by the physician who handled such applications for the County) returned the papers to the State Medical Review Team. It was pointed out there seemed to be some mistake. The diagnosis had been altered and was, in fact, all wrong. A review of the case was requested.

Once more the whole sheaf of papers, forms, etc. was returned to the Welfare office. The State Medical Review Team reconfirmed the man's eligibility and stated: "*At this man's age, most men have arteriosclerosis.*"

Here is a classic example of the way in which public employees deliberately or thoughtlessly pervert the law and the facts to suit themselves.

* * *

Some ten years ago, the Colorado State Department of Public Welfare contacted the San Bernardino County Welfare Department regarding a certain woman and her children. This family apparently had been abandoned by the husband and father. The Colorado State Department of Public Welfare reported that the group was not eligible for assistance in Colorado. The Welfare Department there had already contacted several other States attempting to discover where the family's legal residence, if any, might be. As a last resort, they tried San Bernardino County because the woman had mentioned that she once received some assistance there.

The California social worker who checked the case found that the family had received "transient assistance" at one time. Legal residence had never been established in California, either!

So the California social worker blithely concluded her report, as follows: "Colorado Welfare Department claims no responsibility for this family. They are obviously so transient that there is little (if any) possibility of being able to establish legal residence for them anywhere. Therefore, *I guess we will just have to have them returned to California and take care of them here.*"

Now there is nothing in California Welfare and Institutions Code which obliges Californians to do anything of the kind!

Yet *that family was returned to San Bernardino County*. Its members have now been living on tax-funds for more than ten years. The average *cash* grant for the family has been in the neighborhood of \$1000 per month!

It can be conservatively estimated that from the time the family was brought to California, it has cost the taxpayers well over \$100,000. Moreover, there is NO END in sight. This is just one family! And this is a family which, like so many others, had no legitimate claim to our public assistance in the first place.

After returning to San Bernardino County, the mother continued producing illegitimate infants...some of whom (according to the social case history) are believed to have been fathered by her own sons. Her oldest daughter has produced two illegitimates, both of whom (again according to the case histories) are possibly the result of incestuous relations with her brothers.

The entire family, some of whom are now adults, continues to be wholly dependent on public assistance. One son cannot seem to qualify for his own case, but he is supported on tax funds received from the welfare department by other members of his family. Apparently, he is not quite intelligent enough to "prove" that he is mentally retarded.

Yes, "mental retardation" is alleged as the "reason" for awarding the mother, the oldest daughter and two of the adult sons each with a welfare grant under the "program" called Aid to the Totally Disabled.

The oldest daughter is held to be mentally retarded because she claims she cannot read, write, count, manage money, etc. Yet, entered in her case history, we find a report from a social worker who watched the young woman expertly counting change while employed as a waitress. (She was also simultaneously receiving public assistance.) This young woman, it seems, easily obtains jobs. She has worked as a motel maid, a waitress, etc. Indeed, if she were not so sublimely sure of her Aid to the Totally Disabled grant, she probably could become self-supporting.

One of the adult sons is considered to be mentally retarded because his memory span is "very short". Yet once, after having spent two years in custody, he was able on being released to remember the name of a man who had given him a bicycle more than two years earlier.

In addition to those four Aid to the Totally Disabled grants, the family also receives income from *two* Aid to Families with Dependent Children grants. One is for the mother's minor children. The other is for the daughter's two illegitimate children. Some of the mother's minor (and also illegitimate) children have never been returned to her custody. Their care is still totally paid for by the taxpayers, since these children live in foster homes. The entire brood has been removed from the mother's custody at one time or another. Eventually, the older children were returned to her despite the caseworkers' full knowledge of the lack of supervision, the lack of proper and healthful environment, and the incestuous influence of the mother upon her children.

Recently one of the daughters who had been living for years in a foster home reached the age of eighteen. Her mother expressed a desire to have this daughter at home again. The daughter, for her part, was not unwilling to return. So now, at an impressionable age, this young girl has been returned to the "supervision" of a woman who is supposedly so mentally retarded that she receives Aid to the Totally Disabled for this "affliction."

The caseworker stressed the probable need for soon setting up a separate Aid to the Totally Disabled case for this girl as well, suggesting that her "dreaminess" and "lack of complete comprehension" might indicate a retarded mentality.

Practically everywhere this group has lived, there have been numerous complaints from neighbors about the family's obvious immorality and vicious behavior. In at least one instance, the social worker entered in the case history the fact that she had told such complainants there was nothing she or the Welfare Department could or WOULD do about the wretched situation. In the home, at that time, were several of the very young children, ill-fed and unattended much of the time. Evidently the case worker preferred NOT to read and/or apply those very important sections of the California Welfare and Institutions Code which have to do with neglect of minor children!

Every one of these cases needs to be completely re-examined and re-evaluated. It seems absurd that a sane and modern civilization would turn irresponsible mental defectives out to roam and reproduce freely at the taxpayers' expense. Is this evidence of "good social work?"

* * *

Leo and Mary Cotton readily admit not having arrived in California until March, 1964. Thus, Mrs. Cotton would not have been residentially eligible for Aid to the Totally Disabled until at least April, 1967. There was no proof that her "disability" had not existed long before her arrival in California. Yet, on January 1, 1967, she was placed on Aid to the Totally Disabled, using the device of "presumed" eligibility. Her January warrant was budgeted to the amount of \$215, with \$106.80 for a housekeeper. Her February warrant, and all thereafter, were set up in the amount of \$322, of which \$213.13 was specified for a *full time housekeeper*.

The woman and her husband admit that he is earning \$650 a month. The maternal grand mother lives with them. (She is not presumed to be of help in the house, because she is said to be too old and to have a heart condition, which has never been verified.) There are four children, two of whom could also render some assistance, if the family desired.

The family is buying the home where they live.

The wife appears to be suffering from neuritis. Her social worker entered this statement in the case report: "*It is obvious that the woman is completely incapacitated, since worker noted she spilled sugar as she was trying to sweeten her coffee.*"

For some reason, the worker makes no reference at all to the husband's place of employment. There has been no attempt whatever to find out if medical insurance at his place of employment might not be available to cover his wife's care, instead of placing the entire burden on the taxpayers. In fact, there is no verification of the actual amount of the husband's earnings.

This is just another case of saying: "Let the taxpayers pay all this woman's medical expenses, regardless. Let them support her better than they can afford to support themselves." With unlimited medical and dental care available to her, plus all pharmaceuticals, this woman...who was residentially ineligible at the start of her reciprocity...costs the taxpayers considerably more than her cash grant of \$322 per month.

Her husband, the father of her children, the man with whom she is living, is not held responsible for contributing one single penny towards her care. *Only the taxpayers are responsible!*

Medical report forms from physicians on Aid to the Totally Disabled cases are notoriously lacking in laboratory substantiation of diagnoses. Often they do little more than mirror opinions expressed by applicants before they have even consulted a physician. This indicates that the doctor has merely accepted the statements of the applicants at face value, and has inserted them in the case records as medical facts.

Such falsification by omission is a continuous procedure. It happens again and again and is one reason why so many persons receive Aid to the Totally Disabled when they are not eligible to do so.

Thorough and exhaustive tests, as well as laboratory proof, should be required before applicants are accepted as Totally Disabled. In fact, it would be best if precise medical criteria were established, as requirements for such eligibility.

Under Section 4000, subsection (c) of the California Welfare and Institutions Code, it is stated that persons eligible to receive Aid to the Totally Disabled shall not be capable of holding a job or performing household tasks. This is one of the more widely ignored sections of the Code. Many are the homemakers who make a home for themselves and their families by doing all the house work, cooking, etc. Yet they receive Aid to the Totally Disabled because of various "disabilities", such as being obese, alcoholic, or even "socially unemployable."

It is almost beyond comprehension that whole sections of the code can be so blatantly ignored. And yet it is a fact. Because of it, tax funds are misused and fraudulently expended.

Another problem in the "program" of Aid to the Totally Disabled is that its funds also go to subsidize patients who have been temporarily or permanently released from mental institutions. Frequently such persons would not be released, were it not for the funds they could expect from the Welfare Department.

In many cases, it might have been better for the recipients had they remained in institutions. Certainly it would be much better for their victims and for society at large, if psychotic individuals with a homicidal bent were not released to terrorize the public.

Such individuals, who frequently are far from "cured", place more than mere financial burdens upon responsible citizens. They commit all sorts of violent or erratic acts which cause destruction of life or property, and strike fear into the hearts of their neighbors. Because of the State's secrecy shield, the average citizen is unaware that he has been or is being threatened by a "paroled" mental patient, supported outside the institution by welfare funds. No one protects the public from this type of menace and a menace it definitely is! Were accurate statistics available regarding the number of crimes committed by these patients, they would prove astounding. Often the crime that sent a patient to the institution in the first place is repeated after his release.

If the family group to which the released mental patient belongs were made responsible for his subsistence,

there would be a considerable reduction in the number of persons granted leisure, freedom and money to vent their insane impulses on an unsuspecting citizenry.

A simple way for the private citizen to formulate his own statistics on the subject is to keep track of the number of "parolees" from mental institutions who have been found guilty of heinous crimes.

In one California county there lives a couple "on leave" from a mental institution. They "win" their demands from the welfare department by thinly veiled suggestions of possible physical violence. The husband continually victimizes both business firms and individuals by buying items he does not need and cannot or will not pay for. The people with whom he deals do not know how to treat him. Nor do they know that their own tax funds go to support this couple.

Another "parolee" from a mental institution, who was fully supported by tax funds, had a curious habit of taking other peoples' cars and running them into a row of parked cars.

In still another case, a "parolee" from a mental institution liked to ride around the high desert on his bicycle. During his trips he would destroy or tear down *No Hunting* and *No Trespassing* signs. The signs had been posted by ranchers for their protection and security. They were not bought and set up simply to give a released mental patient the fun of destroying them.

The same individual often paid unscheduled calls at nearby homes, where his wild-eyed appearance provoked alarm. Although his neighbors were aware something was wrong with the young man, they did not know just what it was. Due to lack of information, they were completely unprotected. The young man was allowed to go his bizarre way unrestricted.

These are true examples of disturbing or irritating episodes resulting from such cases. For other more fearful consequences, one need only read the newspapers. Hardly a week goes by without a headline announcing that another gruesome murder has been committed by a "parolee" from a mental institution.

The sober citizen must not only bear the burden of subsidizing such individuals, and providing the leisure and funds for their weird activities; but he must also suffer the atmosphere of terror created by them. He must somehow protect himself and his family against an unidentified danger...because the government is interested only in protecting and pampering the "parolee."

CHAPTER 14 - ANYTHING GOES [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

There are two areas of public assistance guaranteed to have heart appeal for Americans — aid for the elderly and for children.

What is more moving than the spectacle of a lonely, helpless old man or woman? Quite often this is their most potent weapon. Many are capable of using it very effectively, if it helps them to get what they want. They are also voters, quite willing to use the pressure of bloc voting to enforce their demands. Thus senior citizens are handled with extreme care and caution by welfare workers.

Small children, too, are appealing, touchingly so when they have been mistreated, neglected and abused as many welfare children are. But, children are generally unaware of how to use their appeal as a weapon. Moreover, they do not vote. Thus, inspite of their appealing qualities, they are seldom so carefully considered as are the elderly. It is the children's parents who receive the careful consideration. **THEY CAN VOTE!**

The mere fact of having reached his 65th birth day does not necessarily restore an individual to the pristine innocence of infancy, or remove any impulse to larceny he may have acquired over the years.

An old person is quite capable of looking the picture of outraged innocence when faced with proof of fraud or misrepresentation. The picture has a way of getting into newsprint, though the facts behind it seldom do. For this and other reasons great lenience is practiced towards aged recipients of public aid. Consequently, not a few fraudulent claims, leading to misuse of tax funds, are condoned and concealed in the Old Age Security

caseloads.

Take the case of Max and Nemia Saenz. It was a simple matter for them to apply for Old Age Security, shortly after entering the United States from Mexico. That they had not complied with residence requirements, as far as the Welfare Department was concerned, meant nothing to them. Nor did the fact they were violating the oath they had just sworn at the Immigration Department.

Their children, already established here, were able to procure two witnesses willing to testify that the couple had lived in this country the requisite number of years.

To have established the actual date of entry into this country and State, the case worker need only have asked to see the couple's alien registration cards. If they refused, a quick phone-call to the Immigration Department would have produced the information. Had the worker done this, however, she would have been obliged to find them ineligible for public aid, and the Department of Public Assistance would have lost two steady, tax-consuming welfare "clients!"

* * *

R. L. Masters, considerably older than his wife, is on Old Age Security. Mrs. Masters prefers to work outside the home, rather than remain a mere housewife and mother to their teen-age son. As a result, Mr. Masters has been furnished a full-time housekeeper who, of course, keeps house for the whole family, relieving young Mrs. Masters of domestic duties. The taxpayers not only give this man a monthly cash grant, but the money to pay a full-time housekeeper as well.

The Masters own real estate in addition to the house where they live. They actually complained to the Welfare Department because they were forced to collect their rents in person, via automobile. The idea was that they ought to be reimbursed for the expense of collecting these rents. Without the least hesitation, an extra allowance was made in their public assistance grant for gasoline used by Mr. and Mrs. Masters in collecting their rental income. Already included in the case budget were allowances for the upkeep of these properties, and for taxes! Even mortgage payments on the properties was fully paid via public assistance. In other words, tax funds were allowed them, not only towards the purchase of their own home, but of property they were renting to others!

* * *

John and Anna Keene sold their little home in Merced County for \$5000 cash. Then they bought a home in San Bernardino County. They used all the cash from the sale of their former home as a down payment on the new one. Because of this, Old Age Security payments which both received were not affected by their cash assets. Their public assistance grants were transferred from Merced to San Bernardino County. The only difference was that the couple was now making higher payments on a new home, so the additional amount was added to their grants!

The Keenes were provided also with special allowances, from tax funds, so that they could improve the new home in San Bernardino County. Two years after moving from Merced County, they sold the home in San Bernardino County for \$10,000. Again, this cash was not viewed as "assets", because the pair announced they planned to buy a new home in Santa Cruz County.

Thereupon they applied the entire \$10,000 (or so they claimed) as a down payment on the new home in Santa Cruz County. They did not feel obliged, nor did anyone venture to suggest, that they support themselves for at least a certain time from these profits. Obviously, this kind of manipulation can go on indefinitely. This couple has years ahead of them to obtain tax support, while they build up ever larger equities in real estate.

* * *

George and Alice Ray began receiving Old Age Security in 1943. At that time, they claimed to have nothing...absolutely nothing. Soon after, it was learned that they did own a piece of real property...a vacant lot.

Although such falsification is legally grounds for cutting off public assistance, the social worker assigned to their case generously ignored the slip and recommended no change in their status.

Without delay they built a house on the lot, obtaining the material in a most unbelievable manner — but, of course, social workers believe in fairy tales! Emboldened by their success, the Rays then built a second house on the property, and allowed a son to live "rent-free" in the first. Materials for the second house were secured in the same fantastic fashion as before — and though the social worker was a different one this time, she was just as gullible as her predecessor.

In 1958 the Rays sold the property, realizing a net profit of \$5750. (Remember, they admitted to owning absolutely nothing when they originally applied for public assistance!) Subsequently, they bought another house in the same county but near a son in another city.

Of course, they claimed to have put their entire profit into the new home; but they still owed some \$4000 on it. As a matter of routine, their public assistance grant was enlarged to cover payments, taxes, etc., on their new residence.

Casually their successive social workers during the next few years asked to see the deed on the new piece of real estate. Oddly enough, it was never available, although the workers received fervent assurances from the couple, from a son and from the son's wife that the deed was definitely recorded in the names of the elder Rays. Had this not been so, they would have been immediately ineligible for continuance of the welfare.

Five years passed. In 1963, Mr. Ray died. As is customary, the Welfare Department inquired about the estate, on the chance that there might be sufficient surplus to support Mrs. Ray. Then came the "surprise"!

The Welfare Department was curtly informed *there was no estate*. Bit by bit the truth came to light. It was quite true that the entire proceeds from the sale of their original house and lot had been invested in the last piece of real property this elderly couple bought. But the deed was recorded in the names of their son and daughter-in-law. The moment this was done, George and Alice Ray became ineligible for public assistance. They had collected literally thousands of tax dollars illegally! During their years in the new home, they had been completely supported by the taxpayers — even to the extent of being allotted a full-time housekeeper.

The taxpayers made the payments on the property, through grants allowed for that purpose. The taxpayers paid the taxes and the upkeep on real estate that was recorded in the name of a young, healthy and financially able couple, all because the social workers had not been sufficiently interested to insist on seeing the deed to the property.

Owing to the lack of diligence on the part of social workers, this elderly pair was encouraged to commit out-and-out fraud. Their son and daughter-in-law were also guilty of fraud, and apparently were aware of the fact. Although the Welfare Department's inquiry was quite gentle, mild and forgiving, the younger Rays promptly hired the town's most prominent attorney. Actually, they could have saved themselves the trouble. The Department's own negligence would have worked against it in case of a trial. Moreover, fraud charges are hardly ever brought, when the aged are involved.

As a matter of fact, aid to old Mrs. Ray was not interrupted for even a day. To the time of her death four years later, she enjoyed the best care that the taxpayers' funds could provide. Towards the end, she was placed in a rest home with complete nursing care. The son and the daughter-in-law, who had already gained so much, did nothing whatever to share the burden.

* * *

Cases like this are legion. Not infrequently aspirants are well-coached in current welfare practices before they ever apply for Old Age Security. One elderly woman boldly gave her 80-acre ranch to her children just before applying. Although this act would legally have excluded her from receiving the benefits she requested, the Welfare Department decided the acreage was not valuable enough to worry about. Incidentally, this woman had reared her children on welfare, having been an aid recipient most of her life — and such "clients"

invariably get special consideration. (Do you wonder how she was able to acquire an 80-acre farm while on welfare. Don't give it a second thought. The Welfare Department didn't!)

Another phase of public assistance that is highly charged with emotion is medical care for the needy. Few have the courage to state frankly they are against such care as it is publicly administered today, though there may be potent arguments on their side.

In 1937, Los Angeles County initiated a plan for public assistance for the medically-indigent. It was called the "San Fernando Plan". For three and a half years I worked as an admissions worker in the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Social Services. That is the department charged with administration of the "plan". It is my understanding that the Los Angeles medical assistance "plan" was studied by those interested in furthering Federal Medicare and a federally supplemented State medical assistance program.

As indicated elsewhere in this book, there are persons receiving *free* medical care at the expense of Los Angeles County taxpayers who are in no sense eligible. Investigation of the truthfulness of statements made by applicants was frowned upon, to a point where it simply was NOT DONE by any admission worker interested in remaining on good terms with her superiors.

Applicants received *free* medical care even though they were substantial property owners, possessed ample cash resources, were eligible for care under private insurance plans or policies, or were aliens and therefore ineligible. The only complaint ever made about my own work was that *I found too many individuals INELIGIBLE!* This was a constant refrain.

In spite of laws governing the situation, I was constantly told, "But, Mrs. Detlof, we are NOT here to verify the truth of a recipient's statement. We are here to help determine the best plan for his medical care, and then to assist him in carrying Out that plan."

That, however, was not what the law required.

There was a young woman, for instance, who came to the Medical Social Services office at - - - - Hospital for assistance in filling out the appropriate forms for her "husband", who was in the surgical ward awaiting major surgery. Before the interview was over, the woman divulged that she was receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children because she was supposedly HUSBANDLESS. Despite her professed lack of a husband, she had eight children, all under ten years of age.

In addition, the woman revealed that her "husband" worked as a waiter in a well-known hotel. Knowing very well that he must belong to a union whose members were covered by medical insurance, I phoned his employer for the pertinent information.

Can you imagine my bewilderment when the employer told me that the "husband" had not been ill, was at work on that very day, and hadn't missed a day's work in weeks? The mystery deepened. *Who, then, was the man in the ward the young woman claimed was her husband?*

An entry in her case history showed that the woman's husband had been deported from the United States about six years earlier as an illegal alien.

On taking this amazing case to my supervisor, I was instructed to desist from any further investigation and merely provide the unknown man in the ward with *free* medical care. The important thing, I was told, was that the man should receive care, legally or illegally!

* * *

There was another woman, living in Long Beach, who came regularly to - - - - Hospital for medical care. Although she admitted owning her own home, free and clear, and although one of the several diamond rings she wore must have been nearly four karats, she insisted that her total income was only \$66 per month. She and I both knew that amount would hardly pay the taxes on her real property, let alone feed and clothe her. Nevertheless, I followed instructions and accepted her at her word.

There was still another woman with thousands of dollars at her command who received medical care at - - - - Hospital, even though she could easily have paid for the services of a private physician. Since she had long received medical care from the County medical facility, a determination was made that she should continue to do so — free of charge! Yet there was proof she possessed almost \$20,000 in cold cash at the time.

While investigation to establish the truth or falsehood of statements made by recipients of *free* medical care in Los Angeles County was always frowned on, now that the State, the Federal Government and the County administration all combine to provide such *free* care, any investigation to verify such statements is EXPRESSLY FORBIDDEN!

This seems utterly fantastic, yet I know it to be a fact. Especially does it seem fantastic, when one realizes that the Federal Government (the instigator of this interlocking "plan") is presumably familiar with the report from the United States Comptroller General's office in 1962, regarding fraud in welfare cases in Washington, D.C. The report, you may recall, showed that only 9% of the cases investigated were receiving public assistance legally and in the proper amounts.

Medi-Cal, like its counterparts in the other States credulous enough to have joined the Federal Government in these *free* medical care "pro grains", ends by being a program of "free grabs" for all. It is as if someone had turned a crowd of greedy children loose in a candy store and told them, "Help yourselves. It's all free!"

Instructions, rulings, "manual letters", edicts, etc. relating to medical public assistance seem straight out of *Alice in Wonderland*. One welfare supervisor declared that EVERY applicant for Medi-Cal MUST be certified for it, regardless of the circumstances. Asked to give the reason for such a remarkable statement, the supervisor, looking wide-eyed and very earnest, replied: "We get \$18 from the Federal Government for every certification. We can't afford to pass that up!"

Medi-Cal (like similar "plans" in other participating States) is handled in the most carefree manner. No attention is paid to the fact that the recipient may also have private or group prepaid medical insurance. Nor to the fact that an individual may be covered by disability benefits, work man's compensation, et al.

This type of *free* medical care was foisted on the States by the Federal Government with such speed and stealth as to be suspect, if only because of the manner in which it bypassed the afflicted taxpayers. States with efficient and responsible leadership, which did not succumb to the Federal offer of "assistance" for this kind of *free* care, can count themselves fortunate. Apparently California's State administration *at that time* was more eager to influence voters than to render responsible service to all the citizens of the State.

California's present Governor, Ronald Reagan, has stated that in a very few years Medi-Cal would consume an amount equal to or in excess of the State's total income!

To summarize, the pertinent questions are:

1. Is it sensible that any and all investigation into the veracity of an applicant's statements be FORBIDDEN?
2. Should the taxpayers provide *free* medical care for those financially able to provide it for themselves?
3. Should the taxpayers provide *free* medical care where a recipient has other programs or plans available to him?

More specifically:

1. Should taxpayers provide the welfare recipient with *free* private medical treatments for impotence, so that he can continue to produce illegitimate infants for the County and State to support?
2. Should the taxpayers provide artificial insemination for chronic welfare recipients under a "program" of *free* medical care?
3. Should the taxpayers provide free medical care, except on a strictly emergency basis, for aliens whether legally or illegally in this country?

And finally, must taxpayers be forced to support a "plan" that can only result in bankrupting the State?

There is one more question: WHY?...WHY are the taxpayers placed in such an untenable position?

CHAPTER 15 - THE DISADVANTAGED [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

We hear a great deal these days about underprivileged children. The descriptive terms most often used are "socially-deprived" and/or "culturally deprived."

SOCIETY in general, and the Caucasian members of society in particular, are commonly blamed for this alleged deprivation. No fault attaches to the female who produced the child; to the father (if his identity is even known); to the home itself; or to the social agency that has failed to fulfil its prescribed duty of protecting such children.

NO! Oh no! Only SOCIETY at large is found guilty — never an individual! Bluntly, that is plain and simple hogwash. Members of SOCIETY, Caucasian, and non-Caucasian who are responsible, self-sufficient individuals, and who accept such charges as true are instead guilty of moral fraud and criminal stupidity.

How can any OUTSIDE influence successfully combat the devastating, day-to-day effect of an immoral mother on her children? If a mother daily sets an example of flagrant promiscuity, obvious cheating and neglect of her maternal responsibilities, her children reflect her outlook and behavior.

To develop socially acceptable attitudes, a child must be surrounded from infancy by persons exemplifying the good life. To comprehend personal responsibility (which is the first step to good and reliable citizenship), a child must first learn it at home. Similarly he must learn by example the other necessary elements of good citizenship, such as honesty, self-respect, self-reliance, respect for others and their possessions.

What possible influence can a class for "culturally deprived" children have on the small boy or girl who wanders home from a course in "Appreciation of Music" to find Mother and some strange man in bed, busily engaged in creating another child...who will in due time be presented to the world as still another "culturally deprived," "socially deprived" moppet, for whose shortcomings Society alone is to blame?

Is this exaggerated? Not at all. This is REAL, and it happens every day. It is the net result of the "social planning" imposed with such devastating results upon decent citizens of all races and national origins in the United States of America today.

Deprived, such children certainly are. Of that there can be no doubt. To blame such deprivation upon society as a whole is to reveal idiocy. To make correction of such deprivation solely SOCIETY's responsibility is to be ridiculous and asinine.

Their deprivation stems, not from Society at large, but from permissive and irregular "enforcement" of the laws governing public assistance. The blame can be laid directly on the administration of these so-called "welfare programs."

Before these "programs" can be so expertly mismanaged by welfare officials, however, they must first be presented in legal or pseudo-legal form to the American people or their elected representatives. (The fact that laws authorizing the "programs" may be unconstitutional is another matter!) Perhaps the primary fault lies with vote-seeking politicians who hold out promises of security, plenty and a life of ease from womb to tomb in return for an "X" marked after their names on election day.

Patty Pierce is definitely a disadvantaged child. Nobody can even guess how many times she has been raped by her mother's various "common-law spouses," and by the various and sundry males who frequent the house. At any rate, at thirteen years of age, she became pregnant.

For more than twenty years the taxpayers have been supporting Patty's mother, the mother's horde of illegitimate offspring and the many men who assumed, for short periods, the role of the mother's "common-law spouse." The taxpayers have done the best they could, to the tune of more than \$70,000 in cold

cash, not including medical and other fringe benefits.

Patty's mother repaid the taxpayers by seeing to it that Patty began at an early age to increase the tax burden!

As a REWARD for her criminally bad citizen ship, *Patty's mother* received an *increase* in her own "aid" check! Nothing whatever was said or done about enforcing the law against persons contributing to the delinquency of a minor.

The persons immediately to blame for Patty's deprivation are Patty's mother, the rapists her mother welcomed into the home, the social workers handling the case, and the welfare administrators who approved — or closed their eyes — to the situation.

By refusing to enforce the laws that exist to protect children such as Patty, the Welfare Agency administrators and social workers are themselves guilty of contributing to the delinquency of minors.

* * *

Gloria Haney also is a disadvantaged child. The taxpayers have done what they could to assist this child and her family by providing Gloria's mother with three times as much money, via welfare, as she could ever have earned by her own efforts. All the taxpayers hoped was that the money would be wisely used for the benefit of the children.

Gloria's mother, however, used the money to buy narcotics. Little, if any, was left over for the children for whom it was intended. When Gloria, at fourteen, conceived and delivered her first illegitimate infant, the event meant nothing more to her mother than an additional source of funds for the purchase of narcotics.

* * *

The following case is a classic among tales of disadvantaged children. It might be called *The Case of the Pitiful Prostitute*.

Unfortunately, this story is not fiction. Every detail of it has been recorded in case histories hidden in the files of the Department of Medical Social Service and the Bureau of Public Assistance in Los Angeles County, California. You could read it there, if you were ever allowed to see the cases. Do you really wonder why such items are refused public view?

Heading the cast of characters is Felicia, the prostitute that social workers felt was more to be pitied than censured. All she has ever wanted, or seemed to want, was complete and undiluted sexual freedom. Infants born as a result of her promiscuity were no problem to Felicia. She merely left them alone to die of malnutrition and neglect.

Then, FATE, in the shape of "welfare workers", intervened. Eventually they tied her down (although not by marriage) to one man — a weak, pallid, ineffectual creature whom I will call Pliny. Felicia was not happy at being thus restricted.

It is hard to determine the "villain" in this particular case. For Felicia, it might be the social workers who devised and "planned" the whole wretched situation. For Pliny it was doubtless his own terrifying inadequacy. For Felicia's six living children the entire adult group surrounding them was the collective villain. It included their mother and Pliny, as well as the social caseworkers entrusted with the responsibility of seeing that these tax-supported children were properly cared for. Such workers are employed and paid to "insure that the rights or physical, mental or moral welfare of children are not violated or threatened by their present circumstances or environment"...(Section Nineteen of *The California Welfare and Institutions Code*).

For six or more infants (precise number unknown) born to Felicia as a result of her former promiscuity, the question of a villain is academic. Luckily for them, they died before reaching the age of reason. It is entered in the case history in the files of the Los Angeles County Bureau of Public Assistance that these infants expired because of malnutrition and maternal neglect.

Also appearing more than once in the same social case history is the statement that Felicia was a "known prostitute." The various caseworkers...old and new...who handled her case were fully aware of the kind of person with whom they were dealing and to whom they awarded the taxpayers' money.

Although Felicia claims to have been born and raised in the United States, she also claims (at convenient moments) that she cannot speak or understand English. This "fact", as she apparently knows, is a kind of protective cloak, calling for special care, attention and solicitude on the part of social workers.

Felicia's "common-law" association with Pliny has been the most nearly permanent thing in her life. According to entries in the social case history, it came about under pressure from Felicia 's social worker. It was the worker's own inspiration, and due credit is given her in the case record.

It seems the social worker decided that, since Pliny was "obviously living with Felicia...having twice made her pregnant...he might just as well move in with her and make it official".

When the social worker asked Pliny if he cared to move in with Felicia, he is said to have muttered that it was O.K. with him if it was O.K. with Felicia. What Felicia said or thought about the arrangement (or if she was even consulted) is not reported in the case history. Shortly thereafter, Pliny moved in with her and her illegitimate brood.

Soon Pliny was added to the welfare budget set up for Felicia. Thus the social worker not only assured immoral and illegal living arrangements, but also rewarded Felicia for being so acquiescent...by INCREASING HER GRANT.

The poor little waifs who were Felicia's surviving children derived no benefit from Pliny's presence. But this seemingly mattered not at all to the adults. Pliny was interested only in satisfying his personal desires. Felicia evinced no enthusiasm, and appeared to accept the arrangement only because she felt she had to, if she wished to continue receiving her monthly grant from tax funds. Her interest in her living children was little more than for her other children who had died of malnutrition and neglect.

The social worker? Oh, she definitely proved that she was "modern" and "open-minded." She also proved that she felt no desire to be PUNITIVE towards the adult recipients. (Workers try very hard *never* to be PUNITIVE. It is considered VERY bad. One is PUNITIVE if one believes people should live like people and not like animals!)

One detail the worker overlooked. Perhaps she forgot it because it is a section of the Welfare and Institutions Code that is largely ignored in practice. It reads:

It is also the purpose of this code, in establishing programs and services which are designed to provide protection, support or care of children, to provide protective services to the fullest extent deemed necessary by the juvenile court, probation department or other public agencies designated by the board of supervisors to perform the duties prescribed by this code to insure that the rights or physical, mental or moral welfare of children are not threatened by their present circumstances or environment...

Pliny had once worked in a local steel mill. For a time, he had even partially supported his legal wife and child. Possibly he might still be employed there, had he not undertaken (at the social worker's request) the task of trying to satisfy Felicia's appetites. This, he discovered, was a twenty-four hour job. Pliny had no time, energy or inclination left for the normal business of earning a living.

The Welfare Department on one occasion helped him to find a job as a dishwasher; but he quit in short order, saying such work was beneath his DIGNITY! His refusal to work appeared to disturb no one. It was not considered cause for discontinuing the monthly welfare grant. Aid checks continued to arrive with pleasing promptness.

Apparently, however, something WAS beginning to trouble Felicia. She seemed to feel that she had somehow got the worst of a bad bargain. She was not opposed to living with Pliny, providing he was able to satisfy her sexually. This was all described rather vividly in the case histories. Early in 1962 Felicia's dissatisfaction became

critical. And in March, 1962. Pliny applied at the Santa Monica medical aid office (operated by the Los Angeles County Department of Charities and financed by the taxpayers) and requested *free* medical care with a private panel physician. The reason given for his request...IMPOTENCY!

Rather desperately, he told the admissions workers that if he did not soon recover from his disability his "common-law wife" was going to "kick him out of the house."

Solicitous workers gave him medical service orders to go to a private physician, so that he could be treated for "impotency" and continue, with his illicit partner, to produce more illegitimate children for the taxpayers to support.

Could a novelist like William Faulkner have dreamed up anything more fantastic — or more revolting?

At any rate, Pliny went at taxpayers' expense to the office of a physician on Santa Monica Boulevard. The Welfare Department, which cared so little about the welfare of children they were entrusted with protecting, cared so much about the "happiness" of Pliny. No serious unpleasantness must be allowed to mar the even tenor of his life.

According to the physician's diagnosis, Pliny showed "increased fatigue, weight gain, impotence. Examination negative except for obesity. Possibly hypothyroidism."

This is not an alarming diagnosis. Many a taxpayer has graver symptoms. Yet, for the sake of attempting to satisfy a "known prostitute", the taxpayers were forced to shell out their hard-earned money not only to support such a man but also to pay his mounting medical expenses.

Pliny was authorized either to see a private physician, or to obtain "treatment" at - - - Hospital, from that day forward. The total amount of his medical expenses proved formidable.

Pliny started treatment for "impotency" in March, 1962. The following January, Felicia gave birth to another illegitimate infant *for the taxpayers to support*. The event took place, not at a county hospital, but at a choice private one. The taxpayers paid extra for this.

This "family" group finally moved into the medical aid district where I was employed. It was my job to provide Pliny with his first medical service orders to a new panel physician. From the beginning, though Pliny was not very communicative, I had an uneasy feeling that there was something very odd about the whole situation. To be "safe" (as required by my superiors), I authorized *free* medical care for one month only, rather than the usual unlimited care. Then I requested his Medical Social Service case history.

When it arrived from Santa Monica I was appalled at the contents. Much later, in the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office, I was to review the entire case history from records in the Bureau of Public Assistance as well as the Medical Social Service files. At that time, I was more than appalled!

Meanwhile, Pliny came to our medical aid office each month with a request for continued medical care. Finally I took the matter up with our Medical Director, saying: "Why should we provide this man with *free* medical care *at the expense of decent tax-paying citizens*, just so he can be treated for 'impotency'? The only results are more illegitimate offspring, who must be added to the welfare rolls." The Director replied there was only one way to stop Pliny's medical service orders — namely, if the attending physician stated that the patient no longer needed medical care.

So, before calling Pliny for an interview, I phoned his private, tax-paid physician. The office nurse informed me the doctor could not come to the telephone just then, but that she would act as intermediary.

The answers I received from the physician, via his nurse, were clear and unmistakable:

1. There was nothing wrong with Pliny except a slight nervousness.
2. The physician said he had been treating the man with tranquilizers, for the most part.
3. The fact that he DID NOT NEED MEDICAL CARE had been explained to Pliny several times.

Most emphatically, the doctor said, *there was no need for Pliny to make sixteen or more calls to his or any other physician's office IN ONE MONTH'S TIME.*

The physician stated he had advised Pliny to go out and get a job. That would do him more good than anything the doctor could prescribe. As far as his physical condition was concerned, there was absolutely nothing to prevent him from working.

After talking with the office nurse, I called Pliny in and reported the whole conversation. Pliny frowned when I mentioned what the doctor had said about his going to work. Beyond that he made no comment, until I had finished. Then he said he understood, and left quietly.

Later, in the District Attorney's office, when I re-read the social case history from the Medical Aid office, and in addition read the social case history from the Bureau of Public Assistance, I learned still more shocking things. One of them was that after I had been ordered to take a "leave of absence," the Director of the Medical Aid office called Pliny and reinstated him. She provided him with virtually unlimited medical service orders for *free* care from the same physician who had informed me that there was nothing wrong with the man.

It would have been wise for the Director to check Pliny's medical chart at - - - Hospital. She would have found that on alternate days, when Pliny was not at the office of his private physician demanding care for his "disability", he could be found at - - - Hospital engaged in the same activity.

It is entirely contrary to good medical practice to provide medical treatment for an individual from two sources, each unaware of the diagnosis and medication provided by the other. Employees at the Department of Medical Social Service are often cautioned about this. Evidently Directors do not need to be so careful.

The case history from the Bureau of Public Assistance revealed the most shocking atrocities. This is the department that hands out the cash grants to welfare recipients. It is also the department charged with protecting little children.

The record showed that Felicia had a seventeen year old son, Roberto, who had been picked up repeatedly by Santa Monica police on charges of child molestation. At length Roberto was placed in a tax-supported public institution for the mentally retarded.

As reported in the case history, the social worker discussed this turn of events quite fully with Felicia, and some horrifying revelations came to light. *It seems Roberto was merely imitating Pliny's nightly practices with Felicia's small daughters.*

Both the social worker and Felicia (according to the case history) came to the same conclusion. They decided the boy had *misunderstood* Pliny's actions. Pliny wasn't molesting the little girls...even if it appeared so. He was merely LOVING them. When the boy repeated Pliny's actions with other little girls, it was called child molestation. When Pliny molested Felicia's small daughters the ENLIGHTENED, non-punitive social worker concluded it must be only love!

The boy remained at the institution only a few months. In an amazingly short time, considering the reason for his admission, he was released to return to the home of his mother (a "known" prostitute) and Pliny (who had instructed him nightly in their joint perversion).

At this time, the social caseworker made a very mild request. (It all appears in the case history.) *Would Felicia, please, (begged the caseworker meekly) REQUEST that Pliny not "LOVE" the little girls...in front of Roberto...IF IT WAS AT ALL POSSIBLE!*

"If it is at all possible, Pliny, please don't molest the little girls in front of the teen-age boy. It doesn't matter what you do to them, otherwise." This, in essence, is what the social worker seemed to be saying.

NOTHING...BUT NOTHING was done to protect these small children in any way. Clearly the social worker was aware of the type of treatment the little girls received from Pliny. Other wise, she would scarcely have

requested that he NOT perform his rituals in front of the boy.

These are a few examples of the many *truly* DISADVANTAGED children. The real cause and the real reason they are deprived, disadvantaged, eternally pathetic little people can be found in the home that is so often supported by Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Because the people-planners make no effort to correct such monstrous situations, it can only be inferred that they approve and condone.

What good can the future hold for little girls and boys reared by a man who molests them nightly and a prostitute mother who can think only of her own sexual gratification. *If this is approved, scientific social planning we would be much better off with chaos.*

Furthermore, according to government "plans" (and again PLOT is a more appropriate word) the taxpayers and responsible citizens are to be provided with more of this type of thing.

The authorities and most (fortunately, not all!) social caseworkers seem to agree there is only one way to solve ALL social problems. Their "solution" is to give the shiftless, immoral and lazy MORE MONEY. This is supposed to solve every problem.

Aid recipients must have more play-time, more leisure, more "culture" (as if it were something painted on with a brush). Most important of all, they MUST be given MORE MONEY!

Several obvious conclusions can be drawn. The first and foremost is that the kind of "planning" now in force creates an ever increasing swarm of ever more devastating social problems. It does NOT alleviate them, as claimed.

The law enforcement agencies, the schools, the prisons — the organized riots, looting and arson in one American city after another provide ample proof that such "social planning" has been far from successful. Yet the planners say that a double dose of the same old medicine will do the trick.

CHAPTER 16 - WELFARE, A WEAPON [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

The term "pressure from below" comes from the classic account of the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia, clearly and boldly traced by Jan Kozak (official Communist historian) in his book, *And Not A Shot Is Fired*. There Kozak gives a detailed explanation of how known and unknown Communists in high places, with the help of Socialist fellow travelers, do-gooders and dupes, promoted and passed laws which opened the way for the final Communist takeover; and how so-called "pressure from above" was aided and expanded by inciting the masses ("pressure from below") to demand more and greater governmental activity, especially in the field of public assistance. This was called the "pincers tactic", where each increase in pressure from above gave rise to increased action from below, and *vice versa*, until individual freedom was lost to an all-powerful government which the Communists soon openly controlled "without firing a shot".

The similarity of our own Civil Rights, Welfare, Housing and Urban Renewal legislation "pressure from above" to the Civil Rights, Welfare, and "Building for Progress" legislation that was pushed through in pre-Communist Czechoslovakia is startling. We, too, are faced with mass demands, marches, and riots ("pressure from below"). All this is not conclusive proof that Socialists and/or Communists are manipulating events in the United States as they did in Czechoslovakia; but it certainly warrants the suspicion, and calls for careful investigation.

This book does not pretend to substitute for any such investigation but a few pertinent leads are surely in order. If there is any possibility that Socialists and Communists are indeed behind this "pressure," both from above and below, we should know more about their basic plans and tactics. These are freely detailed in many books and pamphlets, the most basic of them all being the *Communist Manifesto* of Karl Marx. In it Marx outlined ten steps to be taken, in order to achieve domination of industrially advanced nations. Quoting from that book:

We have seen...that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class to win the battle of democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e. of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which, in the course of movement, outstrip the old social order and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production.

These measures will of course be different in different countries.

Nevertheless in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State, bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc. etc.

It is frightening to see how many of Marx's ten steps for undermining a free nation have already been accomplished in whole or in part, in our own country.

The idea of manipulating "Welfare" for destructive purposes seems quite far-fetched but actually it was advocated at the very outset of our U.S. "Welfare" program, in such statements as the following:

"We shall push relief programs with the intention of driving the entire country onto relief, thus causing the capitalistic system to commit suicide."

The year was 1933. The man who overheard and reported that statement was George N. Peek, original Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration under Franklin D. Roosevelt. The individuals Mr. Peek heard announcing their "plan" for destroying our government and our Free Enterprise system were later identified as members of Harold Ware's group, believed to have been the first Communist cell established in a department of the United States government.

Mr. Peek, in his book, *Why Quit Our Own*, reveals:

A Plague of young lawyers settled on Washington...in a legal division were formed the plans which eventually turned the A.A.A. from a device to aid the farmer to a device to introduce the collectivist system of agriculture into this country...

...they wanted to get rid of me. They wanted to purge the A.A.A. of all businessmen or any other who did not welcome the coming of the new day of revolution....

Most of that crowd, in their effects, were Communists. They owed allegiance not to the United States — patriotism was for the non-thinking. They had a higher allegiance, an allegiance to the 'Cause'. The end justified the means.

Indeed, one day one of the co-op leaders told me that he could get tips from the Communists' headquarters in New York as to what was going on before I knew what was in the wind.

The Subcommittee of the U. S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, appointed to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws, subsequently reported:

"Peek's successor, Chester A. Davis, made a heroic effort to drive most of these people from Government, in the famous Triple-A Purge of 1935...*But they found lodgement elsewhere as the record of our hearings abundantly demonstrates.*" (Italics added.)

This report to the Committee on the Judiciary ends with the following conclusions:

1. The Soviet International organization has carried on a successful and important penetration of the United States Government and this penetration has not been fully exposed.
2. This penetration has extended from the lower ranks to the top-level policy and operating positions in our Government.
3. The agents of this penetration have operated in accordance with a distinct design fashioned by their Soviet superiors.
4. Members of this conspiracy helped to get each other into Government, helped each other to rise in Government and protected each other from exposure.
5. The general pattern of this penetration was first into agencies concerned with economic recovery, then to warmaking agencies, then to agencies concerned with foreign policy and post war planning, *but always moving to the focal point of national concern.* (Italics added.)
6. In general the Communists who infiltrated our Government worked behind the scenes — guiding research and preparing memoranda on which basic American policies were set, writing speeches for Cabinet officers, influencing congressional investigations, drafting laws, manipulating administrative reorganizations — always serving the interest of their Soviet superiors.
7. Thousands of diplomatic, political, military, scientific and economic secrets of the United States have been stolen by Soviet agents in our Government and by other persons closely connected with the Communists.
8. Despite the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security agencies had reported extensive information about this Communist penetration, little was done by the executive branch to interrupt the Soviet operatives in their ascent in Government until congressional committees brought forth to public light the facts of the conspiracy.
9. Powerful groups and individuals within the executive branch were at work obstructing and weakening the effort to eliminate Soviet agents from positions in Government.
10. Members of this conspiracy repeatedly swore to oaths denying Communist Party membership when seeking appointments, transfers and promotions, and these falsifications have, in virtually every case, gone unpunished.
11. The control that the American Communications Association, a Communist-directed union, maintains over communication lines vital to the national defense poses a threat to the security of this country.

In conclusion, the same report stated:

Policies and programs laid down by members of this Soviet conspiracy are still in effect within our Government and constitute a continuing hazard to our national security. (Italics added.)

Harold Ware, who founded that first Communist cell in the United States Department of Agriculture, represented himself as an agricultural expert. In a manner of speaking, perhaps he was...*but not in any American manner.* His mother stated in her autobiography that Harold had served in the Soviet Union under Lenin and Stalin, helping to collectivize that nation's farms. Harold Ware's mother, incidentally, was Ella Reeve Bloor, hailed by her friends as the First Lady of the Communist Party, U.S.A. So a man who had assisted Stalin and Lenin in the collectivization of Russia's farm system was welcomed in this country as an agricultural "engineer", and given a responsible position in our Government. It was his group in the Department of Agriculture which bluntly stated its intentions of forcing everyone on welfare. This was to bring about the end of the Free Enterprise system, they declared.

If that scheme from the 1930's of "welfare for everyone" seems out of date, some more recent pronouncements can be cited.

Said Ellen Winston, United States Commissioner of Welfare, in the 1966 booklet, *Social Development, Key to the Great Society* (1): "An affluent society needs and can afford *collective* social welfare programs which benefit large segments, or *even its total population.*" (Italics added.)

If everyone were to become a recipient of social welfare, obviously the economy of the United States would collapse and its people degenerate into a nation of slaves. Remember Alexander Hamilton's warning that *power*

over a man's subsistence is power over his will!

The methods by which practically everyone in the United States is to be transformed from an independent, self-reliant citizen into a welfare recipient, have been outlined for us. They appear in a 1966 official booklet entitled, *Having The Power, We Have The Duty*. The title is ominous enough, but this sinister little manual of collectivization develops plans even more threatening than its title suggests.

It was submitted as a report of the President's Advisory Council on Public Welfare. The Council members held hearings and "studied" welfare problems. Apparently, however, they never heard any opposing views. Only persons ardently in favor of the total Welfare State seem to have been invited to testify. Among other things, the President's Advisory Council recommended the following "reforms":

1. A nationwide "floor" for public assistance payments, below which no State could go and still receive Federal funds.
2. Welfare payments to supplement low earnings — i.e., a variation of the "guaranteed income" scheme.
3. Exemption of some earnings for welfare recipients.
4. A nationwide comprehensive program of Public Assistance based on a single criterion: NEED.
5. In effect, all standards would be set by the Federal Government, with Counties, State legislative bodies and the people themselves having little or no voice in the matter.
6. Prompt extension of coverage and liberalization of benefits under Social Insurance programs.
7. Social services and public assistance to be established as a LEGAL RIGHT, enforceable in the Courts at the taxpayers' expense.
8. *Free* medical care to be available for ALL, thus "closing the gaps between the 21 year age group and the 65 year age group." In making this recommendation, the Advisory Council commented:

The new title XIX program under the Social Security Act promises to provide basic assurance to the needy that they will not be without necessary medical services. Title XIX has numerous forward-looking provisions designed to provide medical assistance of high quality with major reliance on declarations of circumstances and hence *the minimum of time-consuming investigations, no unrealistic expectations of support from relatives, or the denial of aid because of State residence....*(Italics added.)

9. Aid to the Totally Disabled to include needy disabled children under eighteen years of age, and to remove the requirement of "permanent and total" from the requirements for eligibility. (This, as we have seen, is already being done without legal sanction.)
10. Old Age pensions to be made available to everyone at age sixty instead of sixty-five.
11. Children up to twenty-two years of age to be eligible for public assistance under Aid to Families with Dependent Children, if such "children" are attending school or obtaining vocational training. (Although Item 11 appears only as a recommendation, it already is being applied in many welfare offices in the State of California. It has been in effect, without benefit of legislation, for several years.)
12. No liens to be placed against the real property of any recipient of Federally aided public assistance. All Federal legislation, in this general area, to be made consistent with the provisions of Title XIX. (This is another "recommendation" which has had legal effect as if it were law in most areas of California for at least four years. In fact, Los Angeles County discontinued taking liens on real property for general relief and *free* medical care, both supported entirely by county taxpayers, at that time, about 1962-63. It is hard to understand a plan which allows — in fact, encourages — so-called indigents to accumulate estates in real property at the expense of the taxpayers and to pass on these same estates to anyone they please — even when the persons inheriting the property have contributed nothing whatever to the support of the aid recipient. This is one of the weirdest of the many flagrantly un-American schemes contained in public assistance "programs" today.)
13. *Relatives should not be required to support those needing public assistance beyond spouses and parents of minor children.* (This "recommendation" has been treated as LAW for some time in many aid programs. The husband or the wife of a recipient of Aid to the Totally Disabled is not held liable for the least expense incurred by spouse even if the couple lives together. Allotments must be made in the budget for the recipient's share of rent or home payments. *Only the taxpayers* are held responsible!)

Welfare case histories outlined in earlier chapters of this book demonstrate that the recommendations of the President's Advisory Council are largely *ex post facto*. Evidently they were made with a view to establishing

"uniform national standards" and obtaining legislative approval for bootleg welfare practices already in effect in many localities. Especially in such pilot-States as California, most of the Council's proposals for the future are being stealthily enforced today — notably, Items 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 12, 13.

To this, United States Commissioner of Welfare, Ellen Winston, added her own particular brand of "pressure from above." She wrote (2):

Nevertheless, ways MUST be found to assure that the pursuit of a more affluent way of life and a higher level of living through economic advancement *is accompanied by the pursuit of social measures* that will enable *all segments of the population* to find fulfillment in this properous society. (Italics added.)

It has always been the American way, fully supported by the Constitution of the United States, that citizens of this country should have the right to handle their own personal and financial affairs, without such Government interference as Ellen Winston suggests.

Then, as if she had not already said enough, our Commissioner (Commissar?) of Welfare deCLared (2):

In the United States, increasing attention is being given to enhancing the quality of life, to offering opportunities for self-fulfillment and to the development of the potential capacities of each individual. To date, the middle and upper classes have benefited most from this social progress.

In other words, you of the middle and upper classes...don't presume that you achieved success by means of your own efforts, ingenuity, and hard work...and the freedom allowed under the good old American system and way of life.

The nation's guardian angel, our Commissioner of Welfare, painting a psychedelic dream of heaven-on-earth, continued:

Cultural pursuits, leisure-time hobbies, learning for the sake of mental enrichment, enjoying of the wonders of nature, travel, or gaining other satisfying experiences not connected with the job are examples. These and other amenities, in the years ahead, may well come to be accepted as a *collective form of social welfare advancement* and made *available to all*, just as gas, electricity, and other conveniences, which were once regarded as luxuries, are now considered necessities. Fortunately, their cost is reasonable in relation to the Nation's income, but *to date public budgets have been far from adequate*. (Italics added.)

Among the programs which, in the not too distant future might be available to all who need them, are day care, *guided family recreation tours*, and neighborhood information and advisory centers. It takes little imagination to see the values of mobile recreation programs, traveling home management programs, traveling libraries, *meals-on-wheels which deliver packaged meals*. There might be adaptations of the Danish folk schools, theatre and opera might be made available and cheap as in European countries, and new forms of public service might be provided by television. (Italics added.)

Commissioner Winston's Cloud Nine dreams sound so very gentle, warm, humane and solicitous. Yet they can only result in devastation: spiritual, mental, financial. Who of us, including welfare recipients, prefers slavery? Most people in the United States still prefer freedom and self-determination. The notion of the Government's entering even into our family outings, with "guided family recreation tours", is repugnant.

But, DIG, TAXPAYERS, DIG! BIG BROTHER AND SISTER demand more money in order to organize, discipline and direct you more completely! You will not be permitted, even during your leisure hours, to do as you please. From infancy you will have your noses wiped, your diapers changed...by edict of a power-hungry squad of destructive do-gooders operating out of Washington, D.C.

Having been subjected to increasingly heavy "pressure from above", we are now entering a period of full-scale "pressure from below." "Pressure from below" can be created in various ways. One is by the use or abuse of government programs, which can be employed (as Jan Kozak aptly phrased it) to "trigger" action by the "masses".

In the ugly task of sowing hatred against the self-sustaining, responsible citizenry; non-government Communists, Socialists and assorted self-styled "Liberals" all do their bit. In this country, the move to generate political heat and activate latent hostility, in order to develop "pressure from below", began some thirty years ago. Present-day organizers of chaos pursue their cynical ends more openly and arrogantly than ever before.

They are confident of full protection from our Federal Government and the Courts, even though responsible citizens are less effectively protected.

How do the more highly educated of these organizers go about their deadly business of stirring up hatred and revolt?

The Socialist Scholars of America are a group that appears to be frankly fomenting trouble and unrest. In September, 1966, at the Hotel Commodore in New York City, this little band of radical prophets held its Second Annual Conference. Alice Widener, well-known columnist and publisher of the monthly magazine, *U.S.A.*, attended the Conference and reported on the proceedings:

...a calmly academic but insidiously dangerous paper presented by Prof. Richard A. Cloward of Columbia, whose work in sociology has greatly influenced the scandal-ridden, multi-million dollar Mobilization for Youth program in New York City, and also the multi-billion dollar federal Poverty Program and Job Corps project. Dr. Cloward is a member of Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, a group organized by Walter Reuther.

Written with associate sociologist Frances Piven of Columbia, Dr. Cloward's paper for the Socialist Scholars opened with a call for *a systematic strategy of 'Irregular and disruptive tactics' among the poor, urging them to overburden city and state governments with their 'demands' as a means of forcing these governments to turn to the federal government for more and more funds.* (Italics added.)

Prof. Cloward said, 'We need to devote more attention to disrupting corporate power.' He described the poor as mere 'supplicants' in the welfare state, and said they have most to gain 'from a major upheaval in our society.' He said our welfare system is 'lawless' and violates human and civil rights. He called for welfare recipients' forcing city welfare departments to impose the labor union 'check-off system' for welfare clients by withholding 50 cents to a dollar for each client as dues to a fund for unionization of welfare clients to impose their demands for special benefits.

Prof. Cloward explained that each welfare client in New York City is entitled under existing law to special benefits for clothing, blankets, etc. He said that in 1965 city special benefits welfare payments amounted to 'about \$40 per client' and he called for each welfare client to demand \$100 to \$1000 in such benefits...

In early August, he said, he himself had taken part in a national conference to organize the welfare recipients movement.' *Dr. Cloward said he personally had taken part in Wednesday night meetings with welfare clients 'week after week, month after month,' and that as a result, 'Next Monday there will be a demonstration of welfare recipients at City Hall!'* (Italics added.)

Dr. Cloward read his paper to the Socialist Scholars Conference in the East Ballroom of the Hotel Commodore on Saturday afternoon, September 10. On Monday night, September 12, CBS and NBC TV newscasts showed the demonstration of screaming welfare recipients that took place right on Cloward schedule. They shouted demands for more "special benefits"....

On Tuesday, September 18, the *New York Daily News* reported, 'About 500 welfare recipients picketed the Department of Welfare Building...and staged sit-downs and sit-ins, yesterday....As police called reinforcements, the demonstrators blocked one of the two entrances to the building and marched along the sidewalk.'

Mrs. Widener wryly comments: "Socialist scholar Prof. Cloward of Columbia certainly was right about the success of his Wednesday night meetings. Evidently his strategy of disruptive tactics will require costly police reinforcements at city welfare departments throughout our nation."

Returning to her coverage of the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, Mrs. Widener reveals:

The prospects delighted Prof. William Ryan, formerly of Harvard, now of Yale, who described himself to the audience as 'a radical without portfolio'. He said, 'I have been enchanted with the Cloward strategy of blowing a fuse in welfare agencies, housing developments, and among unmarried mothers. I wonder what would happen if there was a really systematic overload.'

During the question-and-answer period, someone in the audience asked if Dr. Cloward's strategy was a substitute for "Socialist organization of the proletariat or the industrial factory workers." Dr. Frances Piven of Columbia answered: "I really only want to make one point — the disruption of the system. Welfare rolls will begin to go up; welfare payments will begin to go up — the impact will be very, very sharp. The mounting welfare budget will increase taxes, force cities to turn to the federal government. We have to help people to make claims; for this they will organize and act."

Another academic group working actively with the "poor" and helping to create "pressure from below" is the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration, through its "Ad Hoc Committee for a

Guaranteed Income." This committee has been very successful in unionizing welfare recipients in many parts of the United States, following the lead of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers Union which began organizing recipients more than four years ago.

Taking advantage of situations created by their Socialist brethren, Communist agitators are quick to fan the slightest ember of discontent into a ragging fire. As Herbert Aptheker crowed at the First Conference of Socialist Scholars, held at Columbia University in 1965: "WATTS WAS GLORIOUS!" Mr. Aptheker has been identified by Communist newspapers as a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

More and more it becomes evident today that the statement made in 1933 by members of a Communist cell in the Department of Agriculture was no idle chatter. In fact, it was strangely prophetic. It seems to have been only the beginning of a planned, organized, carefully engineered scheme to socialize and communize the United States of America, utilizing the public assistance program as one of its most potent weapons. What a cruel plan, to exploit and mislead the unfortunate for purely political ends, while professing such passionate sympathy for their plight!

Public assistance becomes in this way a brutal weapon wielded by unscrupulous groups intent on gaining — and keeping — power for themselves. They are sustained by the supercilious conviction that they alone know what is best for all other citizens of this country.

Our nation began its existence as a republic. Government was the responsibility of all the people, not merely the select few. Under that system the nation prospered and grew strong. So did its people. From all walks of life and from all financial strata, came great men and women of whom we are justly proud.

By means of steadily increasing manifestations of both STUPID GREED and FALSE PHILANTHROPY (as outlined by Bastiat in *The Law*) coupled with long range subversion within and without our government, this nation has almost ceased to be a republic. It seems to be rather a Kakistocracy — a government of, by and for evil men, maintained at the expense of fools. This decline is intolerable for all intelligent citizens and effective corrective action is long overdue.

1. *Social Development, Key to the Great Society* is a 92 page official publication of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and welfare (HEW). It is heavily illustrated with sketches, tables, charts and graphs and has a four page introduction by Ellen Winston. (According to the October 1967, *Welfare in Review*, a HEW publication, Dr. Ellen Winston is now "serving" HEW as a "consultant".)

2. These quotes are from the official introduction to the booklet entitled *Social Development, Key to the Great Society* mentioned on p.195.

APPENDIX A - A LITTLE TALK [[BACK TO TOP](#)]

Honorable Board of Supervisors,
Los Angeles County,
Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board:

I am Mrs. Belva Detlof of South Gate. I am appearing here today in response to expressed statements by members of this Board regarding the overwhelming request for additional welfare funds.

At various convenient locations in many parts of Los Angeles County there are located County offices operated by the Department of Charities. These offices are known as "medical aid offices." SUPPOSEDLY medically-indigent persons come to these offices to apply for *FREE MEDICAL CARE*. If they qualify (and most of them do, since just to ask is usually to qualify), they are sent to private physicians who hold contracts with the County to give medical care to those SUPPOSED "indigent" persons. These physicians bill the County for this medical care.

Recently, during an interview, an admissions worker was talking with a woman, who consistently for several years, had claimed that her husband's net monthly income was \$250 to \$260. per month, and that the firm for which he worked did not have medical insurance. Up to this time, the usual rule had been followed. The woman's statements had been accepted as gospel truth. There had been no attempt, whatsoever, to check out her statements. This admissions worker, however, felt that something was wrong. The man was employed in a

trade that normally paid well, and worked for a well-known progressive firm. It did not seem reasonable that this firm would be paying wages so much lower than other similar firms, and that they would not provide the usual group medical insurance.

This admissions worker telephoned the firm and happened to talk to one of the top officials. During the conversation, he stated that the employee in question grossed, annually, between \$9,000 and \$10,000. The company also carried group medical insurance which covered not only the employee, but also his dependents. The official wanted to know what the wife of one of his company's employees was doing in a county aid office.

"What," he asked, "does your office do? What is its function?" The admissions worker answered that her office "dispensed *free* medical care for 'medical-indigents' ."

To make certain that the information received was absolutely correct, the admissions worker asked the company official if he would be willing to answer a request in writing for details concerning the employee's earnings and insurance coverage. He said he would be glad to. The admissions worker, however, who had always been cautioned not to RISK denying medical care to anyone without being absolutely certain of the facts, continued the family's medical care for a short period of time and waited for a reply from the company official.

One morning, not long after, the admissions worker was called to the office of the Medical Director of that particular "aid" office. There, lying on the Director's desk was the social case history of the family in question, and the answer from the company official. The answer stated that the employee had been told to pay back to the County all money that had been spent on his family, or else the company would terminate his services. The Director shook the case history in the admissions worker's face and cried: "I want you to see what you have done. You have made this man lose his job! Do you realize what a terrible thing you have caused!"

Then the Medical Director proceeded to say she was sure the admissions worker must be *quite ill* to have done such a dreadful thing. She suggested urgently that the worker apply at once...**THAT VERY SAME DAY**...for a medical leave of absence. If the admissions worker *did* return to work after that leave of absence she would have to conform to departmental policy, as no more of this type of thing could be tolerated. Furthermore, the director continued, this worker had been cautioned many times about this type of thing. There should be no need for future reprimands regarding this **DISGRACEFUL** type of activity.

Gentlemen, that worker merely verified that a family had — for several years — been committing grand theft felony! The family had been stealing money from the pockets of Los Angeles County taxpayers. The worker had done nothing illegal, she had done only *what the job was set up* to do...namely, to find out whether or not an applicant was "medically indigent."

You may ask how I happen to know about this case. It is very simple. I am the worker who did her job **TOO CONSCIENTIOUSLY** and who found **ONE TOO MANY** cases of fraud and connived larceny in the Department of Public Welfare.

The family that committed the crime (a crime it certainly is!) will not be reprimanded by the social workers in this county. The one who discovered it was rebuked and penalized.

That, in essence, is one reason taxes in this county have risen by leaps and bounds. Actually, the workers who assist such persons in robbing the taxpayers are themselves accessories to grand larceny.

Welfare funds in this county are being used to subsidize prostitution and each additional child produced by these promiscuous women assures them increased "aid".

Officials continually wring their hands about the rise in illegitimacy. They need only refuse to let it be what it is now...a means of earning a living...a way of life. Not long ago, I talked to an eighteen-year old girl who had recently delivered her first illegitimate child. I discussed the new training programs, etc. with her, and finished by saying that she undoubtedly hoped her own daughter would not find herself in this position eighteen years

hence. The girl's answer was: "Why not? I expect my baby will probably do the same thing I have done."

This young unmarried mother was also illegitimate. Her mother had reared her on *Aid to Needy Children*; and now, at eighteen, the girl felt she had really reached maturity, with her own aid case, her own caseworker, and her own monthly income from *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*.

If these persons repeatedly producing illegitimate children for the taxpayers to support were less CERTAIN of such support and loving care, there might be fewer illegitimate births.

Another girl who has several children (and never been married), declared there was no good reason for her to marry. It was easier to get "aid" if one was unmarried, and the money was more sure than that a husband could supply.

I have interviewed many women with twelve or more illegitimate children, all living on funds forcibly extracted from the purses and pockets of decent, law-abiding citizens in Los Angeles County.

Recently, there came to my attention the case of a man who had been receiving *free* medical care for "impotency" through our medical aid office. He told the original interviewer that his so-called "common-law" spouse planned to leave him unless he proved more satisfying to her. The "common-law" wife had already had approximately four illegitimate children by him. After the man was given *free* medical care for his alleged "problem", a fifth illegitimate child was born for taxpayers to support. Yes, let me repeat this: *The taxpayers were paying for private medical care so that this man could be treated for impotency so that he could continue to produce more illegitimate children for the taxpayers to support.* The whole group is supported under *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*.

It seems to me that the aid NEEDED is to have "our heads examined" and, with that, our policies in every area of all types of this so-called "welfare".

Another interesting case is that of a woman who receives *Aid to the Totally Disabled* and also *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*. All told, her income is around \$360 per month, plus all medical expenses; plus an increase, now, since her *fifteen year old daughter has also begun producing her own share of illegitimate offspring.* This woman names four or five different fathers for her five or six children. Do you know why she is considered eligible for *Aid to the Totally Disabled*? It is claimed that she is mentally retarded.

Does this seem a modern "civilized" way to handle a mentally retarded woman? Does it seem socially acceptable to hand this woman approximately \$100 net per week in combined *Aid to the Totally Disabled* and *Aid to Families with Dependent Children* and then turn her out to shift for herself, the prey of unscrupulous and uncaring men? If it is, then we haven't come very far from the days when they chained such women in the barns and left them there unprotected. The amount of money we pay them does not mitigate the lack of social planning in this case. This woman's *Aid to the Totally Disabled* case is #196-17284. Her *Aid to Families with Dependent Children* case is #193-39471. I do not presently have the daughter's case number or numbers.

The Los Angeles County Welfare Funds are subsidizing adulterers and doing this knowingly. In *Aid to Families with Dependent Children* case #193-165621, we have a woman whose legal husband and two legitimate children reside in the East. Yet, here, Californians are supporting this woman and her paramour with their four or five illegitimate children all on the same case. The man in this case is classified as an *incapacitated step-father*, although the children in this home are admittedly his. There are many cases of this type.

In a family whose *Aid to Needy Children* case was originally opened sixteen years ago, the fourteen year old daughter delivered a child whose father was her own step-brother who resides in the home. I wonder what ever became of that law that had to do with "contributing to the delinquency of a minor?" I do not think those who work in the Department of Charities consider it a very useful law. Interestingly enough, this family has always had a pretty good income because the "stepfather" has his own business and does rather well in it. I suppose the "wife" must need the *Aid to Needy Children* money for her pin-money. The case is #193-40062.

Not very long ago, I interviewed a woman who had received medical care through the Los Angeles County

medical facilities FREE for many years...more than thirty years, in fact. At the time I talked to her, she had just sold one of her pieces of real estate...a tri-plex...for the sum of \$31,500, netting \$18,000 for herself. At that time, she had just put \$3,600 in escrow to buy another piece of property. She stated that she had \$2,000 in a checking account in a local bank and \$700 in cash in her home. She said that the balance had gone to pay debts. She had been receiving *free* medical care since prior to 1934, so when I told her that she was ineligible, she took it in great good humor and merely returned the following Monday morning to be continued with her *free* medical care in spite of the above information which I entered in her social case.

Case #1930-63832 is that of an unmarried woman with ten illegitimate children and an income of \$497, clear, a month from Social Security Survivors' Benefits (from the one "common-law" mate who admitted his paternity for some of the children and then later died), including \$308 *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*...plus, of course, *all of her medical, dental and pharmaceutical supplies and expenses*. She claims four different fathers for her multitudinous brood.

We have a Cuban family that demands all sorts of *free* care, whose "head of the house" refuses to work at any type of job that does not pay him over \$100 per week! Yet, already this man has quit several jobs because they do not fit HIS requirements. Although they have received both *free* medical care and financial aid they are angry because greater amounts are not forthcoming and they hiss from between bitter lips: *We will be glad when Castro comes and takes you over!*

Do you know that persons on *Aid to Families with Dependent Children* have now unionized? It has been publicized as having started in Detroit, Michigan. I don't know how such an organization is faring in Los Angeles County, but THIS, to me, is the height of irony...organized demands for charity and organized demands for support from the Taxpayer who is considered a moral delinquent if he ever fumblingly attempts to organize to protect himself.

I could go on and on and quote you case after case. About 60% of the cases now active are fraudulent...both in *Aid to Needy Children* and/or *Aid to Families with Dependent Children* and in the *free* medical care provided by the medical aid offices. This, I have pointed out to those in authority time and again. The answer I have always received from them is: "We are not here to check out the veracity of the applicant...only to determine what plan is best for him and assist him in making that plan."

To correct these abuses those in the Department of Charities need to start using some common garden-variety business sense. Every applicant should be checked out for verification of the truth of his statements. Promiscuous women should no longer be REWARDED for their promiscuity and lack of morals. Laws should be adhered to instead of avoided. Professional "bleeding hearts" who insist upon wiping the noses and changing the diapers of generation after generation of professional "welfare recipients" should be replaced by persons with some moral sense and the ability to read and understand the few laws that have remained to protect the taxpayer from this type of grand theft felony.

If you are truly interested in knowing about this great rat hole into which you have continually been pouring the taxpayers' hard-earned money, I have about one thousand to twelve hundred documented cases all ready and waiting for exposure. They make extremely interesting reading.

If my abrupt dismissal can bring about a worth while change in the so-called "public welfare" picture of this country, it will have been well worth my inconvenience.

You are perturbed about the "turn over" in workers in the Department of Charities. This is *not* due to low wages, but to utter disgust on the part of workers for current policies.

In conclusion, let me add one more little tale of irony. Not long ago, my husband became very ill. One of the most urgent requests he had to make of me was that we sell the place at which we lived. He felt that he just could no longer face the huge tax bill that went with it. Do you know who applied to buy the property? The only people who felt capable of handling such a situation! The prospective buyers consisted of a couple who had been receiving AID TO THE TOTALLY DISABLED for the last three years. In checking out the man's income, we discovered he earned \$1,000 per month, himself, and the County was eagerly providing his wife

with all her medical care — FREE — plus an attendant, or house keeper, plus \$98 per month spending money. Need less to say, we refused this offer.

Also, in conclusion, if I can be of assistance to you, I place myself and my documented evidence at your disposal. I am certain you will be amazed at the items involved.

Respectfully submitted.

* * *

When I turned around — after having given the preceding talk before the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors — I was given my first glimpse of the hunger of the general public for genuinely basic information which is continually denied them.

The audience in the Supervisors' "hearing room" was not only clapping, but the people had all risen to their feet to do so.

It is with the sincere hope that this book can provide some of the details these people seek, need and CANNOT obtain, that it is written.

APPENDIX B - "HAVING THE POWER . . ." [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

Date: April 13, 1967

Place: State Senate Committee Hearing Room, Sacramento, California

Project: Logical and sensible reforms in public assistance programs.

State Senator John G. Schmitz of Orange County had proposed two welfare bills, No. 392 and 485. This, he hoped, might be the beginning of the reformation of the give-away public assistance programs.

Bill No. 392 would establish a law whereby the Welfare Departments must provide the taxpaying public with the names, addresses and amounts of grants of welfare recipients. A law such as this would be of considerable value in decreasing fraud in welfare cases. By providing this information to the public it would allow the responsible citizens (who are paying for this program) to ascertain that their tax funds are not provided for those who do not need such help.

With such a law we would have very few individuals masquerading as was the man who received both veteran's benefits (which made him ineligible for welfare funds because of the amount he received) and *Aid to the Totally Disabled*. It would assist in dispelling the secrecy which nourishes the masquerades perpetuated by the woman whose daughter was provided with such an exceptionally expensive graduation gift as a national tour in the private four-place airplane belonging to the recipient's parents. People like this would look elsewhere for their subsistence. They might even become self-supporting individuals and taxpayers themselves.

Knowledge that fraud could be more easily detected would in itself automatically preclude welfare reciprocity from a goodly portion of its devotees.

For example, an indignant pharmacist recently told me of a couple who were obtaining prescriptions from him...at the expense of the taxpayers. This couple had just purchased a brand-new car. Their "second" car was almost new...newer than any the pharmacist could afford to own. The man in the case had just bought a filling station a few blocks away. His wife was employed. Yet they expected the taxpayers to assist them. It is doubtful if they would have asked and received support from tax funds had they known the fact would be made public.

Senator Schmitz' other bill, No. 485, proposed to end the Government subsidization of illegitimacy. After the first illegitimate infant, the mother would no longer receive tax funds for the support of additional illegitimate offspring. The child could receive public assistance, but not as long as it remained in its mother's custody. Should the child be placed in a foster home, welfare funds would be promptly available for the care of the child.

Placing the child in a responsible foster home is the only way to give such children a chance to live decent, worthwhile lives...something that is inevitably denied these youngsters, when they are reared by promiscuous mothers who continue to produce more illegitimate infants.

Senator Schmitz called three witnesses to testify for Bill No. 485. One was a Welfare Director from a Northern County, one was a woman who had been a deputy sheriff in a coastal area; and the third was myself.

When I reached the Senator's office that morning, his administrative assistant, Dr. Carroll, gave me the file on the hearings and suggested that I go over the material.

California's Director of Welfare, John Montgomery, obviously without having consulted Governor Reagan, had vehemently opposed both bills. To support his views, he submitted a letter from the San Francisco office of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It stated that Federal funds would be withheld if either of the bills was approved and passed.

I read and re-read the material with amazement. One letter stated NEED was the ONLY criterion on which to base eligibility for public assistance.

From experience with agencies dispensing tax funds for so-called public assistance, I *knew* this was not *true*. There are, for example, residence requirements (1). Nothing in the manual of instruction or in the California Welfare and Institutions Code ever stated that NEED was considered the ONLY criterion on which to base eligibility.

In my brief-case I had a copy of the report of the President's Advisory Council on Public Welfare entitled "*Having The Power, We Have The Duty*". It recommends that NEED be made the only criterion upon which to base eligibility. This "report" was not printed until the end of June, 1966. As far as I knew at that time (later confirmed by a letter from the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare) none of the Council's recommendations had been made law. I also learned that House Bill #5710, which contains the "Social Security Amendments of 1967", had not as yet been considered by the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Turning to one of Senator Schmitz' secretaries, I asked, "Is there any way we can get, within a matter of minutes, a copy of the Social Security and Welfare Administration Code?" By some miracle, she produced the book and we started to scan it.

It contained no statement that would give the Federal agency an excuse for withholding Federal funds, should Senator Schmitz' two bills be approved and passed. Furthermore, it provides that the Secretary of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare SHALL approve a State plan as long as it complies with several stated provisions...which the California Code does, and would even with passage of these two bills.

Evidently we are faced with "elaboration" of the Federal law by non-elected government officials. This is the same type of "elaboration" described in Jan Kozak's book, detailing the process by which Communists took over his native Czechoslovakia. In our own case, the "elaboration" is being accomplished by both Federal and State employees. Most interesting of all is the fact that, instead of cooperating with our legislators in reforming welfare practices, Governor Reagan's appointed Welfare officials are blocking such reforms.

In Sacramento, both State and Federal Welfare Departments were fighting two logical and legitimate Welfare reform bills, using as a basis for their opposition NOT law, but a "recommendation" made by a so-called Advisory group, that quite obviously was no more than a mirror reflecting the wishes and desires of certain officials in the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

When the hearing began, however, the testimony proved absorbing. The first witness testified in favor of Senate Bill No. 485, which dealt with illegitimacy. Because I have seen the suffering and damage inflicted on children by irresponsible and promiscuous mothers, I hoped this bill would be approved. When my turn came to testify, I cited evidence from actual cases, illustrating the evil of forcing helpless children into a mother's anti-social pattern of life.

I told the committee it was my understanding that officials opposing this bill based their stand on the belief that Federal funds would be withheld, should the bill pass, because it was contrary to Federal law. Then, I held up the book containing the compilation of laws governing *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*, and explained that there was nothing what ever to indicate this bill was contrary to Federal law.

After the three witnesses testifying for the bill had concluded, John Montgomery, California's Welfare Director, arose and stated, with great assurance and evident satisfaction, that the passage of either or both of Senator Schmitz' Bills would effectively eliminate Federal funds from California's Welfare programs. He cited large and impressive sums which he said would be withheld from California by the Federal Government.

Mr. Montgomery was followed by other witnesses even less concerned with factual accuracy. One individual, representing the American Civil Liberties Union, declared that the bills would violate the Constitutional rights of welfare recipients or would-be welfare recipients. It was a relief to have Senator Stevens, one of the committee members, correct him. Such RIGHTS, Senator Stevens reminded the man, are *not* guaranteed by the Constitution of these United States.

A witness representing the welfare recipients also stated the bills would infringe upon the recipients' RIGHTS! She said that self-supporting citizens are just as immoral as aid "clients". She failed to add, however, that if self-supporting citizens were immoral, which had no bearing on the bill, at least it was at their own expense and not that of the taxpayers.

A lady representing the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People stated in silken tones that such reforms would amount to discrimination against Blacks. If I was Black, I would resent that statement. Constantly reiterated suggestions of this kind make it look as if only Blacks had illegitimacy problems. There was nothing in either bill to indicate that it did not apply with equal force to citizens of every race. This lady, professing to speak for all Blacks, did her own race an injustice. I have a number of Black friends who resent such implications, and who are as disgusted with the welfare situation as I am.

Finally, it was my turn to testify again, this time for Senate Bill No. 392, which would permit the public to know the names, addresses and size of grants of welfare recipients.

That, too, was opposed by Mr. Montgomery on the grounds that it would preclude the State's receiving future Federal funds. My main evidence for this Bill was a letter from the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare which stated that thirty-one states already had a similar law in effect, and these states were still receiving Federal funds. A thirty-second state, New York, had a slightly different law which merely provided somewhat different means for dispensing similar information.

I suggested that Mr. Montgomery read the Federal laws before opposing the proposed legislation. I assured him and the committee that there was nothing in the federal LAW that required the states to use only the one criterion...NEED...in order to establish eligibility for public assistance under the *Aid to Families with Dependent Children* "program".

I suggested also that it was about time we began reading the Federal laws ourselves, since government employees appeared either unable or unwilling to provide us with accurate information about them. And I added that many citizens are becoming more and more irritated by the proposition that everyone must abide by the WILL of Federal officials, or be punished for not doing so.

What John Montgomery thought of my remarks I do not know, but a glance into his background is revealing. There is evidence that Mr. Montgomery has been (and may still be, for all I know) a member of at least two organizations in Southern California which have been formed to bring about regional government, with the governing to be done by appointed or self-appointed (NOT ELECTED) officials!

The groups to which Mr. Montgomery belonged are the Transportation Association of Southern California (TASC) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). These organizations are variously known as "Metro Government", "Federal Metro Government", etc. They are part of a master plan that would enable Federal administrators to bypass our elected government officials and representatives, and rule through

non-elected local officials.

Such groups would have it in their power, through control of Federal grants, to control the public schools in their areas and effectively destroy county, city and even state boundaries. They could force the suburbs to submit to domination by the very urban communities from which the suburbanites had fled.

Under Title II of the Omnibus Cities Bill of 1966 all applications for Federal aid under such programs as construction of sewers, hospitals, highways, libraries, airports, etc., must be submitted to a "METRO POLITAN-WIDE PLANNING BODY" (Metro Government) for recommendation, before being forwarded to Washington, D.C. The body to which applications must be submitted is a joint planning body for the central city and the suburbs.

Title II of the 1966 cities bill calls for Metro Governments which can impose whatever criteria they choose upon communities, as a price for having the Federal Government return to the citizens their own money extracted forcibly in the shape of taxes.

Furthermore the bill containing these provisions gives the secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Robert C. Weaver, authority, in the words of Congressman Albert W. Watson, to send "Federal commissars roaming the country under the name of 'expeditors' in order to facilitate the setting up of Federal Metro Governments...all operated by non-elected officials.

This bill was signed into law on November 3, 1966 by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The fact that John Montgomery, California Director of Welfare, has been a known and active member of two Metro Government groups may explain his indifference to the LAWS that govern welfare and welfare eligibility. It is difficult to see how one can belong to such groups and still believe in Constitutional government. In Communist countries, such Metro Government groups are known as "soviets".

Here, again, we find the parliamentary phrase of "elaboration" as described to us by Jan Kozak in his account of the takeover of his native Czechoslovakia. We not only find our top parliamentary bodies forcing a system of soviets on our communities, so that we will be ruled by non-elected officials; but we find that a past (or present) member of the groups spearheading such action has been appointed by a conservative Governor to the important post of State Welfare Director.

I have received from the acting commissioner of Health, Education and Welfare a letter, dated May 1, 1967, stating that not one of the "recommendations" listed in the booklet, *"Having The Power, We Have The Duty"* has become law. *Yet, a great many of these "recommendations" have been and even now are being enforced by welfare agencies in spite of the fact that they are not law.* The same club has been used to bring this situation about — namely, the threat to withhold Federal funds.

One "recommendation" in the Advisory Council's "report" was that a "child" or "children up to and including the age of twenty-one years" should be considered a "dependent child" or "dependent children" and eligible for funds under the program, *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*, if said "child" and/or "children" were attending school of any kind. It was recommended this should be made MANDATORY upon the States. Failure to comply would, of course, result in the withholding of Federal funds for State Welfare programs.

In California this particular "recommendation" has been in effect, state-wide, for several years. The *reason* given was that it was a MANDATORY LAW of the Federal Government and that Federal funds would be withdrawn should the State or County fail to comply.

There *was* no such law, and never has been. Nevertheless, the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, with appropriate assistance from the State agency, has honored this "recommendation", in spite of the fact that no legislative authority for it existed.

Another "recommendation" put forward by the "Advisory Council on Public Welfare" is that "exemption of a reasonable proportion of earnings of children and relatives caring for them in an AFDC family should be

mandatory upon the States; and earning exemptions should be made consistent for all assistance programs.

In other words, when working out a budget for an AFDC family, a portion of the earnings of the parents and the children are to be considered exempt, or not considered as income to the family. This, too, has also been in effect in most, if not all, California counties, also in the belief that Federal funds would be withheld by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare if the State did not comply with the Department's edict.

Perhaps a few concrete examples will help to clarify the point. Below are duplicates of "Notice of Action" letters mailed out to several families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

Dear - - - -

Your Aid to Families with Dependent Children has been recomputed, effective June 1, 1966. It is figured as follows:

Your earnings were a gross of \$569.25 from the California Interstate Telephone Company.

Of this allowances have been made as follows:

Income tax deduction	5.07
Social Security taxes	19.40
State Disability taxes	4.61
Charity	1.00
Insurance	.75

This leaves you with a "take-home" net earnings of \$432.83. Of this the following allowances are provided:

Standard allowance for working	25.00
Basic transportation	5.00
Mileage	24.70
Child Care	24.00

(This was paid to the recipient's son who was already fully provided for in the AFDC grant.)

Automobile payment	50.00
Auto repair	45.87

Your son, - - - -'s earnings are figured as follows.

Gross earnings	144.37
Social Security taxes	6.51
State Disability taxes	1.44
Standard Allowance for working	20.00
Mileage	8.50
Motorcycle payment	16.00
Motorcycle repairs	45.70
Basic transportation	5.00

This leaves a balance of net income to the family in the amount of \$41.22.

Since only one half of this final amount may be considered as "income to the family," this makes the amount considered to have been contributed by your son as a part of the family income to be \$20.61.

Does the average self-supporting, tax-paying individual consider this to be a "fair and equitable" manner in which to provide for so-called indigents? The taxpaying citizen does not receive special allowances for auto

payments, motorcycle payments, auto repair, motorcycle repairs, nor is he provided with any special incentive as a "standard allowance for working."

* * *

Here is another example of "exemption of a reasonable proportion of the earnings of children and relatives caring for them in an AFDC family":

Dear - - - -

Your *Aid to Families with Dependent Children* has been re-evaluated effective August 1, 1966. You will receive a supplemental check in the amount of \$44. This is in addition to the \$63 supplemental check you have already received and also allows for proper repayment of the \$13 which was still due from the June overpayment.

Your earnings have been figured as follows:

Gross earnings	325.60
Net earnings, after deductions	302.06

Your allowances are as follows:

Car payment	50.00
Auto repair	60.00
Standard allowance for working	25.00

Therefore, with approved allowances of \$166, you are considered to have contributed (net adjusted earnings) only \$136.06 to the family budget and are thus eligible for the supplements mentioned above. Also, although your son, - - - earned a gross of \$234.38 for the month of August, only \$7.50 is being considered, for budgetary purposes, as income from him to the family budget.

In other words, the REAL income of this family of four was between \$650 and \$700 net for that month. This is how "exemption of a reasonable proportion of earnings of children and relatives" works out, budget-wise.

Quite obviously, such an arrangement is not justified either by law or common sense. It is merely a "recommendation" — a psychedelic scheme of some people-planning do-gooders in Washington, D.C. In spite of its not being legal, the taxpayers are paying for it as if it were.

Another "recommendation" made by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare is that the *Aid to the Totally Disabled* program should be "broadened by deleting the eligibility requirement of 'permanent and total' disability." This, too, has already been done. It is safe to say that over 50% of those receiving funds under this type of public assistance are neither totally or permanently disabled.

It is also "recommended" that "no liens should be permitted to be placed against the real property of any recipient of Federally aided public assistance. This to my own knowledge has been in force for at least four years in California. At the time it became "effective", we were told that Federal funds would be withheld, if the States and Counties did not comply with this edict. In fact, in Los Angeles County where I was working in Medical Social Services at the time, liens were discontinued for aid recipients in cases of medical care and general relief which at that time were solely supported by County taxpayers.

To take a lien on the real estate of a person receiving public assistance does not mean that the property is confiscated. It merely means that on his death, before his heirs can inherit, the taxpayers will be reimbursed for funds paid to him through public assistance. Some States still follow this procedure, but not California.

In "*Having The Power, We Have The Duty*", the recommendation was also made that "relatives should not be required to support those needing public assistance beyond spouses and parents of minor children." So far as

I can discover, this had been in effect in 1961 and before. In cases of *Aid to Families with Dependent Children*, it is often the minor child, children and even the unborn embryo actually supporting the adult parents. The "program" would be more properly identified if it were titled *Aid to Children with Dependent Parents*.

Considering the stand taken by State and Federal officials in Sacramento, the most interesting "recommendation" in the report of the Advisory Council was that the Congress should make it MANDATORY for States and Counties to establish NEED as the ONLY criterion for eligibility.

In Sacramento, this recommendation was being given the full force of law by persons opposing Senator Schmitz' attempt to effect reforms in public assistance.

The question should be: HAVING THE POWER, IS IT LEGAL POWER — OR CONSTITUTIONAL?

1. A Federal Court in May of 1967 voided the one year residence requirement of the State of Connecticut on the grounds that it restricted freedom of interstate travel.

APPENDIX C - COMMENTS BY SENATOR SCHMITZ [\[BACK TO TOP\]](#)

Comments by California State Senator
JOHN G. SCHMITZ

Sacramento Report of January 27, 1967

REFORMING WELFARE PROGRAMS

For too long the once proud and inspiring word "reform" has been the exclusive property of collectivist architects of an all-powerful state, whose idea of reform is to go back to methods of force and compulsion which were already old when the Pharaohs of Egypt built the pyramids.

Now that we have a new governor in Sacramento dedicated to reducing the size and cost of government, with more legislators than ever before who share that dedication, it is time to take and use the word "reform" to describe steps to limit government and extend liberty.

Governor Reagan has already taken his stand for much-needed reforms in the financing and administration of our state colleges and universities. This week he announced his reform goals for the much-abused welfare programs of California.

As every observant citizen and every honest welfare worker knows, these programs are now riddled with waste and outright fraud. Welfare has become a way of life. Efforts by conscientious welfare workers and concerned citizens to check abuses have been ignored, or rejected with personal vilification and threats of reprisal against the would-be reformers. Less, not more investigation and supervision of welfare recipients is in prospect under proposals already circulating in the welfare bureaucracy.

The welfare burden, like the public education burden, has become greater than our taxpayers can reasonably and rightfully be asked to bear. Despite all the outcries we have heard from those with a vested interest in continuing almost unlimited spending for higher education — and will soon be hearing from those with a similar vested interest in almost unlimited spending for welfare — much of the spending now being done in these areas is not only unnecessary, but actually harmful.

There must be a decisive shift of emphasis in every welfare program — a shift from unearned, unending handouts of pocket money — to returning temporarily dependent citizens to productive self-support. Governor Reagan has made this his goal. To check abuses, he will support legislation requiring the Department of Social Welfare to assist county welfare departments in setting up effective fraud investigation units.

As a member of the Senate Social Welfare Committee, I welcome such legislation and will do all I can to give it "teeth". While having full confidence in the sincere commitment of the Governor and his Health and

Welfare Administrator, Spencer Williams, to the goals they have announced, I expect they will meet considerable opposition in the lower echelons of the welfare bureaucracy. Anyone who does not support Governor Reagan's approach to welfare should not continue to administer welfare programs.

Sacramento Report of April 7, 1967

WELFARE ABUSES MUST BE STOPPED

The largest single item in the State's annual General Fund budget is education. The second largest is welfare payments.

Half the cost of welfare is paid by the state, partly from state and partly from county taxes. The other half is paid from federal taxes. Since state law sets the specific eligibility requirements for welfare, our legislature exercises primary control over how much money taken from the citizen by federal, state and county tax collectors is paid out through the California welfare program.

Social welfare expenditure in California this fiscal year has reached the appalling total of \$1.7 billion, a 40% increase over last year and a 216% increase from the fiscal year 1960-61. More than half a billion dollars of this total is coming out of the state's General Fund.... By next year, one out of every twelve Californians will be on the welfare rolls.

Welfare assistance was originally justified as a way of helping potentially productive individuals over temporary emergencies, and of caring for the truly helpless. But it has now become a way of life to tens of thousands of people perfectly capable of earning their own living and supporting their own families. During the last three months alone I have received hundreds of letters and documents expressing indignation at these abuses and offering specific evidence of their existence and intent.

I share the indignation of these hard-working citizens and, as a member of the Senate Social Welfare Committee, I intend to attack this evil through every available channel. I have asked for a full-scale Senate Committee investigation of welfare fraud, beginning this year and reporting back to the legislature next January. I have prepared and introduced a package of five bills to curb some of the more obvious and blatant abuses. Two of these bills come before the Social Welfare Committee for hearing on April 13th.

One of them would make public the names, addresses and amounts of payment made to all welfare recipients. The other would stop payments to mothers of all illegitimate children after the first illegitimate child, born more than nine months after the bill becomes law. The business of having babies for profit is one of the worst abuses of the welfare program. My bill would put a stop to it.

Following a familiar line, some critics of the bill have charged that it would hurt children. These critics evidently think that children are not hurt by being condemned, throughout their childhood, in an unspeakably ugly reversal of decent family life, to be their mother's support while they are grossly neglected — and all at the expense of working parents often struggling to support their own children.

Public support is building up for an end to tax-money handouts to every grasping hand. When the full extent of welfare abuses in California is revealed, the demand for fundamental changes in the program will become irresistible.

Sacramento Report of April 28, 1967

ILLEGITIMATE BABIES FOR WELFARE PROFIT

Earlier in this session of the legislature I introduced Senate Bill 485 to change the present practice of making welfare payments to mothers for an unlimited number of illegitimate babies. My bill would stop these payments to mothers for more than one illegitimate child, born more than nine months after the passage of the bill.

A survey by the Legislative Analyst shows that state welfare payments to mothers with more than one illegitimate child now amount to \$65,000,000 a year and that this total is steadily rising.

My bill has been heard twice before the Senate Social Welfare Committee, and a final decision is still pending. It has aroused great interest and enthusiastic support throughout the state. The hundreds of letters on this bill which I have received run 10 to 1 in its favor.

The opposition is small in numbers, but vocal and well entrenched in the state welfare bureaucracy and some of the communications media, notably radio and television. It is passionate and illogical in the extreme.

First of all, opponents of the bill deny — contrary to detailed testimony given by experienced welfare workers, police officers and ordinary citizens — that a significant number of women bear more and more illegitimate children in order to obtain a larger and larger welfare check, which they then spend upon themselves. There is specific evidence that this money goes for liquor, men friends, television sets, Princess telephones, taxi transportation and other purposes not even remotely related to child care.

The most charitable interpretation that can be placed on the denial of these obvious facts by the opponents of the bill is that they just do not want to believe the ugly truth.

Then the cry is raised that to stop welfare payments to the mothers of illegitimate children would harm the children. The bill provides that any illegitimate child whose mother cannot care for it may be maintained with state aid in a foster home. This would rescue children from mothers whose only interest in babies is financial gain, while the loss of welfare benefits would discourage such mothers from having more illegitimate children. To ignore, and actually to encourage the appalling neglect of children by mothers who view them as nothing more than a welfare meal ticket is neither humane nor just....

Sacramento Report of May 12, 1967

FEDERAL CONTROL OF CALIFORNIA WELFARE PROGRAMS

The legislative history of my bill to cut off welfare payments to mothers of more than one illegitimate child, born more than nine months after passage of the bill, has been an object lesson in the full scope of federal power over welfare programs in California.

This bill has received the overwhelming endorsement of those California citizens from every part of the state who have written about it to me and to other legislators. In two personal conferences with me, Governor Reagan showed a full awareness of the illegitimate baby business which the bill was intended to stop, and a very favorable inclination toward stopping it simply by cutting off the money, as my bill provided.

But representatives of the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare announced that if this bill was passed, the federal government would withhold its entire 50% share of the money now being spent on *Aid to Dependent Children* in California. That half share totals \$240 million per year.

Since the purpose of the bill was to prevent mothers of illegitimate children from spending their welfare checks on themselves rather than on their children, the next alternative I investigated was to require the use of these payments for genuine necessities such as food and rent, possibly by the use of food stamps.

It soon became clear that even this modified form of the bill would result in a complete withdrawal of federal funds from *Aid to Dependent Children* in California, since the federal government bars any distinction whatever between illegitimate and legitimate children, or their mothers, in handing out welfare payments. Furthermore, the *Handbook of Public Assistance Administration* of the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare states, "the basic principle that assistance comes to needy persons as a right." This amazing "right" means, according to the *Handbook*, that the state may not require that any welfare payment "be expended for certain designated goods or services."

By these prohibitions, the federal government in effect denies the people of California and their

representatives any power to differentiate between those who save and those who waste, those truly in need and those who live as deliberate parasites on the productive. If such distinctions cannot be made and some reasonable controls imposed, the upward spiral of welfare costs will have no end. The price of accepting federal matching funds in welfare payments is a blank check drawn upon California taxpayers by anyone who makes an unverified claim to be in need.

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

In this year of fiscal crisis the administration is not prepared to make so great and costly a challenge to federal control. If Governor Reagan stands firm in his announced determination to prevent California from becoming a mere administrative subdivision of the federal government, before long he will have to make that challenge.

Meanwhile, for this year, I have introduced an amended version of my bill which would require mothers receiving *Aid to Dependent Children* to sign affidavits quarterly that they spent none of their welfare money on alcoholic beverages, jewelry, color television sets, taxicab fares (except in emergencies), out-of-state travel (except in emergencies), and car payments amounting to more than 25% of their check. This does not appear to be in conflict with federal requirements. It will be very interesting to see who opposes this version of the bill, and for what reasons.

Sacramento Report of June 9, 1967

LIMITING WELFARE INCOME

Should the state pay a man more for not working than for working? At present the State of California pays a junior clerk in civil service from \$326 to \$396 a month for holding down a full-time job. I have introduced Senate Bill 948, which would restrict the total amount of welfare payments to \$400 a month for any household, and would make any household ineligible for welfare assistance when the earned income of that household is more than \$400 a month.

What this means is simply that a family on welfare cannot get more money from the taxpayers than this family would get if the husband and father was earning the highest salary payable to junior clerks in the civil service. There is evidence that some households now receive a grand total of as much as \$1000 a month in welfare assistance of all kinds. In other cases the woman of the house receives hundreds of dollars a month in welfare aid while her husband, living with her, is earning a good salary in a full-time job.

As welfare programs accumulate, payments go up, and standards for selecting the genuinely needy and weeding out chiselers are lowered, a real possibility arises that families can become wealthy on welfare. The time has come to ask the question whether our state government should ever pay an individual or family more for not working than for working.

The Senate Social Welfare Committee is considering this question, as it considered two others I presented earlier this session, which were: Do the taxpayers have a right to know who is getting the welfare money their taxes supply? and, Should money intended for the support of fatherless children be spent on liquor, jewelry, color television and luxury travel for the mother? The Committee agreed with me that the taxpayers do have the right to know who gets welfare payments and that mothers should not waste welfare funds intended for their children, and recommended passage of both my bills for these purposes.

The bill to open welfare rolls to public inspection was killed by a party line vote in an Assembly Committee after passing the Senate, while the bill barring use of welfare funds for personal luxuries will soon be heard again before the Senate Finance Committee.

Concerned and angry citizens all over our state are asking questions like these about our welfare program.

They are demanding answers and even tually will get them.

Sacramento Report of June 23, 1967

HANDOUTS UNLIMITED

Now the proof is in that the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare is committed to a policy of handouts unlimited in the guise of "welfare", and will try to prevent any state from effectively controlling and restricting these handouts.

My Senate Bill 485 to halt welfare payments to mothers with more than one illegitimate child brought an immediate threat from federal officials to stop paying the federal government's half share of the costs of the *Aid to Dependent Children* welfare program in California, on the grounds that the bill allegedly would leave some mothers in need.

I then proposed to amend the bill so as to provide that welfare payments to mothers of illegitimate children be used exclusively for food, shelter and other necessities. This was found to be contrary to a federal regulation ruling out "money management" for welfare recipients.

My final amended version of this bill would simply have required ADC recipients to file affidavits stating that they had not spent any of their welfare checks on alcoholic beverages, jewelry, color television, taxi rides, out-of-state travel and large monthly car payments. No one in his right mind can argue that any of these items is "needed" and ought to be financed at the taxpayers' expense.

Nevertheless the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare has also opposed the requirement of this affidavit on the grounds that it establishes an eligibility condition unrelated to need," and threatened once again to withhold its 50% share of payment for *Aid to Dependent Children* in California if this final version of my bill was enacted.

We could not ask for clearer proof that acceptance of federal funds to help pay for any state program soon leads to the total surrender of effective state control over that program. Nor could we ask for clearer proof that the federal government now intends to give tax-money handouts to anyone ask ing for them, regardless of real need.

The emotion-laden word "need" will continue to be used as an excuse. But obviously real need does not require the purchase of jewelry and color tele vision with welfare checks.

A recent Federal Court of Appeals decision further illustrates the course and rapid develop ment of this trend toward a handout society. The court held state residence requirements for welfare eligibility "unconstitutional" because — and this is exactly what the court declared, incredible though it may seem — they "discourage interstate travel."

As Governor Reagan said in his great inaugural address, there are simple solutions to problems like this — but no easy ones. The obvious but hard solution is to reject federal payment of any part of the cost of our most abused welfare programs. At the very least we should call what may well be a bluff by federal authorities and see if they really will use their full power against the most populous state in the Union to protect the use of welfare checks by persons on relief to buy jewelry and color television.

Every avenue for the expression of grass-roots opinion should be used to encourage a challenge to this fantastic federal give-away, both by California state government and by California's repre sentatives in Congress.

Sacramento Report of December 15, 1967

NEITHER A JOB NOR A HANDOUT IS A RIGHT

Our Declaration of Independence affirms "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as the natural rights of man. Each of these rights is protected by limiting the power of government to coerce the individual.

Just as there are many today who would rewrite our Constitution, so there also are many who would, in effect, rewrite our Declaration of Independence by proclaiming the "right" of every man to a job or to a guaranteed income.

No such right exists, because no one is justified in sustaining himself at another's expense without that person's consent.

If every man could rightfully claim a job or a guaranteed income from anyone he chose, without regard to the actual productive work he did, there soon would be no one left to offer either jobs or income to the multitude of parasites seeking unearned benefits.

These truths should be obvious. They are simple common sense. Yet they are increasingly neglected and even denied today, in the name of compassion.

Compassion is a virtue. But forced compassion is an unethical and social monstrosity, and compassion which robs a man of his independence, self-reliance and self-respect is a destroyer of the best in human beings.

In California and throughout the nation today, we find many people, often very well organized, demanding jobs and income as a matter of "right", regardless of whether their work entitles them to a job, or great and genuine need leaves them no choice but to ask their fellow citizens for welfare assistance. Teachers at our colleges and universities receive "automatic" tenure, so that it is becoming increasingly difficult to discharge any of them after they are first hired, no matter what they have done or failed to do. State employees are similarly locked in their positions by civil service regulations. Welfare recipients go to court to establish the principle that once on the welfare rolls, they must continue to receive their checks indefinitely, without regard to any changes in their own lives reducing or eliminating their need for public assistance. And they are winning their cases in our courts.

The Medi-Cal program in California is barely two years old, yet already some who write to the legislators and testify before legislative committees are speaking of the "right" to have someone else pay for their prescriptions as though it dated from Magna Carta in the year 1215.

A civilized society will not let anyone starve. But a free society cannot endure if those who will not earn their own living are given an unlimited claim on the resources of those who do.

Sacramento Report of January 5, 1968

TO CHANGE OUR COURSE

Four years ago next month I made my decision to become a candidate for the California Senate. Though many of my friends and co-workers among Orange County conservatives urged me to take this step, the final decision had to be mine alone. I chose to seek the office I now hold because of a deep conviction that our state and our nation had to take an entirely new course, if our freedom as individuals was to endure, and that I could help bring about the necessary change.

Now, with three sessions of the California Legislature behind me and a fourth about to begin, the urgency of this new course has become all the greater — and still we have not taken it.

As a people we *must* realize that nothing given to us by other men is "free". Every benefit received that is not paid for in money or goods is paid for in freedom lost.

The greatest threat to freedom is the power of government, now, as throughout history. The colossus that is government in America today is slowly fusing together into an unbreakable mass of raw power. Federal, state and local bureaucracies are becoming interlocked. Each assists the others and bands together against any

attempt by the elected representatives of the people to see that tax money is spent according to the will of those who earned it. A frightening apathy about the growth of government is settling over our people. Too many have assumed, or are beginning to assume that it is inevitable, that every year we must spend more and tax more.

The appetite of those who hold other people's money is obviously unlimited. The capacity of the producers is not. Ever-growing government leads to slavery — and slaves are the poorest of all producers. An America without freedom is an America certain to be totally and permanently destroyed. We have gone far down the road toward government with unlimited powers and an unlimited claim upon the earnings of every productive citizen. The choice before us is not the rate at which this monstrous machine will continue to extend itself. We can no longer reasonably draw hope from small decreases in the expansion rate. To change our course we must actually cut the size and cost of government — and 1968 is the year this could be done in California.

We no longer have any deficit left over from the previous administration. There has been ample opportunity to study all major problems that might arise out of really significant cost reduction. California could still take the lead, and prove to a doubting America that this "modern age" about which we hear so much is not one that will end inevitably in slavery. We could start a new trend toward less government and more freedom.

I ask all those who would like to see this happen — whether or not they still think it possible — to join with me in one last effort before it is too late.