

deviancy; the second is on the contribution to family stability; and the third is on the contribution to national or social stability.

Low levels of education and high rates of crime and delinquency are associated with low levels of income. It is therefore enticing to say that we will eliminate the problems of crime and encourage people to get higher education if we change their income. Earlier it was said that since educational levels correlate highly with crime and delinquency, the obvious way to handle crime and delinquency was to expand the educational levels of individuals. Hopefully, increasing income will lead to a take-off into social mobility.

The argument is attractive. In the recent past, we attempted to do everything about poverty but to make sure that the poor are non-poor in terms of their income. Obviously, increasing the income of the poor will make them able to get many more services and resources than before. It may improve the educational performance of their children.

There is a but here. The evidence to support these contentions is not very strong. Indeed, in the field of education, it turns out that the educational experience of the parents is in general more important than the income level of the parents in affecting the educational performance of the children. This suggests that income alone will not be effective. It becomes important to change schools in order to have some real impact upon the performance of children. Improving family incomes, as important as that is, does not eliminate the problem of improving the schools in America.

The vicious cycle argument of poverty—that every element of poverty builds back upon itself—leads to the notion that we should indirectly try to approve the conditions of people. By improving income, it is believed, we can have a marked effect upon education without directly affecting the educational institutions. This seems to me to be only partly true. Affecting the income of parents is very important, but probably, in most cases, will not be sufficient *if* the schools do not change at the same time so that they can work more effectively with disadvantaged youth.

I think it is important to avoid making the mistakes that we have made with the non-cash programs. That is to oversell them in terms of the range and depth of impact that they can have. A cash program has great value. Even if it does not achieve substantial educational advance, it should not be neglected, ignored, or downgraded. It cannot do everything, but nothing can. It has a useful role; it does not have a total role.

The second argument centers about family stability. The present method of welfare allotment contributes to family instability. Where income is not available on the basis of needs but on the basis of the absence of the male head of the household, we are prescribing family instability. But, on the other hand, we cannot have surety that if present welfare arrangements contribute to family instability, that changing them will automatically produce family stability. The world, unfortunately, tends to be a little more complicated than that.

The argument about family stability is based upon two considerations—that the level and dignity of income are crucial in affecting stability. Here the evidence is rather strong. Higher income families tend to be more stable—that is, the male is present—than lower income families. Second, providing income without stigma contributes to family stability. This is part of the argument for the universalistic system of the family allowance. As far as I know, there is no evidence to test this proposition, but one can be supportive of it, regardless of whether or not it contributes to stability. There are advantages in not demeaning individuals. I want to support the decent treatment of people, not on the basis of its functionality, but on the basis that this is a just way to treat individuals in society.

A third reason for many supporting cash programs is that they will produce national and social stability, that they will cool the ghetto. It seems to me, again, that this argument is misplaced. Indeed, though it may be true that cash programs will make people more secure financially and more accepting of what takes place in society, the issues of ghetto unrest are broader than just economic. Getting money is, of course, being a part of society. But it is not all of that feeling. I think it will be important to try to affect the ghetto situation directly and have new forms of involvement of participation of people and decision making than ever before. A large part of the problems in America today are not only presented by ghetto residents, but also by affluent youth both of whom are alienated by the character of the direction of society and charged with the desire to feel that they participate in the important decisions which affect and sometimes overwhelm