

Comments transferred to
Master copy 3 Oct 76

~~MASSER~~

ONE PARENT FAMILIES

This chapter will explore and describe the economic and social disadvantages of one parent families, illustrating from the national sample and the special areas how the living standards of such families are influenced by their progress through the cycle of home-building and child-rearing, and also by societal disapproval of their minority deviant status. For one parent families are a minority, albeit a substantial one, in our society where an increasing majority of individuals marry at some point in their lives and where the two-parent family, headed by the man, has traditionally been regarded as the most healthy group for child-rearing. And previous studies⁽¹⁾ have established how, in consequence of their atypical membership and their apparent transgression of traditional standards of family life, one parent families tend to suffer economic and social disadvantages. Moreover, our society has not yet been able to agree that all one parent families are equally deserving and should be equally protected against such disadvantages, and as a result, income support for the families expresses differing degrees of public esteem for parents of different marital status: by manipulation of levels and access to income support, in ways which will be discussed in more detail below, attempts are made to control what is felt to be undesirable deviation from normal standards of behaviour.

The national ~~sample~~ sample provides 60 one parent families (including motherless families), to which can^{Sometimes} be added information from the special area studies where there were an additional 47 one parent families. These relatively small numbers reveal the difficulty

(1) Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, (The Finer Report), Cmnd. 5629,

H.M.S.O., 1974; Hunt, A., et al, Families and Their Needs, H.M.S.O., 1973;

R. Marshall, Families Receiving Supplementary Benefit, D.H.S.S. Statistical and Research Report Series No.1, H.M.S.O., 1972; V. George and Wilding, P., Motherless Families, Routledge, 1972; Marsden, D., Mothers Alone, Penguin, 1973

14259

Comments forwarded to
Mother's Union 3 Oct 56
ONE PARENT FAMILIES

This chapter will explore and describe the economic and social disadvantages of one parent families, illustrating from the national sample and the special areas how the living standards of such families are influenced by their progress through the cycle of home-building and child-rearing, and also by societal disapproval of their minority devised status. For one parent families are a minority, albeit a substantial one, in our society where an increasing majority of individuals marry at some point in their lives and where the two-parent family, headed by the man, has traditionally been regarded as the most healthy group for child-rearing. And previous studies⁽¹⁾ have established how, in consequence of their atypical membership and their apparent transgression of traditional standards of family life, one parent families tend to suffer economic and social disadvantages. Moreover, our society has not yet been able to agree that all one parent families are equally deserving and should be equally protected against such disadvantages, and as a result, income support for the families experiences differing degrees of public esteem for parents of different marital status; by manipulation of levels and access to income support, in ways which will be discussed in more detail below, attempts are made to control what is felt to be undesirable deviation from normal standards of behavior.

The national sample provides 60 one parent families (including motherless families), to which can be added information from the special area studies where there were an additional 17 one parent families. These relatively small numbers reveal the difficulty

(1) Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, (The Essex Report), Cmd. 3632, H.M.S.O., 1954; Hunt, J., et al., Families and Their Needs, H.M.S.O., 1953; W. Marshall, Families: Social and Psychological Aspects, H.M.S.O., 1953; and research report series No. 1, H.M.S.O., 1953; V. Gordon and others, Motherless Families, Routledge, 1953; Parker, C., Motherless Families, 1953.

that the geographical dispersion and wide range of social situations among one parent families make the collection of representative data on different types of family very difficult. When the national study was planned, the lack of information at that time guided us to devote one of the preliminary pilot reports to fatherless families who were dependent on state subsistence benefits⁽¹⁾, and since that time, in 1969, the government set up a special Committee on One Parent Families, under Mr. Justice Finer, which reported in 1974⁽²⁾. Special surveys were carried out for that committee, and other official and privately conducted studies now provide further information on the social and economic conditions of one parent families.⁽³⁾

The basis of the disadvantages suffered by one parent families.

A comprehensive explanation of the deprivations experienced by one parent families would entail a searching analysis of work, marriage, and the family. From the studies which have been conducted, it can be established that, in general, what might be called the 'structural' economic disadvantages of the one parent family stem most immediately from the way that hiring and rewards in the labour market are still geared to the father as bread-winner with the mother as, at best, a subsidiary earner. Thus, the average full-time earnings for men have remained fairly constant at twice those for women, a differential which expresses not only higher rates of pay for men but also men's

(1) ~~Marsden~~ Marsden, D., Mothers Alone, Allen Lane, 1969, (revised edition, Penguin, 1973).

(2) Report of the Committee on One Parent Families (The Finer Report), Cmnd. 5689, H.M.S.O., 1974

(3) Hunt, A., et al, Families and Their Needs, H.M.S.O., 1973; Marshall, R., Families Receiving Supplementary Benefit, D.H.S.S. Statistical and Research Report Series No.1, H.M.S.O., 1972; George, V. and Wilding P., Motherless Families, Routledge, 1972

that the geographical dispersion and wide range of social situations and one parent families make the collection of representative data

on different types of family very difficult. When the national study was planned, the lack of information at that time guided us to devote one of the preliminary pilot reports to families who were dependent on state assistance benefits, and since that

time, in 1969, the Government set up a special committee in the largest families, under Mr. Justice Tinker, which reported in 1972.

Special surveys were carried out for that committee, and other

official and privately conducted studies are mounting further information on the social and economic conditions of one parent

families.

The basis of the data reviewed is given by one parent families.

A comprehensive examination of the difficulties experienced by one parent families would entail a searching analysis of work, marriage, and the family. For the studies which have been conducted, it can be established that, in general, what might be called the 'structural' economic disadvantages of the one parent family stem most immediately from the way that living and working in the labour market are still related to the father as breadwinner with the mother as a housewife. Thus, the average full-time earnings for men have remained fairly constant at twice those for women, a differential which expresses not only his higher wages but also his

(1) Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage, 1962, (London: Croom Helm, 1973).

(2) Report of the Committee on the Family, (London: HMSO, 1973).

(3) Family and Their Needs, H.M.S.O., 1973; Family and Their Needs, H.M.S.O., 1973.

Receiving Supplementary Benefit, D.H.S.S. Statistical and Research Series

Reported, 1973

easier access to a range of more highly-paid jobs, and women's conditioned reluctance to aspire to such traditionally male work. Most two parent families will have a man's wage, and increasingly also they will benefit from a woman's wage.⁽¹⁾ But, in contrast, one parent families, most often headed by a woman, have only a woman's earning power. Moreover the earning power of the lone parent, whether a woman or a man,⁽²⁾ tends to be curtailed by obligations to care for the children - obligations which conventionally press more heavily on mothers (although fathers too may experience them) and which are reinforced and made more inconvenient by the continuing lack of alternative public or private child-care facilities. Even for ~~men~~ lone fathers who manage to continue to work, their work interest and careers have been shown to be restricted by family obligations.⁽²⁾

Further economic disadvantages accrue particularly to fatherless families because the greater financial power and status of men is embodied in the structure of property and house ownership, credit and mortgage facilities, the ability to command better housing tenancies, and so on. In fact, resources and status of all kinds tend to be channeled to families primarily through the employed male head, whom the majority of one parent families are, of course, currently lacking.

Related to this structure of male priority, the one parent family also suffers economically for its supposed transgressions of marital and family norms. A society which sets great store by the institution of marriage will tend to reward the married and to withhold rewards from the non-married or even to punish the

(1) The Finer Report discusses in detail these structural disadvantages,

Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, op. cit., Part 3, pp.21-63.

(2) Motherless Families, op. cit., chap.4.

non-married if they should seek to obtain the pleasures of the married state without incurring its formal and social obligations.

Examples of discrimination against the non-married in favour of the married could be documented in all sorts of institutional rules and in less formal behavioural rules concerning hospitality and the practice of gossip about the ~~behaviour of the~~ non-married. But ~~for the purpose of this study~~ discrimination appears most importantly in the property, tax and social security laws.

The provision of adequate social security and even legal recognition for one parent families has hitherto been inhibited by fears that any ~~such~~ support or recognition might tend to perpetuate and increase the numbers of such families and so erode the institution of marriage. For example, the law has been slow to grant married women any economic rights to their husband's income in or outside the marital home, and in particular there has been only a very tardy development of rights to matrimonial relief and financial support for the wife to live apart from her husband. There has been a corresponding reluctance to provide financial support for one parent families through social security of various types. The role of a parent, of either sex, caring for children at home, could have been recognised by some form of income, yet it seems that the provision of such an income would run counter to prevailing male superiority in marriage and also against the higher standing of industrial work as compared with child-care.

A similar reluctance to recognise the right of mothers to live with their children apart from the children's fathers appears

(1) There is a detailed discussion of the history of the obligation to maintain in the Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, op. cit., Vol.2 appendix 5.

non-married if they should seek to obtain the benefits of the married

state without incurring its formal and social obligations.

Examples of discrimination against the non-married in favour of

the married could be documented in all sorts of institutional rules

and in less formal behavioural rules concerning hospitality and

the practice of gossip about the ~~sexual behaviour of~~ non-married. But

~~the most serious form of discrimination against the non-married~~

importantly in the property, tax and social security laws.

The provision of adequate social security and even legal recognition

for one parent families has hitherto been inhibited by fears that any

~~such support or recognition~~ might tend to perpetuate and increase the

numbers of such families and so erode the institution of marriage.

For example, the law has been slow to grant married women any

economic rights to their husband's income in or outside the marital

home, and in particular there has been only a very tardy development

of rights to matrimonial relief and financial support for the

(1)

wife to live apart from her husband. There has been a corresponding

reluctance to provide financial support for one parent families

through social security of various types. The role of a parent,

of either sex, caring for children at home could have been

recognised by some form of income, yet it seems that the provision

of such an income would run counter to prevailing male superiority

in marriage and also against the higher standing of industrial

work as compared with child-care.

A similar reluctance to recognise the right of mothers to

live with their children apart from the children's fathers appears

(1) There is a detailed discussion of the history of the obligation

to maintain in the Report of the Committee on the Family, op. cit., Vol. 2.

Appendix 2.

in the unwillingness of local authorities to permit fugitive wives to enter hostels for the homeless - they are frequently officially classified as not homeless.⁽¹⁾ And there is evidence that in the allocation of tenancies local authorities have failed to make special provision for one parent families, or they have actively discriminated against them.⁽²⁾

The income rights of different types of one parent families.

Within the overall climate of discrimination against one parent families there occur variations between different types of families which affect both their formal rights to income and their informal access to help of various kinds. *These variations are primarily distinctions of marital status, but also they represent discrimination between families of different social class.* *New para* Widows constitute no direct threat to marriage, yet they first received a pension only as recently as 1925, and it was not until the 1960s that a combination of pension increases, tax concessions, and the removal of the earnings rule brought working widows with full pensions more or less onto the economic level of the average two parent family. Even so, widows pensions have an age qualification of forty years, and if the widow herself has not worked and contributed adequately to the pension fund, the amount of the pension is dependent on her husband's work record and even the circumstances of his death:⁽³⁾ in other words she is still not treated as an individual with needs and rights of her own.

~~Nevertheless,~~ *Nevertheless,* In the achievement of parity with two parent families, widows remain far ahead of other one parent families in attaining social security support. From time to time during the present century there has been discussion of an 'end of marriage' allowance, on the lines of a widows pension, but the discussions have foundered on the problems already mentioned, of how the allowance could be linked to the

(1) For example, Greve, J., Homelessness in London, Scottish Academic Press, 1971, p.140, and Glastonbury, B., Homeless Near a Thousand Homes, National

~~(2)~~ Institute for Social Work Training Series, No. 21, Allen and Unwin, 1971, pp.212-3

(2) Glastonbury, B., ~~this~~ op.cit., p68 (3) Wynn, M., Fatherless Families, Michael Joseph, 1969, p.28

in the unwillingness of local authorities to permit families to enter hostels for the homeless - they are frequently officially classified as not homeless. (1)

The allocation of permanent local authorities have failed to make special provision for one parent families, or they have actively discriminated against them. (2)

The income rights of different types of one parent families.

Within the overall climate of discrimination against one parent families there occur variations which affect both their formal rights

to income and their informal access to help of various kinds. These variations are also due to the different degrees of discrimination against one parent families in different areas. (3)

received a pension only as recently as 1935, and it was not until the 1950s that a combination of pension factors, tax concessions, and the removal of the earnings rule brought working widows with full pensions more or less onto the economic level of the average two parent family. Even so, widows pension have an age qualification of forty years, and if the widow herself has not worked and contributed adequately to the pension fund, the amount of the pension is dependent on her husband's work record and even the circumstances of his death. (4)

with needs and rights of her own. (5)

for ahead of other one parent families in attaining social security support. From time to time during the present century there has been discussion of an 'end of marriage' allowance, on the lines of a widows pension, but the discussions have floundered on the problems already mentioned, of how the allowance could be linked to the

(1) For example, Greaves, J., Homelessness in London, Scottish Academic Press, 1971, p. 340, and Glascoombe, S., Homeless Men & Women, National Institute for Social Work Training Series, No. 21, John and Unwin, 1971, pp. 215-7.

(2) Glascoombe, S., Widows' Pensions, (3) Wynn, J., Widows' Pensions, (4) Wynn, J., Widows' Pensions, (5) Wynn, J., Widows' Pensions.

morality of the separated spouses. Failing the provision of such an allowance, the legal rights of one parent families to income maintenance are dealt with by a number of overlapping jurisdictions.

There are three overlapping legal and administrative systems. During the last hundred years or so, divorce law has been made more accessible to people without resources and more equally available to women as well as men. Thus, legal and financial barriers to divorced mothers and their children receiving maintenance from the father have been removed or at least lowered, with the result that the divorcing population now represents more nearly a cross section of the country. Unfortunately the same cannot be said of separation procedures, which come under the summary jurisdiction of magistrates' courts. Originally designed as a redress against wife-beating, separations have remained linked with the administration of the criminal law, and reforms such as changes in admissible grounds have proceeded more slowly than in divorce law. It has only recently been established that the population using magistrates' courts in order to separate are basically people lacking a knowledge of the law and lacking income. Today the magistrates courts remain a separate, unreformed, inferior, discriminatory law for the poor.⁽¹⁾ A substantial proportion of lower manual workers' wives who use such courts for matrimonial relief do not go on to divorce, but remain separated for long periods. Unmarried mothers, who can claim affiliation orders only for their children have even less legal protection than separated wives.

The third administrative and legal system of support for some one parent families stems from the old poor law. The state has now assumed the duty of supporting women and children whose resources fall

(1) McGregor, O.R., et al, Separated Spouses, Duckworth, ~~xx~~ chapter 5.

below a given level: in principle mothers are now allowed to stay at home and care for their children and are not formally required to register for work. However, the Supplementary Benefits Commission, which administers these provisions, has a statutory duty to attempt to reclaim any support for one spouse and children from the other spouse, if the latter is working. They have interpreted this duty by pressing mothers to apply for court orders, or by themselves suing the liable relative, through the magistrates courts. Thus official practice reinforces the links between the residual poor law administration and the unreformed matrimonial jurisdiction for the poor.

By the late 1960s, attempts by mothers to seek maintenance by direct legal action had been rendered increasingly irrelevant as a factor in the living standards of one parent families. Maintenance awards through the courts proved inadequate because the wage earner in most instances could not earn enough to support two households: the amounts awarded by the courts have been low and the higher awards have almost invariably fallen into arrears.⁽¹⁾ As a result, although separated spouses have gone to court ostensibly to get maintenance and permission to live apart, in fact their freedom to live apart has been determined by whether or not they could establish a right to support from the state through supplementary benefits, which are paid at a rate above the level of court orders. Indeed this has become such a recognized practice that many inadequate or irregularly paid court orders are now signed over by the mothers to the Supplementary Benefits Commission for collection.

A large section of the Finer Report on One Parent Families was concerned with sorting out the glaring anomalies of this

(1) McGregor, O.R., Separated Spouses, op. cit., chapters 6 and 7

below a given level; in principle, support is now allowed to stay at

home and care for their children and are not formally required to
reside for work. However, the Department of Health and Social Security

which administers these provisions, has a statutory duty to assist
to maintain any amount for the support and child care from the other

spouse, if the latter is working. They have indicated that they
by pressing matters to apply for court orders, or by themselves

using the family relative, through the Magistrates' Courts. This
official advice reinforces the link between the residential and

law administration and the unregulated matrimonial jurisdiction
for the poor.

By the late 1980s, attempts by women to seek maintenance
by direct legal action had been rendered increasingly irrelevant

as a factor in the living standards of one parent families. Maintenance
awards through the courts proved inadequate because the wife either

in most instances could not even enough to support the household;
the awards awarded by the courts have been low and the living standards

have a most severely fallen level. (1) As a result, although
maintenance awards have been to court eventually to get maintenance and

provision for life maintenance. In fact their freedom to live again has been
determined by whether or not they could establish a right to support

from the state through supplementary benefits, which are paid at a rate
above the level of court orders. Indeed this has become such a

recognized practice that many households or individuals may find court
orders are now almost over by the mother to the supplementary

benefit Commission for collection.

A further section of the paper reports on the present families
are concerned with working and the changing families of this

(1) Department of Health and Social Security, 1988, p. 10.

continued anachronistic overlapping of jurisdictions between the two types of courts and the poor law.

It should be noted that although there are now formal social security provisions for the support of all fatherless families, in practice both formally and informally there may be discrimination against or among one parent families of various statuses, in ease of granting access to benefits and in determining the levels of benefit. Thus widows who have pensions are allowed to retain part of the widowed mothers' allowance for each child. Unsupported mothers may be pressed to work, particularly unmarried and separated mothers.⁽¹⁾

Until 1975 lone fathers who wished to stop work and stay at home because they felt this would be the best way to care for their children, had to bargain individually with officials (and it might be suspected that in spite of official recognition of the father's right to choose, this unofficial bargaining will continue). The further exercise of officials' powers of discretion, or their informal but illegal departures from discretionary rules, may work not only to hinder one parent families' access to benefit, but also to reduce those benefits below the state subsistence level.⁽²⁾ This occurs less often ^{with} ~~the~~ widows.

Variations of Living Standard Between One Parent Families Through the Child-rearing and Home-building Cycle.

There are further variations of living standard between one parent families of different types because they tend to have reached a different stage in the cycles of home-building and child-rearing when they first lose a man's income, and because of the different positions these 'incomplete' nuclear families occupy in the wider kinship network of the extended family.⁽³⁾

Motherless families, of course, have not usually lost a man's wage,

(1) Marsden, D., Mothers Alone, op. cit., pp. 247-251.

(2) *ibid.* pp.261-5

(3) *ibid.* pp.29-30, and chapter 7.

obtained an experimental evaluation of the two

types of courts and the court law.

It should be noted that although there are now formal social

provisions for the support of all fatherless families, in practice

both formally and informally there are no discrimination against or

among the various families of various status, in case of emergency

access to hospitals and in determining the level of benefit. Thus

persons who have been allowed to retain part of the widow's

maternal allowances for each child. Unmarried mothers may be

pressed to work, particularly unmarried and separated mothers.

Until 1932 some fathers who wished to work and were at home

because they felt that would be the best way to care for their

children, had to beguile their way with officials (and it might

be suggested that in spite of official recognition of the father's

right to choose, this official recognition will continue. The father

exercise of official powers of discretion, on their behalf but

official discretion from discretionary rules, they were not only to

under one parent's father, access to benefit, and also to reduce

these benefits from the state assistance level. (2) This occurs less often

variations of living standards and the family through the

child-rearing and home-keeping work.

There are further variations of living standards between one parent

in the of different types because they tend to have more a different

stage in the cycle of home-keeping and child-rearing when they first

lose a man's income, and because of the different position of

'household' nuclear family economy in the wider kinship network of

the extended family. (3)

For less families, of course, have not usually lost a man's wage.

(1) Parson, G., Modernization, etc. 1964, pp. 257-258.

(2) Ibid. pp. 261-2.

(3) Ibid. pp. 257-258, and chapter 5.

and although men's income prospects may be damaged, most continue to work. It also seems likely that motherless families which stay together will usually comprise rather older children. Lone fathers may see themselves as needing child-care and domestic help from female relatives, rather than cash, although such help tends to be spasmodic and inadequate. ⁽¹⁾

As well as being more socially representative than other groups of fatherless families, widows and divorcees tend to be older than other lone parents, and tend therefore to have gone further with home buying and home building. ⁽²⁾ They are also more likely to have older children, so that they ^{mothers without themselves} can work, and ^{the} working children ^{can} contribute to their own upkeep. Although by the same token these older mothers may be less likely to receive support from their parents and may themselves be expected to give to their children.

In contrast, many unmarried mothers are unlikely even to have begun home-building, a fact which constitutes a large future debt if they are to remain unmarried and keep their child, but which is not a current drain on income.

Separated wives ~~are~~ like the unmarried mothers tend to be younger (although by no means all these mothers are young), and do come from poorer families so that they have been starved of resources during the early stages of homebuilding. ⁽³⁾ While some mothers are 'readopted' by their own parents, and receive a great deal of help, others may find themselves cut off from their parents, yet with still a long way to go to get together a home of their own. There is also some evidence that they tend to have more, younger, dependent children, who prevent them from working. ⁽⁴⁾

(1) George, V. and Wilding, P., Motherless Families, pp. 140-8.

(2) Marsden, D., Mothers Alone, op.cit., p.33; Marshall, R., Families Receiving Benefit, op. cit., p.8; Hunt, A., et al., Families and Their Needs, op. cit.

Marsden, D.,
⁽⁴⁾ Mothers Alone, op cit., pp.344 and p.23.

(3) Mothers Alone, ~~op. cit.~~, pp.121-4

at 10:00 AM on 10/10/1964. The following information was obtained from the above mentioned source:

your child's behavior and development. We will

are not used. Therefore, the system is not used. The system is not used.

and the fact of the micro-film process as evidenced by the

was not also very specific, was not certain, whether of

... ..

agreed, participants' written answers will also be added to list B.

1 want info on all my previous bar visits, please. Thank you to

100-443887-100

PLANS BEING MADE TO VISIT THE GULF OF GUINEA

100-443887-100

[illegible]

1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2440 2441 2442 2443 2444 2445 2446 2447 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454 2455 2456 2457 2458 2459 2460 2461 2462 2463 2464 2465 2466 2467 2468 2469 2470 2471 2472 2473 2474 2475 2476 2477 2478 2479 2480 2481 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 2488 2489 2490 2491 2492 2493 2494 2495 2496 2497 2498 2499 2500 2501 2502 2503 2504 2505 2506 2507 2508 2509 2510 2511 2512 2513 2514 2515 2516 2517 2518 2519 2520 2521 2522 2523 2524 2525 2526 2527 2528 2529 2530 2531 2532 2533 2534 2535 2536 2537 2538 2539 2540 2541 2542 2543 2544 2545 2546 2547 2548 2549 2550 2551 2552 2553 2554 2555 2556 2557 2558 2559 2560 2561 2562 2563 2564 2565 2566 2567 2568 2569 2570 2571 2572 2573 2574 2575 2576 2577 2578 2579 2580 2581 2582 2583 2584 2585 2586 2587 2588 2589 2590 2591 2592 2593 2594 2595 2596 2597 2598 2599 2600 2601 2602 2603 2604 2605 2606 2607 2608 2609 2610 2611 2612 2613 2614 2615 2616 2617 2618 2619 2620 2621 2622 2623 2624 2625 2626 2627 2628 2629 2630 2631 2632 2633 2634 2635 2636 2637 2638 2639 2640 2641 2642 2643 2644 2645 2646 2647 2648 2649 2650 2651 2652 2653 2654 2655 2656 2657 2658 2659 2660 2661 2662 2663 2664 2665 2666 2667 2668 2669 2670 2671 2672 2673 2674 2675 2676 2677 2678 2679 2680 2681 2682 2683 2684 2685 2686 2687 2688 2689 2690 2691 2692 2693 2694 2695 2696 2697 2698 2699 2700 2701 2702 2703 2704 2705 2706 2707 2708 2709 2710 2711 2712 2713 2714 2715 2716 2717 2718 2719 2720 2721 2722 2723 2724 2725 2726 2727 2728 2729 2730 2731 2732 2733 2734 2735 2736 2737 2738 2739 2740 2741 2742 2743 2744 2745 2746 2747 2748 2749 2750 2751 2752 2753 2754 2755 2756 2757 2758 2759 2760 2761 2762 2763 2764 2765 2766 2767 2768 2769 2770 2771 2772 2773 2774 2775 2776 2777 2778 2779 2780 2781 2782 2783 2784 2785 2786 2787 2788 2789 2790 2791 2792 2793 2794 2795 2796 2797 2798 2799 2800 2801 2802 2803 2804 2805 2806 2807 2808 2809

1. The following information was obtained from the above mentioned source:

SECRET

and an hour after their release and after 24 hours post-release.

our former life and the world of the future and the world of the present.

~~to be made and will not be withheld from any one of~~

• Explain the importance of the following:

CONFIDENTIAL - This letter is being placed on file and will be destroyed.

over 1000 of them, and intend to erect a religious sep. of the same

William J. Arnold, attorney, 2000 10th St. N.E., Wash., D.C. 20002

4. [unclear] must [unclear]

1. The following information is being furnished to you for your information:

[illegible]

CONFIDENTIAL - EYES ONLY

... ..

12/18/1944

Changing Trends in the numbers of Lone Parents and Their Dependency.

There are a number of crucial factors which have a bearing on any changes both in the ^{total} numbers of one-parent families and of numbers who become dependent and remain on or near the margins of poverty. The numbers of husbands dying while their children are dependent has fallen rapidly, not only because mortality among young and middle-aged adults has greatly declined, but because there has been a shift to families with two and three children, younger marriage and childbirth, and a compression of fertility: three quarters of all children are now born within eight years of their mother's wedding.

Early in this century more marriages were broken by death than by divorce. With the growth of equality before the law this position has now been reversed. There were 110,722 petitions for divorce in England and Wales in 1972, compared with 27,478 annually in 1956-1960.⁽¹⁾ Much of this increase is attributable not so much to evidence of the breakdown of more marriages as an increase in the numbers of those separating who are now not deterred from seeking a formal dissolution, including a high proportion who want to marry again.⁽²⁾

Between the 1950's and the 1970's there has been scarcely any change in the numbers of married women in England and Wales taking matrimonial proceedings in magistrates' courts (varying only by one or two thousands for different years above and below a figure of 26,000). ~~As a proportion of all live births illegitimate births increased~~

As a proportion of all live births illegitimate births increased from around 5 per cent per annum in the 1950's to over 8 per cent in the early 1970's. A large number of such births are ~~excluded from the~~

(1) Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, op. cit., part 3.

(2) Although it has been suggested that the absolute numbers of broken marriages have recently begun to rise. See, Chester, R., Journal of Biosocial Science, (1971), 3, pp.389 -402.

On the basis of the information in the above and the fact that

there are a number of small localities which have a small

any number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

(1) and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

(2) and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

(1) and the number of small localities and of

(2) and the number of small localities and of

and the number of small localities and of

(3) and the number of small localities and of

are to married women, to women living in a stable partnership, or to women who marry soon after the birth. Nearly a fifth of such births are re-registered subsequently as legitimate and about another quarter result in adoptions. Only a minority of illegitimate children born in any year help to form fatherless families, and the proportion of unmarried mothers with older children is very small, possibly because of the social stigma and financial difficulties suffered by unmarried mothers.

Little is known about trends in figures of motherless families, which represent about one sixth of the total of one parent families. There are, even more than for other one parent families, weaknesses in methods of collecting information in the census which tend to conceal the presence of motherless families living with other relatives.⁽¹⁾ There seems to be a very slight tendency (much publicised) for fathers to seek and be granted custody of their children and to bring them up themselves.

A major influence upon the living standards and dependency of one parent families prior to the national study had been the movements in social security benefits and rates. The improved position of widowed mothers has already been mentioned: apart from abolition of the earnings rule, and special tax concessions (since extended to other families), widows receive a weekly allowance for each child which is 70 per cent higher than other national insurance benefits for children. For other one parent families a major shift has been that supplementary benefit rates have been increased relative to the wages a woman can earn, for although maintenance and family allowances are deducted the value of these has declined, and supplementary benefits include an allowance for housing costs which have risen steeply, especially for one parent families. This relative movement of

(1) George, V. and Wilding, P., Motherless Families, op. cit., p4-7.

is to be noted, however, that in the case of women living in a family household, or in a family household, the women who marry even after the birth of a child, usually a fifth of each birth, are recognized as members of the family and should receive similar treatment in the census. Only a minority of illegitimate children born in the family are recognized as members of the family.

Any help to form family units, and the proportion of married women with other children in very small, possibly because of the small number of illegitimate children suffered by married women.

Notes:

1. The first part of the census is in terms of married families.

2. The second part of the census is in terms of one-parent families.

3. There are, even now, some one-parent families, which are

in the process of collecting information in the census, which lead to

(b) the census of women living with other relatives.

There seems to be a very slight tendency (much noticed) for women

to be and to be regarded as one-parent families and to bring them

to themselves.

4. A major influence upon the living standards and economy of

one-parent families prior to the national survey had been the movements

in which, notably, the birth and death rates. The improved position of

widow mothers and already been mentioned: apart from a reduction of

the family size, and a reduction in the number of children, extended to

other families, with a reduction in the number of children for each child

which is 50 per cent higher than the national average for families

for children. For other one-parent families a major shift has

been that supplementary benefits have been increased relative

to the average family size, for although the number of children

has increased and reduced the value of these has declined, and supplementary

benefits include an allowance for housing costs which have risen steadily,

especially for one-parent families. This relative movement of

(1) George, V. and H. J. (1964) Family and Social Change, pp. 11-12.

supplementary benefit rates and wage rates has meant that during the 1960s an increasing proportion of lone parents became dependent,⁽¹⁾ preferring to stay at home and look after their children, perhaps working part-time, rather than take a lower wage working full-time. This trend of growing dependency among fatherless families was a major influence which led to the setting up of the Finer Committee in 1969.

The Total Numbers of One Parent Families.

At this point we turn to a detailed discussion of evidence from the national survey. A significant consequence of societal myopia in relation to one parent families has been that until comparatively recently there was no collective name for, and no official estimate of the numbers of, one parent families.⁽²⁾ Now it has been established that at any time, rather less than one in ten of all families with dependent children have only one parent by reason of death, divorce, separation or births outside marriage. The largest group are the separated, followed by the divorced^{and} ~~and~~ the widowed, then motherless families and finally unmarried mothers.⁽³⁾ In the United Kingdom around two-thirds of a million parents, five out of six of whom are mothers, are looking after one million children single-handed.

Table 22/1 compares national estimates produced by the Finer Committee⁽⁴⁾ with estimates from the survey. Bearing in mind the inclusion of Northern Ireland in the survey and the substantial sampling error to which small sub-samples in the survey are subject, the total estimates from the two sources are very similar.

(1) See Wynn, M., 'F.I.S. and Fatherless Families', Poverty, Child Poverty Action Group, No. 16/17, for a discussion of dependency among widows and other lone mothers.

(2) Margaret Wynn's Fatherless Families, op. cit., appeared in 1964 making a case for common treatment and producing the first composite estimate, but it was not until 1967 that government reports began to present statistics on fatherless families, ~~and other Finer Committee~~⁽³⁾ and (4) Finer Report, op. cit., p

INSERT TABLE 22/1

In all of the studies estimates of married but separated parents tend to be shaky, since spouses themselves will in many cases be unable to decide or unwilling to report whether the separation is temporary or permanent.⁽¹⁾ In its comments on the statistics the Department of Health and Social Security points out that temporarily separated wives (including some whose husbands are mariners, prisoners or in the armed forces) are included in the Census and General Household Survey data.⁽²⁾ In the survey we distinguished three groups of married but "separated" persons - (i) married - away last night; (ii) married, separated - no court order; (iii) married, separated - court order. The interviewer was also instructed to enter reasons for any household member being away. We believe this procedure helped us to identify some temporary separations (including routine separations) which could be classified in (i) above. If such persons had dependent children they were not classed as one parent families. The survey estimates of married but separated parents proved to be higher than those of the DHSS.

On the other hand the DHSS estimates of unmarried mothers may be on the low side, since the DHSS point out that both the Census and GHS results were almost certainly too low when related to information both about numbers in work and numbers drawing supplementary benefit. The DHSS are inclined to adopt a higher figure, while estimates from

(1) See Marsden, D., Mothers Alone, op. cit., pp. 140-1, and pp. 341-2.

There are also problems with other groups who may not report their marital status correctly. As well as concealment of illegitimacy, divorced women are apt to report themselves to be widowed, see Registrar General's Statistical Review of England and Wales, Part III, 1963, pp. 21-7.

(2) Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, op. cit., Appendix 4.

our survey suggest the real figure may be higher still.

The total estimated numbers of children of different age in one parent families from the two sources are listed below:-

Age	Government estimates (thousands)	Survey estimates (thousands)
0 - 4	260	310
5 - 9	370	370
10-14	330	230
15-18	120	160
<hr/>		
total	1,080	1,070
<hr/>		

In the survey 8.4 per cent of family units consisted of one parent families. They comprised 6.6 per cent of all children under 15. Perhaps it should be added that there were other instances of children neither of whose parents were residing in the home. We estimate their numbers at 120,000, about half of whom have either a mother or a father alive.

The Chances of Being in Poverty.

By comparison with two parent families more one parent families have relatively low incomes and substantially more of them live in poverty or on its margins. This can be demonstrated both from the survey and Government studies. In the survey more of the children than of children in two parent families were found to live in households with incomes smaller than the minimum scales of the Supplementary Benefits Commission. Table 22/2

INSERT TABLE 22/2

our survey among the poor figure may be higher still.

The total estimated number of children of different ages in one

parent families from the two sources are stated below:

Survey estimates (thousands)	Government estimates (thousands)	Age
310	300	0-4
370	370	5-9
370	370	10-14
160	160	15-19
<hr/>		Total
1,010	1,000	
<hr/>		

In the survey 0.4 per cent of 0-4 age children consisted of one parent families. They constituted 0.6 per cent of all children under 15. It should be noted that there were other instances of children of whose parents were working in the home. We estimate that 130,000, about half of whom have either a mother or a father alive.

The measure of living in poverty.

By comparison with the parent families and parent families we have relatively low income and a relatively more of them live in poverty on our scale. This can be demonstrated both from the survey and government figures. In the survey more of the children than of children in the parent families were found to live in households with income less than the minimum needs of the family. Table 2A.

Taking household income as the criterion, two fifths of the families and nearly half the children were in poverty or on its margins. They represented a quarter of a million families and about half a million children respectively in the general population. In four poor areas we also found that though more one parent families than elsewhere had low incomes their distribution was not strikingly different from the national pattern (Appendix 8, Table A/90).

Government data confirm the disproportionately large numbers with low incomes but do not suggest such a large number below the State's poverty line. Thus the Finer Committee quote mean figures for the period 1969 to 1971 of 200,000 fatherless families receiving supplementary benefit, plus 43,000 not receiving benefit who are living below the supplementary benefit level and another 22,000 having resources of less than £2 higher than that level. Allowing for an estimated 15,000 motherless families in poverty or on its margins (including about 7,000 actually receiving supplementary benefit)⁽¹⁾ the total number of one parent families living on supplementary benefit, or below or within £2 of that standard was 280,000 or approximately 45 per cent.⁽²⁾ This official figure of 280,000 compares with the figure of 250,000 derived from the survey. The former includes all the families receiving supplementary benefit, however, and not only those whose net disposable income was less than 40 per cent higher than the basic scales.

Another measure of low income is obtained by comparing the mean income of the two groups of families. A 1970 study in five areas by the Social Survey Division of the Office of Population Censuses and

~~Although more motherless than fatherless families are in poverty, or on its margins, or have incomes low relative to two~~

(1) Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, op. cit. p.254 and Appendices 9 and 10.

Surveys found that "in all areas (Dorset, Dundee, Glamorgan, Halifax, Haringey) the mean usual income and the mean adjusted income (allowing for size of family) of fatherless families are less than half those of two parent families.⁽¹⁾

Household income is not necessarily the best measure of the living standards of all one parent families. In the survey 43 per cent lived in households consisting of two or more income units.⁽²⁾ This compares with 22 per cent of two parent families. If the income unit and not the entire household is taken then the number of one parent families living in or on the margins of poverty increases to (check).

Do many of the poorest families have assets which indirectly help them to raise their low living standards to tolerable levels? The short answer is no. When the potential income represented by the value of all assets, expressed as an annuity, is added to net disposable incomes, the number of children of lone parents living at a level below, or just above, the supplementary benefit basic scale rates is reduced only from 49 per cent to 43 per cent. Indeed, one of the critical problems of many one parent families is the total or almost total lack of assets of any kind - whether savings, houses or even consumer durables in the home. Nearly half the one parent families, compared with only 13 per cent of two parent families had assets of no value at all or were actually in debt (though some lived in households with other income units having assets). Another 17 per cent had less than £100. Only 11 per cent had more than £5000, compared with 21 per cent of two parent families.

(1) Hunt, A. et al, Families and Their Needs, op cit, p.31

(2) This corresponds closely with other estimates. The Government's Family Expenditure Survey produced an average figure of 46 per cent for the three years 1969 to 1971. Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, op.cit., Appendix 10, p.331.

Many of the families living around the state poverty line already receive supplementary benefit. Table 22/3 shows that 27 per cent of one parent families in the survey, comprising 37 per cent of dependent children in such families were said to be receiving benefit. The figures represented 170,000 families and 390,000 children in the population. These totals correspond fairly closely with administrative totals for the same period. In 1968 for example, according to official sources there were approximately 360,000 and in 1970 420,000 dependent children in one parent families receiving supplementary benefit.⁽¹⁾ But there were an additional 10 per cent, representing 100,000, who were in 56,000 families eligible for supplementary benefit but not receiving it. About two-thirds of these families were headed by lone mothers.

INSERT TABLE 22/3

Changes in Numbers in Poverty Since the National Survey: the Introduction of F.I.S.

At the time the survey was carried out the Family Income Supplement had not been introduced. What effect will this have had on dependency on supplementary benefits among one parent families? Both in proportion receiving and not receiving but eligible for benefit, children in one parent families are at a disadvantage when compared with other children. But even those children in families unable to claim benefit are at a disadvantage. Their mothers (or fathers) are in full-time employment, but usually earning less than parents in two parent families, and sometimes so much less that they are in poverty. The introduction of Family Income Supplement was intended to help such groups. FIS supplements the incomes of one parent and two parent families in full-time employment by one half of the amount by which their gross weekly income

(1) There were 182,000 fatherless and 6,000 motherless families receiving benefit in 1968, and 212,000 and 6,000 respectively in 1970, with an average of 1.91 and 2.26 children. Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, Appendix 9, pp. 313 and 316.

any of the families living around the state county line already
 receive supplementary benefit. Table 25 shows that 27 per cent of
 the normal families in the survey, comprising 27 per cent of dependent
 children in each family were said to be receiving benefit. The
 figures represented 120,000 families and 380,000 children in the
 population. These totals correspond fairly closely with administrative
 totals for the same period. In 1938 for example, according to official
 sources there were approximately 380,000 and in 1939-40, 420,000 dependent
 children in the country. Families receiving supplementary benefit.
 But there were an additional 10 per cent, representing 100,000, who
 were in 50,000 families eligible for supplementary benefit but not
 receiving it. About two-thirds of these families were headed by
 lone women.

EXPLANATION

Changes in numbers in Norway since the national survey: the introduction of F.I.S.
 At the time the survey was carried out the family income supplement had
 not been introduced. This effect will thus have had on dependency on
 supplementary benefit among one-parent families. Both in proportion
 need and not receiving but eligible for benefit, children in one-
 parent families are at a disadvantage when compared with other children.
 Not even those children in families eligible to claim benefit are at a
 disadvantage. Their mothers (or fathers) are in full-time employment,
 but usually earning less than women in two-parent families, and
 sometimes so much less that they are in poverty. The introduction of
 Family Income Supplement was intended to help such groups. The supplement
 is income of one parent and two parent families in full-time
 employment of one half of the amount by which their gross weekly income

(1) There were 102,000 families and 6,000 children receiving benefit in 1938 and 120,000 families and 380,000 children in 1939-40. The increase in the number of families receiving benefit is 18 per cent and the increase in the number of children is 25 per cent.

falls below prescribed levels. Because the prescribed amounts for family supplements were set a lot higher than the supplementary benefit levels for one parent families, the effect was to "raise the disposable income of one parent families whose incomes were already higher than the supplementary benefit level - that is, the supplements increased the positive net resources of lone mothers who work rather than transferred families from negative net resources to positive net resources" (or from an income position below to an income position above the supplementary benefit level).⁽¹⁾

There is little evidence that the distribution of one parent families above and below the income represented by the supplementary benefit standard has changed since 1968-9. Only 37,000 one parent families with 50,000 (check) children received family income supplements in April 1973.⁽²⁾ As conceded by the DHSS, many of these would not beforehand have been in poverty or on its margins. Moreover, although the survey estimate of 440,000 children under 15 and 250,000 mothers or fathers (check) in one parent families in poverty or on its margins, would have been reduced to some extent because of the introduction of the family income supplements scheme, these numbers will also have increased first because one parent families have themselves increased (without much change in the proportions of families having incomes of different amounts relative to the supplementary benefit scales) and second, because many one parent families have ceased to rely on full-time employment and have applied for supplementary benefits. The Department of Health and Social Security reported that one parent families drawing supplementary benefit increased from 188,000 in November 1968 to

(1) Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, op. cit., Appendix 10, p.355.

(2)

Table 1. Family Income and Family Size. The table shows the distribution of family income and family size for the sample. The first column shows the family income level, the second column shows the family size, and the third column shows the percentage of families in each category. The data is as follows:

Family Income Level	Family Size	Percentage of Families
Low	Small	10%
Low	Medium	15%
Low	Large	5%
Medium	Small	20%
Medium	Medium	30%
Medium	Large	10%
High	Small	15%
High	Medium	25%
High	Large	10%

There is little evidence that the distribution of one parent family is above and below the income represented by the supplementary benefits although the number of one parent families is 1,000. Only 1,000 one parent families in 1980 received family income supplements in 1980. (See Table 1.1) A number of these would not be included by the DSS, many of these would not be included by the DSS, many of these would not be included by the DSS.

of health and social security reported that one parent families growing employment and have applied for supplementary benefits. The Department second, because many one parent families have ceased to rely on child benefit amounts relative to the supplementary benefit scales) and (not out much change in the proportions of families having incomes increased first because one parent families have been relatively unaffected the family income supplement scheme, these numbers will also have would have been reduced to some extent because of the introduction of father's (back) in one parent families in poverty or on the margins, the survey estimate of 140,000 children under 16 and 350,000 mothers but should have been in poverty or on the margins. However, although

252. Report of the Committee on the Activities of the American People, 1952. (P)

(1)
259,000 in November 1972, or by 38 per cent. Strangely, while commenting at length on various demographic trends the Finer Committee did not attempt to develop any conclusions about trends in the numbers of one parent families. (2)

One Parent Families Who are Not Poor.

We have already noted that a small proportion of one parent families have higher incomes and assets than the rest. Who are they? One answer is that they are predominantly from the non-manual class. In the ^{national} survey we found an almost exact representation of non-manual and manual occupational classes (defined in terms of the husband's or former husband's or, in the case of unmarried mothers and motherless families, father's occupation) among one parent families, being 46 per cent and 54 per cent respectively, compared with 45 per cent and 53 per cent of married parents. But a small proportion of predominantly non-manual lone parents had relatively high incomes and other resources.

Thus one in three non-manual lone parents had incomes in excess of 200 per cent of supplementary benefit scale rates, and one in six had an income over 300 per cent, while less than one in fifteen manual lone parents had an income over 200 per cent of scale rate and none had an income as high as 300 per cent. Similarly, almost one in three of non-manual lone parents had assets of more than £5000 (several in excess of £10,000) compared with less than one in fifteen manual ^{lone} parents. (3)

The presence of comparatively well-off one parent families

(1) Report of the Committee on One Parent Families, op cit, Appendix 9, p.313. These figures include an increase from 4,400 to 6,100 in the number of prisoners' wives.

(2) Thus in a 43 page chapter on demographic data there is no discussion of overall trends in numbers. There is, however, a brief reference on later pages to the effect that there has been an increase in recent years, but nothing like as large as the increase in numbers of lone parents dependent on supplementary benefits, which is mainly attributable to a switch by many mothers from relying on earnings to relying on benefit. Ibid, pp. 247-249 and Wynn, M., in Poverty, op. cit.

(3) In this respect the families from the special areas looked very different: less than 10% were from

The low socio-economic status of the families was reflected in their lack of assets: only two families had more than £1000; three-quarters had nothing.
routine non-manual origin, while half were semi-skilled or unskilled manual workers' families.

1. The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, New York City, New York, dated 10/10/50, and 10/11/50, and 10/12/50, and 10/13/50, and 10/14/50, and 10/15/50, and 10/16/50, and 10/17/50, and 10/18/50, and 10/19/50, and 10/20/50, and 10/21/50, and 10/22/50, and 10/23/50, and 10/24/50, and 10/25/50, and 10/26/50, and 10/27/50, and 10/28/50, and 10/29/50, and 10/30/50, and 10/31/50, and 11/1/50, and 11/2/50, and 11/3/50, and 11/4/50, and 11/5/50, and 11/6/50, and 11/7/50, and 11/8/50, and 11/9/50, and 11/10/50, and 11/11/50, and 11/12/50, and 11/13/50, and 11/14/50, and 11/15/50, and 11/16/50, and 11/17/50, and 11/18/50, and 11/19/50, and 11/20/50, and 11/21/50, and 11/22/50, and 11/23/50, and 11/24/50, and 11/25/50, and 11/26/50, and 11/27/50, and 11/28/50, and 11/29/50, and 11/30/50, and 12/1/50, and 12/2/50, and 12/3/50, and 12/4/50, and 12/5/50, and 12/6/50, and 12/7/50, and 12/8/50, and 12/9/50, and 12/10/50, and 12/11/50, and 12/12/50, and 12/13/50, and 12/14/50, and 12/15/50, and 12/16/50, and 12/17/50, and 12/18/50, and 12/19/50, and 12/20/50, and 12/21/50, and 12/22/50, and 12/23/50, and 12/24/50, and 12/25/50, and 12/26/50, and 12/27/50, and 12/28/50, and 12/29/50, and 12/30/50, and 12/31/50, and 1/1/51, and 1/2/51, and 1/3/51, and 1/4/51, and 1/5/51, and 1/6/51, and 1/7/51, and 1/8/51, and 1/9/51, and 1/10/51, and 1/11/51, and 1/12/51, and 1/13/51, and 1/14/51, and 1/15/51, and 1/16/51, and 1/17/51, and 1/18/51, and 1/19/51, and 1/20/51, and 1/21/51, and 1/22/51, and 1/23/51, and 1/24/51, and 1/25/51, and 1/26/51, and 1/27/51, and 1/28/51, and 1/29/51, and 1/30/51, and 1/31/51, and 2/1/51, and 2/2/51, and 2/3/51, and 2/4/51, and 2/5/51, and 2/6/51, and 2/7/51, and 2/8/51, and 2/9/51, and 2/10/51, and 2/11/51, and 2/12/51, and 2/13/51, and 2/14/51, and 2/15/51, and 2/16/51, and 2/17/51, and 2/18/51, and 2/19/51, and 2/20/51, and 2/21/51, and 2/22/51, and 2/23/51, and 2/24/51, and 2/25/51, and 2/26/51, and 2/27/51, and 2/28/51, and 2/29/51, and 2/30/51, and 3/1/51, and 3/2/51, and 3/3/51, and 3/4/51, and 3/5/51, and 3/6/51, and 3/7/51, and 3/8/51, and 3/9/51, and 3/10/51, and 3/11/51, and 3/12/51, and 3/13/51, and 3/14/51, and 3/15/51, and 3/16/51, and 3/17/51, and 3/18/51, and 3/19/51, and 3/20/51, and 3/21/51, and 3/22/51, and 3/23/51, and 3/24/51, and 3/25/51, and 3/26/51, and 3/27/51, and 3/28/51, and 3/29/51, and 3/30/51, and 3/31/51, and 4/1/51, and 4/2/51, and 4/3/51, and 4/4/51, and 4/5/51, and 4/6/51, and 4/7/51, and 4/8/51, and 4/9/51, and 4/10/51, and 4/11/51, and 4/12/51, and 4/13/51, and 4/14/51, and 4/15/51, and 4/16/51, and 4/17/51, and 4/18/51, and 4/19/51, and 4/20/51, and 4/21/51, and 4/22/51, and 4/23/51, and 4/24/51, and 4/25/51, and 4/26/51, and 4/27/51, and 4/28/51, and 4/29/51, and 4/30/51, and 5/1/51, and 5/2/51, and 5/3/51, and 5/4/51, and 5/5/51, and 5/6/51, and 5/7/51, and 5/8/51, and 5/9/51, and 5/10/51, and 5/11/51, and 5/12/51, and 5/13/51, and 5/14/51, and 5/15/51, and 5/16/51, and 5/17/51, and 5/18/51, and 5/19/51, and 5/20/51, and 5/21/51, and 5/22/51, and 5/23/51, and 5/24/51, and 5/25/51, and 5/26/51, and 5/27/51, and 5/28/51, and 5/29/51, and 5/30/51, and 5/31/51, and 6/1/51, and 6/2/51, and 6/3/51, and 6/4/51, and 6/5/51, and 6/6/51, and 6/7/51, and 6/8/51, and 6/9/51, and 6/10/51, and 6/11/51, and 6/12/51, and 6/13/51, and 6/14/51, and 6/15/51, and 6/16/51, and 6/17/51, and 6/18/51, and 6/19/51, and 6/20/51, and 6/21/51, and 6/22/51, and 6/23/51, and 6/24/51, and 6/25/51, and 6/26/51, and 6/27/51, and 6/28/51, and 6/29/51, and 6/30/51, and 7/1/51, and 7/2/51, and 7/3/51, and 7/4/51, and 7/5/51, and 7/6/51, and 7/7/51, and 7/8/51, and 7/9/51, and 7/10/51, and 7/11/51, and 7/12/51, and 7/13/51, and 7/14/51, and 7/15/51, and 7/16/51, and 7/17/51, and 7/18/51, and 7/19/51, and 7/20/51, and 7/21/51, and 7/22/51, and 7/23/51, and 7/24/51, and 7/25/51, and 7/26/51, and 7/27/51, and 7/28/51, and 7/29/51, and 7/30/51, and 7/31/51, and 8/1/51, and 8/2/51, and 8/3/51, and 8/4/51, and 8/5/51, and 8/6/51, and 8/7/51, and 8/8/51, and 8/9/51, and 8/10/51, and 8/11/51, and 8/12/51, and 8/13/51, and 8/14/51, and 8/15/51, and 8/16/51, and 8/17/51, and 8/18/51, and 8/19/51, and 8/20/51, and 8/21/51, and 8/22/51, and 8/23/51, and 8/24/51, and 8/25/51, and 8/26/51, and 8/27/51, and 8/28/51, and 8/29/51, and 8/30/51, and 8/31/51, and 9/1/51, and 9/2/51, and 9/3/51, and 9/4/51, and 9/5/51, and 9/6/51, and 9/7/51, and 9/8/51, and 9/9/51, and 9/10/51, and 9/11/51, and 9/12/51, and 9/13/51, and 9/14/51, and 9/15/51, and 9/16/51, and 9/17/51, and 9/18/51, and 9/19/51, and 9/20/51, and 9/21/51, and 9/22/51, and 9/23/51, and 9/24/51, and 9/25/51, and 9/26/51, and 9/27/51, and 9/28/51, and 9/29/51, and 9/30/51, and 10/1/51, and 10/2/51, and 10/3/51, and 10/4/51, and 10/5/51, and 10/6/51, and 10/7/51, and 10/8/51, and 10/9/51, and 10/10/51, and 10/11/51, and 10/12/51, and 10/13/51, and 10/14/51, and 10/15/51, and 10/16/51, and 10/17/51, and 10/18/51, and 10/19/51, and 10/20/51, and 10/21/51, and 10/22/51, and 10/23/51, and 10/24/51, and 10/25/51, and 10/26/51, and 10/27/51, and 10/28/51, and 10/29/51, and 10/30/51, and 10/31/51, and 11/1/51, and 11/2/51, and 11/3/51, and 11/4/51, and 11/5/51, and 11/6/51, and 11/7/51, and 11/8/51, and 11/9/51, and 11/10/51, and 11/11/51, and 11/12/51, and 11/13/51, and 11/14/51, and 11/15/51, and 11/16/51, and 11/17

14-00000

[illegible][illegible]

On 11/11/11, 11:11 AM, "11/11/11" wrote: "11/11/11" 11:11 AM, 11/11/11

to subversion, since a subversive is known to have been [redacted]
has someone that also refers to a person who is a subversive.

400-724-7150

[illegible]

(E) SECRET

of the increase in the number of land parcels owned by the same person or company. The increase in the number of land parcels owned by the same person or company is a result of the increase in the number of land parcels owned by the same person or company. The increase in the number of land parcels owned by the same person or company is a result of the increase in the number of land parcels owned by the same person or company.

The above information was obtained from the files of the FBI New York Office.

calls for further explanation and investigation along the lines of our introductory discussion. Although numbers in sub-groups are small, it is worth returning at this point to the individual interview schedules

to explore in more detail which families are better and worse off. Usually the figures will refer to the national sample only, but the special areas will be referred to occasionally where ^{these offer further insights.}
Variations of living standard between different types of one parent families.

Families headed by men tended to be better off. ~~Only one man had~~ Taking both the national sample and the special areas together, only two men had incomes below 140% of supplementary benefit, and ~~both~~ ^{were} unemployed

(as incidentally was the only other father who had more than two children). Two of the three richest families, with incomes over 300 per cent and even 400 per cent of supplementary benefit, were headed by men. Thus our data ~~confirm~~ ^{repeat the finding} that motherless families are better off because they had a man's wage.

In fact a high proportion of lone mothers ^{in the national sample} also were in paid employment, 57 per cent compared with only 34 per cent of other mothers (and the difference is more striking if it is remembered that the families of lone mothers contained a disproportionately large number of young children); and a higher proportion worked full-time, 40 per cent as against only 14 per cent of other mothers working more than 30 hours (Table 32). ⁽¹⁾ However, with one or two notable exceptions, such as a woman G.P. working very long hours, these lone mothers could not make enough money from their earnings alone to take them very far above the poverty level: over one in three of mothers who worked full-time still fell below 140 per cent of supplementary benefit rates, although none fell below 100 per cent. We will discuss further below how opportunities to work to supplement other small incomes were not always available and are distributed unevenly between mothers of different marital status in ways which tend to increase rather than decrease inequalities between the various types of family.

(1) Rather fewer mothers from the special areas worked ~~full-time~~, 42%, and fewer worked full-time 30%, a fact which may reflect poorer employment opportunities in those areas.

Handwritten notes in the left margin, including "Handwritten" and "Notes".

...the ... of ... and ... of ...

...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...

...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...

...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...

...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...

...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...

...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...
...the ... of ... and ... of ...

^{national sample}
Among families headed by women, the widows were relatively better off. All the widows had full/pensions, and one third had additional income from their husbands' occupational pension schemes. One half worked full-time and one third worked part-time, and almost half these widows had some income from a working son or daughter. As a result, none of them depended on supplementary benefit. Apart from the motherless families, the only other lone parent whose income exceeded 300 per cent of supplementary benefit was a widow.

The only very poor widow was a young woman with four young children

who could only work part-time. ^{New para} This pattern of relatively better incomes for the widows was repeated in the special areas where only two out of 13 fell below 100% of supplementary benefit rates.
Lacking pensions, none of the other groups of mothers received

very much support directly or indirectly from their relationship with

their children's fathers. For example, the average amount received

per family for ~~non-widowed mothers~~ ^{non-widowed mothers} was less than £2:

one woman who received £5 for herself and her six children, actually

returned £1.25 to her husband because he took the oldest child for

a day. Plainly the collection of maintenance from ~~husbands~~ ^{fathers} by legal

procedures was no solution to the income problems of the divorced,

the separated and the unmarried. ~~However~~ This finding was repeated in the special areas.

It is worth noting at this point that in addition to these mothers

there were ^{five} ~~four~~ women, not formally separated, whose husbands were

away in the services or working at a distance from home. And in two

of these families the money remitted by the father was insufficient

to raise the family above 140 per cent of supplementary benefit level.

Lacking support from the fathers, the situation of divorced women was rather varied, with almost equal proportion of them being relatively comfortable and rather poor. The better off had fewer dependent children and were working full time. About one third had incomes from working children, although because the children were still young such incomes do not appear to have boosted the living standards

of the whole household by very much. As we noted earlier, one difference in the special areas

* However, in line with other findings which show up the families in the special areas as poorer, almost one in three widows in these areas drew supplementary benefit.

fewer non-married families and this seems to be the reason why divorce in the special areas were almost all rather poor.

continue
to *
below

continue
to *
above

other persons

1. 1944 1945 1946 1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352

[illegible]

That would be ,mit-er-ah-rah-rah and the mit-ah-rah.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the assistance of Mrs. J. M. Smith and Mr. J. M. Smith.

These studies demonstrate no benefit with the use of any

Public Information: This data will not be released under the Freedom of Information Act.

• William of Ockham argued that there is no need for God's existence to be proved

~~XX~~

1. The first of these is the fact that the
 2. second of these is the fact that the
 3. third of these is the fact that the
 4. fourth of these is the fact that the
 5. fifth of these is the fact that the
 6. sixth of these is the fact that the
 7. seventh of these is the fact that the
 8. eighth of these is the fact that the
 9. ninth of these is the fact that the
 10. tenth of these is the fact that the

"We did not believe that we were involved yet," said Jameson.

On 12/10/2001, 09:01 AM, V. J. said: vladimir.j.vukobratovic@yale.edu

CONFIDENTIAL - 1000

children, particularly in the United States, have been shown to have

Not also subject to 100% of normal contract rate of U.S. formation

DATE OF BIRTH _____

is somewhat old so the frame is somewhat old. It is made of wood and is made of wood.

... das Lammage sah in der Hand der ...

can't be used as evidence in 1997 or 1998 and is written down 100%.

with regard to room, dining hall, etc. and am, therefore, ~~not~~ ^{not} in a position

SUBJECT: [redacted] b6
[redacted]
RE: [redacted]

Investigations are needed to determine whether the use of the model is appropriate for the purpose of the study.

1968-1969 Employee Group to Integrate Employees of the

Approved: Dr. William A. J. ... Date: ...

Also mentioned: goldmine, 1990s, 2000s, 2010s, 2020s, 2030s, 2040s, 2050s, 2060s, 2070s, 2080s, 2090s, 2100s, 2110s, 2120s, 2130s, 2140s, 2150s, 2160s, 2170s, 2180s, 2190s, 2200s, 2210s, 2220s, 2230s, 2240s, 2250s, 2260s, 2270s, 2280s, 2290s, 2300s, 2310s, 2320s, 2330s, 2340s, 2350s, 2360s, 2370s, 2380s, 2390s, 2400s, 2410s, 2420s, 2430s, 2440s, 2450s, 2460s, 2470s, 2480s, 2490s, 2500s, 2510s, 2520s, 2530s, 2540s, 2550s, 2560s, 2570s, 2580s, 2590s, 2600s, 2610s, 2620s, 2630s, 2640s, 2650s, 2660s, 2670s, 2680s, 2690s, 2700s, 2710s, 2720s, 2730s, 2740s, 2750s, 2760s, 2770s, 2780s, 2790s, 2800s, 2810s, 2820s, 2830s, 2840s, 2850s, 2860s, 2870s, 2880s, 2890s, 2900s, 2910s, 2920s, 2930s, 2940s, 2950s, 2960s, 2970s, 2980s, 2990s, 3000s, 3010s, 3020s, 3030s, 3040s, 3050s, 3060s, 3070s, 3080s, 3090s, 3100s, 3110s, 3120s, 3130s, 3140s, 3150s, 3160s, 3170s, 3180s, 3190s, 3200s, 3210s, 3220s, 3230s, 3240s, 3250s, 3260s, 3270s, 3280s, 3290s, 3300s, 3310s, 3320s, 3330s, 3340s, 3350s, 3360s, 3370s, 3380s, 3390s, 3400s, 3410s, 3420s, 3430s, 3440s, 3450s, 3460s, 3470s, 3480s, 3490s, 3500s, 3510s, 3520s, 3530s, 3540s, 3550s, 3560s, 3570s, 3580s, 3590s, 3600s, 3610s, 3620s, 3630s, 3640s, 3650s, 3660s, 3670s, 3680s, 3690s, 3700s, 3710s, 3720s, 3730s, 3740s, 3750s, 3760s, 3770s, 3780s, 3790s, 3800s, 3810s, 3820s, 3830s, 3840s, 3850s, 3860s, 3870s, 3880s, 3890s, 3900s, 3910s, 3920s, 3930s, 3940s, 3950s, 3960s, 3970s, 3980s, 3990s, 4000s, 4010s, 4020s, 4030s, 4040s, 4050s, 4060s, 4070s, 4080s, 4090s, 4100s, 4110s, 4120s, 4130s, 4140s, 4150s, 4160s, 4170s, 4180s, 4190s, 4200s, 4210s, 4220s, 4230s, 4240s, 4250s, 4260s, 4270s, 4280s, 4290s, 4300s, 4310s, 4320s, 4330s, 4340s, 4350s, 4360s, 4370s, 4380s, 4390s, 4400s, 4410s, 4420s, 4430s, 4440s, 4450s, 4460s, 4470s, 4480s, 4490s, 4500s, 4510s, 4520s, 4530s, 4540s, 4550s, 4560s, 4570s, 4580s, 4590s, 4600s, 4610s, 4620s, 4630s, 4640s, 4650s, 4660s, 4670s, 4680s, 4690s, 4700s, 4710s, 4720s, 4730s, 4740s, 4750s, 4760s, 4770s, 4780s, 4790s, 4800s, 4810s, 4820s, 4830s, 4840s, 4850s, 4860s, 4870s, 4880s, 4890s, 4900s, 4910s, 4920s, 4930s, 4940s, 4950s, 4960s, 4970s, 4980s, 4990s, 5000s, 5010s, 5020s, 5030s, 5040s, 5050s, 5060s, 5070s, 5080s, 5090s, 5100s, 5110s, 5120s, 5130s, 5140s, 5150s, 5160s, 5170s, 5180s, 5190s, 5200s, 5210s, 5220s, 5230s, 5240s, 5250s, 5260s, 5270s, 5280s, 5290s, 5300s, 5310s, 5320s, 5330s, 5340s, 5350s, 5360s, 5370s, 5380s, 5390s, 5400s, 5410s, 5420s, 5430s, 5440s, 5450s, 5460s, 5470s, 5480s, 5490s, 5500s, 5510s, 5520s, 5530s, 5540s, 5550s, 5560s, 5570s, 5580s, 5590s, 5600s, 5610s, 5620s, 5630s, 5640s, 5650s, 5660s, 5670s, 5680s, 5690s, 5700s, 5710s, 5720s, 5730s, 5740s, 5750s, 5760s, 5770s, 5780s, 5790s, 5800s, 5810s, 5820s, 5830s, 5840s, 5850s, 5860s, 5870s, 5880s, 5890s, 5900s, 5910s, 5920s, 5930s, 5940s, 5950s, 5960s, 5970s, 5980s, 5990s, 6000s, 6010s, 6020s, 6030s, 6040s, 6050s, 6060s, 6070s, 6080s, 6090s, 6100s, 6110s, 6120s, 6130s, 6140s, 6150s, 6160s, 6170s, 6180s, 6190s, 6200s, 6210s, 6220s, 6230s, 6240s, 6250s, 6260s, 6270s, 6280s, 6290s, 6300s, 6310s, 6320s, 6330s, 6340s, 6350s, 6360s, 6370s, 6380s, 6390s, 6400s, 6410s, 6420s, 6430s, 6440s, 6450s, 6460s, 6470s, 6480s, 6490s, 6500s, 6510s, 6520s, 6530s, 6540s, 6550s, 6560s, 6570s, 6580s, 6590s, 6600s, 6610s, 6620s, 6630s, 6640s, 6650s, 6660s, 6670s, 6680s, 6690s, 6700s, 6710s, 6720s, 6730s, 6740s, 6750s, 6760s, 6770s, 6780s, 6790s, 6800s, 6810s, 6820s, 6830s, 6840s, 6850s, 6860s, 6870s, 6880s, 6890s, 6900s, 6910s, 6920s, 6930s, 6940s, 6950s, 6960s, 6970s, 6980s, 6990s, 7000s, 7010s, 7020s, 7030s, 7040s, 7050s, 7060s, 7070s, 7080s, 7090s, 7100s, 7110s, 7120s, 7130s, 7140s, 7150s, 7160s, 7170s, 7180s, 7190s, 7200s, 7210s, 7220s, 7230s, 7240s, 7250s, 7260s, 7270s, 7280s, 7290s, 7300s, 7310s, 7320s, 7330s, 7340s, 7350s, 7360s, 7370s, 7380s, 7390s, 7400s, 7410s, 7420s, 7430s, 7440s, 7450s, 7460s, 7470s, 7480s, 7490s, 7500s, 7510s, 7520s, 7530s, 7540s, 7550s, 7560s, 7570s, 7580s, 7590s, 7600s, 7610s, 7620s, 7630s, 7640s, 7650s, 7660s, 7670s, 7680s, 7690s, 7700s, 7710s, 7720s, 7730s, 7740s, 7750s, 7760s, 7770s, 7780s, 7790s, 7800s, 7810s, 7820s,

"There are no other people here," said the man, "and I am afraid you will find it very difficult to get help."

The United States would like to see the situation in the Middle East resolved.

Left: how things did succeed. Right: how things did not.

CONFIDENTIAL - (S) Approved for release by NSA on 09-08-2013 pursuant to E.O. 13526

[Faint, illegible handwritten text]

1944

~~From the national sample~~
(~~that finding was repeated~~) In the special areas ~~there~~ very few families had any assets, 22
but those who had were ~~all~~ widows: one had over \$5000, one had over \$1000.) ~~and~~

START →

Motherless families, the widows and divorced mothers were the only groups to have any substantial capital assets. Between one quarter and one third of these lone parents had assets in excess of £5,000, compared with none of the separated and unmarried mothers, which meant that they were more likely than other groups to have adequate housing and household goods. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that there were divorced mothers who had lost the marital home during the divorce, or who came from poorer circumstances initially, so that as a group divorcees are likely to show a wider range of inequality of assets than any other. (✓)

The living standards of the unmarried mothers were to some extent protected (or in some instances their poverty was concealed) because they all lived with relatives (although ^{this was also true of the special areas, it appears that} in this respect the unmarried mothers of our ^{two} samples were not quite typical of the general population). Living with relatives enabled some unmarried mothers of very young children to go out to work, which gave them an adequate income, although it postponed the expense and problems of homebuilding. On the other hand, there were two unmarried mothers who did not work but who acted as housekeepers for rather little reward: one of these was judged to live at a standard considerably below supplementary benefit rate. A further disadvantage of continuing to live with relatives after the birth of an illegitimate child was that well over half of these particular families were the most overcrowded. (1)

Of all these one parent families, the very poorest tended to be separated wives living alone on supplementary benefits supporting large families. Thus among the separated, ~~there were~~ over one third of the mothers, with an average of more than three children each,

(1) A finding echoed in the pilot report, Marsden, D., Mothers Alone, Op cit, pp120-

Mothers' families, the widows and divorced mothers were the only groups to have any substantial capital assets. Between one quarter and one third of these lone mothers had assets in excess of \$5,000, compared with none of the separated and unmarried mothers, which meant that they were more likely than other groups to have a separate housing and household goods. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that there were divorced mothers who had lost the marital home during the divorce, or who came from poorer circumstances initially, so that as a group divorced are likely to show a wider range of inequality of assets than any other.

The living standards of the unmarried mothers were to some extent protected (or in some instances their poverty was concealed) because they all lived with relatives (although in this respect the unmarried mothers of our sample were not quite typical of the general population). Living with relatives enabled some unmarried mothers of very young children to go out to work, which gave them an adequate income, although it postponed the expenses and stresses of housekeeping. On the other hand, there were two unmarried mothers who did not work but who relied on housekeeping for rather little reward; one of these was judged to live at a standard considerably below supplementary benefit rates. A further disadvantage of continuing to live with relatives after the birth of an illegitimate child was that well over half of these particular families were the most overcrowded.

Of all these one-parent families, the very poorest tended to be separated lives living alone on supplementary benefit supporting large families. Thus across the separated, unknown over one third of the mothers with an average of more than three children each

(1) A finding echoed in the pilot report, Harahan, G., Mothers Alone, pp. 112-4.

had incomes actually below 100 per cent of supplementary benefit rates, in several instances very substantially below. Moreover these mothers were usually drawing supplementary benefit allowances. From the interviews (and following similar findings from the pilot report⁽¹⁾) the explanation appears to be that the supplementary benefit allowances of these mothers were fixed on the basis that their husbands were also supporting them; in one instance there was an unpaid court order, but in the remaining instances the allowance rate appeared to assume that the woman was receiving undeclared income from the husband. These poorer mothers ~~had~~ almost invariably had separated from husbands who were semi or unskilled manual workers. At the other end of the income scale there was only one separated wife whose income exceeded 200 per cent of supplementary benefit scale rate.

*To stress this point, it was ^{also} found ~~also~~ in the special areas that seven out of the fourteen
We have not been able to follow up for these subgroups the*

extent to which the lone parent's position in the home-building and child-rearing cycle might influence the amount and content of contacts with the extended family. However, family contacts are about the same for one and two parent families (Tables 41 and 53), but because they tend more often to live with relatives some groups among one parent families can be said to have more frequent contacts, particularly the unmarried. And here once again separated wives, who are in an intermediate position in the family structure, appeared to be the least fortunate in this respect in neither living with an older relative, nor having support from a younger adult like the widows and some of the divorced mothers.

(1) Marsden, D., Mothers Alone, op cit, pp. 263-4

→ Separated wives who lived with only their children, had incomes below supplementary benefit rates, yet all but one of the wives were drawing supplementary benefit allowances. And in the special areas there appeared to be a similar pattern among the divorced wives of unskilled manual workers.

water filled underground to form an artesian (natural) reservoir.

(P) [REDACTED]

SECRET//NOFORN

of these items were found on the basis of the following information:

[illegible]

system of language also controls the external world and vice versa.

liberal and more honest political system than we have at the

and between the 10th and 11th of the month, 1964.

Two month old of juvenile female butterfly on fern frond at roadside.

amount of my other holdings, also time on staff since March 1st 1964

~~status of the affected individuals to the age of 13 months~~

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses, which appears to be a directory or a list of contacts. The names are written in a cursive script, and the addresses are listed below them.

published and original editions of theses and the rights of authors

The document has been reviewed and examined by the [redacted] and found to be a true and correct copy.

one standard glass, however, filled with water and this is used

1922 was 14 million 600,000 dollars, but by 1923 it had fallen to 10 million.

[illegible]

Admission is dependent upon proof of ability to pay and ability to meet the requirements of the program.

which had been along some road in the vicinity of the "Black" area.

but none, a student who is not a student as of the date of the

deliberately violating its jurisdiction about his other "good" work. He said he

will also know whether the article was in the article file or

Journal of Management Education 32(1) 1-10

[illegible][illegible]

The Consequences of Poverty.

The fact that the incomes of many one parent families are low, and are relatively lower than those of two parent families, has many outcomes. Following the analysis of the previous section, Table 22/4 breaks down the families by sex and marital status of head, and lists a number of deprivations suffered by lone parents. ^{overall, lone parents} The list clearly reveals that ~~unmarried and separated families~~ are deprived in relation to two parent families, according to a variety of indices. Fewer than of other parents own their own homes, fewer own a representative selection of consumer durables; fewer take a holiday during the year away from home and fewer have an afternoon or evening out in the course of a fortnight. Moreover, Table 22/4 clearly reveals the clustering of deprivation among the unmarried and the separated, and the slightly better position of families headed by widows, divorced mothers and men. The widowed and divorced are deprived relative to two parent families on some but not all counts, whereas the unmarried and separated are substantially deprived on all counts. Only in the matter of going out in the evening do the widowed and divorced appear more disadvantaged than the unmarried and the separated. This may be partly explained, as can the other deprivations, in terms of the mother's age and stage in the family cycle, as well as in terms of lack of cash and child care resources. In the survey most of the widowed and divorced mothers were in their forties and early fifties, most of the married but separated mothers were in their thirties and early forties, and most of the unmarried mothers were in their twenties and thirties.

INSERT TABLE 22/4

Deprivations due to low incomes and resources are also suffered by the children in one parent families. Table 22/5 lists a variety of characteristics in which more children in one parent than two parent families are deprived.

The fact that the incomes of many one parent families are low, and are relatively lower than those of two parent families, has many outcomes. Following the analysis of the previous section, Table 22¹ breaks down the families by sex and marital status of head, and lists a number of characteristics which are related to the sex of the head. The list clearly reveals that ~~marital status~~ ^{sex} and ~~sex~~ ^{marital status} are related in relation to two parent families, according to a variety of indicators. Lower than of other groups are their own income, lower own and representative selection of consumer goods; fewer take a holiday during the year away from home and have an all-around lower evening out in the course of a fortnight. However, Table 22¹ clearly reveals the significance of marital status among the married and the separated, in the slightly better position of families headed by widows, divorced mothers and men. The widowed and divorced are related relative to two parent families on home but not all counts, whereas the unmarried and separated are substantially related on all counts. This is the matter of going out in the evening, the widowed and divorced are more disadvantaged than the married in the evening, this may be partly explained, as can the other characteristics, in terms of the mother's age and stage in the family cycle, as well as in terms of lack of certain child care resources. In the survey most of the widowed and divorced mothers were in their forties and early fifties, most of the married but separated mothers were in their thirties and early forties, and most of the unmarried mothers were in their twenties and thirties.

II. THE TABLE 22¹

Characteristics of the low income and resources are also related to the children in one parent families. Table 22² lists a variety of characteristics in which one parent families are disadvantaged relative to two parent families and are listed.

Turning now to the more subjective aspects of deprivation, in line with their objective deprivation, the heads of one parent families ~~are~~ ^{are} more likely than others to feel deprived. 76 per cent of heads of one parent families say they are worse off than the rest of their families, compared with only 22 per cent of other families (Table 49). Similarly 42 per cent of heads of one parent families feel they ~~were~~ are worse off than their neighbours, compared with 12 per cent (Table 50). And 37 per cent felt they were worse off than the average in society, compared with 18 per cent of heads of two parent families (Table 51).

Comparisons with the past to some extent mirrored the divisions of living standard between parents of different marital status. Thus, while about 36 per cent of all one parent families feel they are no worse off than in the past (compared with 13 per cent of other families) (Table 52), as many as three quarters of separated and divorced mothers say they are worse off after the end of marriage or separation (Table 44). However about a fifth of all fatherless families ~~now~~ say they are better off than previously, that is, divorced and widowed women who say that they have experienced greater privation.

Finally an indication of the diffidence of one parent families in asserting their rights appears in the difference between the objective and subjective indices of overcrowding (Table 22/5). Although substantially more children in one parent families were objectively overcrowded, expressions of need for additional accommodation were about as common among two parent as one parent families. Is it the awareness that society is not exactly generous in acknowledging their needs which disposes these one parent families not to be assertive about their needs or rights?

Conclusions.

The evidence from the survey has confirmed, illustrated and extended the analysis of deprivation begun in the introduction to this chapter. The one parent families best protected against poverty are those headed by a man, the families of non-manual workers, and widows and their families, although it must be stressed that all these groups still suffer deprivations of various kinds in relation to two parent families. Older mothers who have already got a home together (and in some ways younger mothers who have not yet started home-building) may be relatively less disadvantaged than the separated wives and families of semi-and unskilled manual workers who proved to be especially vulnerable. These wide variations in circumstances between different groups indicate that data should be presented by marital status, sex and age of the head of the household if we wish to avoid concealing the disadvantaged position of certain groups.

Explanations of the disadvantages of one parent families must be sought at a number of levels beyond the stage reached in home-building. Above all we must examine the manner in which relationships ^{of dominance and subordination} between the sexes are institutionalised, particularly in marriage, so that mothers ~~also~~ have restricted access to resources except through ~~their~~ husbands. Second, explanation has to be pursued through the history and present effect of direct social policies for lone parents, including protection by the courts and taxation laws, as well as education, welfare and housing services and social security payments. The story here, with the possible recent exception of widowed mothers, is of the tendency for a principle of "less eligibility" to operate - of aid falling short of that required to establish parity of status and of living standards with married parents, especially married mothers.

And finally, explanation has to be pursued through the unequal opportunities of lone parents to secure alternative resources through the labour market.

In each respect, lone parents of different social class are differently placed. What has to be recognized is that the three systems of law carefully identified and described by the Finer Committee - the law of divorce, the law which the magistrates administer as between husband and wife, and mother and putative father, and the law of supplementary benefits, which is the successor ~~to~~ of the poor law - reflect and help to confirm among lone parents ~~general~~ inequalities ~~between the classes~~ which are general between classes.

14

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...