
The Rise and Fall of a Pedagogical Empire: The Board of State Charities and the Indiana Philosophy of Giving

Milton Gaither*

This article describes a moment in Indiana's history when many institutions united in a vast educational endeavor to change the philanthropic traditions of the people. Led by the Indiana Board of State Charities, the progressive forces in philanthropic work self-consciously set out to steer Indiana away from a patchwork system of poor relief and toward a bureaucratic, organized, and efficient system of preventive measures. Their efforts, spanning the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth, proved so successful that the movement was eventually deemed unnecessary and the massive educational front it organized was neglected.

There are at least two reasons why a study of this process is necessary. A standard history of philanthropy like Robert Bremner's *American Philanthropy* chronicles the shift from charity to organized philanthropy and from amateur almsgiving to scientifically managed care, but it does not explain how this shift came about. If it is true that "it was the spread of this scientific approach" that impressed reformers as "the great humanitarian achievement of their day," then it would seem important that the historian investigate how this spread was accomplished.¹ A second reason is the uniqueness of the Indiana situation. While charity organization was a national movement, its remarkable success in Indiana suggests that at least in this regard progressivism was more potent than standard accounts have noted. The "Indiana way" may indeed be moderation in all things with a tendency to round off the corners and blunt the sharp points of dispute, but the charity reformers of Indiana were notable not so much for their moderation as for their zeal. Their success suggests that the much-touted Indiana love of tradition might need to be qualified, at least for this period, with an equally strong emphasis on innovation. Robert Crunden has suggested the term "innovative nostalgia" as a label for the mindset of progressive reformers. This

* Milton Gaither is assistant professor of education at Messiah College, Grantham, Pennsylvania. The author would like to thank Robert W. Lynn for his prescient comments on an earlier version of this paper and Andrea Walton for her encouragement and careful reading throughout the research and writing. Also helpful were the comments of the anonymous reviewers of the *Indiana Magazine of History*.

¹Robert H. Bremner, *American Philanthropy* (1960; reprint, Chicago, 1988), 86.

article demonstrates the validity of such a paradoxical description of organized giving in Indiana.²

While organized concern for the general welfare in Indiana extends back at least to the original 1816 state constitution, which contained notably “progressive” educational and prison clauses, it was 1889 which saw the beginning of the most effective instrument for organizing Indiana’s benevolent work, the Board of State Charities. The brainchild of prominent Indiana citizens Timothy Nicholson and Oscar Carleton McCulloch, the board sought to organize Indiana’s charitable and correctional institutions along scientific principles and served as the transitional force from the largely private nineteenth-century efforts to twentieth-century government operations.

Nicholson, dubbed “master Quaker” by his biographer, was beyond question the grand old man of organized charity in Indiana. He was by profession a bookseller in Richmond, where he served as a trustee for forty-nine years at Earlham College. After the Civil War he embarked on a long career of social action as a leader in administering Quaker relief to freedmen. In 1867 he joined the Indiana Yearly Meeting’s committee on prison reform, which began his forty-year campaign to regularize and humanize Indiana’s correctional facilities. He served on the Indiana Board of State Charities from 1889 to 1908 and in 1901 was elected president of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections.³

If Nicholson personified the board’s history, McCulloch represented its vitality. In 1870 he gave up a lucrative career in drug sales to attend the Chicago Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1873. After serving for four years as a Congregational minister in Sheboygan, Wisconsin, McCulloch moved to the Plymouth Church in Indianapolis. By 1884 he had built one of America’s first and most successful “institutional churches,” where creeds were replaced by lecture courses, savings and loan offices, and organized charity. With Plymouth as his base, McCulloch created a wide array of philanthropic organizations, including the Charity Organization Society (1878), the Children’s Aid Society (1881), Flower Mission Training School for Nurses (1882), the Dime Savings and Loan Association (1885), and the Summer Mission for Sick Children (1890). He was president of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1891 and is perhaps best known for his six-generation study called “the Tribe of Ishmael,” charting the heritability of “feeble-mindedness” and associated behavioral abnormalities. His work was

²James H. Madison, *The Indiana Way: A State History* (Bloomington, Ind., 1986), 228; Robert Morse Crunden, *Ministers of Reform: The Progressives’ Achievement in American Civilization, 1889–1920* (New York, 1982).

³See Walter Carleton Woodward, *Timothy Nicholson, Master Quaker: A Biography* (Richmond, Ind., 1927).

first published in the national conference proceedings for 1888 and subsequently disseminated throughout the nation in state and county publications. McCulloch drafted and was largely responsible for the passage of the law that created the Indiana Board of State Charities and by his death in 1891 had gained a reputation of near mythic proportions among Indiana reformers.⁴

The first secretary of the state board and one of the most tireless workers in organized giving was Alexander Johnson. Born in England to a respectable Baptist merchant family, Johnson immigrated in 1869 to Canada and then to Chicago and Cincinnati, following the cloth manufacturing trade. But in 1882 he volunteered with the Cincinnati Associated Charities, and by 1884, when he became secretary of this organization, he had dedicated himself to professional social work. After serving as secretary of the Chicago Charity Organization Society, he became secretary of the newly created Board of State Charities. His specific interest in the "feeble-minded" led to his appointment in 1893 as superintendent of the Indiana State School for the Feeble-minded at Fort Wayne.

Johnson's work with the National Conference of Charities and Corrections was considerable. He served as secretary from 1890–1893, in 1900, and again, this time with salary, from 1904–1912. He was elected president of that organization in 1897. Though he also became active in the American Red Cross, he maintained a visible presence and palpable influence at the national conference until his death at the age of 94.⁵

The board these men created and governed disbanded in 1936 when the Indiana legislature created the Department of Public Welfare, but during its forty-seven-year history it revised the way many Indiana citizens thought about and practiced charity, and it provided opportunities in the form of its *Annual Report* and its annual conference for like-minded individuals to network, share ideas, and strategize for political and educational action.⁶

Though prominent nineteenth-century Indiana citizens like George Washington Julian, Isaac Reed, and Almira Harrah would

⁴See Genevieve C. Weeks, *Oscar Carleton McCulloch, 1843–1891: Preacher and Practitioner of Applied Christianity* (Indianapolis, 1976).

⁵Alexander Johnson, *Adventures in Social Welfare: Being Reminiscences of Things, Thoughts and Folks during Forty Years of Social Work* (Fort Wayne, Ind., 1923).

⁶No complete history of the Indiana Board of State Charities exists, though the sources for such an account are readily available. The only accounts extant are by veterans of the organization itself. The latest, though not the best, of these is John A. Brown, *Historical Sketches of Public Welfare in Indiana and Indiana State Conference on Social Welfare* (n.p., 1963). There is a good literature on scientific philanthropy as a phase of the history of social welfare. See Michael B. Katz, *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America* (New York, 1986), and Edwin Amenta, *Bold Relief: Institutional Politics and the Origins of Modern American Social Policy* (Princeton, N.J., 1998).

have demurred, Emma Lou Thornbrough's generalization that mid-nineteenth-century Hoosiers tended to be reluctant to spend on public services, opting instead to "maintain law and order through private efforts," captures well the perception of the Indiana mind held by reformers.⁷ It was this longstanding belief in self-help, frontier individualism, *ad hoc* charity, antiplanning, antibigness, and anticontrol that the men who masterminded the Board of State Charity sought to change. They wanted to replace amateur giving with professional management, to shift the emphasis of charity from body to soul and from treatment to prevention, and to prove to the rest of the country that Indiana was no longer backwards and backwoods but in the forefront of corrective planning and organizing.

Perhaps the most visible element in the ideology of progressive charity organizers was the desire to have Indiana switch from outdoor to indoor relief. While outdoor relief supplied handouts freely to beggars or to those in need, indoor relief consisted of institutionalized care properly managed and overseen. It was the firm conviction of members of the board and their supporters that almsgiving meant misfortune for the recipient. The rhetoric on this topic could get quite heated, as comments from W. C. Smallwood of Terre Haute's Society for Organized Charity make clear: "Finally, my co-workers and friends, if you have not. . .the heart to say 'No' when found 'not worthy,' then stay out of the charity work and stop creating paupers and encouraging professionals." Sydney B. Davis, president of the Third State Conference of Charities, expressed the same sentiment: "Much harm to the individual and the community comes from misdirected, ignorant, careless, misnamed charity. Much of our so-called charity is only laziness and selfishness. The man who gives to the vagrant is a public enemy. If there was no back-door giving there would be no tramps."⁸

Essential to the idea of indoor relief was the principle of cooperation for prevention. For indoor relief to work, every citizen and every organization had to present a united front against almsgiving. C. E. Prevey, secretary of Associated Charities in Fort Wayne, explained cooperation as "the centralization of the philanthropic forces of the city corresponding to the centralization which has taken place in the industrial world." These groups needed to unite in a common mission to eradicate handouts, for as Johnson noted, "one of the effects on a thinking mind of many years of varied social work is a profound distrust of relief in every form; a positive conviction that its complete eradication, except in the presence of overwhelming disaster, would be a great social gain."⁹

⁷Emma Lou Thornbrough, *Indiana in the Civil War Era: 1850-1880* (Indianapolis, 1965), 6.

⁸Indiana, Board of State Charities, *Report, 1894*, part II, 7, 43.

⁹"Fifth Annual State Conference, November 11, 12, 13, 1896," *Indiana Bulletin of Charities and Corrections* (June 1897), 102; Johnson, *Adventures in Social Welfare*, 53.

Along with the idea of prevention was the replacement of concern over bodily suffering with care of the inner person or what came to be called "mental hygiene." Father John R. Quinlan of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul made the connection explicit: "Too many engaged in charitable work are satisfied with relieving without trying to reform. It is more charitable to reform the degradation of heart and soul than to relieve bodily wants." McCulloch, founder and guiding spirit of the consolidation movement, agreed: "life is spiritual and not material. . .[,] it is our souls, not our bodies, which are the significant things of life." The care of the soul of the weak person was not the sort of thing just anyone could do, so it is not surprising to find reformers advocating the establishment of professional standards for care-givers over the traditional practice of granting such posts as political favors. Board secretary Ernst Bicknell looked forward to the day when "wards of the State will be entrusted only to officers of recognized training and fitness."¹⁰

At the heart of charity ideology was a desire to replace unorganized almsgiving with organized work guided by professionals who would seek to prevent poverty by altering the soul such that the individual would become a productive member of society. The motivations behind such a perspective were diverse and contradictory. As the foregoing quotations demonstrate, a religious spirit permeated the rhetoric. Most of the members of the board and a high percentage of those attending the annual conferences were either members of the clergy or active in local churches. Yet many were businessmen as well, and pecuniary motivations surfaced nearly as frequently as religious ones. Johnson frankly noted the construction of poor asylums served as both "an insurance of every citizen against death by destitution, and . . . a protection of the well-to-do against the assaults of those who might be made desperate by suffering." W. C. Ball, speaking at the eighth annual conference in 1899, agreed that the poor person "must be helped, or assisted to help himself, lest he keep himself rather wastefully at our expense. Either this or he must be disposed of as Cain disposed of Abel."¹¹

Nor does this practical theme exhaust the motives of the reformers. Pervading their discussions was a keen self-consciousness of the position of Indiana relative to that of other states. The state board and the state conference were only one subdivision of a national movement with its own organizations and conferences, and the rep-

¹⁰Indiana State Conference of Charities, *Proceedings, 1896*, 10; Oscar C. McCulloch, *The Open Door: Sermons and Prayers* (Indianapolis, 1892), 107; Indiana, Board of State Charities, *Report, 1896*, 15. See Theresa Richardson, *The Century of the Child: The Mental Hygiene Movement and Social Policy in the United States and Canada* (Albany, N.Y., 1989).

¹¹Indiana, Board of State Charities, *Report, 1890*, appendix 2, p. 3; "Proceedings of the Eighth Annual State Conference," *Indiana Bulletin of Charities and Corrections* (June 1890), 52.

representatives of Indiana wanted their state to look good in the eyes of everyone else. Nicholson remarked that "Indiana seems to have been a slow state But it has been very remarkable how soon our state has come up with the others." Johnson could boast in 1893 that "In many respects the institutions of the State of Indiana and the laws upon her statute books which govern them, compare very favorably with those of the most enlightened and progressive States of the American Union."¹² One particular reform effort that was of special concern to Johnson and of which Indiana may justly be said to have been in the vanguard was the issue of sterilization for eugenic purposes. Indiana passed the first law in the nation legalizing sterilization in 1907, though it seems that the procedure had been performed by Dr. Harry Sharp at the Indiana Reformatory since 1899. The law was strengthened in 1927 and made more explicit in 1931. L. P. Harshman reported that by 1935, 168 individuals had been sterilized under these laws, though the actual number was probably larger when unreported cases, especially those before 1907, are taken into consideration.¹³

Among progressive charity organizers, the issue of forced sterilization produced much discussion and controversy. Johnson, for example, argued strongly against the practice for a time, advocating instead the total institutionalization of all "feeble minded" persons throughout their childbearing years, even though it was clear that a surgical procedure was more economical than expensive boarding. In 1912 Johnson reluctantly reversed himself on the issue: "the number of the idiots, imbeciles, and epileptics is so appalling that I fear only the method of sterilization is equal to the need." This opinion found ready assent among the majority of his colleagues and proved to be the dominant view until new research in the late 1930s began to suggest the possibility that feeble-mindedness has an environmental rather than an hereditary cause.¹⁴

But for at least the first three decades of the twentieth century, there existed a consensus among charity organizers on the question of eugenics. Their problem then became how to persuade voters on this question. They had to convince their fellow citizens that "a nation which fosters and cares for its good-for-nothings will sooner or later become a good-for-nothing nation" and that "the remedy lies in selec-

¹²"Fifth Annual State Conference," *Indiana Bulletin of Charities and Corrections* (June 1897), 111; Indiana, Board of State Charities, *Report, 1893*, 42.

¹³Harshman's figures can be found in the *Indiana Bulletin of Charities and Corrections* (March 1935), 484-85.

¹⁴"Proceedings of the Twenty-First State Conference," *Indiana Bulletin of Charities and Corrections* (June 1913), 268. For a partial history of sterilization in Indiana see Stephen Ray Hall, "Oscar McCulloch and Indiana Eugenics" (Ph.D. dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1993). Philip Reilly, *The Surgical Solution: A History of Involuntary Sterilization in the United States* (Baltimore, Md., 1991), provides the best survey of the movement from a national perspective.

tive and eugenic sterilization. It is . . . the kindest service possible to the defective, namely, the prevention of his coming into existence." The answer, it seemed, was "by the diffusion of sound information and the enlightenment of public opinion," which would insure that marriages between mental incompetents "could be made as odious in the mind of the general public as they are now to those who have studied and thought upon the question."¹⁵

The charity reformers had set for themselves the difficult task of changing the thoughts and behaviors of the majority of Indiana's citizens on a series of issues that penetrated to the deepest assumptions about the nature of the person, the responsibility of the individual to further the general good, the method of stewardship, and the procedures of generosity. Success, they came to realize, would require the coordinated effort of many institutions tirelessly serving over a long period of time. In short, educational success would require exactly the same sort of organized effort that they were preaching for philanthropy itself. And so they set themselves to the task.

At the turn of the century churches still played a powerful role in shaping the opinions of most citizens, and therefore the reformers turned especially to the pulpit for assistance. At the fourth conference in 1895 W. C. Smallwood asked, "how can the Church help the poor from a charity organization standpoint?" and answered, "if the ministry would at least once a month deliver a lecture on scientific giving, would not the effect be felt?" The proposal here only expanded the program already in effect that asked Indiana pastors to set aside the last Sunday of October as "Prison Sunday." Since 1890 the board had been sending out literature to churches across the state prior to the Prison Sunday sermon "for the purpose of supplying hints and illustrations for such discourses."¹⁶

Attendees of the annual state conferences began to utilize the pulpit more directly as well. Some of them were pastors in their own right, but even those who were not would often preach as guests, especially on the Sunday after the conference. On this day nearly every pulpit in the town hosting the conference would be filled by some guest speaker fresh from a weekend's collegial stimulation. This tradition of guest-preaching persisted until 1933, when the conference organizers finally capitulated to increasing diversity and decided to hold the conference during the week so as not to offend Jewish delegates or secular persons.

Another educative institution the charity reformers seized upon was the press. From the board's very beginnings the press had been

¹⁵"Review of 'Fewer and Better Babies,'" *Indiana Bulletin of Charities and Corrections* (February 1932), 447-48; Indiana, Board of State Charities, *Report*, 1893, 60.

¹⁶Indiana State Conference of Charities, *Proceedings*, 1896, 8; Indiana, Board of State Charities, *Report*, 1890, 18.

a crucial element in its strategy. Johnson, who recognized the influence the press exercised on politics, utilized it for the board's purposes.¹⁷ Johnson was able to count on the support of the leading men of various professions for plans that had been worked out collectively by such literary groups as the Fortnightly Literary Club and the Commercial Club. In these clubs prominent Indianapolis newspapermen like Bicknell and William Fortune swapped ideas with the charity organizers and in so doing picked up a "scoop" or two, interpreted of course with the most congenial spin. Fortune used his partnership with Colonel Eli Lilly and his own position at the *News*, to create "civic projects aimed at making Indianapolis into a progressive, modern city which would keep pace with the changing world around it." Included in this modernization project was the organization of the city's philanthropic resources, perhaps most notably in response to the depression of 1893–1894, but also later with the Indiana War Chest, which would eventually become the Board of Public Welfare, of which Fortune would become the first chairman. Surely Johnson spoke from experience when noting that "the enviable reputation of Indiana in social work is largely due to the way the Board of State Charities has made known and has carried into effect, the wishes and desires of the best people of the state."¹⁸

The press was an early ally to the charity reformers, and the relationship continued for several decades. Bicknell was surprised and delighted to learn that his early association with the board as an Indianapolis newspaperman resulted in his unanimous election as secretary to replace Johnson. Thus the tradition of a close relationship between board and press was continued and even strengthened as the man at the helm combined an insider's knowledge of both domains. In his 1915 address to the state conference entitled "The Newspaper as an Interpreter of Social Welfare," Tom S. Elrod made this connection clear, stating that "there is a vast difference between printing something about poverty, crime or mental sickness, and printing something that is strong enough to arouse the public to a point where the removal of unnecessary causes will be demanded." This close association was to continue throughout the board's existence. Even in its final years one could find newsmen such as Harold C. Feightner of the Indianapolis *News* speaking regularly at the annual conference.¹⁹

Perhaps the most powerful educational forces for organized philanthropy were the board's own initiatives. One of the major provi-

¹⁷Alexander Johnson, "A State Aged 100: Glimpses of Social Progress in Indiana During One Hundred Years," *The Survey*, XXXII (January 1919), 8.

¹⁸Charles Latham, *William Fortune (1863–1942): A Hoosier Biography* (Indianapolis, 1994), 33; Johnson, *Adventures in Social Welfare*, 169.

¹⁹"Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Conference," *Indiana Bulletin of Charities and Corrections* (June 1916), 224–25; see, for example, Harold C. Feightner, "Influence of the Press on Social Relations," *ibid.* (February 1932), 55–58.

sions of the board's charter was the production by the secretary of an annual report. Under Johnson's administration this report quickly became much more than merely a compilation of the board's minutes or a summation of expenditures. Johnson and his successors Bicknell and Amos W. Butler used the report as a pulpit for proclaiming the gospel of charity organization in ways analogous to Horace Mann's famous reports for the Massachusetts Board of Education. "There is probably no other part of the work of the Board more likely to subserve the end for which it was created," Johnson stated, "than the plentiful distribution of well chosen literature." Johnson also expanded the role of secretary by advising and suggesting improved methods, speaking at public meetings, and promoting the cause of charity. "In these ways," he concluded, "I have done something towards popularizing the methods of charity which this Board stands for [. . . which] may be stated in the two words, efficiency and economy."²⁰

The greatest instrument of education employed by the Board was its annual State Conference of Charities and Corrections, explicitly modeled on the national conference. Johnson had noted early the significance of the national conference: "There is nothing more useful to the members of a Board of Charities, in qualifying them to perform their responsible duties to the State, than attendance upon the meetings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections." In 1890 the first state conference, held in Indianapolis, was attended by over one hundred and fifty people.

Delegates to the annual conference had the opportunity to meet others, to hear reports of the latest advances in various fields, to be inspired by nationally known figures, and to have their resolve steeled and their doubts assuaged by the solidarity prompted by the event. Perhaps one of the most important functions of the conference was to provide participants a larger narrative of progress within which each participant could place his or her own struggles. Very quickly the presidential address at the annual conference resembled a grand review, an attempt by a state leader to provide the group with a collective and useful past. Thus every annual presidential address gradually took on the same general tenor, since the familiar story of Indiana's rise from the mire of a past of unorganized charities to the stunning prospects of the current day's heights was told over and over again.

Once this history was formalized it found its way into official printed publications of the society, the most notable of which was Butler's *A Century of Progress*. By the time Butler's book was published, the founders McCulloch and Nicholson had joined early sec-

²⁰Indiana, Board of State Charities, *Report*, 1892, 24-25; *ibid.*, 1893, 23-24.

retaries Johnson, Bicknell, and Butler himself as a holy patriarchy of the movement, and the history Butler relates is generous in its praise of these figures. The document itself was displayed, sold, and given away at the state conference year after year and was in such demand that by 1916 Butler had revised it three times. His account has been followed by every successive chronicler of the state board, leaving behind an educational legacy the reach of which has been unquestionably broad and the therapeutic effect of which on the state's charity workers must surely have been significant.²¹

Just how much impact did the ideas of charitable organizations have on reform practices? Throughout the board's existence attendance at the conferences continued to increase, reflecting an increasingly broad reach into various Indiana counties. Joan E. Marshall provides two helpful case studies of Lafayette and Tippecanoe County that demonstrate just how pervasive the charity organization ideology was: she notes that "the founders of both the Tippecanoe County Children's Home Association and the Indiana Board of State Charities shared a common Progressive Era perception of dependent children as having only tenuous ties to their parents that could be snipped and reattached permanently to good substitute families."²² Such work begins to demonstrate the relationship between idea and activity and between the intellectual and social histories of welfare policy and practice.

The 1930s saw many changes in organized benevolence. The state conference, reflecting increased professionalization and the resultant concern for proper nomenclature, had changed its name to the State Conference on Social Work as early as 1925. In 1932 the usual full coverage given of the conference was replaced in the *Bulletin of Charities and Corrections* by short summaries of all but the major addresses, a move that coincided with the changing nature of social service as a profession. The next year the Board of State Charities reorganized as the Indiana Department of Public Welfare. In 1936 the *Bulletin* was discontinued and the *Indiana Welfare News* replaced it. The stated goal of this new publication was "PROMOTION of social betterment among our aged, or physically and mentally handicapped, our wayward and dependent and other wise less fortunate fellow citizens, at the least possible expense to the taxpayers OF THE STATE."

²¹Indiana Department of Public Welfare, *A Century of Progress: A Study of the Development of Public Charities and Corrections, 1790–1915* (Jeffersonville, Ind., 1916).

²²Indiana, Board of State Charities, *Report, 1890*, 17; Joan E. Marshall, "The Charity Organization Society and Poor Relief for the Able-Bodied Unemployed: Lafayette, Indiana, 1905–1910," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XCIII (September 1997), 242; Marshall, "Parents and Foster Parents, Shapers of Progressive Era Child Saving Practices: A Case Study, Tippecanoe County, Indiana, 1887–1916," *ibid.*, XC (June 1994), 173.

The magazine continued to note the State Conference on Social Work, but it offered only selected quotations from various addresses.²³

All in all the new publication was a more popular affair, seemingly intended for leisurely perusal by professional social workers rather than by the "leading citizens of the state." There were sections written in the style of *Reader's Digest*, which related anecdotes of the humorous experiences of regional social workers or that presented in colloquial dialect some of the grammatical, Freudian, and other slips of uneducated clients of the state. As the years passed the intellectual content of the magazine grew increasingly thin while the production quality rose, as glossy pictures and elegant layout replaced the homespun style of earlier issues. All of this reflected national trends, to be sure, but it also suggests that the movement could afford to dispense with the fundamentally intellectual concerns of explaining and justifying its mission, because its mission had in large measure been accomplished. By the 1950s there was no longer pressing need to expound the message of organized giving. Having no opposition to identify and censure, at length even the flimsy *Indiana Welfare News* was discontinued.²⁴

²³*Indiana Welfare News*, I (November 1936), 2. The capitalization of the phrase "promotion of the state" is in the original.

²⁴For recent legislation and discussion see State of Indiana, Family and Social Services Administration, *Indiana State Plan, Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193: Partnership for Personal Responsibility* (Indianapolis, 1996), and State of Indiana, Family and Social Services Administration, *Welfare Reform: Working in Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1996).