The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 28
Issue 4 *December*

Article 11

December 2001

The National Domestic Workers Union and the War on Poverty

Elizabeth Beck
Georgia State University

The National Domestic Workers Union and the War on Poverty

ELIZABETH BECK

Georgia State University
School of Social Work

This article explores values, strategies, and tensions found within the War on Poverty and examines a War on Poverty-supported initiative, the National Domestic Workers Union(NDWU). The article makes the argument that the NDWU is illustrative of the War on Poverty in that each held structurally based descriptions of poverty and individually based prescriptions. The article explores the relationship of domestic service to the institutions of racism, classism, and sexism and how the NDWU strategies of training, service, and, advocacy-like those of the War on Poverty-sought to address the needs of individual domestic workers while circumventing larger and more complicated issues.

Along with establishing government programs to reduce poverty, hunger, and disease, the War on Poverty lowered barriers to political participation and supported education and training for African Americans. Underpinning much of the War on Poverty was the notion that grass roots social action needed to be cultivated so that a new generation of reformers could move from the neighborhoods into a larger public sphere (Henry, 1978; Katz, 1986; Katz, 1989; Moynihan, 1967).

Although the U.S. government's involvement in social services expanded helping poor Americans, analysis of the War on Poverty suggested a program riddled with contradictions. The primary inconsistency involved the difference between the analysis of poverty and program development. Specifically, the War on Poverty held a structurally-based description of poverty with service-based prescriptions. In this regard, David Austin (1973) questioned, "the issue is why a service strategy with a structural

diagnosis" (see discussion in Katz, 1989, p. 91). The few strategies that were structurally based focused on lack of opportunity, not on inequality. Toward developing a new generations of reformers, the War on Poverty supported community action but not its most powerful tool, conflict (Katz, 1989; Marris, Martin, & Rein, 1967).

This article explores the values, strategies, and tensions inherent within the War on Poverty by examining a specific War on Poverty supported initiative, the National Domestic Workers Union (NDWU) housed in Atlanta, as well as highlighting the work of the NDWU and its founding director, Dorothy Bolden. The information was derived from an examination of the archived original papers held by the Pullen Library Southern Labor Archives. Beyond two brief interviews with Bolden in Lerner's (1992) *Black Women in White America* and Seifer's (1976) *Nobody Speaks For Me*, Bolden has received little scholarly attention. Yet domestic service in the United States continues to hold significant implications for most low-skilled women of color and is implicated in the institutions of racism, classism, and sexism. To place the NDWU in context, the article begins with an overview of domestic work. This overview ends in the late 1970s and thus does not explore immigrants' expansion into the field of domestic work.

Race, Class, and Gender and the Domestic Worker as "Other"

Between 1890–1960, in the south, the majority of employed African American women were domestic workers (Katzman, 1978). Dubois described this work pattern as "a despised race to a despised calling" (in Rollins, 1985). Practices established under slavery continued to affect the association between race and domestic work. Specifically, black women ran the households for whites under slavery, and this norm continued after abolition for those whites who could afford it. Indeed, as Katzman (1978) suggested, in the south, domestic service was integral to the maintenance of its racial caste structure.

Slavery also provided the context for what has been considered by Hill Collins (2000) a key controlling image of African American domestic workers, the "mammy." As represented by the character in Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind*, this persona holds repercussions for domestic workers today. The

Mammy, who was faithful and obedient and loved her white children more then her own, continues to be the yardstick by which domestic workers are often measured.

Domestic service does not provide a gateway toward a better life. Rather, it reinforces racial stereotypes, which helps to maintain a social, racial, and economic underclass. In this regard a theory of poverty could be invoked, suggesting that poverty exists, in part, so that the poor are forced to service the non-poor (Gans, 1991).

Domestic work has always been women's work and women's secondary gender position within society and the household are associated with its low status (Dill, 1994; Katzman, 1978; Rollins, 1985). However, through an exploration of the 19th century's Cult of Domesticity, Van Raaporst (1988) suggested that domestic work was actually less than women's work. Supporting women as demure, the 19th century medical field warned against women's engagement in physical and household labor. This caution was heeded. Van Raaporst argued that this warning marked the point in time at which domestic workers once again—as during slavery—lost their identity as women. Thus, the nature of household work relegated domestic workers to a gender status of less than women (Van Raaporst, 1988). Further supporting this view is Rollins' (1985) claim that domestic workers became surrogates for, or extensions of, the employer's least feminine self.

An exploration into the existentialist construct of the "Other" provides an interesting framework for exploring the implications of race, class, and gender with domestic work, and helps to interpret the role that domestic workers held in many households. The concept of Other focuses on the idea that individuals are viewed from two perspectives, that of their own self and how they appear to the Other (Hagel, 1807; Sartre, 1992). deBeauvoir extended the concept of the Other to explore reciprocity. Specifically, she explained, "to me, I am self, you are other; but to you, you are self, and I am other" (de Beauvoir, 1952, p.). However, according to de-Beauvoir this reciprocity does not exist among men and women. Both men and women view men as the subject and women as the object or in the subordinate role of the Other.

There are several interesting ways in which Othering is featured in domestic service. First, consider that often a domestic

worker's race, class, and gender in themselves supports Othering. However, even if gender, race, or class is shared, within her work environment, a domestic worker is never subject, and becomes Other to the women and families that employ her. Second, either through an initiated conversation by an employer or through observation, domestic workers often gain access to intimate knowledge about very private aspects of their employers' lives (Dill, 1994; Kousha, 1995; Kousha, 1999; Rollins, 1985). To protect her status an employer might consider it in her best interest to view the domestic worker as one who might provide comfort, but not as an individual who has thoughts and feelings and is able to make judgements, that is as Other.

The Othering of domestic workers is also evidenced in Rollins' (1985) characterization of the relationship between domestic workers and their employers, as maternalism. Rollins explained that maternalism, not unlike Othering, has the dual function of protecting and nurturing as well as degrading and insulting. "The female employer with her motherliness, protectiveness, and generosity is expressing in a distinctly feminine way her lack of respect for the domestic as an autonomous, adult employee" (p. 186) and as such ensures the domestic worker's role as Other.

Rollins' (1985) discussions with women employers about their evaluation of domestic employees provides further evidence of maternalism. Employers indicated that they held high value for domestic workers personal attributes and their personal relationship. In contrast, domestic workers reported feeling at the whim of employers who may want to chit-chat or share their burdens (Dill, 1994; Rollins,1985). Thus, as Kousha (1999) explained, in addition to cooking, cleaning, and childcare, domestic workers were often forced to respond to the emotional needs of their employer.

In exploring relationships between employers and employees, employers' views of employees ranged from invisible to "like family," a term often used by employers. In this regard, employers indicated that they sought intimate relationships with their employees. However, in households where the employee was viewed "like family," little mutuality was actually found. Instead, relationships tended to be steeped within the power

dynamics that characterized maternalism and women as Other (Dill, 1994; Rollins, 1985).

Domestic Work as Contract Work and Unionization

Domestic work also raises a variety of labor issues and important implications stem from the exclusion of domestic work from wage-an-hour legislation. Foremost, domestic work has always existed outside of the purview of wage, hour, and safety regulations. When state legislators began to limit the workday for women, domestic work was disregarded (Van Raaporst, 1988). In order to pacify the racist sentiment of southern Democrats, the Social Security Act excluded employment sectors dominated by African Americans such as domestic work (Williams, 1986). Moreover, there are no standards for domestic work. Uniformity does not exist in terms of demands, expectations, and remuneration. Thus, firings and reprimands can be capricious and arbitrary, and there is no process for mediation (Van Raaporst, 1988).

Isolation is perhaps the most difficult aspect of domestic work for the workers themselves as well as for addressing the labor-related issues. Domestic workers must bargain individually, without the sense of the collective. Additionally, domestic workers lack institutional support for addressing sexual and other harassment (Rollins, 1985). Finally, because domestic workers tended to work in areas outside of their geographic community, their isolation is further exacerbated. In interviews, domestic workers often talked about long and lonely bus rides taking them away from their family and community (Bolden, 1965–1979; Rollins, 1985).

Unionization and Domestic Service

Women led the organizing of the U.S. garment industry and played critical roles in the development of union activity in numerous sectors. Yet except for perhaps in public education, women historically have been excluded from union leadership, and women-dominated employment sectors largely have been left out of unionization drives (Foner & Lewis, 1989). Despite these obstacles, there were attempts to unionize domestic workers.

In 1916 Jane Street founded and became secretary to IWW Local No. 113, a Denver Domestic Worker's Industrial Union. Working to undermine the employment agencies, known as employment sharks, which served as paid intermediaries for employment placement, she developed her own employment agency. Within a year she attracted enough domestic workers that a supply-and-demand strategy enabled Local No 113 to drive up wages. As a way of circumventing the practice of employees living with families, Street organized communal housing. Toward improving domestic workers' treatment, her employment service asked employers to do such things as speak gently to employees. If employers did not meet demands, Street advised them that they would be blacklisted. Inspired by Street's success, six other locals were started across the country, however, none of these efforts solidified (Van Raaporst, 1988).

Organizing was further thwarted by the development of a collective response from the business community. For example, in Atlanta during the 1950s, the white community ended domestic workers' attempts to unionize by getting landlords to raise the rents of striking domestic workers. Moreover, the city passed an ordinance that required all union members to pay a 25 dollar license fee (Van Raaporst, 1988).

It is important to note that not all resistance was collective. Indeed the literature is full of numerous examples of individual acts of resistance in which women sought to address their own status and the status of the field (see for example Dill, 1994; Katzman, 1978; Rollins, 1985).

Domestic Workers' Views About Their Work

In interviews with domestic workers, most expressed ambivalence about their work (Katzman, 1978, Rollins, 1985). On the positive side the women interviewed tended to relate their feelings to the household in which they were employed. Other advantages included flexible hours, not being subjected to the humiliations associated with a segregated work environment, and when no one was home being able to act as their own boss. Negative experiences were also closely tied to the household in

which the women worked. Drawbacks included difficult work, light housekeeping becoming heavy work, removal of breaks, increase in expectations on the part of the employer, as well as low pay and long commutes (Dill, 1988; Katzman, 1978; Rollins, 1985).

Dorothy Bolden and the National Domestics Workers Union

Born in 1824, Dorothy Bolden, was the granddaughter of a slave and a third-generation domestic worker, who grew-up in the Vine City neighborhood of Atlanta. She started domestic work at nine and quit 41 years later to devote herself full-time to the NDWU. In her mid-twenties she was arrested for talking back to her employer who fired her and whom she described as the meanest person she knew. On her way home from work, Bolden was picked up by the police. The officers told her that she was sick in the head for talking back and sent her to a mental institution where she stayed for five nights. Bolden credits her uncle who knew a judge for her release (Bolden, 1965–1979).

Bolden was married twice and bore ten children; three of whom died in infancy. When she was not working, she said she was in school checking on her children, working with the PTA, and counseling other parents. Her first organized activist experience actually revolved around her children's schooling. When the Atlanta superintendent sought to move all of the classes in her children's all African American school to a condemned building, Bolden vowed that she would never let that happen. She organized parents and ministers not only to protest against the use of the condemned school, but also to fight for a new building. She and her group kept up the pressure, and six years later a new building was opened. "I really gave our superintendent a hard way to go. I think he was dumbfounded to see that low-income people like us were really concerned with quality education" (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1624/31). According to Bolden, she did not know how she assumed a leadership role, just that people would call her when anything happened in the neighborhood (Seifer, 1976).

The civil rights movement unified Bolden's interest in social justice and domestic workers. Active in the Student Non-Violent

Coordinating Committee (SNCC), she served as the liaison between the planning committee and domestic workers. Specifically, she provided outreach and education to domestic workers about the strategies and tactics of the civil rights movement. She also conducted voter registration drives with domestic workers. Bolden described the civil rights struggle as something that had really gotten "into my blood and has not gotten out" (Seifer, 1976, p. 157). Although Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. died before she began organizing domestic workers, she indicated that "all of the inspiration came from him" (Seifer, 1976, p. 157).

Bolden first thought about full-time organizing in the 1960s but was concerned about losing her income. However, financial constraints became less controlling when the advent of school integration brought larger issues to Bolden. Bolden explained: "I knew that the maids weren't making anything for anyone to talk about sending their children across town. We couldn't afford the twenty-cents round trip for the bus." Moreover, "We couldn't integrate the schools out there barefooted. Cause they weren't making no money. I didn't want to integrate my child into a society like that [white society]. Have no shoes or decent clothes to put on" (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1624/31).

In 1968 founding director Dorothy Bolden, with the help of a young civil rights attorney, Maynard Jackson, called the first meeting of the National Domestic Workers Union. A handful of church leaders, activists, and domestic workers started the NDWU, and later that year the NDWU incorporated for the purpose of elevating the status of domestic workers. Membership was a dollar and a current voter registration card. By the end of 1969 there were dozens of members in good standing.

That domestic workers were not represented in the public sphere was of paramount concern to Bolden. She explained, "societies' unwavering negative attitudes toward domestic work [are] reinforced by change agent forces [who are] unresponsive to the needs of individuals in domestic service occupation" (Bolden, 1965–1979, taped interview). In fact Bolden first approached the National Urban League with the suggestion that they organize domestic workers, and while the urban league supported the idea they were not willing to take on the project (Bolden, 1965–1979).

There were about 30,000 domestic workers in Atlanta; 2,000 joined the NDWU. According to Bolden, the word "union" in the organization's title proved disconcerting to many domestic workers who, since their families depended on their income, were fearful of strikes and other traditional union tactics (Bolden, 1965–1979).

Bolden also recognized that many African Americans believed that women should walk away from domestic work, an argument articulated by activist Maria Miller Stewart in 1832 (Guy-Sheftall, 1995). Yet she also knew that in many cases that was financially impossible. Having entered the field herself for economic necessity, Bolden argued that thousands of African American women were "hopelessly dependent upon the lowest economic system [domestic work] in order to obtain the bare essentials for human need" (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1625/53). For Bolden, household work had become a necessary evil in need of improvement and not something from which one could walk away.

Therefore, Bolden stated that she never saw the NDWU engaging in strikes nor as operating from a traditional union structure (Bolden, 1965–1979). Indeed the focus of the NDWU was on training, social service, and to a lesser extent, wages and advocacy. As she explained, "I didn't organize just on money. I organized to update the field, to make it more professional" (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1625/54).

Professionalization of Housework

Training

Bolden believed that the best way to elevate wages was through professionalization. With this goal in mind, she sought and received federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) money through the local Community Action Agency to initiate a *homemakers' skills training program*, which was funded with between 20,000–30,000 dollars annually from 1969 and 1978. Bolden described the program as oriented toward the training of inner city housekeepers. The homemakers' skills training program reflected two important beliefs held by Bolden. First, low-income women had to learn skills to help them in their private roles as

mother and homemakers. In this regard, Bolden argued that "the lack of home management knowledge and skills is a major factor in intensifying and perpetuating poverty" (Bolden, 1975). Second, the perception of domestic service needed to be elevated in society as a whole so that domestic workers could take pride in their profession and their work (Bolden, 1965–1979).

The exact nature of the homemakers' skills training program depended somewhat upon the year and OEO funding, however, the program's core remained constant. In general, a twelve-week training course was offered regularly to women working as domestics. Enrollment tended to range between 10–20 participants. The training curriculum reflected Bolden's interest in supporting the professional and private lives of women and included homemaking, child development and child care, budgeting, nutrition, human relations, and health and safety (Bolden, 1965–1979). The course work also included math and reading skills. Additional aspects of the curriculum were geared exclusively toward the women's private lives, such as goal setting and family planning. Over time the training was divided into two tracks: one for women who worked in private households and the second for women who worked in institutions. The trainers were described, as case managers by Bolden and from the archives appear to be paraprofessionals, many of whom were graduates of the course. For the skills sections of the course, Bolden drew on area social services such as the literacy council (Bolden,1965–1979).

Later Bolden developed a program for non-working women living in public housing that provided training in home management, nutrition, housekeeping, sewing, budgeting, and parenting skills. In addition the program sought to create community cohesiveness, including a tenants' association with block captains. The primary goal of the tenants' association was to develop a welcoming committee that would disseminate information gained from the homemakers' skills training course. The committee also organized clean-up projects and activities for children (Bolden, 1965–1979).

In addition, the NDWU developed an informational booklet concerning social security, minimum wage, and unemployment benefits. The booklet encouraged domestic workers to ask for

overtime payments and not to exceed the negotiated workday without pay. One section outlined tasks that household workers should not perform such as standing on ladders or scrubbing floors on one's hands or knees. Employees were further reminded that they should be treated with respect, and if not, they needed to alter their work situation. The final section of the booklet was entitled *roles for maids* and suggested to women that they needed to be dependable, to keep a neat appearance, and to exercise careful use of language (Bolden, 1965–1979).

Maids Honor Day

Bolden believed that official recognition of the efforts of domestic workers could be used to help counter "a master/slave relationship between employee and employer" (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1628/97). Specifically, employers needed to remember that employees were not only humans, but also individuals with unique issues and demands. And employees needed to be reminded that their work had meaning (Bolden, 1965–1979).

The cornerstone of Bolden's public recognition strategy was the "Maids Honor Day" celebration which began in 1970. Maids Honor Day was essentially a banquet with all of the trimmings including speakers and awards. Employers and employees attended the dinner together. One of the speakers, Sony Walker, a regional director for the OEO, expressed a sentiment that captures one of Bolden's key motivations in organizing the NDWU when he said, "the dignity of work is as much a part of the four freedoms as the right to work (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1627/76).

A second feature of Maids Honor Day was an award given to the "domestic worker of the year." Employers who sent letters describing the unselfish work of their household employees nominated workers. One letter discussed how a domestic worker made nursing home visits to the mother of her employer, and another employer sent a financial contribution with his nomination, to, as he said, "sweeten the pot." Hundreds of these letters remain in the archived files. The certificate given to the employee discussed her service, energy, and dedication, as well as indicating that by example she had brought "respect and admiration to domestic employment" (Bolden, 1965–1979 1628/97).

Service

The NDWU also provide homemakers' skills trainees with social services, such as information and referral activities, limited case management services, and mentoring. The mentoring program involved pairing women having difficulty with highly competent graduates of the homemakers' skills training course. Mentors worked with individuals on such activities as budgeting, nutrition, and parenting skills. Mentors often said that they prevented women from making large financial mistakes such as taking out high interest loans. Mentors also acted as a go-between for the families and other social service workers (Bolden, 1965–1979).

The homemakers' skills training sessions also informed women about support services available to them such as legal aid, counseling, and additional tutoring. In addition, numerous activities were directed toward enhancing the participants' self-image, self-awareness, and abilities to set goals. Finally, field trips included visits to such places as the comprehensive health center clinic where women were able to procure birth control (Bolden, 1965–1979).

Advocacy

As director of the NDWU, Bolden became the spokesperson for 30,000 domestic workers in Atlanta. In this regard she advocated for services that would improve the quality of life for poor African American working women and sought to represent the reality of issues facing her constituency. As she explained, "I was out there for a cause and a reason. The reason was women and the cause was there wasn't anything to live on" (Bolden, 1956–1979,1624/31).

Bolden belonged to numerous local, state, and national organizations, and spoke at conferences and events across the country. Moreover, she maintained close relationships with such prominent Georgians such as Governor Herman Talmudge, Senator Sam Nunn, and Lillian Carter mother of President Jimmy Carter. The closeness of these relationships is evidenced in the warm banter and mutual respect shown in their correspondence. Many of Bolden's letters are requests for support. Specifically, she asked support for such items as a particular piece of legislation, public

policy, or funding for her own program. She also worked on an employment project with the Black Congressional Caucus (Bolden, 1965–1979).

In the 1970s Bolden was appointed by Health Education and Welfare Secretary Elliot Richardson to the Committee on the Status of Women's Rights and Responsibilities. As a member of that committee she consistently raised issues facing poor women. Moreover, she reminded committee members that they needed to be thinking about women such as domestic workers who were surviving on as little as six dollars per day. Bolden also used this committee to champion her major issue—the inclusion of domestic work in legislation that affects hourly minimum wages, health and childcare, and social security. Bolden also testified before Congress on these issues and advocated for national mobilization to work on full-employment legislation, raises in the minimum wage, and limits in those fields that are outside the review of regulations (Bolden, 1965–1979).

Because of her association with Jimmy Carter and friendship with Lillian Carter, Bolden was asked to address the 1976 Democratic Party Platform Committee (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1625/44). In her statement she argued that "the poor essentially live in concentration camps—locked in and cannot get out" (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1625/44). She further called the neighborhoods in which the poor live "death zones" because of the absence of working adults to meet children after school. She argued that domestic workers were not able to address issues in their own neighborhoods since they spend so few waking hours in these areas. Further, she made the point that domestic workers earn such low incomes, they cannot provide their children with opportunities to leave the "slum areas" in which they live. Bolden cited examples of some children not attending school because of inadequate clothing or because their mothers needed their help on the job. Finally she advocated again for the inclusion of household workers in legislation that affected wages and benefits (Bolden, 1965–1979).

Locally, Bolden campaigned for the development of MARTA, Atlanta's public transportation system, and advocated for MARTA to truly serve the transportation needs of the poor. She also took a major interest in the movement toward neighborhood development, citizen-run banks, and community development

corporations. Moreover, she urged that the assets and strengths of the poor needed to be incorporated into community development projects: "There are 30,000 maids that are able to give counseling and early education. They do it where they work—surely they can give this knowledge and experience to slum dwellers" (Bolden, 1965–1979, 1624/33). In an interview with Seifer (1976), Bolden described her advocacy efforts:

> I made a lot of changes. I met a lot of people. I made the Congress listen. I finally got a minimum wage through [the House of Representatives]. Bill 49 is in the Senate—an act to establish a minimum wage for domestic employees. (p. 169)

Discussion

The Southern Labor Archives File includes numerous testimonies by women who talked about the importance of the NDWU in their own personal development and in their lives. These women clearly indicated that the service aspects of Bolden's strategy made a difference to them. Several women said that they now knew that they no longer had to scrub floors on their hands and knees. Others described asking and receiving more time off and starting social security accounts.

As an advocate Bolden sought to drive up the wage scale by discouraging domestic workers from accepting less than fifteen dollars a day. Domestic workers were supported by NDWU printed materials, which they were encouraged to share with employers, indicating that fifteen dollars a day was the going rate for domestic work. These materials also encouraged employers to participate in social security and discussed the efficacy of domestic work.

As a spokesperson for domestic workers Bolden raised awareness about the issues that domestic workers experienced and the strengths that they held. Bolden's audiences ranged from government officials, members of congress, and employers to the workers themselves.

Bolden's orientation and accomplishments shows that she sought a service-based prescription to address her clearly structural based analysis of the problem. Moreover, Bolden's advocacy was steeped in raising awareness rather than in effecting larger

structural change and developing a citizens' movement. Not only did Bolden receive funding from War on Poverty programs, but also it can be suggested that she emulated it. Like the War on Poverty, Bolden primarily used a service strategy to effect a structural diagnosis of poverty. Additionally, her service strategy reflected a strategic decision articulated by Adam Yarmolinsky, a War on Poverty framer, which was not to concentrate on finding people jobs but on preparing people for jobs. Thus for Bolden, supporting domestic workers in their jobs through education was more important than finding them alternatives to domestic work. This strategy stands in contrast to more militant organizers such as Miller Stewart who believed that African Americans should not degrade themselves by participating in this profession.

Through her advocacy work, Bolden, like the War on Poverty leaders, raised awareness about structural issues of poverty as well as sought change from inside government sanctioned institutions. In this regard, Bolden's advocacy was largely centered on speech making and participation in government rather than citizen appointed committees. Similar to other War on Poverty programs that supported community action, Bolden steered clear of confrontation. While Bolden's advocacy work did support domestic workers in numerous ways, her orientation that domestic workers needed their jobs stymied her willingness to accept the more radical orientation of domestic work held by Miller Stewart and Dubois, for example. Moreover, in choosing a service strategy Bolden knew that she could effect some change in some people's lives, an outcome that was not guaranteed through an advocacy strategy alone.

Consequently, the goal and mission of the NDWU was to reduce individual hardships and although Bolden participated in relevant advocacy, she did not move beyond speech making to organizing, nor did she address the more complicated issue of the efficacy of domestic work in general.

Thus, the decision to focus on a service-based strategy within the NDWU to address economic justice did result in an implementation strategy that could only provide, at best, a mixed outcome. Consider that domestic work remains outside the purview of wage-an-hour legislation; not all domestic workers receive a minimum wage, few receive a living wage.

It is interesting to note that the same mixed result is evidenced in Bolden's advocacy of the Atlanta MARTA system. With others Bolden was able to advocate for the MARTA system to link with poor neighborhoods, however, without such tactics as broad based citizen involvement advocates lacked the power to get the system to link with the wealthy suburbs, which house numerous jobs. Thus, there remains a large disconnect in the Atlanta area between people who need jobs and access to work; a phenomena that has been described as perpetuating poverty (Brookings Institution, 2000). Perhaps the most efficacious way to address large social problems is to include both an individually based component and a component that seeks to confront structural inequalities through the use of a wide range of strategies and tactics.

Finally, Bolden herself is an example of the orientation held by the War on Poverty toward the development of community leaders. Many War on Poverty framers felt strongly that community leaders, whose skills may not be well developed, should be given opportunities to participate in and lead their communities (Farmer, 1986). From archival work that allowed Bolden's original unedited documents to be viewed, it can be noted that she had issues with grammar, spelling, and the like. But Bolden also had a flair in her writing that made her arguments compelling. From domestic worker to participation in national policy, her experience truly spoke to one of goals of the War on Poverty—supporting the development of community leaders.

References

Bolden D. (1965–1979). *Southern Labor Achieves.* Special Collections Pullen Library Georgia State University. Atlanta, GA.

de Beauvior, S. (1952). *The second sex* (3rd ed.). New York: Bantham Books.

Brookings Institution (2000). *Moving beyond Sprawl: The Challenge for Metropolitan Atlanta.* edu/urban/atlanta/transportation.htm

Dill, B. (1988). Making your job good yourself. Domestic service and the construction of personal dignity. In A. Bookman & S. Morgan (Eds.), *Women and the politics of empowerment.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dill, B. (1994). *Across the boundaries of race and class: An exploration of work and family among black domestics servants.* New York: Garland Press.

Farmer, J. (1985). *Lay bare the heart: An autobiography of the Civil Rights Movement.* New York: Arbor House.

Foner, P. & Lewis, R. (1978). *Black workers: A documented history from colonial times to the present.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Henry, A. (1978). *Politics and the professors: The Great Society in perspective.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Hill Collins, P. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge consciousness, and the politics of empowerment,* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gans, H. (1991). *People plans and policies: Essays on poverty racism and other national urban problems* (2nd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press Russell Sage Foundation.

Katz, M. (1996). *In the shadow of the poor house: A social history of welfare in America* (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Katz, M. (1989). *The undeserving poor from the War on Poverty to the war on welfare.* New York, Pantheon Books.

Katzman, D. (1978). *Seven days a week: Women in domestic service in industrializing America.* New York: Oxford.

Kousha, M. (1995). African American private household workers, white employees and their children. *International Journal of Sociology and the Family, 25,* 67–89.

Kousha, M. (1999). Race class and intimacy in southern households: Relationships between Black domestic workers and White employers. In B. Smith (Ed.). *Neither separate nor equal: Women, race, and class in the south.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lerner, G. (1992). *Black women in white America: a documented history,* (2nd ed.). New York: Vintage Books.

Marmor, T., Marshaw, J., Harvey, P. (1992). *America's misunderstood welfare state: Persistent myths and enduring realities.* New York: Basic Books.

Marris, P. & Rein, M. (1967). *Dilemmas of social reform: Poverty and community action in the United States.* New York: Atherton.

Moynihan, D. P. (1969). *National feasible misunderstanding. Community action and the war on poverty.* New York: Free Press.

Rollins, J. (1985). *Between women: Domestics and their employers.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Sartre, J. P. (1992). *Being and nothingness: A phenomenological essay on ontology* (3rd ed.). New York: First Washington Square Press.

Seifer, N. (1976). *Nobody speaks for me!: Self-portraits of American working class women.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Van Raaporst, D. (1988). *Union maids not wanted: Organizing domestic workers 1870–1940.* New York: Prager.

Williams, M. (1986). The role of racism in shaping the social security act. *Journal of Applied Social Sciences,11,* 31–44.