Volume 16, No. 8 August 1988

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

Funding Candidates: Patterns of Political Giving

Small Contributions From Individuals to Presidential Campaigns Are Equal Between Democrats and Republicans

Congress and Immigrants of the Future

Immigration Ceilings and New Admission Criteria Could Reduce the Flow of Newcomers From the Third World

Blacks and the 1988 Republican National Convention

JCPS Publication Suggests Republicans May Have to Garner New Black Support to Win in November

FOR DISPLAY ONLY
Please do not remove from the office of Communications

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

Remembering a Man Called Moses

"Call Carl" is a familiar phrase to many motorists in the Washington, D.C. area. You get stranded, have a flat, your engine quits on you, whatever—if you call one of the service stations known as "Call Carl," they send a truck and mechanic to your rescue.

Another "Call Carl" had been relied on for many years by the nation's civil rights establishment. This reference of course is to M. Carl Holman, the late president of the National Urban Coalition, who died on August 9 at age 69.

Carl was a personal friend, mentor, colleague, and fellow member of the Black Leadership Forum. He will be sadly missed. He will be fondly remembered.

The "Call Carl" idea popped in my mind when journalists and others started asking me about Carl's life and his role among black leaders. I remember him as a thoughtful, brilliant tactician that other leaders could turn to to get some of their ideas and programs off the ground. Got a problem? Call Carl. A letter to the president? Convene a high level meeting? Call Carl. And Carl always responded, even when doing so required an enormous personal sacrifice.

So many of the recent dramatic civil rights events—marches, conferences, meetings—were put together and held together by the wisdom and tenacity of Carl Holman. He was a leader's leader, one who often took the back seat while his genius was being displayed through others.

Among his many attributes—and they were considerable—was his ability to overcome the inertia that inevitably sets in when it came time to put an idea into action. Call Carl and he'd come up with a first draft, or a position paper, or a strategic plan, or he'd have the wisdom and the courage to say the idea was really not a good one in the first place.

We can't call Carl anymore. He is now responding to a higher calling. But we can remember and be grateful for his contributions on so many fronts and battlefields, and be motivated to continue the struggle.

Carl was a man of diverse interests. He was an educator, a journalist, and an award-winning poet. One of his poems, "And to the Leaders," written over forty years ago while he was a student at Lincoln University in Jefferson City, Mo., presaged the man of political acumen and vision that he was to become:

You must have vision:
Know like a blueprint the way you have come,
And know the present like a familiar sum.
Climb through the smoke to the Eastern Hill
And watch the dawn rise beautiful and still,
Fire on your tongue, fire in your heart,
Hold the helm in the dirty weather;
When war and prejudice have done their part
Lead us all out together.

For the longest time after I returned to Washington in 1972 to head the Joint Center, I used to hear Vernon Jordan refer to Carl as "Mo." I didn't think much of that at first because "Mo" sounded like it might be one of those good old home boy names like "Bo" or "Bro" or "Man" with no legal significance. But when Vernon persisted, I asked someone about this nickname. The reply: "Because Carl's name is Moses Carl Holman." He rarely used his full name. He used M. Carl Holman to be formal. Most of us knew him as just Carl Holman.

How fitting. A man called Moses helped to lead blacks and this nation to this time and place. Come to think of it, Moses was a Call Carl in his day. ■

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

Copyright © 1988 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.® The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies,** 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Linda F. Williams
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Congress of National Black Churches
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Mervyn Dymally/U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

Funding Candidates: Patterns of Political Giving

Small Contributions From Individuals to Presidential Campaigns Are Equal Between Democrats and Republicans.

by Dr. Emmett D. Carson

As November 8th draws nearer, national attention is focusing on the presidential sweepstakes as well as the 435 races in the House of Representatives and the 33 in the Senate. For those seeking elective office, it has become evident that political contributions, particularly by political action committees (PACs), are becoming more important. As the cost of running for office continues to escalate with increasingly expensive campaign technologies—radio and TV commercials, direct mail appeals, as well as public opinion polls and computers—the fundraising game has become more sophisticated and more costly than in the past years.

Candidates receive contributions from a variety of sources—individual contributors, political parties, and PACs. Several PACs even give money to other PACs. However, while some information on larger donors is available, little is known about the socioeconomic characteristics of the political givers who make contributions below $100. And even less is known about blacks who make small political contributions. Nevertheless, small contributors play important roles in determining the success of a campaign, especially for black candidates.

Blacks made substantial contributions to Jesse Jackson's 1988 and 1984 presidential campaigns. First-time black candidates often receive most of their *initial* financial support from members of the black community. This was certainly the case in the 1983 campaign of Chicago's former mayor, the late Harold Washington, and in the 1986 race of freshman Congressman Michael Espy of Mississippi.

This article provides a unique profile of the socioeconomic and political characteristics of blacks and whites who make political contributions. It is based on data from the Joint Center for Political Studies' 1987 survey conducted by the Gallup Organization. The data on political giving include direct contributions to political parties, individual candidates, and PACS. The survey was not, however, designed to identify patterns of political giving that occur through other types of organizations, such as churches, to support political activities or candidates.

Dr. Carson, a research associate at the Joint Center, is the manager of the Center's Philanthropy Project.

Who Are Political Contributors?

The majority of blacks and whites who made political contributions in 1986 gave less than $100 (table 1). Contributions of $100 or less may appear small when compared with the contributions from corporations or the wealthy, but in the aggregate they represent a significant portion of the total contributions to political organizations. Small individual contributions also serve as an important barometer for measuring the general public's willingness to put its money behind a candidate or organization, and they allow a candidate to remain viable until he or she can secure other funding.

While the overwhelming majority of both blacks and whites reported making no contribution to a political organization in 1986 (81 percent and 74 percent, respectively), among those who did contribute, the most active were older, better educated, and earned higher incomes.

Among blacks, older persons were more likely than younger persons to contribute $100 or less (in the remainder of this article, all references are to political contributions of $100 or less). Among blacks ages 18 to 30, 2.9 percent made a political contribution, compared to 3.5 percent of blacks between the ages of 30 and 50 and 4.7 percent of those over the age of 50.

Blacks with higher levels of education and those with greater household incomes were also more likely to have made a political contribution. For example, while

Table 1. Political Contributions of Blacks and Whites in 1986

	Blacks	Whites
No Contribution	81.0%	73.9%
Less than $50	2.6	8.9
$50—$99	1.0	2.8
$100—$499	0.5	3.8
$500 or More	0.1	0.7
Unreported	14.7	10.0
Total Respondents	*918*	*916*

Note: The response data in tables 1 through 3 have a sampling error of 4 percentage points for each group. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

only 1.8 percent of blacks who had not completed high school made a contribution, 3.1 percent of black high school graduates made one. This compares to 5.4 percent of blacks with some college and 9.7 percent of black college graduates. Similarly, while only 1.1 percent of blacks with household incomes below $12,000 made contributions, 5.9 percent of those with incomes of $12,000 to $25,000, 7.7 percent with incomes of $25,000 to $40,000, and 7.9 percent with incomes above $40,000 made contributions.

Contributions among blacks also vary by region and gender. Those living in the Midwest (5.9 percent) were the most likely to have contributed to a political organization, followed by blacks living in the East (4.3 percent), blacks living in the South (2.8 percent), and blacks living in the West (1.2 percent). Finally, black men were more likely to have contributed than black women (5.2 percent compared to 2.3 percent).

Party Affiliation and Political Giving

Our survey also reveals that a greater percentage of whites than blacks made political contributions, regardless of political affiliation. This difference is illustrated in table 2, which shows giving by political affiliation and race in 1986. For example, 14 percent of white Democrats made a political contribution compared to 4 percent of black Democrats. Similarly, while 18 percent of white Republicans contributed, only 1 percent of black Republicans did so.

But nonaffiliated givers contributed more than contributors who reported a specfic party preference. Six percent of black independents and 20 percent of white independents reported that they had made a political contribution in 1986.

An interesting revelation of the survey is that blacks with a Republican presidential preference for the 1988 election and those with a Democratic preference reported roughly the same level of contributions: 4 percent and 5 percent, respectively. Similarly, the giving behavior of whites with a Republican preference and those with a Democratic preference showed nearly identical levels of political contributions: 20 and 19 percent, respectively.

These two observations are illustrated in table 3, which shows the percentage of blacks and whites who made contributions to political organizations in 1986, according to their presidential party preferences.

Table 2. Political Giving by Party Affiliation and Race in 1986

	Democrats		Republicans		Independents	
	BLACKS	WHITES	BLACKS	WHITES	BLACKS	WHITES
Less than $50	2.6%	7.9%	0.5%	9.4%	4.0%	10.8%
$50-$99	0.9	2.4	0.9	2.4	2.4	4.0
$100 or More	0.7	3.3	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.9
$500 or more	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.2
No Contribution	81.9	74.6	70.8	72.6	81.8	73.0
Unreported	13.8	11.7	27.7	9.9	11.8	7.1
Total Respondents	*679*	*300*	*7*	*277*	*111*	*293*

Table 3. Political Giving in 1986 by 1988 Party Presidential Preference (1987 Survey)

	Republican Presidential Preference		Democratic Presidential Preference	
	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	Whites
Less than $50	4.2%	10.8%	2.8%	10.8%
$50-$99	0.0	2.8	1.2	3.3
$100-$499	0.0	4.9	0.6	4.6
$500 or More	0.0	1.7	0.2	0.2
No Contributions	73.2	70.2	81.5	71.6
Unreported	22.6	9.5	13.7	9.5
Total Respondents	*71*	*325*	*715*	*317*

Conclusion

Overall, the data suggest that few blacks or whites make any political contributions at all. A greater percentage of white independents were found to have made political contributions than white Republicans or Democrats, and the same was true for blacks. Finally, when one looks at political contributions by those who have a party presidential preference, contributions from Democrats and Republicans seem to be made in roughly equal proportions. ■

Upcoming Books, Documentary on Black Philanthropy

Dr. Emmett Carson has been collecting data on black giving patterns since 1986. The results of his work on black philanthropic behavior will be released this winter in two books he has authored. In addition, a documentary on black philanthropy produced by the Joint Center's Communications Department is currently available.

In *Black Philanthropy in America,* Dr. Carson presents data, much of which is previously undocumented, on which blacks give, how much they give, who they give to, and why. He also describes the history of philanthropy in the black community since the days of the Underground Railway. *The Charitable Appeals Fact Book,* a smaller companion volume, focuses on the effectiveness of different charitable appeals techniques—telephone calls, letters, telethons—in persuading blacks to give.

A Tradition of Giving is a 30-minute documentary that takes an inside look at churches, fraternal groups, social service agencies, and fund-raising organizations around the country that are dedicated to helping black Americans. The documentary and other products of the Joint Center's Electronics Programs Division will be reviewed in the September issue of *Focus.* The documentary is available on VHS cassettes for $39.95 ($25.00 each for three or more copies). To order, contact the Office of Program Development, JCPS, 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004; telephone 202-626-3500.

August 1988

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- **The House votes for more comprehensive sanctions against South Africa.**
- **Senate voting records show significant differences between vice presidential nominees Lloyd Bentsen and Dan Quayle.**
- **Across the Nation: JCPS President Eddie N. Williams wins a MacArthur Foundation award; Yonkers continues to defy the federal courts over desegregation; black Republican Ron Crutcher runs again in Ohio; Rep. Mickey Leland may try for Bentsen's Senate seat in Texas; Voting Rights advocates lose in Virginia.**

House Passes Tougher Sanctions Against South Africa

In what some have described as "a declaration of economic war" against the South African regime, the House of Representatives voted August 11 to impose more stringent sanctions against the regime and U.S. corporations and individuals who have investments there. The Anti-Apartheid Act Amendments of 1988 (H.R. 1580), sponsored by Rep. Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.), were adopted with bipartisan support by a vote of 244 to 132.

These sanctions, which supporters of the bill argued were needed because of the regime's increasing intransigence, are far more extensive than the limited measures passed by Congress in 1986 over President **RONALD REAGAN'S** veto. The Anti-Apartheid Act Amendments would ban virtually all trade with South Africa except the importation of strategic minerals; require U.S. corporations, institutions, and private citizens to withdraw all investments in South Africa except those in wholly black-owned businesses; end all U.S. exports to South Africa except farm products, publications, and humanitarian assistance; ban the shipment of oil to South Africa on ships owned, controlled, or registered by American concerns; and prohibit intelligence and military cooperation between the U.S. and South Africa except intelligence relating to Cuban troops in the People's Republic of Angola. Furthermore, the legislation would prohibit the issuance of new federal leases for oil, coal, and natural gas to American subsidiaries of foreign concerns that have investments in, or export oil to, South Africa.

Proponents of H.R. 1580 argued during floor debates that while the 1986 legislation had been an important first step toward ending U.S. support of the apartheid regime, some of that bill's provisions have since been circumvented. **Members of the Congressional Black Caucus led other bill supporters in charging that the Departments of State and Commerce have been exploiting loopholes in the 1986 law and have weakened some of its major provisions by implementing loose regulations. The General Accounting Office has reported, for example, that the administration undermined the 1986 ban on uranium imports by allowing South African and Namibian uranium to be imported in the form of uranium hexaflouride. And while certain bank loans to South Africa were prohibited, short-term credits, through which South Africa finances 70 percent of its trade, were made exempt. Other loopholes have permitted the rescheduling of outstanding loans and the reinvestment of profits from U.S.-based South African operations.**

Advocates of the current bill also asserted that more stringent measures were needed because the 1986 law required President Reagan to renew and strengthen the sanctions measure if the apartheid regime were to fail to decrease its internal and external repression. Last October, Reagan refused to recommend the additional measures required by law, and instead released a report citing the administration's view that sanctions are the

reason for the lack of progress because they have resulted in "a marked reduction in our ability to persuade the South African government to act responsibly on human rights issues."

Dellums and other sponsors said President Reagan's refusal to obey the law required the Congress to respond. They noted that in the past two years, the apartheid regime has indeed intensified its repression of blacks in both South Africa and neighboring Namibia, which South Africa illegally occupies. Examples of this increasing entrenchment include the extension of the State of Emergency (now more than three years old), the banning of all activities by anti-apartheid organizations and leaders, the expansion of press censorship, and the jailing of white conscientious objectors who refuse to serve in the apartheid army. Sponsors of the bill also warned that South Africa's recent escalation of military attacks against the neighboring black-ruled countries, known as the Frontline States (Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana, Tanzania, and Lesotho), may soon lead to an all-out regional war.

Legislators seeking stronger sanctions began drafting a new bill shortly after passage of the 1986 law. They introduced it on March 12, 1987, but it was held up in eight different House committees and therefore only reached the floor this August. Nevertheless, House Republicans and administration officials have accused Dellums and the other sponsors of making the bill a partisan issue during the presidential campaign. They have also contended that implementing the new sanctions could damage current negotiations among officials from South Africa, Angola, and Cuba concerning the removal of South African troops from Angola and the creation of an independence plan for Namibia.

Dellums countered these objections on the House floor, arguing that the vote on the bill should not be delayed on behalf of the ongoing southern African negotiations. He challenged President Reagan to agree not to veto the bill so long as it passed both houses, and promised that in return he would then delay the vote until early September. When administration officials and House Republicans refused Dellums' compromise, he refused to delay the vote. Said Dellums, "They said they could not deliver. So we are going forward; this is our responsibility."

Dellums added that the current call for sanctions had nothing to do with the 1988 presidential election. "My objective here is not simply to pass a bill," he remarked, noting that he has been pushing for South African sanctions since he was elected to the House 18 years ago. "This has been no quick fix....We are not bringing up this bill to attempt to embarrass the Republicans. We are here to try to free South Africa....I want to see **NELSON MANDELA** free, and I will not stop until I do." Dellums' appeal was greeted with a standing ovation from his House colleagues on both sides of the aisle—a rare display of bipartisan respect during legislative debates. Shortly thereafter, H.R. 1580 was passed.

A companion Senate measure (S. 2378), introduced by Senators EDWARD KENNEDY (D-Mass.) and ALAN CRANSTON (D-Calif.), is scheduled to be voted on by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on September 8. However, congressional insiders say it is doubtful that S. 2378 will be voted on by the full Senate before Congress adjourns. Even if the bill does get to the floor for debate, Republican opponents are standing by to filibuster and halt its passage.

Bentsen and Quayle Voting Records: Where They Differ

Debate over the experience and qualifications of the two parties' vice presidential nominees, while occasionally intense, has often failed to focus on substantive policy issues. Both men have been called conservative. Both voted for the massive cuts in social programs and the tax reductions requested by President Reagan early in his administration. Both supported large increases in military spending, and **LLOYD BENTSEN** voted with **DAN QUAYLE** for Contra aid as well. Finally, both nominees voted for the balanced-budget amendment to the Constitution which, had it passed, would have brought even greater pressure to make deeper cuts in domestic social programs.

But the voting records of Bentsen and Quayle differ markedly on a number of key issues. Quayle opposed the Civil Rights Restoration Act and voted to confirm **ROBERT BORK** for the Supreme Court. And while he cosponsored the Job Training Partnership Act with Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), Quayle opposed a measure to require employers to give 60 days notice of plant closings. In the accompanying table, *Focus* magazine takes a look at how Quayle and Bentsen voted on 17 selected issues of national concern.

Comparison of Quayle and Bentsen Roll-call Votes in the Senate on Selected Domestic and Foreign Issues, 1982-1988

LEGISLATURE MEASURE (Year and Vote No.)	QUAYLE'S VOTE	BENTSEN'S VOTE	SENATE ACTION
Passage of **Civil Rights Restoration Act,** reaffirming pre-Grove City civil-rights compliance rules for institutions receiving federal funds (1988, vote #12)	AGAINST	FOR	Passed: 75 to 14
Vote to **override Reagan's veto** of the Civil Rights Restoration Act (1988, vote #67)	AGAINST	FOR	Passed: 73 to 24
Confirmation of **Robert H. Bork** to the U.S. Supreme Court (1987, vote #348)	FOR	AGAINST	Defeated: 42 to 58
Amendment to designate **Martin Luther King's Birthday** as a commemorative day instead of a paid national holiday (1983, vote #295)	FOR	AGAINST	Defeated: 24 to 69
Amendment to repeal requirements in the **Voting Rights Act** for bilingual assistance during elections (1982, vote #182)	FOR	AGAINST	Defeated: 32 to 54
Resolution calling for a Constitutional amendment to require a **Balanced Federal Budget** (1986, vote #45)	FOR	FOR	Defeated: 66 to 34*
Bill requiring **60 days notice of plant closings** and major layoffs by employers (1988, vote #225)	AGAINST	FOR	Passed: 72 to 23
Passage of **Job Training Partnership Act** (1982, vote #207)	FOR	FOR	Passed: 95 to 0
Measure to block defunding of the **Legal Services Corp.,** which provides legal assistance to the poor (1987, vote #410)	AGAINST	AGAINST	Passed: 70 to 28
Medicare Catastrophic Protection Act to protect elderly beneficiaries from catastrophic health costs. (1987, vote #353)	FOR	FOR	Passed: 86 to 11
Measure to block addition of $25 million in funding for **Childhood Immunization** (1986, vote #80)	FOR	AGAINST	Passed: 49 to 46
Bill to establish **Veterans Administration as a cabinet-level department** (1988, vote #242)	AGAINST	FOR	Passed: 84 to 11
Small Business, International Trade and Competitiveness Act (H.R. 4848, also known as the "Trade Bill") (1988, vote #288)	FOR	FOR	Passed: 85 to 11
Measure to block retention of $300 million in appropriations for **African famine relief** (1986, vote #217)	FOR	AGAINST	Passed: 51 to 49
Measure to block an amendment requiring the Secretary of State to **negotiate with South African-backed rebel forces (RENAMO)** in Mozambique (1987, vote #305)	AGAINST	FOR	Passed: 61 to 34
Amendment to appropriate $100 million in **aid to the Nicaraguan Contras,** including $70 million in military aid, together with aid to other Central American nations (1986, vote #229)	FOR	FOR	Passed: 53 to 47

* The required two-thirds majority was missed by one vote.

Source: David C. Ruffin, *Focus* editor.

Across the Nation

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: EDDIE N. WILLIAMS, president of the Joint Center for Political Studies for 16 years, was one of 31 recipients of a John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation fellowship award. Each of the Fellows received a grant totalling from $150,000 to $375,000, to be allocated over five years and to be used as he or she wishes. Individuals cannot apply for fellowships; their names are proposed to the Foundation by a group of 100 nominators who serve anonymously.

Williams, an advocate of black political participation, has a background in journalism and is an authority on civil rights and black leadership. He is also a co-founder of the Committee on Policy for Racial Justice. Williams said that his grant will allow him to accomplish some of his life's ambitions while he continues in his position at the Joint Center.

NEW YORK: On September 1, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld fines and a contempt ruling imposed in August by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals against the City of Yonkers for its failure to implement a court-ordered housing desegregation plan. At the same time, the high court granted a stay of fines levied against the four city councilmen who opposed adoption of a program to build 1,000 low- and middle-income housing units in the city's mostly white neighborhoods. The council defied Federal District Court Judge **LEONARD B. SAND'S** 1986 order to remedy what he described as "forty years of deliberate housing and school segregation." In late June, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld Sand's desegregation order by refusing to hear the city's appeal.

On August 1, however, the council voted 4 to 3 not to implement any plan. Sand responded by imposing fines beginning with $100 on the first day and doubling each day until they reach a limit of $1 million daily on the fifteenth day. In addition, all four of the council members opposing a desegregation plan—Republicans PETER CHEMA and NICHOLAS V. LONGO, Democrat HENRY SPALLONE, and Conservative EDWARD J. FAGAN—were held in contempt, fined $500 per day, and faced possible jail terms. The stays on these fines recently granted by the Supreme Court will remain in effect, however, until the councilmen formally request that the Court review their cases.

The city has the resources to pay the fine until day 79, referred to by city officials as "doomsday," when the cumulative fines would exceed $66 million. The fines were temporarily suspended in August, were resumed for one week, and were then suspended again pending the outcome of a further appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Meanwhile, the State Emergency Financial Control Board, established in 1984 to save the city from bankruptcy, has assumed full control of the city's financial operations. A wage and hiring freeze has already been imposed and the board is considering laying off municipal workers.

New York Governor MARIO CUOMO has been reluctant to get involved in the Yonkers dispute. He has the power to remove the councilmen from office, but has been waiting for the Supreme Court to rule before taking action. With fines depleting Yonkers' coffers and no sign that the councilmen will resign, the ball now seems to be in Cuomo's court.

OHIO: Black Republican **RON CRUTCHER,** a Dayton businessman, has launched his second attempt to unseat white five-term Democratic Congressman **TONY HALL** in Ohio's third district. Crutcher, the president of Cardinal Air Freight Company since 1986, is also a partner of R & D Associates, a tax and financial consulting firm where he began working soon after graduating from Wright State University in 1977 with a degree in political science. Although he's been active in the local Republican party, Crutcher has never held elective office.

Local observers say the odds are against Crutcher for several reasons. First, Hall defeated him in this heavily Democratic and blue-collar district in 1986, by a margin of 74 percent to 26 percent. And although Crutcher has worked hard to become better known in the black community, whites outnumber blacks four to one.

Nevertheless, Crutcher has been helped by the Dayton business community, which has raised $70,000 for his campaign thus far. And while he admits to weaknesses in his campaign organization, he is getting support from big guns in the Republicans party. This year, Crutcher is being bolstered by Senate Minority Leader **BOB DOLE,** whom Crutcher backed during the presidential primaries.

TEXAS: If three-term Democratic Senator **LLOYD BENTSEN** is elected vice president in November, black Houston Congressman **MICKEY LELAND** is "definitely interested" in replacing him as the next senator from the Lone Star State. Leland cannot actively campaign for the U.S. Senate now because Texas, unlike other states, allows a candidate to run for the offices of vice president and senator simultaneously, an option Bentsen has taken up. A 1959 state election statute, known as the "LBJ law," permits any incumbent Texas officeholder to run for reelection to his or her present post while also a candidate for president or vice president of the United States.

In the event that Bentsen becomes vice president, Leland plans to run for the Senate in a special election. A five-term congressman, Leland currently chairs the House Select Committee on Hunger and the Subcommittee on Postal Operations and Civil Service.

Other possible contenders for Bentsen's seat, should he vacate it, include Lt. Governor **BILL HOBBY** and Commissioner of Agriculture **JIM HIGHTOWER,** both Democrats, and incumbent Republican Governor **WILLIAM CLEMENTS.**

VIRGINIA: In Richmond, Federal District Judge **RICHARD WILLIAMS** dealt a blow on August 18 to minority voting rights in that state. Concluding the case of ***Irby v. Fitzhugh,*** **Judge Williams ruled against the black plaintiffs, represented by American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) attorneys, who had sued the state for maintaining a discriminatory school board selection system.** The state's system, in which school board members are appointed rather than elected, is used in 136 cities and counties throughout Virginia. (See "Taking History to Court," *Focus,* January 1988).

Despite substantial evidence that the appointive system has been maintained over the years with a racially discriminatory intent, Judge Williams ruled that the system no longer has a discriminatory impact. In fact, however, while blacks in some areas of the state are proportionately represented on school boards, in rural southern Virginia they are largely excluded or appointed in only token numbers. Judge Williams' ruling keeps the selection of school board members in the hands of the overwhelmingly white boards of county supervisors, commissioners, and city councils.

The plaintiffs' attorney, NEIL BRADLEY, declared that he will appeal the decision to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals early this fall.

Congress and Immigrants of the Future

Immigration Ceilings and New Admission Criteria Could Reduce the Flow of Newcomers From the Third World

by Olivia Phillips

Two years after dramatically changing the nation's immigration laws, Congress is again considering new legislation that could reduce the flow of immigrants from the Third World to our shores while increasing the flow of new arrivals from Europe. The Immigration Act of 1988 (S. 2104), sponsored by two senators who rarely agree on legislation, Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.), passed the Senate on March 15 by a vote of 88 to 4. In sharp contrast to most immigration reform bills, this one moved through the Senate swiftly and drew little media attention. A companion bill, H.R. 5115, sponsored by Rep. Peter Rodino (D-N.J.), is now under consideration in the House of Representatives.

As currently drafted, the Senate measure would set a higher and firmer annual ceiling on immigration; increase the number of highly skilled entrants; and adopt a point system for admitting into the United States "selected immigrants," that is, those without family connections in this country. Most important, the bill would deemphasize family-based immigration, which today generates most of the entry visas to the U.S., and would establish two new categories for "independent immigrants" which would make it easier for highly educated, highly skilled English-speaking immigrants to enter the country.

With its new approach, the proposed bill has caused Hispanics and other minority groups to fear the restoration of a European bias in immigration policy and a curtailment of migration from Latin America and Asia. This would be a reversal of immigration trends over the last 20 years. During the 1980s, the regional distribution of immigration has been 45 percent from Asia, 37 percent from Latin America and the Caribbean, and a mere 12 percent from Europe. Immigration from Africa was under 3 percent during the 1980s, the lowest of all the continents.

Among those opposing the measure is Hispanic Representative Edward R. Roybal (D-Calif.), who believes that the bills' new education and English-language criteria for independent immigrants will reduce opportunities for Hispanics to immigrate from Mexico and Central America. He also views the bill as intensifying the trend of reducing migration from Latin American countries, a trend begun with the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986.

Nevertheless, proponents of the bill argue that it is in the national interest. "The distribution of legal immigration should better represent the labor needs of the country, as opposed to family relationships," says Dr. Malcolm Lovell, professor of government and business at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., and a specialist in labor relations and employment policy. Lovell testified in favor of the bill in December 1987 before the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Affairs, which Kennedy chairs.

Congressional attempts to change immigration policy have long been controversial. Advocates of preserving the "open door" tradition of U.S. immigration policy (more myth than reality) must often confront racial and ethnic bias.

Controversial Policy Proposals

The Kennedy-Simpson bill has two key provisions that are especially controversial. The first key provision would impose a new ceiling of 590,000 immigrants annually. This figure is about 100,000 higher than current annual immigration, and it would include all legal immigrants except refugees.

One point of controversy is that a ceiling is being proposed before IRCA's impact on immigration applications has been assessed. Passed in 1986, IRCA established an amnesty program for undocumented immigrants who had been residing in the U.S. since before January 1, 1982. Theoretically, the immigration rolls could be swelled by the thousands as the relatives of these new permanent residents enter the U.S. legally. Some Hispanic groups fear that the ceiling may not be high enough to handle the projected increase by the end of the century, which ranges from 200,000 (according to the Immigration and Naturalization Service) to 1.5 million (according to the Center for Immigration Studies, a Washington based research organization). Hispanic groups are also worried that a fixed ceiling could be lowered in the future, an act that could severely limit entry visas for the immediate relatives of U.S. citizens, who are currently subject to no numerical limits.

The second key provision entails "independent immigrants." As defined in current law, the term refers to

Ms. Phillips, a graduate of Duke University, was an intern with the Joint Center for Political Studies.

those who have skills which are in short supply in the U.S. as well as those who are unable to enter through the current system because they do not have relatives here. The Kennedy-Simpson bill would expand the number of independent immigrants allowed from up to 60,000 to about 120,000 annually. Currently, there are three categories for the admission of independent immigrants: special immigrants, such as ministers of religion (6,000 visas per year); professionals with advanced degrees or exceptional abilities in the arts, sciences, and education (27,000); and skilled and unskilled workers (27,000).

Two new independent categories would be created by S. 2104: employment-generating investors (4,800); and "selected" immigrants (55,000). Applicants in the latter group could qualify for entry through a point system that would use age, English proficiency, educational level, occupational training and work experience, the U.S. need for people in a particular occupation, and age as the criteria for issuing visas. These criteria have stimulated strong protests because they would give European applicants an advantage and diminish opportunities for Third World applicants.

A Family Reunification House Bill

On July 28, a companion bill, the Legal Immigration Amendments of 1988, H.R. 5115, was introduced in the House of Representatives by retiring Rep. Peter Rodino (D-N.J.), who chairs the Judiciary Committee. The House bill, which differs from the Kennedy-Simpson bill by focusing on non-family-related immigration issues only, is currently in the Immigration, Refugee, and International Law Subcommittee which plans to hold hearings in early September.

The House bill is less odious to the groups that oppose S. 2104 because, in the words of Rep. Rodino, it respects the "principle of family reunification, but at the same time acknowledges the need for expanding the opportunities for immigration by the so-called new seed [independent immigrants]." Unlike the Senate bill, H.R. 5115 contains no overall ceiling, and it would provide an additional 800,000 visas over a five-year period for the close relatives of permanent residents, many of whom were granted amnesty under IRCA.

The measure would establish a five-member National Commission on Independent Immigration, which would be authorized to adjust the annual number of independent immigrants to a figure as low as 75,000 or as high as 225,000 (adjustments outside of these perimeters would require Congressional approval).

"Old Seed" Vs. "New Seed"

The different House and Senate proposals demonstrate a philosophical struggle that is rooted in the history of American immigration policy. On the one hand, the Senate bill's deemphasis of family-related immigration could cause "old seed" immigration streams to flow once again from European countries. Rodino's proposal, on the other hand, stresses family reunification. In fact, when he introduced H.R. 5115, he stated, "The principle of family unity must remain the primary basis of our immigration policy. My philosophy in this regard stems from my own immigrant heritage and the proud immigrant tradition of this country."

Between 1820 and 1860, immigrants from northern and western Europe constituted 95 percent of the nation's total. Congress passed discriminatory laws to limit immigration to those Europeans ethnically and culturally similar to the majority of America's white population. By 1910, immigrants from virtually all Asian countries had been denied immigration rights, and the 1921 national origins principle set quotas for each country based on the population of its nationals residing in the U.S.

Not until the peak of the civil rights movement in 1965 did Congress amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, eliminating country quotas. Ironically, the amendments were sponsored by the then freshman Senator, Edward Kennedy. Currently, about 82 percent of the legal entrants come from Latin America and Asia; last year, Mexico alone (with 72,300) sent more than one and a half times as many legal emigrants to the U.S. as did the whole of Western Europe (44,400).

Now, proponents of S. 2104 claim that the 1965 law shortchanges the "old seed" countries that no longer have numerous family ties in the U.S. For example, in 1950, Irish nationals comprised 8 percent of U.S. legal immigrant totals, but since the 1965 Act, their numbers have dropped to no more than 0.2 percent for any given year.

The Race to Adjournment

Time is working against the passage of any new immigration legislation before Congress adjourns in early October. The House Judiciary Committee must complete action on H.R. 5115, and the measure must wait until more pressing legislation is passed before it can be taken up for a vote on the House floor and a House/Senate conference committee irons out the differences between it and S. 2104.

If Congress adjourns before a bill can get through the legislative process, those opposed to changes in immigration policy may face a more difficult challenge next year. Some opponents argue that if passage is inevitable, they should get a bill passed during this Congress while Rodino is still involved. It is unclear whether a more generous bill would be developed under the chairmanship of Jack Brooks, the 18-term Texan who, as the next-ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, will most likely succeed Rodino as chairman. ■

Blacks and the 1988 Republican National Convention

JCPS Publication Suggests Republicans May Have to Garner New Black Support to Win in November

With the release of this publication, the Joint Center has now completed a pair of studies that examine the size, distribution, and voting behavior of blacks over the past 20 years and that offer vital information on both 1988 party conventions. *Blacks and the 1988 Republican National Convention* not only lists the black delegates and alternates at this year's Republican convention in New Orleans, it presents an overview of black political participation in the party over the past 50 years. It also reviews the positions taken by the party's nominee, Vice President George Bush, on major issues, especially those of concern to black Americans. Following are highlights from the book.

- **Importance of the Black Vote in November.** Polls this summer have indicated that white voters are likely to split their support evenly between the two major candidates this November. Such a close race would make the black vote pivotal, especially in electoral-vote-rich states like New York and Texas with their large black populations.
- **Trends in Black Participation.** This year's Republican convention showed a decline in the number of black delegates, from 69 (3.1 percent) in 1984 to 61 (2.7 percent) this year. Since 1976, the level of black participation in Republican conventions has varied little, ranging from a low of 2.7 percent in 1980 (and again this year) to a high of 3.4 percent in 1976. This suggests that the Republican party has not benefited from the increases in black voter participation across the country in recent years. In the South, growth in black participation has been dramatic: by 1986 the black registration rate (64.6 percent) had exceeded the white rate (63.2 percent).
- **Republican Prospects Among Black Voters.** The prospect that Republicans could gather substantial black support this fall appears remote, given that they have not won more than 15 percent of black support in presidential races since 1964. The excitement of the recent Jesse Jackson campaign, coupled with the historical ties between blacks and the Democratic party, reinforce this prediction. Nevertheless, if the Republicans can capture between 15 and 20 percent of the black vote (departing from the 1980 and 1984 elections where they garnered only 12 and 9 percent, respectively) they might have enough of an edge to put them over the top in a close election.
- **Opportunities to Recruit Blacks.** Although Democratic support is still strong among blacks, there is increasing evidence of a weakening in black loyalty to the Democratic party. A 1987 survey by the Joint Center revealed a drop in the number of blacks who consider themselves strong Democratic supporters: from 55 percent in 1984 to 41 percent today. Further, younger blacks (ages 18 to 29), in spite of the fact that they constituted Democrat Jesse Jackson's strongest supporters, are three times as likely as blacks over age 30 to identify themselves as Republicans (18 percent vs. 6 percent). In addition to these broad trends, blacks have offered considerable support for Republican candidates in a number of recent nonpresidential elections, including the successful reelection bids of New Jersey Governor Thomas Kean, Illinois Governor James Thompson, and U.S. Senators Alfonse D'Amato (N.Y.) and Arlen Specter (Pa.). This year, the Republican party is running black candidates for major national seats as well, including two candidates for the U.S. Senate and at least three for the House of Representatives.
- **Today's Civil Rights Climate.** The younger generation of blacks today may be less concerned about civil rights issues than were their elders, who lived through the movement in the 1960s, and consequently may be less attached to the Democratic party's record of reform.

Although many blacks are likely to remember that Vice President George Bush supported President Reagan's veto of the Civil Rights Restoration Act earlier this year, some may be inclined to take his current "politics of inclusion" campaign theme seriously given today's civil rights climate. If the Republican ticket is willing to address issues of concern to blacks, it may have a chance to put some distance between itself and its party's history of resistance to civil rights legislation and thus garner greater black support.

Altogether, these trends and events may provide a window of opportunity for Republican party strategists seeking to bring blacks into their ranks. The fight over the black electorate, as a result, should prove intense as election day approaches. ■

This summary was prepared by Marc DeFrancis, senior editor at the Joint Center for Political Studies.

Copies of *Blacks and the 1988 Republican National Convention* can be ordered through the Publications Clerk, Joint Center for Political Studies, Suite 400, 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004; telephone 202/626-3500.

Black Leadership Meeting in New Jersey

The New Jersey Black Issues Convention (N.J.B.I.C.) will hold its sixth annual convention on Wednesday, September 7 through Sunday, September 11, at the Somerset Hilton Hotel in Somerset, New Jersey. This year's theme is "Where Do We Go From Here," as the conference will address the impact of black voters on the upcoming presidential election as well as the role and influence of blacks in the next decade. Eddie N. Williams, president of the Joint Center for Political Studies, will be the keynote speaker.

N.J.B.I.C. is a state institution modeled after the National Black Leadership Roundtable. The annual convention is designed to enable black New Jersey residents and leaders of statewide and nationally affiliated organizations to develop strategies, coalitions, and networks by which they can pursue their common interests. More than 1,500 black participants from throughout the state are expected to attend. The convention is considered one of the most important vehicles in the state through which the concerns of the state's 925,000 black residents are raised and addressed.

Among the issues to be addressed in workshops and seminars are:

Black Seniors: Accessing Services and Income Improvement

Minority Health Issues for the Elderly

The State of Black Health in New Jersey: AIDs, Hypertension, Infant Mortality

Welfare Reform: New Jersey's Project "REACH"

Where Do We Go From Here?—Political Prospects for the Year 2000

Blacks in Corporate America

Political Empowerment of Black Women

Racism in Education in New Jersey

Black Voter Participation

Youth: Building Positive Self-Images

The Afro-American Family

The Black Middle Class: Priorities and Responsibilities

Blacks in Culture and Entertainment

Blacks in the Peace Movement

Minority Groups and the Uses of the Press

Blacks and Labor

Civil Rights 25 Years After the March

The Role of the Black Church in Politics

For more information about this organization, write or call N.J.B.I.C., P.O. Box 1843, Newark, N.J. 07101; telephone 201-824-7463.

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.