


VOL. 5, NO. 6

JUNE 1977

A high-contrast, black and white photograph of a dilapidated building. In the foreground, a large, rusted metal structure, possibly a piece of machinery or a large container, is partially visible. The background shows a multi-story building with a corrugated metal facade and a fire escape. The overall image has a gritty, industrial feel.

FOCUS

ENVIRONMENT:

A MAJOR ISSUE FOR MINORITIES

Joint Center for Political Studies

Editor's Note: The following remarks are excerpted from a speech delivered by Eddie N. Williams, President of the Joint Center, at the Sixth Annual Convention of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, May 29, 1977, at the New York Hilton Hotel, New York City.

Today black Americans have a special presence in the nation and in the world, due in large part to their growing political impact in recent years and especially in 1976.

However, before we take our new found political impact for granted or get caught up in the rhetoric of our political power, there are two difficult questions we must answer. Can our present political condition produce desired results? Can our influence be increased or even sustained?

So far, our batting average is low in such matters as reducing poverty and unemployment; erasing visible vestiges of racism; being assured of a quality education; reducing crime in our communities; achieving fair political representation and being an integral part of the public policy process.

So, despite our political accomplishments — and they have been considerable — we are left with a feeling that we have not yet become captains of our own ship, or even first mates.

As Lerone Bennett observed in his book, *BLACK POWER USA*, the freedmen understood clearly that power in a democracy is derived from three things: *numbers, resources and organization*. We know these truths to be self-evident also.

We have the numbers. Just look at the 1976 presidential election. We are ten percent of the electorate, but more importantly our people are concentrated in key states with large blocks of electoral votes. In 13 crucial states blacks gave Carter his winning margin of victory thereby assuring him of a base of 216 electoral votes.

However, we must find a way to get the necessary resources to sustain our political momentum. The first step is to share, or sacrifice if you will, more of the financial and human resources already at our disposal.

The resources we have to offer may be money, and we must put more of that where our mouths are, but they also may be labor and sacrifice.

The third ingredient of empowerment is organization. The black community is rich with organizations; social, civil, fraternal, religious, community, political, labor, business, educational and public interest. They represent the healthy diversity of black America. They must be maintained. And when we can get all of these organizations moving together in one direction at the same time, they exert one helluva pull.

Operation Big Vote last year was just such a coalition effort. It led to a successful citizens movement in 36 cities in 13 states to increase registration and voter turnout.

Organization is crucial to leadership and direction. It also is crucial to the development of a cadre of troops to carry out objectives.

What all of this suggests to me is the need for a mass citizens movement to pursue our political and economic objectives.

Common Cause is a citizens' movement worthy of emulation. But what we need is a movement with a *special* mission. Change, especially social and economic change, not just reform, is our first priority. We need a mass organization to do for civil rights, equal opportunity and affirmative action what Common Cause has done and is doing for governmental and electoral reform.

Our new organization must be self-supporting, hardhitting, and professionally staffed. It must be a tactical force capable of mobilizing people, pressure, and public opinion through moral suasion and use of law; through research and lobbying; and through public protest and direct political action.

If every black voter allocated one dollar to this citizens' organization, its vitality and impact would be assured. It would be a winner, a force that could neither be tuned out nor otherwise ignored.

We must have an unswerving and unselfish dedication to our own common cause.

I think a mass citizens' movement would do much to meet our needs today.

FOCUS

Copyright © 1977 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc. The monthly newsletter of the **Joint Center for Political Studies**, 1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 926, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 638-4477. JCPS is a private non-profit and non-partisan organization which provides research, education, technical assistance and information for the nation's black and other minority elected officials. Its objectives are to respond to minority group aspirations to participate in the political process, and to enhance their effectiveness at every level of government. The Joint Center does not fund or participate in voter registration, lobbying or campaigning. JCPS is funded by foundations, other organizations, and private gifts. Contributions are tax exempt.

president: Eddie N. Williams
vice president: Eleanor Farrar
director of administration: Alfred Lang
director of development: Kathleen Vander Horst
director of fellowships: Milton D. Morris
director of information services: Brenda D. Neal
director of research: Adam Herbert
director of training: William D. Ellis
special assistant to the president: Malachi Knowles
focus editor: Oliver W. Cromwell

Board of Governors

Louis E. Martin, Chairman — President, Sengstacke Publications, Chicago

Hon. Edward W. Brooke — U.S. Senator from Massachusetts

James E. Cheek — President, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Kenneth B. Clark — President, Clark, Phipps, Clark and Harris, New York

Wendell Freeland, Esq., Pittsburgh

Charles V. Hamilton — Wallace S. Sayre Professor of Government, Columbia University, New York

Samuel C. Jackson, Esq., Washington, D.C.

Eddie N. Williams — President, JCPS

The Ford/Carter budget for 1978

by Adele Jackson

Ms. Jackson is currently serving as an analyst in the Human Resources Division of the Congressional Budget Office.

	1977 Estimate (In Billions)	1978 Estimate
Outlays		
Ford Budget	\$411.2	\$440.0
Revisions	6.2	19.4
Carter Budget	417.4	459.4

President Carter's revised \$459.4-billion budget for fiscal 1978, which was submitted to the Congress on February 22, called for spending \$19.4-billion more than former President Ford had proposed. Carter's proposals made a number of revisions to the \$440-billion budget submitted to Congress by Ford on January 17.

In his message to Congress accompanying the revised budget, Carter said: "The 1978 budget is essentially still President Ford's budget, with only such limited revisions as my administration has had time to make. But these revisions do reflect our careful choices among many possible options; they are important first steps toward a federal government that is more effective and responsive to our people's needs."

Carter's proposed budget also called for revised estimates for spending and receipts in fiscal 1977, which ends on September 30, 1977.

In an effort to provide a shot in the arm for the nation's sluggish economy, Carter proposed an economic stimulus package for fiscal 1977 which included tax cuts, and increased spending for jobs. The new level of spending for fiscal 1977 proposed by Carter was \$417.4-billion, which is \$6.2-billion over Ford's \$411.2-billion.

Carter's economic stimulus plan is viewed as a major factor in the fiscal 1977 deficit, which is projected to be \$68-billion — a record. A \$57.7-billion deficit is expected in 1978 under the revised Carter budget.

Carter's proposals for increases over the Ford budget are concentrated in the area of domestic assistance programs, which aid minorities and the poor.

Of the \$12.4-billion in spending cuts recommended by Ford for fiscal 1978, the Carter administration proposed the restoration of \$7.8-billion in its revised budget. Most of the spending increases would restore cuts that Ford had proposed in employment and training programs, food and nutrition programs, health and education programs and community and regional development.

Ford had requested \$7-billion in spending authority for defense and nuclear energy; much of this was eliminated in the revised Carter budget.

Congressional Involvement

Traditionally, the President has annually submitted to Congress a package of requests to spend money. The Congress has reacted to the President's package through a series of independent authorization and appropriations committee actions.

However, with the passage of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (PL 93-344), the Congress made itself an in-

tegral part of the budgeting process. The Act established: a budget committee in the House and Senate; the Congressional Budget Office; and a system for developing an annual congressional budget.

The creation of a congressional budget provides an independent framework for evaluating the President's budget proposals. The congressional budget is in the form of a concurrent resolution which establishes dollar ceilings for budget authority and spending or outlays.

So far this year, preliminary actions by the Congress on the fiscal 1978 budget would alter spending in many areas from levels proposed by President Carter. Final ceilings will be adopted by the Congress this fall which will establish real limitations on federal spending.

Employment

The Carter budget calls for \$11.7-billion in budget authority for jobs programs, an increase of \$6.3-billion over the Ford requests. Increases would be used primarily to continue grants to states and localities to fund public service jobs and to continue the local public works program administered by the Economic Development Administration. Congress has already passed a bill authorizing an additional \$4-billion for an emergency public works jobs program. The bill (HR 11) signed by Carter on May 13, is designed to stimulate the economy. Ford had proposed no additional funds for this program.

The Carter budget also called for increases in the countercyclical revenue sharing program for states and localities with high unemployment rates. The program, which funds job stimulation activities, was eliminated in the Ford budget proposal. Carter would extend the program through 1982, with quarterly spending estimated at \$125-million plus \$30-million for every tenth of a percentage point by which the national unemployment rate exceeds 6 percent.

Social Services

Carter's fiscal 1978 budget for social services is \$312-million higher than Ford's \$3.9-billion request. The majority of the increase — \$200-million — would be used to provide funds to states for day care centers for children of the poor.

Health

The Carter budget requested \$47.8-billion for health programs in fiscal 1978 — \$413-million above the Ford request. Under the Carter budget, a new program was proposed to diagnose and treat children from low-income families. A similar program is available to some 12 million children eligible for Medicaid. The new program — comprehension health assessment and primary care (CHAP) — would reach an additional 1.8 million poor children. States would be provided with 75 percent of the costs of screening and treating the children compared with 55 percent now. The cost for this program would be \$345-million in fiscal 1978, more than double the \$165-million that Ford proposed. A new immunization program for disadvantaged children in rural areas is also a part of the President's health package.

Continued on page 6

Environment: a major issue for minorities

by Sydney Howe

Mr. Howe is executive director of the Urban Environment Foundation. The Foundation is a non-profit organization which provides technical assistance and information to those concerned with environmental quality.

ITEM: Air pollution measurements in St. Louis, Chicago, Gary, New York City, Washington, D.C., Denver, Kansas City, Los Angeles and San Francisco-Oakland have shown that poor and/or black residential areas tend to have the most polluted air.

ITEM: Before 1950 the cancer death rate for whites in the United States exceeded the rate for non-whites (primarily blacks). From 1950 to 1975 the cancer death rate for blacks rose to twice that of whites, according to the National Center for Health Statistics. Dorothy Rice, director of the Center, explains that the heavy migration of blacks from rural areas into industrialized cities, where many took jobs exposing them to cancer-causing chemicals, is part of the reason for the increased cancer death-rate for blacks. It has been determined that environmental pollutants are one of the primary causes of cancer.

There can be no doubt that poor people stuck in the most degraded living and working conditions are suffering early deaths, and inordinate health losses, from environmental pollution. The resulting economic hardships from wages foregone and breadwinners lost are immense.

Numerous other environmental ills plague minorities and the poor. Lead poisoning from peeling paint and auto exhausts, which causes brain damage and death, affected some 30,000 children in 1972. There are health threats in the vermin that slum garbage breeds, and in rodent and insect poisons applied in crowded living quarters. Noise in streets and buildings has been shown to impair hearing and retard children's reading scores. And persons from crowded, inner cities, who are lucky enough to have jobs, tend to endure the most polluted working conditions.

Minority leaders, the environmental movement and government agencies have not responded appropriately to this massive burden on those least able to bear it. Two principal efforts are required: first, pollution and blight that are focused upon inner city areas and which, in turn, are intensified by energy waste, must be controlled; and second, decent and dispersed housing opportunities must be provided for all in need of them.

The Energy-Jobs-Pollution Linkage

Energy production and use are the prime generators of pollution, but there has been a dilemma for blacks concerning energy's connection to jobs. Colorado Lt. Gov. George Brown states that the vital jobs of many blacks have been tied to industries depending on increasing fuel supplies and that blacks have accepted spiraling energy consumption as necessary to "our ability to seek the dream of middle-income America." But he then observes: "Yet, the truth is, the greater the American dependency upon higher energy production levels, the more jeopardy blacks are in. For example, who was laid off in 1973 when

the Arab oil embargo went into effect? It wasn't top management but those in the lesser-skilled jobs with least seniority — often blacks. Moreover, the technological advances made possible through increased fuel consumption have meant for blacks fewer jobs, higher prices, and a higher level of training needed for employment."

This would suggest that blacks may find some energy corporation advertising as misleading as environmentalists do. One typical ad pictured a black youngster shooting a basketball, with this message: "Must a good job be a long shot, too? He's just a kid having fun, shooting from the outside. But he wants to be on the inside when he grows up. Where the good jobs are . . . What's needed is to develop more energy right here at home. That means cutting the red tape that's been tying up offshore drilling for oil and gas, mining of America's abundant coal and construction of nuclear power plants. Some of these actions may require setting back environmental timetables a little . . ."

Housing and Environment

Unfortunately, housing is less clearly seen, even by the more socially-concerned environmental forces, as a basic environmental need of millions of people.

Suburban exclusion was in full bloom long before the term "environment" came into vogue. Local environmentalists have often aligned themselves, carelessly or otherwise, with zoning ordinances and other controls that preclude lower-cost housing. Environmental group pressures and law suits have often frustrated low-income housing efforts.

National environmental organizations, with leadership and resources to press for socially and ecologically sound housing, have rarely taken up this cause.

Exclusion of the poor from suburban jurisdictions can hardly be justified on environmental impact grounds, especially when the implications of continued slum environments are considered.

On the other hand, the suburban housing issue has been a frustrating one for those environmentalists who do recognize housing needs. They have seen once small-town amenities and natural systems disrupted by unplanned, junky development that has enriched fast-buck developers and provided little for the ill-housed.

Joining Forces for Environmental Quality

The belief that human deprivation and damage to natural systems have common roots is gaining ground. John Hampton of the Tenant Resource Center said a few years ago: "It strikes me that the opportunity is now here to talk about those two movements — the urban movement, representing the inner-city minority, and the environmental movement, representing a great section of the white population in the suburbs who have some concern about what will happen in the city. The possibility is now here, I think, for those two movements to get together for sheer survival . . . broader kinds of things than would have been possible under the 'let's get together for good will purposes' kind of coalition."

Three principal adjustments seem essential to success in such getting together. First, environmentalists must alter

certain practices and priorities in order to provide short-term payoffs in health and housing for the disadvantaged. This is vital to the credibility of environmental forces in minority circles, and it will muster moral and political support for longer-term environmental goals. Second, minority leaders must aggressively assert their constituents' specific interest in environmental and natural resource programs. Many environmental leaders with a concern for social justice know the personnel and processes of those programs and are ready, even anxious, to help. And third, both groups must press government and industry for orderly overhaul of production, employment and consumption systems that degrade both environments and people.

A Few Victories

There have been some modest beginnings. *Ad hoc* joinings have been the most common, as when the now-thwarted Three Sisters Bridge would have damaged Potomac River parklands and given rise to an expressway through black neighborhoods in the District of Columbia. Izaak Walton Leaguers, Audubon members and the (mostly black) Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis announced their joint-force opposition in a press conference at the National Wildlife Federation. In the Watts area of Los Angeles, Sierra Club and NAACP members combined to fight a freeway through the black community. Texas NAACP and Audubon groups sued to prevent development of a segregated golf club, the clearing for which would have destroyed a rare warbler's habitat.

Such "anti-something" joinings have been called opportunistic and short-lived alliances, but they could be made stepping-stones to a larger mutual effort. More positive and lasting activity can be seen in the Open Lands Project formed by Chicago's Metropolitan Welfare Council, in Audubon groups' provision of curriculum materials and teaching assistance in inner city schools, and in two Florida universities' formation of a Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems. The New Jersey Conservation Foundation has worked with the City of Newark in environmental planning and has helped establish a park on vacant land opposite the City Hall.

At the national level, the Urban Environment Conference (UEC) has lobbied the Congress and federal agencies on positions shared by environmental and urban social groups, as in diversion of Highway Trust Fund money into public transportation, occupational health measures, and control of lead and other toxic pollutants. UEC directors include senior persons from the Sierra Club, Urban League and United Auto Workers. The organization's stated aim is "an urban society where the environment is harmonized with people's rights." An allied group, Environmentalists for Full Employment, assists those who would work to bring about a balance between employment needs and a livable environment.

Among the large national environmental organizations, the Sierra Club stands out for action on problems not typically experienced by its own members. The Club, along with some other environmental groups, certainly

went far beyond member self-interests in supporting the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers' (OCAW) 1972 strike against Shell Oil. Executive Director Michael McCloskey told the OCAW: "Your union is pioneering the effort to make environmental health and safety in the workplace a matter that can be reached through collective bargaining, and it was incumbent upon the environmental movement to back you up. In doing so, though, the Sierra Club drew a blast of abuse upon itself. Shell denounced us . . . some members were alienated and resigned, but we felt we made the right decision and feel additionally vindicated now that Shell has settled the issue and acceded to many of your demands."

In May 1976, labor, minority and environmental groups gathered for four days at Black Lake, Michigan and achieved an understanding that surprised most participants. Some who were infused with "the spirit of Black Lake" have brought the same interest groups together at local levels. In January, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency granted funds to the Urban Environment Conference to encourage such local gatherings. UEC invites inquiries from those interested in the schedule of meetings for this year or in specific environmental needs.

Some Minority Initiatives

A year ago, Rep. Parren Mitchell (D Md.), Congressional Black Caucus Chairman, made a statement to this effect: "We have some nice open space in Baltimore, but I think the children out there are hurting their lungs." While he found a serious gap between urbanists and national environmentalists, Rep. Mitchell called for "a people's lobby from urban centers" on behalf of the environment.

The National Urban League is now preparing materials for a training program that will equip urban minorities to influence environmental policies that affect them. The League is drawing interested environmentalists into its program. This venture could promote the coalitions needed for metropolitan environmental quality. In June, Urban League and NAACP leaders attended an Urban Environment Foundation meeting on parks and recreation and called for greater attention to minority needs in open space and recreation programs.

There is mounting evidence of net employment gains from clean air and clean water investments. There are high stakes for training and employment of the chronically poor as new environmentally-oriented technologies are applied. Technological advance need not idle people as it has. It can be designed to employ them, in pollution control, materials recycling, transportation, and new methods of energy conservation and supply. Such gains will not be realized, however, without pointed pressure to secure them.

Although minority leaders have found quite enough to do in struggles for jobs, housing, education and basic civil rights, environmental improvement may now be seen as an intrinsic component of progress on all of those fronts. Given the broad reach of environmental policy today, it will become increasingly important that representatives of minorities and the poor have the knowledge and the influence to move and shake such policy.

Continued from page 3

The Carter budget eliminates two Ford health proposals: one, to replace Medicaid and other health grant programs with a block grant program; and a requirement that Medicare recipients share more of the cost of medical care. Several small increases in the Carter budget would be provided for health research and education programs.

One of the few new policy proposals in the revised Carter budget is in the area of health cost controls. Ford had proposed that increases in Medicare reimbursements to hospitals and doctors be limited to 7 percent. Under Carter's hospital cost control proposal, annual hospital cost increases would be limited for all patients, not just for those on Medicare. High hospital costs in 1976 were considered a major stumbling block to the implementation of a comprehensive national health insurance program.

Education

The Carter budget called for a total of \$10.8-billion in budget authority for education programs administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This amount represents an increase of nearly \$2-billion over the Ford budget. The largest increase appeared in the basic educational opportunity grant (BEOG) program which is designed to aid college students.

Carter's revised budget called for \$2.3-billion for student aid programs, an increase of \$472-million over the Ford proposal. This increase would allow maximum grants to students of \$1,600 a year as opposed to the \$1,400 a year that Ford had recommended. A maximum of \$1,800 a year has already been authorized by Congress.

Carter also asked for \$350-million more in authorizations to aid poor and disadvantaged pupils in elementary and secondary schools. The Carter budget also proposes increases for bilingual education and emergency school aid.

The Ford proposal to consolidate funding for 23 education programs into a single block grant to the states was eliminated from the Carter budget.

The revised budget would authorize spending of \$380-million to restore supplemental opportunity grants and work study programs that were eliminated in the Ford budget.

Both the Ford and Carter budget proposals recommended the elimination of federal aid to school districts with large numbers of children whose parents work for the federal government. However, the House Appropriations Committee has already added funds to continue the impact aid program.

Income Security

The Carter budget requested \$177.8-billion for the income security program — \$9.7-billion more than the Ford budget. Carter's revised budget eliminated Ford's proposal to consolidate existing categorical child nutrition programs into a block grant program to states.

Budget authority for the food stamp program remained at \$5.6-billion for fiscal 1978 under the Carter budget. The Congress refused to grant reforms in the program which were proposed by Ford in 1976. Recent Carter administrative proposals to eliminate the purchase require-

ment for the food stamp program will not alter the total amount of funds available. However, it will mean that while more very low-income citizens may participate in the program, some current (and higher income) recipients will not be eligible.

Housing

The Carter budget proposes to increase the number of subsidized housing units under the Section 8 program from 235,800 to 400,000 in fiscal 1977. For fiscal 1978, the Carter budget asked contract authority for \$1-billion for Section 8. The Section 8 rental subsidy program is designed to provide funding assistance to low-income persons for housing needs. Additional funds of \$53-million are also requested for public housing operating subsidies for public housing tenants. The revised budget also restores cuts proposed by the Ford budget for the farmers home housing repair grant program in fiscal 1977. The Carter budget also requested an additional \$55-million to increase the rehabilitation loan program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Community and Regional Development

The Carter budget asks for \$500-million over the Ford request for a total of \$4-billion for community development block grants. Four-fifths of the increase would go to establish a new urban development action grant program intended to benefit economically distressed cities. The balance would be used to improve the distribution of formula grant funds to benefit older declining cities.

The Carter budget also called for increased funds for the water and sewer grant program administered by the Department of Agriculture; for Action; and for the Community Services Administration.

Welfare

The Carter budget proposed no additional funding for two of the nation's largest welfare programs — Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI). President Carter has pledged to overhaul the existing welfare program in favor of a system that would provide a job for welfare recipients that can work and a "decent income" for those who cannot. However, Carter's specific legislative proposals for welfare reform are not expected to be sent to the Congress until August. If welfare reform was adopted by the Congress in early 1978, it would take about three years to put the new programs into effect, according to the President.

Budget Timetable

Congress must complete action on all appropriations bills which fix the amounts agencies and programs can spend by September 12, 1977.

Appropriations bills and the final revenue and spending limits for fiscal 1978 will be adopted by September 15.

New Members on JCPS Staff

The Joint Center for Political Studies is pleased to announce the addition of four new members to its senior staff. They are: Dr. Adam Herbert, director of research; Alfred Lang, director of administration; William D. Ellis, director of training and technical assistance; and Dr. Lenneal Henderson, associate director of research.

Dr. Herbert, a former White House Fellow, served as special assistant to the Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) during the Ford administration. He has taught public administration at the University of Southern California and was chairman of the urban affairs program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. He received his B.A. and M.P.A. degrees from the University of Southern California and his Ph.D. in urban affairs and public administration from the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Herbert is the author of several articles and papers in the areas of decentralization, citizen participation and urban management practices.

Mr. Lang served at Virginia Union University in Richmond, Virginia before coming to the Center. His extensive background in accounting and administration includes positions as chief accountant or business manager at Claflin College-South Carolina; St. Augustine's College-North Carolina; Lincoln University-Missouri; and Knoxville College-Tennessee. Mr. Lang received his B.A. and M.A. in business administration from the University of Missouri.

Mr. Ellis has had an extensive background in the development and implementation of training and assistance programs at all levels of government, including task force assignments at HUD and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). He received his B.A. in business administration from South Carolina State College.

Dr. Henderson is on a one-year leave of absence from the faculty of the political science department at Howard University. He has served as a senior research associate with the Verve Research Corporation in Bethesda, Maryland. Dr. Henderson received his B.A. in political science, M.A. in public administration and Ph.D. in political science from the University of California. Dr. Henderson is the author of *Black Political Life in the U.S.*, published in 1972 by Chandler Publishing Co. He has also authored several articles in the areas of political science, public administration and black politics.

Hawkins Announces Hearings on EEO Reorganization

Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins (D Calif.), chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, announced June 3 that the Subcommittee would hold several days of hearings during July on reorganizing the federal equal employment opportunity enforcement agencies.

Hawkins said that the reorganization alone will not resolve the problems of the federal agencies but he feels that "clearly there is a great need to address the overlapping and frequently inconsistent activities of the agencies charged with enforcing non-discrimination in employment laws."

Citing the findings of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities oversight investigation on federal EEO enforcement during the last Congress, Hawkins stated, "Federal equal employment activities are now so fragmented and uncoordinated that a single employer may be found to be discriminating under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act yet in compliance with the contract compliance program under Executive Order 11246. The confusion and contradiction is no less frustrating for complainants as standards and procedures for the resolution of complaints differ from agency to agency. The proliferation of equal employment enforcement agencies allows responsibility to be passed from agency to agency with little or no accountability."

Hawkins also stated that during the July hearings the committee will "seek a broad spectrum of viewpoints on the most effective way to restructure EEO enforcement activities."

20th Annual Convention of the SCLC

The Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) will hold its 20th Annual Convention, in the city of its inception, Atlanta, Georgia, August 16 - 19. The major business of the convention will be the selection of SCLC's third president.

The convention will honor the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the founding president and Rev. Ralph David Abernathy who became president of the organization after Dr. King's death. Abernathy resigned the presidency in February, 1977. (See February FOCUS).

Dr. Joseph Lowery, chairman of SCLC's board of directors, is currently serving as acting president. Lowery will also be honored along with Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth of Cincinnati, Ohio and Rev. C.K. Steele of Tallahassee, Florida — all founders of SCLC.

The theme of the 20th convention will be Human Rights. Human rights issues involving unemployment, housing, and injustice within the American system will be discussed.

President Carter, U.S. Ambassador Andrew Young and Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.) have been invited to address the convention.

New Publication on Minorities

FOCUS is pleased to welcome a new publication concerned with minorities entitled, *Southwest Journal*, published by the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project (SVREP).

The *Southwest Journal* will be gathering information concerning the political development of Mexican Americans and Native Americans throughout the Southwest and presenting it to its readers.

The first issue deals with the "Latino vote, 1976: The beginning of clout". It details the part played by the Latino community in the November election and comes to the conclusion that "while Latinos played a key role in the election of President Jimmy Carter, they came nowhere near measuring up to their potential."

"Of the 1,888,000 Latinos who voted, 81 per cent chose Jimmy Carter, giving him the margin of victory in two key states, Texas and Ohio."

Continued on page 8

Continued from page 7

"But the turnout among Latino voters was substantially below that of the nation as a whole. For every two Latinos who voted, three potential voters stayed home. This hurt Carter especially in California, the nation's most populous state, where the Democratic candidate would have won if the Latino turnout had matched the national average."

These findings and others can be found in "The Latino Vote in the 1976 Presidential Election," a study conducted by SVREP director of research Andy Hernandez. The study can be obtained by sending \$1 to the *Southwest Journal*, Southwest Voter Registration Education Project, 212 East Houston St., San Antonio, Texas, 78205, Phone (512) 222-0224.

JCPS Publishes Energy Book

On May 12, the Joint Center sponsored an energy roundtable discussion to examine the implications of the energy crisis on minorities and the poor. (See May FOCUS). As a result, the Center is publishing a book entitled, *Energy Policy and the Poor*, which documents the proceedings of the roundtable.

The roundtable included representatives from the fields of energy or public policy, whose views by no means always coincided. On the contrary, their diverse approaches to a variety of issues made it abundantly clear that much more research and much more sophisticated analyses are required to assess accurately the impact of the energy problem on the poor, to evaluate the various plans now being circulated and to develop, where necessary, alternative proposals.

The roundtable, which was chaired by Joint Center president, Eddie N. Williams, included: Keith Bodden, representing Rep. Charles Rangel (D N.Y.); Leonard Bower, American Petroleum Institute; Jeff Copeland, Newsweek; Joel Darmstadter, Resources for the Future; Denis Hayes, Worldwatch Institute; Dr. Lenneal Hender-

**Attention black elected officials:
Please be sure to return your data
form as soon as possible for the
1977 National Roster of Black
Elected Officials. Your coopera-
tion is necessary to make the
Roster complete and accurate.**

son, Joint Center; Robert Meskunus, National Council for Community Action; Rufus McKinney, Southern California Gas; Judson Parker, Federal Energy Administration; Frank Pollara, AFL-CIO; Richard Saul, Community Services Administration; Larry Young, representing Congressional Black Caucus Chairperson Parren Mitchell (D Md.).

A reading of these proceedings indicate general agreement among the participants on the existence of an energy problem that deserves prompt attention; support of the efforts of the President to develop policies based on fuel conservation; acknowledgement that lower income families are likely to be more adversely affected by the energy crunch than other segments of the population; and a firm conviction that blacks, other minorities and the poor must make themselves heard now in the debate on energy being conducted at various levels of government.

To obtain your copy of *Energy Policy and the Poor*, send \$2.00 to Publications Department, Joint Center for Political Studies, 1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 925, Washington, D.C. 20005.

FOCUS

Joint Center for Political Studies

1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 926
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-4477

**ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED**

**Postmaster:
Form 3547 requested**

**NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify Focus of
any change of address or title. YOU MUST
INCLUDE YOUR OLD ADDRESS AND ZIP
CODE along with your new address and zip
code. No change can be made without this in-
formation.**

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 44958
Washington, D.C.

FIRST CLASS MAIL