VOL. 7, NO. 6 June 1979

FOCUS



THE CENSUS & MINORITIES: WHO GETS COUNTED?

Joint Center for Political Studies

Perspective

This column falls under the category of desirable legislative remedies to declining youth political participation.

On numerous occasions we have reported that black youth (18-24-year-olds) represent a vast untapped reservoir of political potential: 23 percent of all 15-million eligible black voters in the U.S. In 1976, only 39 percent of them were registered to vote and only 28 percent actually voted. This abysmal voter participation rate was more than six percentage points lower than the embarassing rate in 1972 when 48 percent were registered and only 34 percent voted.

Among Hispanics, the picture is even worse. In 1976, only 29 percent of the 1.5-million 18-24-year-olds were registered and only 22 percent voted. These rates also were down substantially from what they were in 1972. A possible saving grace for Hispanics, however, is that those who do register turn out to vote at a relatively higher rate than their black counterparts.

It does no good to belabor the obvious significance of this data. Nor does it help to say that minority political participation—in all age groups but especially among the young—is substantially below that of whites or to haggle over why the rates are so low. What may do some good are specific, workable programs to reverse the trend toward political impotence.

Fortunately, we can point to some encouraging signs. The Rev. Jesse Jackson's PUSH-EXCEL voter registration program is working. The Joint Center's Youth Leadership workshop is working (and, hopefully, will be funded for expansion). Operation Big Vote is alive and well and planning a major voter participation campaign in 1979-80. The National Urban League and the NAACP are putting their shoulders behind youth mobilization campaigns.

This is good. But there is one thing that only elected officials, especially state legislators, can do to help increase minority youth political participation. It is to introduce and pass legislation to make voter registration more accessible to young people.

President Jimmy Carter, to his credit, was a party to such a legislative effort when he was governor of Georgia. On March 31, 1971, he signed into law an amendment to the Georgia election code, which required that the principal or assistant principal of every public or private high school and the director of each area vocational school *"shall be"* deputy registrars.

Today, such legislation is under consideration by the Michigan legislature, and it ought to be introduced and passed by the legislatures of the other 48 states, the District of Columbia, and the voting territories. Surely, such legislation would help to put life and meaning into high school civics and social studies courses, and, in the process, help to solve the problem of young minority political drop-outs. I commend the following legislative language to elected officials for their consideration and use:

> An enactment by the Georgia Assembly to amend the election code: "(c) Each principal or assistant principal of every public or private high school and the director of each area vocational school in this State shall be deputy to the Board of Registrars for the purpose of registering as electors only those qualified applicants who are enrolled students with the principal's school or employed by the school . . ."

On February 20, 1979, Michigan State Senator Jackie Vaughn, III (D) introduced a similar amendment which stated, in part: "AN ASSISTANT APPOINTED UNDER SUBSECTION (1) SHALL NOT TAKE REGISTRATIONS FROM PERSONS OTHER THAN ENROLLED STUDENTS IN, AND EMPLOYEES OF, THE SCHOOL IN WHICH THE PRINCIPAL, ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL, OR DIRECTOR IS EMPLOYED.

"(4) An assistant shall not take registrations or assist in taking registrations while that assistant is a candidate for an elective public office other than for the office of clerk of a county, city, village, or township.

"AS USED IN THIS SECTION, "SCHOOL" MEANS A PUBLIC OR NONPUBLIC SCHOOL IN THIS STATE IN WHICH GRADES 9 TO 12 OR GRADES 10 TO 12 ARE TAUGHT, AND INCLUDES A VOCATIONAL OR A VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL."

Think about it, and do something about it.

Eddie N. Williams
President

FOCUS

Copyright © 1979 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. FOCUS is published monthly, $12.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.*

president: Eddie N. Williams
special assistant to the president: Malachi Knowles
vice president: Eleanor Farrar
director of administration: Alfred Lang
director of community development programs: Henry Moore
director of development: Kathleen Vander Horst
director of fellowship: Louise Taylor
director of publications: Robert E. Anderson, Jr.
director of training: Lucia Edmonds
editorial assistant: Barbara LaMarr

Board of Governors

Wendell Freeland, Esq., Chairman
Edward W. Brooke, Esq., Attorney at Law
James E. Cheek, President, Howard University
Kenneth B. Clark, President, Clark, Phipps, Clark & Harris
Hortense Williams Dixon, Vice President, Texas Southern University
Jayne Brumley Ikard, Political Columnist
Samuel Jackson, Esq., Attorney at Law
Eddie N. Williams, President, Joint Center for Political Studies
James Wolfensohn, General Partner, Salomon Brothers

Minorities and the New Right

by **Rep. Ronald Dellums (D Calif.)**

(Editor's Note: The following is extracted from a speech given by Rep. Dellums in February, 1979, before the Teacher's Rights Annual Conference of the National Education Association.)

We have read a great deal over the past several months about the notion that America is moving farther and farther to the right and that the majority of American people are now part of a great right wing movement. I, for one, reject that notion . . .

I see a right wing movement in this country, but, in my estimation, it is a minority movement that is well organized, well financed, highly visible, dominating the political arena, and determining the parameters of discussion. Who are the people in the right wing? They are the reactionary thinkers, doers, and political figures, people who believe that we can return magically to the days of the past . . .

I also believe that the right wing includes the corporate oligarchy which has a great deal to gain by focusing on profits and not human priorities and, by using the historic approach of divide and conquer, to keep people polarized.

The right wing has done an interesting and uncanny thing. It has exploited a moment and a situation. Millions of middle-class, middle-income, middle-American taxpayers feel the pain of inflation and increased taxation. Since no one spoke to those realities, right wing advocates seized the moment, said they understood the pain and agony of inflation and increasing taxes, and offered an analysis of America's problems and a solution to relieve the pressure. Proposition 13 emerged as the vehicle by which it would be done . . .

Those in the right wing are demanding less government and less spending for human services, anti-union activity, and fewer taxes. The practical effect is to lock in all the existing inequities and injustices . . .

When members of the right wing speak of less government, what do they mean? . . . Government allows us to establish on the basis of our values a set of priorities, a budget that would reflect those priorities, a set of policies and programs that we would use, and resources to carry forward the people's concerns and needs—in short, the expression of the people's will . . .

Where are the modern conservatives and moderate liberals? Where are the people who have traditionally believed in the great values of democracy, freedom and justice and who stood up in the 1960's and the early 1970's to fight for what they considered to be better approaches to addressing human problems? Where are they at this moment of right wing analysis and solutions? They are so busy diving for cover under the conservative and reactionary umbrellas in this country that they have totally abdicated their political responsibilities—all of them . . .

Competing Analysis of America's Problems

We now must offer a competing analysis of America's problems. We must first point up the dangers of the right wing movement that manipulates fears and fosters greater polarization, whether it is at the level of race, class, or ideology . . .

It is my fundamental notion that a society answers the questions that it asks. If our society asks of our scientific genius how we can more efficiently and effectively destroy life, it will answer that question: neutron bombs, trident submarines, MX missiles, Mark 12-A warheads. If we ask how to evolve a society that is worthy of us, our genius will be directed at answering that question . . .

It seems to me that our challenge must begin with humanist values. We have got to move beyond our tenacious clinging to the values of materialism that have made us a debt-ridden society . . .

A New Coalition

It is my belief that life is the most precious substance on the face of the earth—not property, not prestige, and not status. I believe that each of us in our own way must be responsible for the world we perceive and for the knowledge we possess. If through our own eyes we see pain, sorrow, injustice, oppression, death or destruction, whether we are members of Congress, teachers or whatever, we must challenge and be responsible for the agony we see and the knowledge we have.

Martin Luther King understood. Many people eulogized Martin Luther King as a moderate civil rights leader, but I reject that notion. He understood that civil rights was a journey that the nation and the world must take, that the issue had to transcend the parochialism of race at some point. . . . He came to Washington once and spoke to 250,000 people about the fundamental notion of civil and human rights in the country. The next time he was to lead a march into Washington, he was building a broad coalition of human beings. That coalition never came together . . .

Martin Luther King died and the movement stopped with him. But, we now have a new moment and the universality of economic injustice is still here. Borrow a page from the right. They saw a set of problems and focused on solutions. Let us offer to the same group of people an analysis and a new set of programs that do not embody fear and the danger of polarization . . .

That is my challenge to you. Tomorrow will not belong to the children if we leave it to the frightened, the fearful, and the exploiters. Frightened people will not change the world. Only people who have the courage to challenge evil and who are willing to try to right wrongs will give hope.

Before King died, he talked about the redistribution of power and a redistribution of wealth. He pointed out that generosity was not throwing a few crumbs to a beggar, but dealing with the circumstances inherent in our society that made a person beg. My interpretation of that statement is that neither liberalism, nor expedient moderate politics will solve human problems. Only when we come together as people to shape our institutions so that they reflect those priorities will we ever solve the human problems in our society.

Reducing the Census Undercount

(Editor's Note: In 1973, the Joint Center for Political Studies reported that blacks and other minorities were being shortchanged in general revenue sharing and other federal funds because they were disproportionately undercounted in the 1970 census. (See FOCUS May 1973). This revelation sent shock waves through minority communities and eventually commanded the attention of the President, the Congress, researchers and the media. The Census Bureau and its parent agency, the Department of Commerce, have conducted numerous hearings and research investigations, looking at what caused the undercount in 1970 and at ways to prevent or minimize an undercount in 1980.

Last year the Department of Commerce asked the prestigious National Academy of Science to look into this matter and specifically to review the plans of the Census Bureau for the 1980 Census. The Academy appointed a panel to conduct this work. It was headed by Dr. Nathan Keyfitz, professor of sociology and demography at Harvard University. Among the panel members were three minority representatives: Eddie N. Williams, president of the Joint Center for Political Studies; Dr. Hylan Lewis, professor in the department of sociology, City University of New York, and Dr. Leonardo F. Estrada, professor in the school of architecture and planning, University of California.

Included among the panel's recommendations was a proposal that the Secretary of Commerce adopt a procedure to make an adjustment for any undercount that might occur in 1980 so as to assure greater equity in the distribution of funds among states and areas with large concentrations of minorities. This recommendation vindicated the position taken earlier by the Census Bureau advisory committees representing blacks, Hispanics, and Asian and Pacific Americans. However, to date, no action has been taken on it.

In view of the rapidly approaching 1980 census, the Congress is also taking a special interest in this subject. In the interest of assuring clarity on matters pertaining to the undercount and to proposals to rectify the undercount, a representative of the National Academy of Science testified in March before the House Subcommittee on Census and Population of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Excerpts from that testimony by Dr. Harold Goldstein are presented here.)

The National Academy of Science Panel noted that the undercount of 1970, as estimated by the Census Bureau, though only 2.5 percent, fell unevenly on various population groups: it was four times as large for blacks as for whites, and probably also disproportionately large for Hispanics and other minority groups; it was greater for men than for women, and greater for persons under age 10 and between 25 and 44 than for other age groups. The differential undercount by race or ethnic groups presumably resulted in a greater undercount for states and cities with large minority populations. This aspect of the undercount creates inequities and engenders controversy.

The Panel reviewed evidence as to reasons for the undercount. Census Bureau studies show that probably less than half of the missed persons in 1970 were in households that were missed entirely; more than half were missed by incomplete enumeration of their households or were persons not living in households at all. Dwelling units in rural areas may be hard to find, but even in urban areas, dwelling units in subdivided structures, in basements, attics, condemned buildings, or commercial buildings are often hard to find. Even when dwelling units are found and enumerated, people may be missed because they are boarders, roomers, or persons considered by the household to be only temporarily staying there. Most difficult to enumerate are those deliberately omitted from the household's report because they do not want the authorities to know of them. The Census Bureau has procedures to count most kinds of missing people, but these procedures are vulnerable to human error or lack of skill, thoroughness, or persistence.

In reviewing the plans of the Bureau of the Census to obtain a more complete enumeration of the population in 1980, the Panel was impressed by the likelihood that this census may be more difficult than earlier ones. Since over 60 percent of adult women are now in the labor force, it will be harder for enumeration to find people at home during the daytime. There is, in addition, a large number—estimated in the millions—of undocumented aliens, adding to the number of persons adverse to being identified by the authorities.

Innovations in Census Count

The Panel concluded that the Census Bureau's plans were responsive to the problems and well-considered. It noted that several innovations have considerable potential for improving the enumeration: first, the development of the most complete list of dwelling units possible, which serves as a control over enumerators' errors; second, inclusion in the actual census of two procedures that previously had been used only afterwards to provide a statistical check on the results: a check of apparently vacant dwellings for possible occupants, and the matching of independent records to the count obtained in households; and, third, plans for active participation by local government in reviewing block-by-block counts of dwelling units and of population during the census, so that errors can be picked up and re-checks made while the census staff is still at work.

The Panel believed that the plan to conduct the census initially by mail in areas where 90 percent of the population live makes good sense: it takes advantage of the literacy and cooperativeness of most residents, so that special efforts can be focused on those who fail to return the forms or who are difficult to enumerate. The Panel was concerned, however, that as a result of loss of personal contact with enumerators some households would not fully understand whom to report, so that some persons with partial attachment to the household might be missed. It urged that on an experimental basis enumerators visit households in hard-to-enumerate areas to explain what is wanted and see if further help is needed.

Willing and intelligent participation by the people to be counted was seen as essential to improving the count. The Panel noted with approval the Census Bureau's plans for an expanded community relations program. It recommended that the Bureau change

its approach in advertising the census, shifting from use of the free publicity provided in earlier censuses through the efforts of the Advertising Council to a program of paid advertising that could focus more effectively on the media that reach minority groups.

Other Recommendations

The extensive plans for review by local government officials in the course of the census could be effective in improving the count and in averting subsequent disagreements, the Panel said. But the success of this commendable program is endangered by limitations of expertise, data, time, or resources in many local governments. The Panel recommended that the cooperation with local officials be initiated early, and that the Census Bureau mount an effective program to give them technical assistance and to alert them to devote sufficient time and resources to the work. Since some counts may be contested, the Panel recommended that, in addition to the informal review process now used, the Census Bureau should establish a formal review process, with a written record, to provide a route of appeal for dissatisfied local governments short of filing suit in a court of law.

The Panel warned that despite all efforts to improve coverage it is unrealistic to expect a complete enumeration. This is not attained even in much smaller countries with highly literate, civic-minded, and homogeneous populations. With large increases in effort and cost, the undercount may be reduced below 2.5 percent, but each successive small increment in completeness comes at increasingly higher cost. If, as in the past, it affects population groups or geographic areas differently, a serious issue of inequity arises because the population, both as counted in the census, and as estimated for intercensal years, is used in allocating billions in federal funds under a number of programs.

The Panel saw this use of census figures and postcensal estimates as different from ordinary uses of statistics, in which the uncertainty inherent in statistics can be tolerated if the probable degree of uncertainty is known. For distributive uses even small errors or uncertainties can affect how much each recipient gets, and controversy is inescapable. For such uses, there has to be a public understanding, or convention, as to how the figures on which distribution of funds is based are to be arrived at in view of the inevitable uncertainty of statistics.

Adjusting the Census Count

The Panel carefully considered the question of adjusting the census count for fund distribution purposes. The Census Bureau is understandably hesitant to do anything that may be interpreted as tampering with the figures. Yet, the Panel noted, the Bureau is already engaged in work involving substantial exercise of professional judgment to improve its figures or to develop estimates on the basis of data with severe limitations. One important instance is the development of intercensal population and income estimates for 39,000 geographic areas, for use in distributing federal funds. A second instance is the addition to the population actually enumerated in the 1970 census of several million persons whose existence was inferred from partial evidence and whose characteristics were estimated from those of other persons in the same communities. *The Panel commended the Bureau for these imaginative and responsible responses to needs for information, and saw the adjustment of census data for the remaining undercount as, in principle, an extension of the procedures by which the 1970 census was made more complete.*

In reviewing various techniques by which the count could be adjusted for underenumeration, the Panel was unable to select one that could be identified at this time as clearly superior. Nevertheless, the Panel believed that some adjustment would lead to greater general equity in the distribution of funds among states and areas (even though the figures for some individual areas might be farther from the true population rather than closer).

It, therefore, recommended a procedure by which the Secretary of Commerce, if she agreed with the Panel's conclusion, could direct the Census Bureau to adjust the counts for the purpose of distribution of funds. The adjusted figures would not be used for legislative apportionment (a constitutional matter which the Panel felt should be decided by legislative bodies) or for the vast body of census data on characteristics of the population, but they would serve as the basis for postcensal estimates of population by states and areas, which are also used for fund distribution.

The Census Bureau would be technically responsible for the method of adjustment to be used. It would be required to publicly state the general methods it would follow, in advance of the census date, so that interested parties might comment on them; to issue the adjusted figures within a reasonable time after the census data for use in fund allocation; and to publish a full account of the methods followed, their effect on the estimates for states and areas, and, to the extent possible, the accuracy of the adjustment.

The Panel was aware that if the decision to adjust the census counts is made, some people may feel that the substantial additional costs of the Bureau's planned procedures to improve the count may no longer be warranted. The Panel did not accept that view. It strongly supported making a major effort to get the most complete enumeration feasible. It pointed out that (1) the original count is needed for legislative apportionment, and (2) the more complete the original count, the less room for error in the adjustments—especially if efforts to improve the count of minorities reduce the differential underenumeration. In addition, a better job of adjustment can be done if the Census Bureau has adequate funds for post-enumeration surveys, matching studies, and other research required on the undercount.

Finally, the Panel recommended an extensive Census Bureau program of evaluation of the accuracy of the census results, and of research into the causes of the undercount and how to deal with it. This research should examine not only how to improve census methods of finding and counting people, and how to publicize the census more effectively, but also why people are missed, and the underlying social and attitudinal factors. (In the July FOCUS, JCPS President Eddie N. Williams will charge that Secretary of Commerce, Juanita Kreps has failed to react to the National Academy of Science's recommendation in time to improve the 1980 Census count.)

Planning Small Cities

Despite the fact that the nation's population is more and more concentrated in the great metropolitan centers, most Americans have never really become urbanized in the sense that they actually prefer to live in a large city. The roots of most of us are in small towns and rural areas and when we move to the city we bring with us a nostalgia for the past. Combine this with the impersonal aspects of city living, the tensions and anxieties; the sense of being only one among millions: and there is little wonder that polltakers find the majority of us prefer life in smaller towns.

But, small towns have their problems, too. Many are losing population and industry. Their tax bases are shrinking. They cannot provide all of the amenities that are available in larger cities and towns.

How are they planning for the future? What are the characteristics of growing cities and of declining cities? What are their special problems in planning? These and related questions are addressed in a book published in March under the auspices of the Joint Center for Political Studies (JCPS).

Joint Center Survey

Planning Small Cities; by Herrington Bryce, former JCPS research director, evolved from a 1975 Joint Center survey of the planning needs of five small to medium sized localities. The scope of the study was enlarged to include sponsorship of a major national conference on the problems of small cities and finally to this book which covers more than 500 cities.

Preference for small city living seems to be predicated on several factors. The small cities which grew the fastest between 1960 and 1975 were able to annex surrounding areas, and were in or near centers of activity such as colleges, airports and governmental operations. They had little manufacturing, low percentages of minorities, higher incomes, better educated populations, and were very dependent upon surrounding jurisdictions for employment. Many were residential centers.

Declining cities are poorer than growing cities. They have larger percentages of minorities, depend heavily on manufacturing and have an older supply of housing.

Assessing Small Cities

Bryce assesses the cities according to three indicators—population growth rates, poverty rates, and age of housing. The cities in which population is declining, poverty is high, and housing is old, he defines as "distressed" cities. The South has the highest percentage of such cities; the West has the lowest.

The most common need of declining cities is to improve their housing stock. The most often expressed need of growing cities is land use planning. All rate economic development high on their agendas.

Annexation is the means by which most cities have been able to grow. Bryce believes this is likely to continue. Indeed, more than half of the cities surveyed reported that they are considering annexation of neighboring land. This is true of cities that are growing rapidly as well as of those that are growing more slowly and even of those that are declining in population.

There are, however, regional differences, especially in the New England and Middle Atlantic states where annexation laws are more restrictive, and towns are surrounded by other, already incorporated cities. More affluent towns in those areas see little advantage of being annexed and, therefore, resist the process. Only 5 percent of New England small towns surveyed and 15 percent of Middle Atlantic towns plan annexation.

Bryce examines in detail the decline of five small Michigan cities—Albion, Pontiac, Inkster, Highland Park, and Benton Harbor. Their experiences, he notes, demonstate that population decline is often accompanied by changes in population composition. One such change is related to age.

"The age structure of the population becomes increasingly one in which there are many elderly and many young people with relatively few individuals in between. Another change results in an increase in the black population relative to the white population, as the latter outmigrates. The two factors often combine to create a population that is characterized by very many young blacks residing in the same milieu as very many elderly whites. This cleavage is often a prescription for social as well as political problems."

Such a situation, Bryce observes, leads to a high dependency ratio in a city. "The number of working-age individuals is small relative to those who are by virtue of age either outside the labor market or are most difficult to employ. The consequence is that the financial burden of the city falls on a relatively few people—many of whom might eventually migrate as the tax burden increases. This cycle either leads to a decline in the quantity of quality of services and/or further increases the tax burden on those left behind."

Obstacles in Planning

Bryce notes, too, that, while cities recognize their problems and their need for planning, they face obstacles in doing so. All express the need for more data, more staff, and better local leadership. Downtown development, planning and zoning are major community development problems. County government is the most common source of intergovernmental conflict.

Most of the cities which are declining do not do their own planning, but, rather contract it to outside sources. Other outside factors, such as dependence on the economics of surrounding areas and on federal funds, affect their planning abilities and diminish their control over what they can do.

This weakening of local control, Bryce concludes, "severely limits the best-laid plans by small cities."

Planning Small Cities is a comprehensive study of how cities are planning to meet the large challenges of the future. It was funded by the National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Charles F. Kettering Foundation. It may be purchased for $21.95 through Lexington Books, a division of D.C. Heath & Company, 125 Spring St., Lexington, Mass., 02173.

—Robert E. Anderson, Jr.

Telescope

Administration Proposes Equity in Interest Rates

The Carter Administration last month asked Congress to enact legislation giving small depositors the same interest return on their money that is given large investors.

Under current regulations, the amount of interest which banks and other savings institutions can pay to depositors is limited to a maximum of 5.5 percent. But, investors with a minimum of $10,000 can earn as much as 9.5 percent by buying corporate or government securities.

To remedy the disparity, the President asked for reforms which would permit interest on deposits to rise to the market rate level.

The President said that ceilings on depositer interest rates "are costing the American people billions of dollars in lost interest annually."

Lower income and elderly citizens who keep their money in savings accounts have been the most severely handicapped by present regulations, the President said.

National Bar Association Seeks to Increase The Number of Minority Judges

The National Bar Association (NBA) in May urged President Carter and the Justice Department to increase the number of minority and female judges selected for the federal bench.

Currently, recommendations for 72 of 117 new federal district court seats have been received by the Justice Department. They include the names of only nine blacks and five Hispanics. Eleven states—Arkansas, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia and Connecticut—have all submitted names of white male candidates.

"The most serious defect of the judicial selection process," said Julius Williams, Newark attorney and president of the NBA, "is the continuation of the 'good old boy' corporate elite syndrome where the names and faces of lawyers and judges associated with large corporate law firms continue to dominate the lists of those nominated. The warriors of the civil rights era, those attorneys who championed the cause of black equality in the 50's and 60's, have been bypassed by the current selection process."

The new judgeships were created under the Omnibus Judgeship Act of 1978. The NBA has itself submitted the names of more than 50 candidates.

Minority Surname Not Enough

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has informed the Montgomery County (Maryland) Executive that it takes more than a name change to qualify as a minority. A white male employee of Montgomery County changed his name from Robert E. Lee to Roberto Eduardo Leon in order to qualify as a minority under the county's affirmative action plan.

The EEOC stated in a letter to the county that it would be an abuse of Federal law and regulations to accept the conversion of name to a Spanish surname as an acceptable yardstick to assess an individual as being a member of a minority.

368 Cities Eligible for Interior Department Funds To Renovate Urban Parks and Recreation Areas

Three hundred and sixty-eight cities and counties in 44 states are now eligible to receive direct matching grants from the Department of the Interior to renovate deteriorating urban parks and recreation systems.

In announcing the grants, Interior under-secretary James A. Joseph said, "The Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program is a key element of President Carter's 1978 Urban Policy. It will upgrade recreation facilities for people who need them most—in the neighborhoods where they live."

The grant program is part of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program, which was approved by Congress as Title X of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978. The five year program is funded at $151-million annually from 1979 to 1982 and at $126-million for 1983.

Under the law, the Secretary of the Interior can authorize discretionary grants, up to 15 percent of the appropriated funds, to needy jurisdictions which may not qualify under the eligibility criteria.

The eligibility criteria, which consisted of six variables developed by the Interior Department and the Bureau of the Census, included: population density; net change in the per capita income, 1969-1975; percent unemployed; percent of households without automobiles available; total population under 18 years of age, and 60 years and over; and percent of persons with incomes below 125 percent of "poverty level" income.

Joseph also said that the eligibility criteria would be reviewed annually to be sure that the funds will be directed to areas of the greatest need.

For further information, contact the Chief, Urban Programs Task Force, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Room 205, 440 G Street, N.W., Pension Building, Washington, D.C. 20243.

Gayton Appointed Deputy Administrator

Gary D. Gayton, an attorney from Seattle, Wash., has been appointed deputy administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

Gayton, who has been special assistant to Transportation Secretary Brock Adams since July 1977, will serve as acting administrator until that position is filled.

Gayton received a law degree from Gonzaga University in 1962 and a doctor of laws in 1967. Prior to joining DOT, Gayton had worked as an assistant U.S. attorney under Adams when he was U.S. Attorney General for the Western District in Washington.

Hearings on 1980 Census Begin

Rep. Robert Garcia (D N.Y.), chairman of the House Census and Population Subcommittee, has begun a series of hearings on the 1980 Census and how it will affect minority communities.

According to Garcia, "Few realize the tremendous impact of the Census on a community. Each year, over $50-billion is allocated to communities across the country on the basis of population data obtained from the Census.

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

"Somehow we have to convince people—especially minorities—that it is actually in their best interest to be counted. I'm not convinced that the Bureau (of the Census) has effectively put this message across to minority groups. That's what we hope to accomplish by these hearings."

The hearings, which began in March, have been held in Washington, D.C.; New York City; San Francisco; Houston; Los Angeles and San Diego.

Garcia said that in the past, minorities mistrusted the government in general and that misconceptions about the purpose of the Census, use of data, and confidentiality of information made minorities reluctant to fill out forms, and answer questions.

In California, these difficulties led to 500,000 individuals being missed by the 1970 Census and a loss to the state of over $14-million in revenue-sharing funds through 1976.

Concerned that the Census Bureau seems to have made little progress toward an accurate 1980 count, Garcia has requested that the U.S. Comptroller, Elmer B. Staats, carry out an audit on procedures within the agency.

Garcia has asked Staats to determine the Bureau's ability to "compile an accurate and complete national address register . . . especially in areas of high minority concentration such as the South Bronx and Harlem sections of New York City, or in areas for which commercial mailing lists are of historically poor quality."

1979 Roster Forms in Mail

The Joint Center is updating data on black elected officials which will be included in the 1979 edition of the *National Roster of Black Elected Officials.* Failure to return your questionnaire by July 15 may result in the exclusion of your name from the Roster.

CBC Supports Carter On Rhodesian Sanctions

The Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) in June went on record in support of President Carter's recent decision not to lift economic sanctions against Rhodesia in the aftermath of that country's elections.

The Caucus statement read in part: "The Congressional Black Caucus supports the President's basic principled determination that, as a matter of law, the recent Rhodesian elections were not free and fair, and that it is not in the national interest to lift sanctions. We will work on the basis that sanctions should not be lifted before a true and fair transfer of power to the Rhodesian black majority occurs.

"The Caucus urges black Americans to immediately make known to their congressional representatives and the White House their vocal support for the President's basic determination, their concern about ambiguities which remain in the President's position, and their strong opposition to the lifting of sanctions."

JCPS Seeks Data Collectors

The Joint Center is developing a network of individuals throughout the country who will assist our ongoing data collection tasks. Participants will be designated Joint Center Associates and will be eligible to receive any Joint Center publications up to $15.00 in value. Anyone interested in participating in this very important project should contact Ms. Alice Harper at

Joint Center for Political Studies
1426 H Street N.W., Suite 926
Washington, D.C. 20005

or by calling Area Code 202/638-4477.

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

3

PRICE $1.25

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 and allow 3 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 44958
Washington, D.C.