VOL. 7, NO. 3 March 1979

FOCUS



CAN MINORITIES SURVIVE THE BUDGET?

Joint Center for Political Studies

Perspective

On the occasion of the Joint Center's second annual dinner, honoring Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, on March 6, I had the privilege of delivering these closing remarks on the role and work of the Joint Center for Political Studies:

"Last year we described the Joint Center's dinner as an ecumenical occasion. It is more ecumenical tonight. Many people deserve credit.

"One of them is Dr. Mamie Phipps Clark whose professional contributions and whose contributions to Ken Clark's contributions, you must know or presume.

"I am not exaggerating when I say this dinner could not have been held had it not been for this remarkable woman. Only she was able to persuade the modest Ken Clark to allow us to honor him. Another reason to salute Mamie Clark is because she has devoted much of her life, with remarkable effect, to the welfare and happiness of children, particularly neglected children.

"I will close with a few brief thoughts about the Joint Center for Political Studies which is entering its tenth year of operations.

"There is, as Carter G. Woodson recognized in 1926, a continuing need to curb and correct myths and misconceptions about black people and about minorities in general.

"Perhaps so many of us wish so hard for equality that we allow our wishes to blind us to the realities. Social and economic statistics point to some progress, but on the whole they paint a picture of continuing inequality.

"Therefore, it is dangerous for any of us to be lulled into a false sense of accomplishment in race relations. In making this point recently, Justice Thurgood Marshall recalled an observation by John F. Kennedy:

" 'The great enemy of truth very often is not the lie . . . but the myth . . .'

"Public policies must be based on facts—not myths—and on informed interpretations of those facts. The views and intelligence of blacks and other minorities should be welcome in the policy making process. Their perspectives and concerns should be clearly delineated by research, analysis, and thoughtful deliberations. This effort must come not only from white scholars and institutions but must also come from the very minorities who are affected by our policies.

"Yet, it does not take much research to show that almost all of the public and private grants made for research on racial issues and on the impact of public policies on minorities go to white scholars, think tanks, and institutions. It is as though minorities are not expected to think for themselves or to have anything important to say on substantive matters.

"This is yet another barrier of discrimination that must be lowered.

"As a nation, the limits of our knowledge in public policy areas are so agonizingly apparent that we should tap every available pool of talent. Minority perspectives are needed in the early stages of policy development rather than after ideas have been locked in concrete and the only alternative is protest.

"To be present at the creation of policy, so to speak, would give minorities an equal opportunity not only to shape what is being created, but to witness, at close range, the complexity of problem-solving and the elusiveness of final solutions.

"With your help and generosity, the Joint Center will expand its programs in research and public policy. There is a need for timely, factual, and analytical reports on minority public policy perspectives—in the traditional areas of concern as well as in energy, economic development, governance, and in those areas where foreign policies and domestic policies intersect.

"In the process, we will continue to be a center of intellectual discovery and of excellence and a non-partisan forum where diverse views may be exchanged.

"These are the qualities which have brought us to this time and to this place. With your help, we will continue."

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 South 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

The 1980 Budget

by **Adele D. Jackson**

Ms. Jackson is on the professional staff of the House of Representatives Budget Committee. The following article reflects the view of the author and not of the committee.

President Carter's new budget for fiscal year 1980 has as its primary objective reducing the level of inflation. His proposals would provide for revenues of $503-billion and total federal spending in 1980 of $532-billion. This would result in a deficit of $29-billion. The spending level represents an increase of $38-billion, or 7.7 percent, over the estimate of $493-billion for 1979. Even so, compared to past years, the budget represents a decrease in the growth of Federal expenditures. Between 1973 and 1978, Federal spending grew at an average annual rate of 12.1 percent.

Looked at in real terms (i.e., adjusted for inflation), the overall budget for 1980 would provide for about the same level of activity as in fiscal years 1978 and 1979. However, real increases would occur in the following areas: (1) benefit programs in which payments are automatically adjusted for cost-of-living increases; (2) health care programs in which the number of eligible beneficiaries can be expected to increase; and (3) materials purchased for defense activities. The rest of the budget would decrease in real terms. Thus, the President is able to describe his budget as "austere." At the same time, however, he also characterizes it as "compassionate" by maintaining what he regards as adequate support for programs which provide services to people most in need of assistance. In general, I believe his budget can best be characterized as mixed in terms of serving those in need of basic social services.

"Current Policy"

One method of analyzing implications of the President's budget is to apply the concept of "current policy." Since fiscal year 1975, Congress has subjected the President's budget to a comparative analysis which projects what Federal spending would be if current spending policies were continued into the next budget year. Using this approach, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that in 1980, "current policy" outlays would total $551-billion, almost $19-billion or 4 percent above the President's budget request. Here are some of the major changes from "current policy" proposed in the President's 1980 budget:

Human Resources Programs

- *Employment and Training programs*—The President's budget would cut spending for Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs by $3-billion or 31 percent below "current policy" levels. The major decrease is in the public service jobs programs. Such jobs would decrease to 467,000 by the end of 1980. This compares to 725,000 jobs under "current policy." For this same period (1979-1980) the Congressional Budget Office estimates unemployment to run between 6.2 and 7.4 percent. The 1980 budget would also mean significant reductions in the summer youth programs. Jobs would decrease to 750,000 from 1,165,000 jobs in 1978 and 1,000,000 in 1979. Summer jobs for 14-year-olds would be eliminated under the President's proposal. Unemployment among black youth is expected to remain at over 30 percent.
- *Education*—The President's budget would reduce spending for education programs by $1.2-billion below "current policy" levels. The budget would decrease funding for the Impact Aid program by $300-million by eliminating payments for children whose parents do not live and work on Federal property. Increases are proposed for: full funding of the Basic Education Opportunity Grants (BEOGs) program; Title I concentration grants, and education for the handicapped.
- *Other Social Services*—The President's budget indicates that legislation will be submitted to set a permanent ceiling of $2.9-billion on the Title XX Social Services program; and to increase funding for Title IV-B Child Welfare services by $85-billion. The budget proposes reducing subsidies to middle and high income children for the school lunch and school breakfast programs, and eliminating the special milk program in schools which operate breakfast or lunch programs. However, funding would be increased for the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children.
- *Health*—The budget proposes spending below "current policy" levels for Medicare and Medicaid programs. This is due mainly to anticipated savings from proposed legislation for hospital cost containment and other cost-saving measures. Significant reductions are also proposed for health research programs and health manpower training programs (e.g. nurse training). However, the budget includes proposals to increase preventive and public health education programs, and to expand Medicaid coverage for child health and low-income pregnant women. Additional expenditures are also proposed for mental health programs and for psychiatric coverage under Medicare.
- *Social Security*—The President proposes reductions in some social security benefits, including eliminating the $255 lump-sum death benefit, and phasing out college aid for survivors. The "current policy" estimate for social security outlays is $1.4-billion above the President's request of $117-billion.
- *Housing Assistance*—The budget would reduce support for the number of new section 8 and public housing units to 300,000 in 1980 from 370,000 in 1978 and 360,000 in 1979. In addition, the budget proposes reduced housing assistance under the low-interest Rehabilitation Loan program and the Urban Homesteading program. The budget also proposes to rescind

Continued on page 6

The 1980 Budget: Impact on Minorities

by **Rep. William H. Gray, III (D-Pa.)**

Rep. Gray is a newly elected black U.S. representative. He is a member of the House of Representatives' budget committee.

President Carter was put into office by the poor and minority people of this country. In my district, he benefitted from 98 percent of the minority vote on a 90 percent turnout. From analyses I have seen by the Joint Center for Political Studies and other groups, this pattern was repeated in most minority communities.

We voted for Carter because we wanted to give him the opportunity to deliver on his promise of fairness, to deliver on his promise to "treat the poor, the elderly, the weak, and the disabled with respect, compassion and love" and to deliver on his promise to place domestic programs above military spending when setting national priorities.

The President's 1980 budget provides us with an opportunity to take a look at the President's performance, to determine whether or not he is delivering on his promises, and to ask whether or not he is deserving of our continued support.

The Budget-Making Environment

The President is operating in an economic environment colored by the Proposition 13 syndrome and demands for a balanced budget. Put simply, the principal economic belief in this environment is that large Federal deficits cause inflation. Related to this are the beliefs that to control inflation you must limit economic growth, and permit unemployment to rise.

The President had a choice; to exercise leadership and point out that these beliefs are unfounded, or to let himself be pulled along by the political tide. It saddens me to report that the President's 1980 budget demonstrates that he has chosen the latter course.

The President has set as his overall economic objective the containment of inflation. To accomplish this, he intends to limit Federal spending to $532-billion for fiscal year 1980, and to reduce the Federal deficit to $30-billion or below. The President expects that this action, coupled with his voluntary wage and price restraints and supportive monetary policies, will reduce inflation from a projected 7.4 percent in the fourth quarter of 1979 to 6.3 percent in the fourth quarter of 1980 (the inflation rate in December of 1978 was 9.2 percent). Such high priority has been assigned to this anti-inflation policy that the administration is willing to permit unemployment to rise from the 5.8 percent rate of December, 1978 to 6.2 percent in December, 1980. Most economic analyses project that the unemployment rate resulting from the administration's fiscal policies will be much closer to 7.2 percent, and the inflation rate closer to 8 percent. Thus, it is likely that the benefits will be fewer and the suffering greater than the administration projects.

Impact on Domestic Programs

Originally, the administration proclaimed that its program of budgetary austerity would carefully target available resources to serve those most in need. I would have been anxious to support such a program. However, a detailed line-by-line analysis of the President's proposed budget, focusing on programs which serve poor and minority communities, leaves me angered and appalled.

The programs I reviewed can in no way be considered "frills." They provide day care, housing, employment opportunities, food, and vital services to neighborhoods. In these programs alone, there have been budget cuts totaling $11-billion. Some programs have been increased, notably programs for the elderly and support for Community Development Corporations. But overall, cuts in social programs have been drastic. The impact on poor and minority individuals can be expected to be severe.

Beyond its effect on individuals, the administration's budget promises to debase the quality of life in America's cities. In Philadelphia, for example, as a result of cuts in the Local Public Works Program alone, the city will lose $8-million. The CETA cuts will reduce the city's workforce by 1,000 employees by next January. Where will these workers go for jobs? Philadelphia's unemployment rate is *already* 8.6 percent, well above the national average.

The Defense Budget

Further complicating the President's commitment to fiscal restraint is his simultaneous commitment to our NATO allies to increase by 3 percent the resources of the American economy devoted to NATO defense. This has been interpreted by the administration to require an across-the-board 3 percent increase in the budget of the Defense Department, over and above the 7 percent necessary to cover inflation.

We should not quarrel with the need for an adequate national defense. Nor should we quarrel with the need to contribute to the defense of our allies. But we should question the need for not just continuing, but increasing many defense programs which are wasteful, duplicative, and unrelated to NATO. Extraneous planes, tanks, helicopters, nuclear submarines, operations and maintenance of admittedly unneeded military bases, all have been given priority in the President's budget over treating "the poor, the elderly, the weak, and the disabled with respect, compassion, and love." The $11-billion cut in social programs shows up in a $10-billion increase in military spending.

The difference between the treatment of Defense and employment is particularly striking. The method used for calculating the 3 percent growth was the one which provides the greatest possible increase in the military budget. Other choices could have been made which would have met our three per-

cent commitment for perhaps $2 to $3 billion less.

On the other hand, the President's commitment to target employment opportunities to those most in need received the weakest possible support in dollar terms. The jobs program which benefits low income, long term unemployed people most was kept at the 1979 job level. Failure to provide even an inflationary increase for this program means that the benefits of the program will in fact be reduced. The summer youth employment program was actually cut 25 percent from its 1979 level.

Employment is the one area where a commitment to three percent real growth would have signalled that the President understands priority problems of the poor and minority communities and that he is genuinely committed to helping solve those problems.

Are These Cuts Necessary?

In questioning the need for massive cuts in social programs, I begin by questioning the President's economic assumptions. I do not want to create the impression that I think controlling inflation is unimportant, because inflation hits hardest at poor people and people on fixed incomes. I support the President in the pursuit of this goal. But let us examine a few facts.

In a $2.5-*trillion* economy, a $30-billion deficit is insignificant. The Administration itself has stated that, all things being equal, an additional $15-billion in the deficit might add at the most, only 0.2 percentage points to the inflation rate. Unforeseeable international events (increases in oil prices and other raw materials, decreases in the value of the dollar) can have a far greater impact on inflation than the Federal deficit. To promise the American people that keeping the deficit low will control inflation—and to have us suffer inflation anyway because of circumstances beyond our control—is to perpetuate a cruel hoax on the nation.

An equally important point is that all things do not remain equal when Federal spending increases. Jobs are created—jobs which generate revenue and savings in unemployment-related costs. One percentage point of unemployment costs $20-billion in lost revenues, welfare, unemployment benefits, food stamps, etc. Reducing unemployment by 1 percent would cost $10-billion, so we would make a "profit" of $10-billion in the public sector alone by going for jobs instead of the low deficit, not to mention the impact on goods and services produced in the private sector.

Another myth that should be penetrated is the relationship between unemployment and inflation. A popular economic theory has it that if unemployment goes down, inflation goes up; therefore, you cannot solve both problems. What we are *not* told is that this theory is based on data from the *British* economy, and that when it was tested under conditions in the 1970's of the American economy, the same relationship did not hold. The recessions of those years—when we had both high unemployment and high inflation—should have been sufficient to convince us that this theory may not be relevant to our system.

Even if all the President's economic assumptions were correct, it is still highly questionable that all the proposed cuts in essential social programs would be necessary. If we examine the overall structure of Federal revenues and expenditures, we find that most of the money the Federal government takes in each year is committed in advance. We have to pay Social Security and other pension benefits, interest on the national debt, salaries, payment on contracts which last more than one year. These are relatively uncontrollable—so-called nondiscretionary—expenditures, and they will account for 76 percent of the total federal spending in 1980. The remaining 26 percent ($132.9-billion in 1980) is what we have left over to spend. The administration proposes to spend $77-billion of this on defense, i.e., 58 percent of all the money we actually have to spend in 1980.

Even the remaining $55.9-billion has not been scrutinized with the kind of care that the pressure for budgetary austerity would seem to dictate. A careful review of the budget shows that even on the domestic side, healthy increases have been proposed for planning programs and research and development—the kind of programs we should spend money on *after* our basic needs are satisfied. It is clear that the President does not have a high regard for the survival needs of minorities and the poor.

What Can We Do?

The time has not yet come for despair. Recent events in Cleveland, when voters supported an increase in the city income tax, indicate that when taxpayers fully understand the implications of a cutback in public spending, not only will they support increases in spending—they will tax themselves to pay for it.

Congress makes the final decision on government priorities. What we must do is convince the Congress that our commitment to NATO can be met by well-targeted increases in NATO-related defense expenditures; that we can no longer afford to spend 58 percent of our discretionary income on defense; and that responding to pressing social needs is more important than placing an arbitrary, meaningless $30-billion cap on the Federal deficit.

Most importantly, we must form new alliances—alliances which enable us to go forward. In 1976, we gave President Carter our wholehearted support.

Our challenge now is to make the Administration aware that it *must* honor its commitment to the disadvantaged of this nation.

We must have firm targeting of any program cuts which have to be made. The budgetary scapel should be applied to the Defense Department before cutting into programs for the poor, the elderly and the frighteningly high numbers of unemployed black youth in our nation. We must not sacrifice desperately needed social programs for hypothetical anti-inflation, balanced budget policies.

Continued from page 3

$600-million in budget authority which was appropriated in 1976 for interest reduction grants to state housing agencies.

- *Community Development Programs*—The President's budget would increase funding for community development programs by $3.1-billion above the 1979 level and $1.8-billion above "current policy." The increase is primarily due to $3.5-billion requested for a proposed National Development Bank which would be used to stimulate private sector development in economically depressed areas. Increases are also requested for the Community Development Block Grant program, for a proposed Inland Energy Impact program and for the Livable Cities and Neighborhood Self-Help programs. The President is requesting 20 percent less than current policy projections for the remaining community development programs. For example, no new support is proposed for the local public works construction program in 1979 or 1980; over $2-billion will be spent on this program in 1979 resulting from projects funded in 1977.
- *Other Aid to State and Local Governments*—Federal assistance to state and local governments is estimated to total $82.9-billion in the President's 1980 budget. This amount represents an increase of less than 1 percent from the 1979 level of $82.1-billion; however, it is 8.2 percent lower than the "current policy" level of $90.4-billion. Many of the programs included in this total (e.g., Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, CETA) have already been discussed. Other programs of special interest to minorities and residents of urban areas include:
  - —*General Revenue Sharing*—the budget proposes to fund this program at the full amount authorized for 1979, $6.9-billion.
  - —*Anti-recession fiscal assistance*—This program was designed in 1977 to stimulate the economy and it expired at the end of fiscal year 1978. It was not renewed by Congress for 1979 funding. The President's budget proposes a targeted fiscal assistance program to reduce the fiscal strain on distressed local governments which depended heavily on the anti-recession program. The budget would provide supplemental funding of $250-million in 1979 and $150-million in 1980.
  - —*Law Enforcement Assistance Administration* (LEAA)—The budget proposes a reduction in new funding for LEAA of about $100-million from the 1979 level of $658-million, and $163-million below the "current policy" level.
- *Real Wage Insurance*—The President's budget also includes $2.5-billion for a tax proposal of special interest to employed persons. This proposal, called the "real wage insurance program" provides that certain groups of workers who receive an average hourly pay increase of 7 percent or less would be eligible for refundable tax credits if the inflation rate exceeds 7 percent. The credit would apply to wages up to $20,000, but no credit would be allowed for inflation in excess of 10 percent. Congressional forecasts for inflation for calendar year 1980 range from 6.4 to 8.4 percent.

Summary

Although the potential impact of the Carter budget on minority and low-income groups is mixed, the intent of the proposals is clear—a tight budget should produce a smaller deficit which should reduce inflation. The final congressional action on the President's proposals is not yet known. So far, reactions have ranged from strong support and proposals for an even tighter, balanced budget to arguments which question the validity of the relationship between budget deficits and inflation. The development of the final budget for 1980 in Congress deserves the careful attention of all state and local officials.

Current Policy Outlays and the Administration's Proposed Changes: Fiscal Year 1980, in Billions of Dollars

	CBO Estimate of Current Policy	CBO Estimate of Administration's Request	Difference
National Defense			
Military and civilian pay raises	3.1	2.2	—0.9
DoD operations and maintenance	38.0	38.9	0.9
Other national defense	84.2	84.3	0.1
Subtotal	125.3	125.4	0.1
Human Resources			
CETA employment and training programs	12.7	9.6	—3.1
Education programs	14.5	13.9	—0.6
Other function 500	7.6	7.3	—0.3
Medicare and Medicaid	48.4	46.1	—2.3
Other health programs	9.3	8.9	—0.3
Social Security	117.3	116.7	—0.6
Food stamps	6.1	7.5	1.4
Real wage insurance	—	0.3	0.3
Other income security	60.8	60.8	a
Veterans' readjustment benefits	2.6	2.3	—0.3
Veterans' hospital and medical care	6.4	5.8	—0.5
Other veterans' benefits and services	12.6	12.5	—0.1
Subtotal	298.2	291.6	—6.6
Net Interest	46.0	45.2	—0.8
All Other			
Natural resource and environment programs	12.8	11.9	—0.9
Farm price supports	3.4	2.6	—0.8
Commerce and housing credit	4.1	3.4	—0.7
SBA disaster loans	0.8	a	—0.8
Anti-recession fiscal assistance	0.5	—	—0.5
Civilian agency pay raises	1.4	0.9	—0.5
All other, net	59.0	59.0	a
Subtotal	82.0	77.8	—4.2
Total	551.5	540.0	—11.5

a = Less than $50 million.

Source: Congressional Budget Office staff working paper, "An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for Fiscal Year 1980. January 1979.

Telescope

Franklin Thomas to Head Ford Foundation

Franklin Thomas, 45, has been named president of the Ford Foundation. He will replace McGeorge Bundy, who will retire June 1.

Thomas, a lawyer, is well-known for his efforts over the last 10 years to restore the Bedford-Stuyvesant area in Brooklyn, the second largest black community in the country.

In 1967, he was named president of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corp., one of the most successful community development efforts in the U.S. In 1977, he stepped down to go into private practice and was later named to the Foundation's board of trustees.

Before becoming president of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Thomas was a deputy New York police commissioner in charge of legal matters. He has also worked for the federal Housing and Home Finance Agency and was an assistant district attorney in New York.

The Ford Foundation is one of the largest philanthropic foundations in the country with assets of $2.2 billion.

Evers Forms Coalition to Influence Mississippi Politics

Charles Evers, mayor of Fayette, Miss., convened a meeting of approximately 700 January 28 to form the Independent Coalition for Mississippi. The organization will be concerned with the rights of blacks and the poor, and will seek to have impact on local and state politics.

Evers, a well-known black politician and longtime civil rights activist, will head the Coalition. He was an independent senatorial candidate in last November's general election and garnered 20 percent of the vote. (See FOCUS December 1978)

Participants came from 61 of the state's 82 counties and included the 19-member Mississippi Conference of Black Mayors.

Hospital Costs in Washington Area Higher Than Increase Nationally

The Center for Municipal and Metropolitan Research has released a study entitled, *Rising Hospital Costs in Metropolitan Washington,* which states that hospital costs in the Washington, D.C. area have increased by 37 percent between 1975 and 1977 compared to a 33 percent increase nationally.

The study also found that:

- In 1977, 33 public acute-care and private hospitals operated 9,492 beds in the Washington metropolitan area costing $714-million;
- Rising hospital costs have a direct impact on government expenditures. On the average, Medicaid reimbursement for a day of hospital care in the District of Columbia increased by 46 percent between 1975 and 1977—from $153 to $244. It increased another 19 percent to $266 in the first nine months of 1978;
- Over half of the area's hospital expenditures are in personnel costs, and they rose by 36 percent in Northern Virginia and 35 percent in the District and suburban Maryland. Although the percentages increased, the employment levels remained relatively constant at 30,000 employees.

The report recommends that regional planning for hospital care should be strengthened. "A consensus is emerging, both locally and nationally, that recent trends in hospital care costs cannot be allowed to continue. Locally, regional solutions seem to be the only ones that are broad-based enough to have any measurable impact on the problem."

For further information, contact the Center for Municipal and Metropolitan Research, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 403, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 387-0900. Copies of the report are being sold for $3.00.

Bass Appointed Missouri Director of Transportation

Former St. Louis city councilmember John F. Bass has been appointed Missouri's Director of Transportation. The appointment was announced recently by Gov. Joseph P. Teasdale. As a cabinet member, Bass is responsible for all forms of transportation: rail, air, water, and transit. His appointment must be confirmed by the state senate in the next few weeks.

African Policy Group Denounces U.S. Presence at Rhodesian Elections

TransAfrica, a Washington, D.C. based organization concerned with U.S. foreign policy in Africa and the Caribbean has gone on record in opposition to the United States' sending observers to Rhodesia (also known as Zimbabwe) for that country's elections which are slated for April 20, 1979.

Randall Robinson, executive director of TransAfrica, testifying in March before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that Senate resolutions to send a team of observers to Rhodesia to measure the fairness of that country's upcoming elections would "diminish to zero what credibility the United States has remaining in Africa."

Robinson said the resolutions imply that fair and free elections are possible under Rhodesia's proposed constitutional arrangement on which the elections are based. Under that arrangement, whites, who constitute only 4 percent of the population, would be given 28 percent of the seats in Parliament and the cabinet. The Judiciary, public service and the military would remain under white control.

"The elections," Robinson said, "will be unfair because the constitution out of which they grew is designed singularly to preserve white supremacy and privilege in Rhodesia."

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.* Persons receiving the questionnaire are urged to take a few minutes to complete and return it to the Joint Center promptly.

Continued on page 8

Continued from page 7

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 Mrs. Dolores Wainwright or 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.

Mississippi Elects First Black State Senator Since Reconstruction

Arthur J. Tate, 39, a Canton, Miss. businessman, was elected to the Mississippi state senate in a special election held January 27. His election has made Tate the first black state senator in Mississippi since Reconstruction.

The election was called after a federal court approved a reapportionment plan requiring the state to move from multi-member to single member districts.

Census Bureau to Hire 35,000 Temporary Workers to Compile Address Lists For 1980 Census

Approximately 35,000 temporary workers will be hired by the Census Bureau to compile a list of about 30 million addresses to help the process of taking the 1980 Census by mail.

Mailing lists containing about 80 million addresses must be put together in the next 15 months so that a 1980 census questionnaire can be mailed to each household in the country.

In this year's "pre-list" operation, the 35,000 temporary workers will walk or drive thousands of miles of roads and streets asking for correct mailing addresses at each household.

Temporary workers usually will work three to four weeks each and will be paid on a per-address basis. For an eight-hour day, the average worker will earn $27 to $30. Applicants for the jobs must pass a written examination.

For further information, contact your state employment agency offices.

JCPS Second Annual Dinner Honoring Dr. Kenneth Clark Well Attended

The Joint Center's second annual fundraising dinner was held in Washington, D.C. on March 6, 1979 at the Washington Hilton. More than 1,100 people joined AT&T chairman Charles Brown and M.I.T. president Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, co-chairmen of the dinner, in honoring Dr. Kenneth B. Clark for his outstanding contributions in the field of education, social psychology and civil rights. Marian Wright Edelman, director of the Children's Defense Fund presented Clark with a citation and a gift. Other participants in the program included Washington, D.C. mayor Marion Barry and U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young. Wiley Branton, dean of Howard University's School of Law, served as master of ceremonies.

The 1978 edition of the National Roster of Black Elected Officials is now on sale. To obtain your copy of this valuable reference source, send $17.50 for each copy to Publications Department, JCPS, 1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 926, Washington, D.C. 20005. All orders for a single copy must be accompanied by payment. On orders of two copies or more, we will send a bill if you request, but postage and handling charges will be added to the bill.

FOCUS

Joint Center for Political Studies
1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 926
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-4477

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 information.

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

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED
Postmaster:
Form 3547 requested

PRICE $1.25