Volume 14, No. 5 May 1986

FOCUS

"THE RAINBOW IS EMERGING"

Jesse Jackson equates Rainbow Coalition with a new majority.

Retreat on Voting Rights?

Black electoral progress threatened by Department of Justice.

Mixed Signals on Affirmative Action

What did the Court really mean?

ISSN 0740-0195

Joint Center for P[illegible] Studies

Perspective

Involvement in Foreign Policy Vital to Blacks

Eddie Williams has ceded his "Perspective" column this month to Kenneth Longmyer, a career officer in the U.S. Foreign Service. Mr. Longmyer is currently assigned to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, where he is studying ways of encouraging black Americans to participate in the formulation of American foreign policy. His article here is an abridged version of one that originally appeared in the Atlanta Constitution.

The death of Sgt. Kenneth Ford, who was killed in April in West Berlin by a terrorist bomb, is a painful reminder that black Americans bear a significant share of responsibility for carrying out U.S. foreign policy. They are not, however, playing an equitable role in the formulation of the American foreign policy that so profoundly affects their lives.

While it is true that black Americans affect U.S. policy toward Africa through such groups as TransAfrica, the Free South Africa Movement, Africare, and the Congressional Black Caucus, black influence even on African policy should not be exaggerated. (Black influence on policy toward Asia, Latin America, and Europe is even less.) Successive administrations have pursued policies toward Africa without the support, and often contrary to the wishes, of black Americans.

Black influence on foreign policy is meager at all stages of the policy-making process. Candidates for public office and elected officials pay little attention to the foreign-policy views of their black constituents. Indeed, influential members of Congress who represent thousands of black voters frequently take foreign-policy positions that do not have the support of their black constituents. Neither are blacks making their share of foreign-policy decisions as appointed officials, since very few blacks serve in policy-level positions in the State Department and other foreign affairs agencies.

We should not accept the status quo. Black Americans must take an active interest in U.S. foreign policy. Our country's responses to international challenges directly affect the daily lives of all Americans and will do much to determine the future of our children.

Foreign policy determines our chances of survival. And even if we are fortunate enough to avoid a third world war, local conflicts could take the lives of thousands of Americans. In such conflicts blacks, who compose 20 percent of our armed forces, can expect to suffer a disproportionate number of casualties.

Our policies toward other countries also affect the quality of life in the United States. America's quest for military security and world leadership consumes enormous resources that might otherwise be used for education, civilian job creation, housing, health care, and protection of the environment. The defense budget of $258.4 billion for 1986 represents 24.4 percent of the total federal budget and 6.2 percent of the gross national product. And going to war increases military expenditures still further. The Defense Department estimates that between 1966 and 1974 the Vietnam War cost the United States $237.6 billion, and the Lebanon expedition in 1983-84 cost $152 million. Foreign aid, used primarily to support U.S. foreign-policy goals, will cost an additional $10.4 billion in 1986.

In addition to diverting resources that might otherwise be used for domestic social programs, foreign aid and military expenditures also affect black Americans by raising the national debt. Moreover, they may contribute indirectly to a higher rate of inflation and higher interest rates.

In sum, black Americans have a duty to help shape our foreign policy. As enfranchised citizens of a democracy and as military and civilian executors of U.S. foreign policy, black Americans are morally liable for America's conduct in the international community. Neither the background of slavery nor the existence of discrimination can relieve black Americans of this burden and privilege.

Kenneth Longmyer
U.S. Foreign Service Officer

FOCUS

Copyright© 1986 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc. The monthly newsletter of the ***Joint Center for Political Studies,*** *1301 Pa. Ave., N.W. Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed FOCUS articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. FOCUS is published monthly. $12.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.*

president: Eddie N. Williams
vice president: Eleanor Farrar
director of development: Kathleen Vander Horst
director of finance: Brenda Watkins Noel
director of information resources: Auriel Pilgrim
director of marketing: Carl Cook
director of research: Milton Morris
manager of administrative services: Patricia Roberson
senior editor: Jane E. Lewin
editorial assistant: Constance B. Toliver

Board of Governors

Wendell Freeland, Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
William B. Boyd, Johnson Foundation, *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin, Howard University, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams, Congress of National Black Churches
Robert McCormick Adams, Smithsonian Institution
Lucius Jefferson Barker, Washington University
Charles U. Daly, Joyce Foundation and Ireland Fund
Hortense Williams Dixon
Mervyn Dymally, U.S. House of Representatives
Marian Wright Edelman, Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster, Moton Memorial Institute
Jayne Brumley Ikard
Robert C. Maynard, *Oakland Tribune*
Bernard Rapoport, American Income Life Insurance Co.
Eddie N. Williams, Joint Center for Political Studies
James D. Wolfensohn, James D. Wolfensohn, Inc.

Eleanor Farrar, Joint Center for Political Studies, *Secretary to the Board*

"The Rainbow Is Emerging"

by Reverend Jesse Jackson

(Reverend Jackson is the founder and president of the National Rainbow Coalition, a national progressive political organization.)

The National Rainbow Coalition (NRC) held its first national convention in Washington, D.C., on April 17-19, 1986, to establish a permanent political organization in each state. The state organizations will offer policy alternatives to counterbalance the rightward drift of both major political parties.

More than 1,000 delegates from 45 states attended the NRC convention. They included hundreds of white and black farmers from the South and the Midwest; rank-and-file unionists; recent immigrants; teachers; college students; preachers; and others. They ratified the NRC as a corporation and established its by-laws.

Below is an excerpt from Jesse Jackson's keynote speech, in which he defines the constituency of the NRC and the challenges it faces.

"A String of Pearls"

The spirit of patriotism, the spirit of moral authority, and the new majority are present tonight. Together we can turn trauma and tragedy into treasure and triumph. This is who we are—the New Majority, the Caring Majority, the Rainbow Majority. We are a new coalition, a challenging coalition that is choosing a new course. We must connect this string of pearls—the energy workers who fuel the nation, the farmworkers who

We must oppose the presuppositions of the current administration's domestic policies, not just react to the result.

labor in the fields, the unionists who protect and give dignity to common men and women, the workers of all sorts who build this great nation, the teachers who lay the foundations of the future, the youth who will inherit the nation, the soldiers who defend us, the firefighters and police who bring safety to our daily lives, the women who are the majority of our nation. We must string all of these precious pearls, and others, into a fine necklace—a thing of beauty.

Challenging Domestic Policy

We must oppose the presuppositions of the current administration's domestic policies, not just react to the result. We must separate ourselves from Reagan's definition of America and the world. He conceives of America too narrowly and too romantically; his view is too narrow to see all Americans, and he cannot see all of America in perspective.

The administration is rapidly shifting wealth upward, the middle class downward, and the poor outward. Reagan's assault on the middle class is laying the basis for a social explosion. We must repeal the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings balanced budget law. It is part of Reagan's radical economic polarization which gives tax cuts to the "haves" and wage cuts to the "have nots."

Just ask the farm family that lost its land; just ask the teachers who have lost their jobs; just ask the steelworkers and the shipbuilders and the air traffic controllers. Reagan has given the middle class prayer cloths and flags, but has undercut their standard of living. He has substituted symbolism and patriotism for substance and security. We must fight for an alternative national budget. The Congressional Black Caucus has presented the *Quality of Life Budget.* We should study and promote this budget.

We must fight the collapse of values in our children. Our children are afraid of the future. Living under the nuclear shadow, facing increasing unemployment and underemployment, having seen the loss of the family farm, our youth are afraid to go forward. They are turning to drugs to numb their fears, engaging in sex without love and making unwanted babies, or turning to nostalgia to avoid their anxieties. We must give them hope and strengthen their values, and show them a vision of the future with justice, jobs, and peace.

Challenging Foreign Policy

We must also challenge the presuppositions of the administration's foreign policy. In East-West relations, Reagan wants superiority over parity and escalation over negotiation. We must be against terrorism in the world, and we must be against it in all of its forms. We must oppose terrorism practiced by extremist splinter groups, and we must be against state-sponsored terrorism—and we must be against it regardless of the state doing the sponsoring. Only if we are consistent do we have the moral authority to challenge others to join us in opposing terrorism.

After a period of threats, counter-threats, name calling and street-corner diplomacy we have bombed Libya. Let's count the cost. The world is less secure and more dangerous today than it was yesterday; terrorism and counter-terrorism are more likely; and we have entered into a period of unconventional warfare whose end we cannot control or predict. When a rock is thrown into the water, one must be concerned about the resulting concentric circles. The street corner rhetoric and the "eye for an eye" and "tooth for a tooth" approach that are passing for this administration's foreign policy could leave the world blinded and toothless.

We must also challenge the presuppositions of the administration's foreign policy.

We are going to war with the world and bombing ourselves into a corner. Reagan's foreign policy has us seeking superiority over parity in the nuclear arms race; escalating tensions rather than reducing tensions through negotiations in East-West relations. Our Third World policy is blinded by an anti-communist obsession—with a radical disregard for the context of the Third World's history of struggle against oppression. We must support human rights as our foreign policy. Human rights is a tough policy; it heals rather than destroys. Human rights as foreign policy is morally cor-

(Continued on page 8)

Retreat on Voting Rights?

by Frank R. Parker

(The author, currently Distinguished Scholar at the Joint Center, is on leave from his position as director of the Voting Rights Project of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. He has been involved in voting rights litigation, including cases brought under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, since 1970.)

Congress passed the Voting Rights Act in 1965 to ensure that every American, regardless of color, would have the right to vote. In the 20 years since the act was passed, blacks have gained representation in every southern state legislature and in many county and city governments where discriminatory voting laws and procedures before 1965 had kept them away from the polls. Black electoral progress, however, is now in danger of ending, as the Justice Department proposes to change the regulations under which it administers one of the most crucial sections of the Voting Rights Act: Section 5.

Black electoral progress . . . is now in danger of ending.

Under Section 5, the U.S. attorney general (or, alternatively, the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C.) is required to review all new voting laws and procedures that are proposed in the states and localities covered by that section.[1] Not until the attorney general (or the District Court) finds the proposals nondiscriminatory in purpose or effect can they become law. Examples of discriminatory changes in electoral procedures are redistricting plans that dilute minority voting strength and relocations of polling places to discourage minorities from voting.

The importance of the Justice Department's "preclearance" reviews derives from their number and their effect. The department conducts reviews of 3,000-4,000 submissions involving 15,000-18,000 voting law changes every year, and the courts often use the department's standards to decide litigation brought under Section 5.

Changing the Regulations?

In May 1985, the Reagan administration proposed new regulations for the Justice Department's preclearance reviews. Opponents of the proposal fear it would reduce future enforcement of the Voting Rights Act, as well as reverse many of the gains already made.

The proposed regulations were published in the *Federal Register* of May 6, 1985, and the public was asked to comment. In November 1985, the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights held hearings on the proposal. Testimony was given by Assistant Attorney General William Bradford Reynolds and by representatives of civil rights and public interest organizations (including the League of Women Voters, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund).

Reynolds said that the regulations currently in effect, which were promulgated in 1981, had to be amended to reflect recent judicial decisions and the 1982 legislative amendments to the Voting Rights Act.

The effect of the proposed regulations would be that the Justice Department could approve of voting law changes whether they were discriminatory or not, unless the complaining party was able to prove "by clear and convincing evidence" that the changes would result in discrimination.

Representatives of the civil rights and public interest organizations said that many of the proposed regulations were contrary to the statutory language of the Voting Rights Act, contrary to the court decisions that controlled enforcement, and contrary to Congress's intent in passing the 1982 amendments to the act.

In a report issued in January 1986, the House subcommittee concluded that, "if adopted, the proposed regulations would undermine effective enforcement of the Voting Rights Act" by making it more difficult for minority voters to challenge discriminatory voting practices.

The Justice Department had planned to issue the final version of its guidelines by February 1986. It has not yet done so. Neither has it withdrawn its proposal in order to let the current regulations stand. The delay may indicate that critics' comments—which are summarized in the remainder of this article—had an effect. It may also indicate that the department itself is divided on the legality or desirability of the proposal. In any case, the department is committed to revising the proposal, and only when its final revision is published will the department's intentions concerning enforcement of the Voting Rights Act become clear.

The "Results" Test

Opposition to the Justice Department's proposed regulations has focused especially on the standard the department would use in determining whether a new state or local voting law is discriminatory. The standard used since 1982 is called the Section 2 "results" test because Congress, in amending Section 2 in 1982, prohibited voting laws that "result" in discrimination. A law is held to "result" in discrimination if it denies minority voters equal access to the political process or an equal opportunity to elect representatives of their choice. The legislative history of the 1982 Section 2 amendment makes it clear that Congress intended the Section 2 standard to be used in the Justice Depart-

[1] Section 5 originally covered seven entire states and parts of two others. After being amended in 1970, 1975, and 1982, it now covers nine entire states, mostly in the South and Southwest, and parts of eight others.

ment's reviews of new voting laws submitted for approval under Section 5.

Under Section 5, when a state or local government submits a proposed voting law to the Justice Department for preclearance, the state or local government must bear the burden of proving that the new law is not discriminatory in purpose or effect. But under the Justice Department's proposed rules, "the party or parties alleging violation of . . . section [2]" (generally the minority voters opposing the change) would bear the burden of proof. Critics of the proposed regulations protest that to place the burden of proof on the victims of discrimination, rather than on the perpetrators, would be an extraordinary departure from the statutory language of Section 5 and from long-standing practice.

Furthermore, under the proposed rules the proof of discrimination would have to be "by clear and convincing evidence." This is the strictest standard of proof applicable in civil cases. A case that is held to this standard is very difficult to prove, and therefore the "clear and convincing evidence" test is normally reserved for a limited group of legal claims.

The proposed regulations . . . would allow some voting law changes to be implemented without being submitted for preclearance.

The effect of the proposed regulations would be that the Justice Department could approve of voting law changes whether they were discriminatory or not, unless the complaining party was able to prove "by clear and convincing evidence" that the changes would result in discrimination.

Supporters of the proposal argue that the Justice Department would not approve of discriminatory changes in any case. But that is hard to believe. Even under the regulations currently in effect, Assistant Attorney General Reynolds approved of six voting law changes (a Louisiana congressional redistricting plan, a North Carolina legislative reapportionment plan, and four county and city redistricting plans) that federal courts subsequently struck down as discriminatory in result. In June 1985, when the Senate Judiciary Committee voted against confirming Reynolds as associate attorney general (the number-three officer in the Justice Department), an important part of the case against him was his unwarranted Section 5 approvals.

Exceptions to Preclearance Review

A second objection to the proposed Justice Department regulations is that they would allow some voting law changes to be implemented *without* being submitted for preclearance. One such exception to the current requirement would be a redistricting plan that a state or locality had prepared and that was put into effect by court order. The proposed regulations would exempt such plans from preclearance "when the court concludes that exigent circumstances (e.g., impending elections) warrant use of such a plan on an interim basis." In 1981, the Supreme Court determined that these plans are covered by Section 5.

As Judith Sanders-Castro of the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund has pointed out, the Justice Department's proposal creates a "dangerous loophole" through which local governments could circumvent preclearance requirements almost entirely. Most court-ordered redistricting plans are adopted under exactly such exigent circumstances, so what the proposed regulations are calling an exception would, in effect, become the rule. The Supreme Court's 1981 determination would be negated.

Limitations on Preclearance Review

A third objection to the proposed regulations is that they would unduly limit the scope of Section 5. Under existing law, the Justice Department is required to object to any voting change that would leave minorities worse off than before. The proposed regulations follow existing law, but they would add an escape clause: the Justice Department would not object to changes that would leave minorities worse off than before when such changes are "unavoidable." But as Laughlin McDonald of the American Civil Liberties Union has commented, "There is no such thing as unavoidable retrogression. The attorney general can always avoid it by objecting to a discriminatory change."

Special Elections and Redistricting

Two other sections of the proposal have been much criticized by voting rights advocates: the sections involving special elections and redistricting.

In 1985 the Supreme Court ruled that the actions of state and local officials in setting dates and procedures for the holding of special elections (for example, to fill a vacancy in an office) must be precleared under Section 5. Currently, there is no Justice Department rule spelling out the circumstances under which special elections must be precleared. The department's proposed regulation would require preclearance of special elections only "to the extent that the jurisdiction makes changes in the practices or procedures to be followed."

Continued progress by minorities in registering, voting, and winning elections in the South and Southwest still depends upon the Justice Department's strict enforcement of the provisions of the Voting Rights Act.

Critics say that this proposal is too restrictive in its coverage and would unduly limit the 1985 Supreme Court decision. For example, setting the date for a special election might not involve "changes in the practices or procedures . . . followed" in setting special election dates, but the date selected could have an

(Continued on page 7)

Mixed Signals on Affirmative Action

by David S. Tatel and Elliot M. Mincberg

(Mr. Tatel was director of the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare from 1977 to 1979. He and Mr. Mincberg are partners in the Washington, D.C., law firm of Hogan & Hartson.)

The Supreme Court's recent ruling in *Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education*—the Court's first decision on a voluntary affirmative action plan adopted by a public employer—sent mixed signals about the validity of such plans. In a 5 to 4 decision that included five separate opinions, the Court ruled unconstitutional a provision of a collective bargaining agreement that partially protected minority teachers against lay-offs in order to promote affirmative action. At the same time, however, most of the justices indicated that voluntary affirmative action plans by public employers are permissible under certain circumstances. Because all public employers are subject to the same constitutional requirements as the school board in *Wygant,* the decision has important implications for school systems, city governments, and other public employers across the country.

Most of the justices indicated that voluntary affirmative action plans by public employers are permissible under certain circumstances.

Wygant involved the section of a collective bargaining agreement in Jackson, Michigan, under which, in the event of teacher lay-offs, the percentage of minority personnel laid off would be no greater than the percentage of minority personnel employed by the school system at the time of the lay-offs. Several laid-off white teachers challenged the section. The board of education argued that the lay-off provision was important to preserve the gains the board had made through its affirmative action hiring plan. Both the federal district court and the court of appeals ruled that the lay-off provision was constitutional, and both courts upheld the plan.

Virtually all the justices agreed that . . . such plans "need not be limited to the remedying of specific instances of past discrimination."

The Supreme Court reversed the lower court decisions and invalidated the plan—without, however, presenting any single controlling rationale for its decision. Five opinions were written: three separate ones by the five justices who voted to invalidate the lay-off plan (a plurality opinion by Justice Powell, which Justices Burger and Rehnquist agreed with entirely and which Justice O'Connor agreed with in part; a concurring opinion by Justice O'Connor; and a concurring opinion by Justice White); a dissenting opinion that Justices Marshall, Brennan, and Blackmun joined; and a separate dissenting opinion by Justice Stevens.

All five of the justices in the majority appeared to conclude that under the circumstances, the lay-off provision had too severe an impact on non-minority employees and was too broad to be justified as an affirmative action measure. At least four of these five justices (Justice White did not express his opinion on this subject) agreed that a public employer could justify affirmative action on the basis of evidence of past discrimination by the public employer itself. The four justices concluded, however, that the school board in question did not present sufficient evidence of such discrimination and that the school board's goals of remedying general societal discrimination against minorities and providing role models for minority students did not in themselves justify the board's affirmative action lay-off plan.

The Meaning of *Wygant*

The multiple opinions in *Wygant* make it unclear precisely how the decision will affect future cases. An analysis of those conflicting opinions, however, suggests that the following questions and answers are important for public employers to bear in mind.

Are voluntary affirmative action plans still permissible?

Yes. Virtually all the justices agreed that some form of voluntary affirmative action by public employers is permissible in some circumstances and that, as Justice O'Connor explained, such plans "need not be limited to the remedying of specific instances of past discrimination." Even the plurality opinion of Justice Powell reaffirmed the principle that "it may be necessary to take race into account" in remedying prior discrimination, and that persons not responsible for any past discrimination "may be called upon to bear some of the burden of the remedy."

May voluntary affirmative action plans be justified solely by past "societal" discrimination or the wish to introduce more minority "role models"?

Probably not. In evaluating any particular affirmative action plan, the Court will consider both the importance of the objectives that the plan seeks to serve and the extent to which the plan is tailored specifically to achieve those objectives. But the Court will apparently not accept the goals of remedying general societal discrimination and providing role models for minority students as sufficiently important to warrant affirmative action.

May past discrimination by a public employer justify voluntary affirmative action by that same employer?

Yes. An employer's attempt to compensate for the effects of its own past discrimination is clearly an important enough objective to warrant adoption of an affirmative action program. Moreover, an explicit finding

of discrimination by a court or other body (such as an administrative agency) is not necessary before adoption of the plan. What is not clear, however, is precisely the type of evidence that *is* required. Statistical evidence of a disparity between the percentage of minorities in the employer's work force and the percentage of minorities in the relevant labor market is pertinent, and that evidence alone may be enough to justify affirmative action. But a disparity between the percentage of minority faculty members and minority students in a school system will not help justify affirmative action.

Can the promotion of racial diversity in a work force justify voluntary affirmative action?

Possibly. Depending upon the circumstances, the promotion of racial diversity may be a sufficiently important goal to help justify some affirmative action programs, particularly for educational institutions. What is not clear, however, is whether that purpose is enough in itself.

Where voluntary affirmative action of some sort is permissible, what affirmative action techniques may be used?

The kind of affirmative action programs considered permissible will depend upon the circumstances. The kinds of plans that will be very hard to justify are those relying upon lay-offs or other measures that, as Justice Powell explained, "impose the entire burden of achieving racial equality on particular individuals" and disrupt "settled expectations" of existing employees. At least four justices apparently believe that lay-offs may be used—if at all—only where less stringent methods would not achieve the employer's legitimate goals. Measures much more likely to be acceptable are those that tend to "impose a diffuse burden" on a larger number of individuals—measures such as hiring goals.

How does the Court's decision affect the affirmative action provisions of Executive Order 11246 (which concerns government contractors) and the U.S. Department of Labor's regulations that implement the executive order?

The decision in *Wygant* does not directly affect the presidential executive order and its implementing regulations, particularly since the executive order and the regulations do not deal with lay-offs or similar techniques. *Wygant* is quite unlikely, for example, to have any effect on the provisions of the executive order that require contractors to avoid discrimination, to post notices of their non-discriminatory policy, and to attempt to recruit minority employees.

There is some question, however, about the Labor Department's requirement in situations in which the racial composition of a contractor's work force is substantially different from the racial composition of the labor force in the contractor's geographic area. In such situations, the department requires the contractor to adopt affirmative action hiring goals. *Wygant* does not appear to question the validity of the requirement. Indeed, several of the opinions in *Wygant* suggest that such differences in racial composition can help justify affirmative action. Nevertheless, the validity of the requirement after *Wygant* is unresolved.

Additional guidance from the Supreme Court should be forthcoming in two more decisions on fair employment practices and affirmative action that are expected by early July. The continuing divisions on the Court, however, mean that public employers do not have clearcut guidelines to follow. Therefore, they should carefully evaluate their employment practices, especially in the area of affirmative action, in light of the general issues discussed above. In particular, they should scrutinize closely both the objectives served by particular affirmative action programs and the methods employed.

. . . Voting Rights

(Continued from page 5)

impact on who was eligible to participate in the election, and it should come under Section 5 preclearance rules. Therefore, critics argue, the proposed regulations should be broadened to require Section 5 preclearance for *any* exercise of discretion by state or local officials in the holding of special elections.

On redistricting plans, the proposed regulations would limit the occasions on which redistricting plans could be found objectionable under Section 5. The attorney general would be able to object only if a plan would result in a "significant reduction" of minority voting strength—but no definition of what would constitute a "significant reduction" is given. As Cynthia D. Hill of the League of Women Voters has pointed out, the phrase *significant reduction* implies that "some undefined degree of discrimination is needed before a voting change is considered objectionable." But voting rights advocates argue that elections can be won or lost by a single vote and that no degree of discrimination is acceptable. All discrimination should be "absolutely prohibited" by law, they contend.

The gains of the past 20 years have been possible, in part, because under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act the Justice Department is required to block proposed laws and procedures that would curtail the rights of blacks and other minorities to cast a meaningful vote. Continued progress by minorities in registering, voting, and winning elections in the South and Southwest still depends upon the Justice Department's strict enforcement of the provisions of the Voting Rights Act. The proposed regulations indicate that the Reagan administration's commitment to enforcement may be questionable.

Telescope

Charles U. Daly Joins JCPS Board of Governors

Charles U. Daly, director of the Joyce Foundation and of the Ireland Fund, joined the Joint Center's Board of Governors in May. He is also an underwriting member of Lloyd's of London, a director of the Council on Foundations, and a national trustee of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation.

Daly was a vice president of Harvard University from 1971 to 1976 and a vice president of the University of Chicago from 1964 to 1969. Between his years at Harvard and his years at the University of Chicago he founded and served as president of the Children's Foundation.

From 1962-1964 he was a staff assistant for congressional liaison in the White House under Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Black Christian Group Launches TV Station

WJCB-TV 49, a black-owned Christian television station, recently went on the air in Norfolk, Virginia. According to Reverend James Vaughan, president of the Tidewater Christian Communications Corporation that owns the station, WJCB is the nation's first black-owned Christian television station. It will broadcast religious, family, and community programs.

Census Bureau Report Profiles Black Population

The U.S. Bureau of the Census is producing a series of booklets on various segments of the U.S. population, and the latest one is on black Americans. Using 1980 census and current population surveys, *We, the Black Americans* describes America's black population in terms of its growth, distribution, education, income, occupations, voter participation, and other characteristics.

Booklets already published cover American women and Hispanics. Future booklets will cover Asian and Pacific Islander Americans, American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts.

Copies of the booklets are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Single copies are free. Discounts are available for bulk orders.

The Rainbow . . .

(Continued from page 3)

rect; it is the majority opinion; it is cost efficient; it is defensible; and it is in the national interest.

"Peace and Justice in Our Time"

Our priorities must be more accurate than our missiles. In this nuclear age we cannot settle for guided missiles and misguided leadership. In this age of tension we must come together—the workers in Austin, Minnesota, PATCO and TWA strikers, energy producers, farmers, youth—we must find common ground. The sadness of war is around us. It's dark, but the morning comes. Weeping may endure for a night, but joy comes in the morning. We are convinced that our nation—a great nation, a blessed nation—is only leadership away from being the source of hope and peace and joy in the world. Beyond the storm are rays of sunlight. The Rainbow is emerging. It is a thing of beauty, an act of nature, a sign of God pointing toward the gold of peace and justice in our time.

FOCUS

Joint Center for Political Studies

1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED
Postmaster:
Form 3547 requested

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. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

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