Call to a National Meeting
of Black Elected Officials
(see page 8)



Perspective

During the past 12 months, the black vote has been endowed with a respect long sought but never before received. It now looms as the wild card or the "X factor" in the 1984 elections. A number of developments account for this turn of events.

A string of recent mayoral victories (Harold Washington in Chicago, Wilson Goode in Philadelphia, Harvey Gantt in Charlotte, and James Sharp in Flint) and Jesse Jackson's bid for the Democratic presidential nomination are sometimes cited as the cause of the recent upsurge in black political participation. But these developments are the result of a movement much bigger than the candidates.

In the 1982 mid-term elections, black voter participation increased 6 percent over 1978, while white participation increased 3 percent. As a result, the gap between black and white turnout, normally 10-15 percentage points, was reduced to 7 points, the smallest ever. Looking at the 1982 returns another way, black voters contributed crucially to the winning margins of the governors of New York and Texas and the victories of 21 black members of the House of Representatives (an all-time high). They also sent some House members home, most notably several conservative Republicans in the South. Now, more than a year later, we can look back on the political activism in 1982 as the tip of an iceberg headed for the 1984 elections.

What accounts for this upsurge in political participation? The conventional wisdom is that the Reagan administration is the catalyst. A Gallup poll last year showed that nonwhite disapproval of President Reagan's job performance exceeded approval by a whopping 77 to 12 percent.

But is this the only reason for the upsurge? I think not. It does not give proper credit to the strong, attractive black candidates running in both 1982 and 1983—both winners and losers (Tom Bradley, Robert Clark, and Mel King, to name a few). Nor does this thesis give due credit to the charismatic Reverend Jackson, who was preaching voter registration long before he was seeking the Democratic nomination.

There were also a number of very successful voter mobilization campaigns. Certainly, the continuing, often unheralded efforts of the National Coalition on Black Voter Participation, the Voter Education Project, the NAACP, National Urban League, and Southern Christian Leadership Conference—not to mention PUSH—made an enormous contribution to increased political awareness and participation.

To all these factors—Reaganomics, black candidates, voter mobilization programs—still one more must be added. It is the quiet determination of blacks to use the political process as a vehicle for self-help, social change, and economic survival.

This new political activism beats in the bosom of the community, and that is good. We control it—not the administration, not the candidates, not the mobilizers. And when we decide to sharpen our political participation as the new cutting edge of the civil rights movement, we become a force to be reckoned with.

In a way, Harold Washington and Jesse Jackson, as well as many others, tapped into this new political circuitry that predated their candidacies. The community was in search of leaders. These candidates filled a vacuum.

Thus, regardless of the political outcome in 1984, one large gain has already been made: We know we can make a difference and that we have candidates with "the right stuff."

We know there is hope when the grass roots and the bourgeoisie are both turned on by the prospect of a black presidential candidate; when black staff from foundations, academia, and corporations volunteer to help develop a policy framework for racial justice; when black elected officials from *all* levels of government—not just the highly visible leaders—meet to discuss issues and strategies (see page 8) and when a woman from Tucson writes me with these questions:

"What can I do to establish an active campaign here? How would I go about getting the necessary funds, and how can we establish a program to register people and take registered voters to the polls on election day?"

Eddie N. Williams
President

FOCUS

Copyright © 1983 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. The Joint Center does not fund or participate in voter registration, lobbying or campaigning. JCPS is funded by foundations, other organizations, and private gifts. Signed FOCUS articles are presented solely for the information of readers, and they 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 community development programs: L. E. Jackson, Jr.
director of development: Kathleen Vander Horst
director of finance: Brenda Watkins Noel
director of information resources: Auriel Pilgrim
director of publications: Catherine Iino
director of research: Milton Morris
staff writer: Kevin D. Armstrong
editorial assistant: Constance B. Toliver

Board of Governors

Wendell Freeland, *Chairman,* Attorney at Law
Bishop John Hurst Adams, Congress of National Black Churches
William B. Boyd, Johnson Foundation
Kenneth B. Clark, Clark, Phipps, Clark, and Harris
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
Louis E. Martin, Howard University
Percy E. Sutton, Inner City Broadcasting Corporation
Eddie N. Williams, Joint Center for Political Studies
James D. Wolfensohn, James D. Wolfensohn, Inc.

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

Jesse Jackson: Why Not? to How To

by Thomas E. Cavanagh

(The author is a research associate at the Joint Center.)

Jesse Jackson ended months of speculation by declaring his candidacy for the Democratic presidential nomination on November 3.

Accompanied by a diverse array of political leaders and activists, Jackson announced before an enthusiastic crowd of 2,000 his determination to move from the "Why Not?" to the "How To?" "The voice of duty has whispered 'thou must,' " Jackson told his listeners.

Jackson proclaimed, in a speech that flowed with the religious cadences of the civil rights movement of the 1960s, that the black experience uniquely encompasses "the experience and perspective of the rejected. . . . Thus, our perspective encompasses and includes more of the American people and their interests than do most other experiences."

Campaign Strategy

Although Jackson's call for a "rainbow coalition" of blacks, Hispanics, women, and others has become a hallmark of his campaign, his political base is still the black community; consequently, he will probably target a half-dozen or so Deep South states, Illinois, New York, and the District of Columbia—areas with sizeable black populations and, thus, greater likelihood of electing Jackson delegates.

Most estimates of the total number of delegates Jackson can win range between 100 and 400; political analysts generally agree that in order to fall within this span, he would have to carry at least half of the black vote. The *Chicago Sun-Times,* in a computer simulation of possible scenarios for the primaries, found that the largest block of black Jackson delegates would come from Illinois, because of that state's party rules, and three heavily black Congressional Districts on the South Side. But there is talk of Chicago Mayor Harold Washington running as a favorite son candidate there, so the situation is somewhat complex.

Registration, Representation, and Reagan

Jackson has preferred to emphasize aspects of the campaign other than the acquisition of delegates. A key issue for Jackson is black voting rights in the South. He intends to push the Democratic party, both nationally and in individual southern states, to eliminate run-off primaries, at-large elections, racial gerrymandering, annexation, and inconvenient registration requirements.

Jackson also hopes to encourage more black candidates to run for office in the coming year, confident that an increased registration and turnout of black voters will improve these candidates' chances for nomination and election. "I plan to have the longest and widest coattails of any candidate in this race," he declared.

In a concluding outline of his vision for the nation, Jackson erected the battle lines between himself and Ronald Reagan. His opening salvo: "For nearly four years, our nation has had to endure the substitution of showmanship and acting for statesmanship and positive leadership." What followed was a pledge to contest the president's policies on several domestic and international issues from economic initiatives to diplomatic and military undertakings.

How Will Jesse Run?

The question on everyone's mind now is, how will Jackson translate his powerful appeal into powerful action on the part of voters? To date, only the outlines of his campaign structure are clear.

Arnold Pinkney, a partner in a Cleveland insurance agency, has been named the campaign's national director. A former president of the Cleveland school board, Pinkney served as a deputy director of Hubert Humphrey's 1972 campaign, and has also organized in Ohio for Jimmy Carter, Governor Richard Celeste, and Congressman Louis Stokes (D, East Cleveland).

The co-chairmen of the Jackson Finance Committee will be George E. Johnson, chairman of Johnson Products, Inc., and Percy Sutton, former Manhattan borough president and currently the chairman of Inner City Broadcasting Company. Samuel Foggie, chairman of the board of the black-owned United National Bank of Washington (D.C.), is serving as campaign treasurer.

(The Joint Center is currently preparing an in-depth, updated analysis of the electoral situation Jesse Jackson will face in the primaries. The paper will be available by the end of the year.)

In the Reverend's Own Words

"This day we gather strangely exhuberant and hopeful amidst so much chaos, confusion, despair, and pain. We sense that we are part of a special moment in history, pregnant with possibility. We courageously press forward for we dare not abort this moment. We are destined to redirect the course of this nation and we shall. We have been hoping against hope, on this journey from slaveship to championship, that the stars in their courses have directed us to this station today. We are here to heed the call of this nation's highest and noblest principles that we might fulfill our mission to defend the poor, make welcome the outcast, deliver the needy, and be the source of hope for people yearning to be free everywhere."

"This candidacy is not for blacks only. This is a national campaign growing out of the black experience and seen through the eyes of a black perspective—which is the experience and perspective of the rejected. Because of this experience, I can empathize with the plight of Appalachia because I have known poverty. I know the pain of anti-Semitism because I have felt the humiliation of discrimination. I know firsthand the shame of bread lines and the horror of hopelessness and despair because my life has been dedicated to empowering the world's rejected to become respected. Thus, our perspective encompasses and includes more of the American people and their interests than do most other experiences."

Shelving Immigration Reform

by Milton D. Morris

(Dr. Morris is director of research at the Joint Center. His major study of immigration issues will be published by the Brookings Institution next year.)

On October 4, 1983, House Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill announced that the Immigration Reform and Control Act (the Simpson-Mazzoli bill) would not be considered by the House this year, bringing to an abrupt end several years of Congressional effort to enact immigration reform. The bill had been approved overwhelmingly (80-19) by the Senate in August 1982; the House debated its version of this bill during the last days of the 97th Congress but set it aside owing to a lack of time to resolve major complications. In May 1983, a majority of the Senate (76-18) again passed and sent to the House another—identical—immigration reform bill. An extensively revised version of this second bill was the one shelved by the Speaker.

An Unsurprising Decision

For those familiar with the complexities of immigration politics, the bill's failure is not entirely surprising. Immigration policy has always been excruciatingly difficult to enact. The country has been deeply ambivalent about immigration—proud of its tradition of receptivity to immigrants and committed to the right of individuals to migrate, yet fearful of immigration's potential ill effects. Furthermore, many of the measures used or proposed for controlling immigration appear to threaten jealously guarded civil rights and liberties of both the aliens involved and some segments of the domestic population. And a complex array of often conflicting domestic and foreign policy interests are bound up with the immigration issue.

All of these forces were evident in the attempt to enact the Simpson-Mazzoli bill, whose primary purpose was to solve the widely acknowledged problem of illegal immigration. The Senate version imposed a new, more inclusive ceiling of 425,000 on annual immigration; sought to improve the process by which petitions and disputes, especially asylum and refugee claims, are adjudicated; and adopted two measures to deal with illegal immigration—an amnesty provision, under which all illegal immigrants in the country prior to January 1980 would be granted legal status, and an employer sanction provision, under which employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants would be subject to modest fines.

The House Judiciary Committee discarded the idea of a revised ceiling and concentrated instead on the provisions dealing with illegal immigration and reform of the adjudicative process, which, its opponents argue, does not now permit judicial review of adverse decisions. The employer sanction provisions, always the most controversial element in proposals to curtail illegal immigration, quickly became the sticking point in committee deliberations on the House side. Although many people consider such sanctions essential in any effort to curb illegal immigration, there are at least three sources of vigorous opposition to them: agricultural interests in the Southwest, which have relied for decades on illegal immigrants as seasonal workers; Latino organizations, which fear that such a provision would result in greatly increased discrimination against Latinos in the labor market; and several civil liberties and civil rights organizations, which also fear greater discrimination in the labor market. Moreover, many people outside these three alliances oppose the creation of a worker identification card, widely considered indispensable to an effective employer sanctions program.

Months of deliberation by several House committees—Judiciary; Argriculture, Education, and Labor; Energy and Commerce; and Ways and Means—failed to resolve the deep disagreements over these issues. When Speaker O'Neill refused to allow consideration of the bill, he was both acknowledging this impasse and avoiding the political cost of enacting so controversial a law on the eve of a presidential election.

Disappointed Supporters

Despite the Speaker's assertion that the immigration reform bill lacked a constituency, it clearly enjoyed wide public support. Scores of newspapers across the country had urged its adoption, and numerous public opinion polls indicated a popular desire for firm action to reduce illegal immigration. Not surprisingly, therefore, O'Neill's action has been roundly criticized by the press and by those in Congress who worked for adoption of the bill.

Journalist Carl Rowan described the action as "a blunder that could cost the Democrats far more votes than can ever be delivered by the Hispanic politicians O'Neill was trying to placate." And Representative Romano L. Mazzoli (D-Ky), who sponsored the bill in the House, complained that "the speaker's abrupt, unnecessary, thoroughly unfounded action deprives the Congress and the country of the right to deal with an issue that has plagued us for 30 years."

Both Congress's failure to enact immigration reform and the manner in which Speaker O'Neill scuttled the attempt are regrettable; the country would have been better served had the bill been brought to the House floor for consideration—even if it failed to win approval. The Speaker's assertions that he feared a politically motivated presidential veto and that any future bill should have the approval of the Hispanic Congressional Caucus are unpersuasive and disturbing. Unpersuasive because there is no evidence to suggest that the political benefits accruing to the president from a veto (were it exercised) would have exceeded gains to the Democrats for having supported the bill: disturbing because investing the Hispanic Caucus with virtual veto power over future immigration reform is imprudent and an unfair burden to impose on any single group in Congress.

The Future of Reform

The Speaker's apparent bad judgment notwithstanding, some important questions arise from his

(Continued on page 6)

FOCUS

Index to Volume 11
January-December 1983

©1983 Joint Center for Political Studies • 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 400 • Washington, D.C. 20004

Subject Index

	Month	Page
The Black Family		
Black Family Income, 1960-1980	Aug.	3
Wealth and Economic Status	June	3
Black Officials		
Black Appointed to Virginia Supreme Court	May	8
Black Candidate for Mayor of Boston	April	8
Black Candidates in Spring Mayoral Primaries	Jan.	8
Black Mayors Urge Conventions in Cities Headed by Blacks	July	7
Black Presidential Appointees Down Sharply Since 1980	July	7
Black Presidential Candidacy Endorsed	July	6
Coalition Monitors Pennsylvania's Judicial Appointments	Oct.	7
Goode Wins Philadelphia Primary	June	7
Harold Washington's Victory in Chicago	March	8
Hayes Wins Seat Vacated by Washington	Oct.	7
How Washington Won Chicago	May	3
New Committee Assignments for CBC Members	Feb.	7
Outlook for a Black Presidential Candidacy	April	1a+
South Carolina Elects First Black State Senator Since Reconstruction	Nov.-Dec.	7
Tom Bradley's Defeat and Absentee Voting	Jan.	8
Black Political Participation		
A Black Gender Gap?	Oct.	7
Black Voter Registration, 1982	June	8
CUNY's Student Voter Registration Drive	Oct.	7
Election 1984 Alert: Delegate Selection	Sept.	4
The Gender Gap, Continued	Nov.-Dec.	7
Governor Robb Creates Voter Registration Commission in Virginia	Aug.	8
Increased Black Representation in So. Carolina	April	8
Jesse Jackson: From Why Not? to How To	Nov.-Dec.	3
National Baptist Convention Sponsors Voter Registration Drive	April	8
Perspective (black political progress)	May	2
Perspective (the black vote)	Nov.-Dec.	2
Perspective (selecting delegates for the 1984 democratic convention)	March	2
Race and Political Strategy	June	1*
The Shape of Politics to Come	Oct.	3
Businesses/Organizations		
AT&T Reorganization and Blacks	Nov.-Dec.	7
Black Journalist Buys Oakland Tribune	June	7
Conference on the Threat of Toxic Substances to Minority Communities	Oct.	7
Information Please	Oct.	7
NBC/LEOs 12th Annual Conference	Jan.	8
PTI Conference for Black Public Administrators	March	8

Surety Bonding and Minority Business — Aug. 6
U.S. Court of Appeals Rules in Favor of Ohio MBE Act — Aug. 8

Defense Issues
Briefing: Blacks and the Military — March 6
Good News, Bad News — June 7
Public Attitudes Toward the Military — March 4
Recruiting Black Officers — March 3

Economic Issues
Congressional Select Committee on Cities Proposed — June 7
Foreign Trade Policy and Unemployment — Nov.-Dec. 5
Investment Policy for Economic Revitalization — Aug. 4
Reforming the Tax System — April 5
What the Recovery Means for Minorities — Oct. 4

Education
Final Report on School Desegregation — Sept. 8
Perspective (federal spending for education) — July 2
Perspective (illiteracy in America) — April 2
School Desegregation in States and Cities — Feb. 5

Employment
Blacks Gain in City Jobs — March 7
The Emergency Jobs Bill: Who Does It Help? — May 4
Perspective (national youth service) — Oct. 2
Unemployment: A Look Behind the Numbers — Oct. 5

Energy
The Debate Over Natural Gas Decontrol — Sept. 6
Using Fuel Company Overcharge Funds — Jan. 5

Federal Budget and Policies
FEC to Sponsor Conferences on Federal Election Campaign Laws — July 7
Perspective (emerging black counter-offensive to Reaganomics) — Jan. 2
Perspective (Reagan's State of the Union message) — Feb. 2
Social Security Reform and the Black Aged — Feb. 3
Statistics and Public Policy — April 7

Industrial Policy
Blacks and the Industrial Policy Debate — April 3
Perspective (blacks and industrial policy) — June 2

International Relations
Bill to Stop Nuclear Exports to South Africa Reintroduced in 98th Congress — Feb.
Foreign Trade and Minority Businesses — Jan. 3
Immigration and Black America — Feb. 1*
Peace Corps Recruits Black Volunteers — Aug. 8
Shelving Immigration Reform — Nov.-Dec. 4

Joint Center
Focus Indexes — July 7
Fourth National Policy Institute — Nov.-Dec. 8
JCPS Provides Technical Assistance for Minority Community Development — Sept. 8
Joint Center Appoints New Board Member — March 8
Joint Center Board Appoints Three New Members — Nov.-Dec. 7
Military Officers to Participate in Joint Center's Senior Fellows Program — Feb. 7
Senior Military Fellow to Join JCPS — July 7
Two New JCPS Publications — Nov.-Dec. 7

Landownership
The Decline in Black Landownership — May 6

Racial Justice
Perspective (blacks and public policy) — Aug. 2
Perspective (structural discrimination) — Sept. 2
A Policy Framework for Racial Justice — June 4
Rating Congress on Minority Issues — May 8
Senate Passes King Holiday Bill — Nov.-Dec. 7
20th Anniversary of 1963 March on Washington — Feb. 7

Transportation
Commuting: Extra Burden for Blacks — Sept. 3
Minority Enterprise and Mass Transportation — Jan. 6
Surface Transportation Assistance Act — Jan. 7

Voting Rights & Redistricting
Redistricting in Mississippi — July 3
Resources for Voting Rights Litigation — July 4
VRA Follow-Up: Two Court Cases — Feb. 6

---

* Conference Report
+ Special Report

Author Index

Author	Article	Month	Page
Armstrong, Kevin	Foreign Trade Policy and Unemployment	Nov.-Dec.	5
Brooks, Joseph F.	The Decline in Black Landownership	May	6
Cavanagh, Thomas E.	How Washington Won Chicago	May	3
	Jesse Jackson: From Why Not? to How To	Nov.-Dec.	3
	The Shape of Politics to Come	Oct.	3
Derfner, Armand	Redistricting in Mississippi	July	3
	VRA Follow-Up: Two Court Cases	Feb.	6
Dorn, Edwin	Surface Transportation Assistance Act	Jan.	7
Dorn, Edwin and Paul Butler	Recruiting Black Officers	March	3
Dyels, Jr., Jake M.	Foreign Trade and Minority Businesses	Jan.	3
Felder, Henry E.	Black Family Income, 1960-1980	Aug.	3
Fox, Jeanne	Election 1984 Alert: Delegate Selection	Sept.	4
Holden, Jr., Matthew,	Social Security Reform and the Black Aged	Feb.	3
Jaynes, Gerald David	What the Recovery Means for Minorities	Oct.	4
Malveaux, Julianne	The Emergency Jobs Bill: Who Does It Help?	May	4
Marchbanks, Jack R.	Surety Bonding and Minority Business	Aug.	6
Morris, Milton D.	Shelving Immigration Reform	Nov.-Dec.	4
O'Hare, William P.	Commuting: Extra Burden for Blacks	Sept.	3
	Resources for Voting Rights Litigation	July	4
	Statistics and Public Policy	April	7
	Unemployment: A Look Behind the Numbers	Oct.	5
	Wealth and Economic Status	June	3
Scholz, John Karl	Reforming the Tax System	April	5
Smith, A. Wade	Public Attitudes Toward the Military	March	4
Squires, Gregory D.	Investment Policy for Economic Revitalization	Aug.	4
Teele, Jr., Arthur E.	Minority Enterprise and Mass Transportation	Jan.	6
White, Philip V.	The Debate Over Natural Gas Decontrol	Sept.	6
	Using Fuel Company Overcharge Funds	Jan.	5
Wilson III, Ernest J.	Blacks and the Industrial Policy Debate	April	3

Name Index

Abernathy, William J., Aug., p. 4
Adams, John Hurst, Jan., p. 2; Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Alexander, Clifford, March, p. 6
Askew, Reubin, April, p. 2a+; July, p. 6

Baker, Howard, May, p. 8
Barnes, John, Jan., p. 8
Barry, Marion, Nov.-Dec., p. 8
Bembery, Sharon A., Oct., p. 7
Bluestone, Barry, April, p. 3; Aug., p. 4
Bond, Julian, Feb., p. 4*
Bosshard, John, Aug., p. 4
Boyd, William B., March, p. 8
Bradley, Tom, Jan., pp. 4, 8; Oct., p. 6
Brown, Virgil, June, p. 2*
Bryce-Laporte, Roy, Feb., p. 4*
Bush, Mrs. George, April, p. 2
Byrne, Jane, Jan., p. 8; March, p. 8; May, p. 3;

Calhoun, Jerry, March, p. 6
Camp, John, Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Carter, Jimmy, May, p. 2; Sept., p. 6; Oct., p. 7; Nov.-Dec., p. 3
Celeste, Richard, Nov.-Dec., p. 3
Cisneros, Henry, Oct., p. 8
Clark, Kenneth B., June, p. 4
Clark III, Major, Jan., p. 7
Colling, George, Oct., p. 7
Conyers, John, July, p. 8; Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Coyne, William J., June, p. 7
Cranston, Alan, April, p. 2a+; May, p. 8; July, p. 6
Crockett, George, Feb., p. 7

Dahl, Robert, May, p. 2
Daley, Jr., Richard, Jan., p. 8; March, p. 8; May, p. 3
Davison III, Fred, March, p. 6
Dawkins, Miller, Feb., p. 3*
Dellums, Ronald, Feb., p. 7; March, p. 6
Dilk, Suzanne B., Feb., p. 3
Dillard, Morris, Jan., p. 7
Dingell, John, Sept., p. 7
Dixon, Julian, Feb., p. 7
Dole, Bob, May, p. 8
DuBois, W. E. B., June, p. 4
Duncan, Joe, April, p. 7
Dymally, Mervyn, Feb., p. 7

Eaglin, Joseph, Feb., p. 4
Edelman, Marian Wright, Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Edwards, Don, Feb., p. 5; July, p. 8
Egan, John, June, p. 7
Elkins, Bill, June, p. 2*
Epton, Bernard, March, p. 8; Oct., p. 3
Etherly, Woody, Jan., p. 8

Farrell, Robert, Jan., p. 8
Fauntroy, Walter, Feb., p. 7
Feldstein, Martin, Jan., p. 7
Foggie, Samuel, Nov.-Dec., p. 3
Ford, Johnny, Jan., p. 8
Foster, Luther Hilton, Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Franklin, John Hope, June, p. 4
Fuchs, Larry, Feb., p. 3*

Gardner, Bettianne, May, p. 3
Gardner, Edward, May, p. 3
Gephardt, Richard, Sept., p. 7
Gibson, Kenneth, Jan., p. 4
Gibson, Larry, June, p. 3*
Gillette, Errol, Jan., p. 3
Glenn, John, April, p. 2a+; May, p. 8; July, p. 6; Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Godwin, Lamond, July, p. 8
Goode, W. Wilson, Jan., p. 8; May, p. 2; June, p. 7
Graber, Doris, May, p. 3
Graham, Saundra, Jan., p. 8
Graves, Clifford, Feb., p. 4*
Gray, William, Feb., p. 7

Hall, Katie, Feb., p. 7
Harrison, Bennett, Aug., p. 4
Harrison, Tony, June, p. 2*
Hart, Gary, April, pp. 3, 2a+; May, p. 8
Hatcher, Richard, Jan., p. 4; July, p. 6
Hayes, Charles, Oct., p. 7
Hayes, Robert H., Aug., p. 4
Helms, Jesse, May, p. 8; Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Hill, Robert, Feb., p. 4
Hillman, Gracia, June, p. 4*
Hirschman, Charles, Feb., p. 3*
Hollings, Ernest, April, p. 2a+; May, p. 8; July, p. 6
Hooks, Benjamin, Feb., p. 7
Humphrey, Hubert, Nov.-Dec., p. 3

Jackson, Jesse, Jan., p. 8; July, pp. 6, 8; Nov.-Dec., p. 3
Jackson, Maynard, Jan., p. 4
Jacques, Vince, Jan., p. 4
Jakovich, Cecelia, June, p. 2*
James, William, Oct., p. 2
Jemison, T. J., April, p. 8
Johnson, Aaron, Jan., p. 8
Johnson, George E., Nov.-Dec., p. 3
Johnson, Lyndon, Sept., p. 2

Kemp, Jack, May, p. 8
King, Coretta Scott, Feb., p. 7
King, Edward J., April, p. 8
King, Melvin H., April, p. 8
King, Jr., Martin Luther, Jan., p. 2; Feb., p. 7; July, p. 6; Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Kirkland, Lane, April, p. 3

Leonard, Thomas, Jan., p. 8; June, p. 7
Leone, Fred, April, p. 7
Lewis, Drew, Jan., p. 7
Lichtenstein, Jules, Feb., p. 3*
Loftis, Tom, Aug., p. 4
Long, Russell, April, p. 6
Lowery, Joseph, Feb., p. 7

McDaniel, Claudette Black, Jan., p. 8
McDuffie, Ron, June, p. 4*
McLemore, Leslie B., June, p. 1*
Martin, Louis, June, p. 2*
Maslin, Paul, June, p. 2*
Maynard, Robert, June, p. 7
Mazzoli, Romano L., Nov.-Dec., p. 4
Metzenbaum, Howard, Aug., p. 4
Michaux, Mickey, June, p. 1*
Mitchell, Parren J., Jan., p. 7; Aug., p. 6
Mitofsky, Warren, June, p. 3*
Mondale, Walter, April, p. 2a+; July, p. 6
Moore, Jr., Jerry, April, p. 8
Morial, Ernest (Dutch), Feb., p. 2*
Morris, Horrace, Feb., p. 4*
Morris, Milton, Feb., p. 3*
Myers, Robert J., Feb., p. 3

Newman, I. DeQuincey, Nov.-Dec., p. 7

O'Neill, Tip, Feb., p. 3; Nov.-Dec., p. 4
Owens, Major, Feb., p. 7

Palmer, Lu, May, p. 3; Oct., p. 7
Patterson, Richard, Jan., p. 8
Pena, Federico, Oct., p. 8
Pettigrew, Thomas, June, p. 2*
Pierre, Percy A., March, p. 6
Pinkney, Arnold, Nov.-Dec., p. 3
Powell, Lewis F., May, p. 8
Preacely, Diane, Oct., p. 7

Rangel, Charles, Feb., p. 7
Raspberry, William, Aug., p. 2
Reagan, Ronald, Jan., p. 2; Feb., pp. 3, 1*; March, p. 2; April, pp. 5, 7; May, pp. 4, 8; June, p. 5; July, pp. 2, 6, 7; Sept., p. 7; Oct., p. 7; Nov.-Dec., pp. 5, 7
Reich, Robert, April, p. 3
Reynolds, William Bradford, July, p. 8
Rizzo, Frank, Jan., p. 8; May, p. 2; June, p. 7
Robb, Charles, May, p. 8; Aug., p. 8
Roberts, Michael, Jan., p. 8
Roberts, Steven, Jan., p. 8
Robertson, William B., March, p. 6
Rohatyn, Felix, April, p. 3
Rowan, Carl, Nov.-Dec., p. 4

Sanders, Alex, Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Shalala, Donna E., Oct., p. 7
Shannon, John, March, p. 6
Shannon, Odessa, June, p. 2*
Sherrill, Robert, Aug., p. 4
Slater, Courtney, April, p. 7
Spurlock, Delbert L., March, p. 6
Stokes, Louis, Nov.-Dec., p. 3
Sutton, Percy, Nov.-Dec., p. 3

Tarrance, Lance, June, p. 3*
Teitelbaum, Michael, Feb., p. 2*
Thomas, John Charles, May, p. 8
Thurow, Lester, April, p. 3
Torres, Arnold, Feb., p. 4*
Towns, Edolphus, Feb., p. 7
Tsongas, Paul, April, p. 3
Tucker, Donald, Jan., p. 8
Turner, E. B., Jan., p. 8

Vrdolyak, Ed, March, p. 8; May, p. 7

Warren, Ed, Oct., p. 7
Washington, Harold, Jan., p. 8; March, p. 8; May, pp. 2, 3; Oct., p. 7
West, Togo, March, p. 6
Wheat, Alan, Feb., p. 7; Oct., p. 6
White, Kevin, April, p. 8
Whitmire, Kathy, Jan., p. 2
Williams, Eddie, June, p. 4*
Wilson III, Ernest, June, p. 2
Winter, Nadine, Jan., p. 8
Wolff, Harold, June, p. 3*
Wooldridge, Blue, Oct., p. 7

Young, Andrew, Jan., p. 4; Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Young, Coleman, Jan., p. 4

* Conference Report
\+ Special Report

Foreign Trade Policy and Unemployment

by Kevin D. Armstrong

(The author is staff writer at the Joint Center for Political Studies.)

On November 3, the House of Representatives passed, by a vote of 219 to 199, so-called domestic content legislation. The controversial bill would require foreign automobile manufacturers who sell more than 100,000 cars a year in this country to use specific percentages of American parts and labor. The bill now moves to the Senate, where it is likely to be taken up early in 1984. It will face a tougher battle there, and even if it is passed, President Reagan, who has actively opposed such legislation, will probably veto it.

The bill is one of the first congressional actions in what will be a hotly contested political battle in 1984. Organized labor has succeeded in making a central issue of U.S. trade and its impact on American workers. In this article, we will explore some of the basic arguments behind the rhetoric, with special attention to their significance for blacks and other minorities.

Representation of women and minorities in U.S. industries most harmed by foreign trade, 1980.

Industry*	Women	Minorities
Apparel	80%	12%
Motor vehicles	13%	14%
Furnaces, Steel products	7%	14%
Nonrubber footwear	62%	4%
Motorcycles, Bicycles	19%	8%
Radio, TV sets	40%	8%
Broadwoven fabric mills	42%	13%
Rubber footwear	25%	10%
Petroleum refining	15%	7%
Furniture, Fixtures	27%	11%

*Industries are listed in order of business lost to imports.

Source: Data from Department of Labor

Representation of women and minorities in U.S. industries most helped by foreign trade, 1980.

Industry*	Women	Minorities
Machine shop products	16%	5%
Refrigeration machinery	16%	5%
Fabricated plate work	12%	7%
Veneer and plywood	10%	16%
Semiconductors	41%	7%
Electronic components	41%	7%
Wiring devices	41%	7%
Motors, Generators	22%	5%
Pumps and compressors	16%	5%
Special industrial machinery	14%	7%

*Industries are listed in order of business gained from export trade.

Source: Data from Department of Labor

Changing Nature of U.S. Trade

Since the early 1950s, rising global prosperity and the easing of trade restrictions have led to increased U.S. trade with both industrialized and less developed nations. These trends have altered America's economy markedly, making it considerably more dependent on world commerce: the value of imports and exports as a percentage of the gross national product bounded from 7.3 percent in 1965 to 18.4 percent in 1980.

The expansion of international trade has undoubtedly yielded increased job opportunities in American industries dependent upon exports—semiconductors, aircraft engines, and construction machinery, to name a few. But some basic U.S. industries for various reasons—ranging from the relative strength of the dollar to problems in the industries themselves—have been unsuccessful in competing with foreign imports: industries such as autos, steel, and machine tools have been severely damaged by foreign competition. (The enormous deficits in America's balance of trade over the last few years—$36.4 billion in 1982—attest to the extent of the damage.) These industries have had to reduce their work forces through temporary or permanent layoffs and plant closings. A disproportionately high number of the affected workers are black.

Trade and Minority Unemployment

According to a study prepared for the Joint Center by Dr. Jane-yu Li (an economist now at the World Bank), the U.S. Department of Labor has identified the 20 sectors hurt most by recent shifts in trading patterns and the 20 sectors that have enjoyed the greatest expansion as a result of the same shifts. The sectors most harmed by foreign competition employ relatively more minorities: in 1980, the weighted average percentage of minority workers was 11.5 for the sectors adversely affected by trade and 7.4 for the sectors that benefit from trade. The statistics for women are similar: 41.1 percent of workers in the former sector but only 21.5 percent of those in the latter were women.

What's more, the burden on minority and women workers may be much larger than these figures suggest. For example, the Department of Labor has estimated that black workers make up 14 percent of the work force in the automobile industry but 33 percent of laid-off auto workers—more than double the rate for whites.

Minorities and women, therefore, are most likely to experience—and least able to afford—the job disruption brought on by increased competition.

Competition or Protection?

Some within organized labor have called for government assistance to counter industrial decline. A position paper adopted by the Fifteenth Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO, which met last month in Hollywood, Florida, advocates emergency relief measures that "could include loans and loan guarantees, direct subsidies, targeted tax measures,

(Continued on page 6)

. . . Immigration Reform

(Continued from page 4)

action: Did the country lose very much in the failure of Simpson-Mazzoli, and if so what? Where do we go from here with immigration reform?

The failure to enact Simpson-Mazzoli now means that no similar legislation is likely before 1985, since Congress will be even more reluctant to deal with the issue in 1984—a presidential election year. This delay means that the problem of illegal immigration will persist and perhaps worsen after this new evidence of the government's inability to act. Millions of people who would have been granted legal status by Simpson-Mazzoli will continue to lead a clandestine existence, and the inequitable way immigration petitions are now adjudicated will remain unchanged.

Nevertheless, the failed bill was far from adequate; it would have delivered considerably less than most press comments about it imply. Even its sponsors conceded that it had serious weaknesses and should be viewed as only a modest first step in immigration reform. The principal problem was that both House and Senate versions of the bill failed to offer a credible means of curtailing illegal immigration. The proposed employer sanctions seemed too weak to be effective especially in the absence of a reliable worker identification system or a plan to expand the responsible enforcement agencies to enforce the new provision.

The failure of Simpson-Mazzoli demonstrates the extreme difficulty of achieving major immigration reform. If the current problems worsen considerably, however, Congress may be driven to harsh and imprudent measures. But there are alternatives.

Congress might now turn its attention to passage of pending refugee legislation that could include some of the modifications in the adjudication process painstakingly worked out as part of Simpson-Mazzoli. Next, it could provide direction and funding to drastically reorganize and strengthen the immigration bureaucracy to improve services and enforcement. Congress might also review its foreign economic assistance programs to determine how they might help improve the economic conditions that contribute to the increasing emigration pressures in nearby developing countries. These measures would help to reduce illegal immigration significantly and would improve the effectiveness of future immigration reform legislation.

. . . Foreign Trade

(Continued from page 5)

and trade relief . . ." And the United Auto Workers union vigorously supports the domestic content legislation.

The unions and their supporters maintain that such measures would create jobs for Americans and "send a message" to other countries to open their markets to more American goods.

The government response has been moderate so far. Laws were enacted in 1974 and 1978 to provide some assistance to domestic industries, and the U.S. signed the internationally negotiated General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which allows for the imposition of an off-setting duty when imports are being sold at "less than normal value." "Normal value" is defined as the price at which a product is sold in its domestic market or—for products manufactured solely for export—the price at which the product is sold to a third country; in cases where third country comparisons cannot be made, the normal value is defined as an item's cost of production.

Besides these antidumping duties, the most commonly used import relief measure is the negotiation of "voluntary" export restraint agreements with other nations. Some such agreements have been struck between the United States and such newly industrialized countries as Japan, Taiwan, and Korea, yet they have failed to halt the slippage of America's heavy industries. More extensive remedies, therefore, continue to be advocated.

Opponents of these remedies argue that if international trade is restricted, a trade war may ensue, depriving all nations of the gains made possible by the comparative advantages of each trading partner. Among the results, they say, lower-income families in the United States would no longer benefit from lower-priced imported necessities such as clothing, shoes, consumer electronics, and cars, and minority families would suffer more than whites because of their lower incomes.

A worse consequence cited frequently by farmers' groups and other export-oriented industries is the likelihood that foreign countries would retaliate by restricting U.S. imports. Firms producing goods for export would then lose business, and although there are relatively few minority workers in these firms, these few would probably suffer job losses in the same disproportionate way that is occurring now throughout heavy industry.

Protectionist measures cannot save many jobs in heavy industry either, according to the advocates of unrestricted trade: competing domestic producers will simply increase the level of automation to cut their costs. As an example, they point to the automobile industry, which bought itself time to retool by persuading the government to negotiate a voluntary export restraint agreement with Japan. Increased automation means that jobs in the industry will probably never reach prerecession levels.

The debate over the proper U.S. response to increased competition from abroad is seen by many as a debate over the future of their livelihood. Those in the auto industry, for instance, fear the loss of sales and jobs if imports are allowed to continue unabated, while farmers fear that limitations on imported cars will lead to foreign restrictions on American agricultural exports. The struggle among these competing interests is perhaps the natural result of a changing world economic order, but it promises to be a protracted and potentially bitter confrontation.

Telescope

South Carolina Elects First Black State Senator Since Reconstruction

Reverend I. DeQuincey Newman was elected South Carolina's first black state senator since 1888, in a special election held in October. Newman, a Democrat, is a businessman and former NAACP field director for South Carolina. He defeated white Republican John Camp for the seat, which represents Richland, Fairfield, and Chester counties. It was previously held by Alex Sanders, now a chief judge of the state Court of Appeals.

AT&T Reorganization and Blacks

A CBS News/*New York Times* poll taken in late September found that 69 percent of black respondents say they could not afford a telephone if rates double. Many people have predicted just such an increase in rates as a result of the court-ordered reorganization of the telephone system scheduled to take place in January 1984. Fifty percent of the elderly and 72 percent of respondents with incomes under $10,000 also said they might have to give up their phones if rates double. The reorganization plan is drawing increasing scrutiny from Congress and from state legislators.

Joint Center Board Appoints Three New Members

The Joint Center's board of governors has three new members: Bishop John Hurst Adams, Marian Wright Edelman, and Luther Hilton Foster.

Bishop Adams has served as the bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church since 1972. He is chairman of the Congress of National Black Churches and director of the Interdenominational Theological Center. Bishop Adams received his master's degree from the Boston University School of Theology.

Marian Wright Edelman has been president of the Children's Defense Fund since 1975. She is a trustee and chairman of the board of Spelman College. Ms. Edelman received her law degree from Yale University and has served as an attorney for the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., and as director of the Harvard University Center for Law and Education.

Luther Hilton Foster is chairman of the board of the Moton Memorial Institute in Washington, D.C. He holds several honorary degrees and is president emeritus of Tuskegee Institute.

Senate Passes King Holiday Bill

On October 19, 1983, the Senate voted 78 to 22 to make Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday the nation's tenth federal holiday. Its passage followed two days of intense and often bitter debate. Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) was the main opponent of the legislation. The House passed the bill in August, and President Reagan signed it on November 2.

Legislation to create a national holiday in memory of Dr. King has been before the U.S. Congress for 15 years. Congressman John Conyers (D-MI) of the Congressional Black Caucus introduced the first bill in April 1968, four days after Dr. King's assassination in Memphis; other bills have been introduced every year since then. The closest a bill had come to passage was in 1979, when the bill fell four votes short of passage in the House.

The holiday will be observed on the third Monday in January, starting in 1986.

The Gender Gap, Continued

The widely noted "gender gap" in support for Ronald Reagan is found even among blacks, who give the president the lowest approval ratings of any group. Sixteen percent of black men but only 6 percent of women approve of President Reagan's job performance, according to the Gallup survey.

Women overall have given President Reagan lower job approval ratings in all the national Gallup surveys since he took office in 1980. The recent boost in the president's approval ratings following the invasion of Granada and the attack in Lebanon came entirely from men, according to the ABC News/*Washington Post poll.* Reagan is no more popular with women now than he was before the actions—49 percent of women approve of his job performance, compared to 67 percent of men.

Among the Democratic candidates for presidential nominees, the only one with a gender gap is Senator John Glenn. The Garth Analysis found that 34 percent of men and 27 percent of women support Glenn. But 23 percent of women are undecided, as compared to 10 percent of men.

Two New JCPS Publications

Wealth and Economic Status: A Perspective on Racial Inequity, by William P. O'Hare, uses information on wealth (accumulated assets) to compare the economic status of blacks and whites. The more commonly used income measure suggests that blacks as a group have reached 60 percent of parity with whites, but blacks have only one-third as much wealth as whites. O'Hare, senior research associate at the Joint Center, examines differences in wealth accumulation between blacks and whites for a range of assets, from income and property to savings and investments. *Wealth and Economic Status* also looks at changes in black and white wealth accumulation between 1967 and 1979.

Race and Political Strategy, edited by Thomas E. Cavanagh, research associate at the Joint Center, is based on proceedings of a JCPS roundtable discussion on the impact of race in electoral contests between black and white candidates. Roundtable participants included black candidates who ran in the 1982 elections and their assistants, political consultants, pollsters, and academic researchers. Their discussions centered on three issues that confront black candidates: strategic choices, use of campaign technologies, and grass-roots organizing.

Mayor Andrew Young of Atlanta says in his introduction to *Race and Political Strategy,* "Any black man or woman involved in politics should draw a measure of moral support as well as practical insight from this book. . . . Everyone interested in the political process will enjoy the give-and-take."

Copies of both publications are available for $4.95 each, prepaid, from the Joint Center.

FOURTH NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE

Black elected officials from all levels of government and all parts of the country will meet in Washington, D.C., from February 29 to March 3, 1984, for the *Fourth National Policy Institute.* The institute's sponsors—the seven national organizations of black elected officials and the Joint Center for Political Studies—issued a call to the meeting on November 9.

The political climate of the last few years and the forthcoming presidential campaign give this meeting special significance. It will provide an opportunity for the 5,400 black elected officials in the nation to establish a strong network, share ideas on policy and strategies for governance, and demonstrate to the rest of the country their substantial political presence.

The institute will include seminars on public policy and the political process, caucuses by level of office, and plenary sessions at which resolutions may be proposed, discussed, and adopted. Though the institute is nonpartisan and will not endorse any candidates, it can be expected to have a strong impact on the larger political arena.

Seminars will feature elected officials with expertise on specific subjects, political scientists and commentators, federal officials, and other knowledgeable professionals. They will examine how public policies affect governments at the national, state, and local levels, with particular attention to the interests of blacks and to the actions elected officials can take to address the concerns of their constituents. On the issue of employment, for example, local problems will be examined in the context of large-scale economic and social trends, and possible remedies will be weighed. Among other issues to be discussed are U.S. trade, the environment, education, and the black family.

Another set of seminars will focus on ways to increase and improve minority political participation, including voter mobilization, campaign strategies, and enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. Workshops will provide concrete information on federal and state initiatives in resource development and on resources available in the private sector. Representatives of federal and state agencies will discuss programs in housing, transportation, social service delivery, and community and economic development. Special attention will be given to strategic planning for local governments. Other highlights of the institute include a caucus for women officials, a reception hosted by Washington, D.C., Mayor Marion Barry, and the JCPS Seventh Annual Dinner, whose theme will be "A Salute to Black Elected Officials."

The registration fee is $90 for black elected officials and $200 for observers. The fee covers all events except the JCPS dinner. For further information, please call 202 626-3534, or write Fourth National Policy Institute, 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004.

Sponsored by:

Congressional Black Caucus
Joint Center for Political Studies
Judicial Council of the National Bar Association
National Association of Black County Officials
National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials
National Black Caucus of State Legislators
National Caucus of Black School Board Members
National Conference of Black Mayors

100

FOCUS

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

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED
Postmaster:
Form 3547 requested

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

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

PRICE $1.25