Volume 14, Nos. 11 and 12 November-December 1986

FOCUS

The monthly newsletter of the Joint Center for Political Studies

1986 Elections: Major Implications for Blacks

Will the Senate and the Democrats Reward Black Voters?
What Will Black Politics Be Like in the Post-Reagan Era?

Workfare Is No Panacea for Ills of Poverty

Few May Benefit, But Not the Large Underclass

Political TrendLetter

Voter Turnout; Congressional Black Caucus; Statewide Winners; "Across the Nation"

Perspective

PLUS:
1986 *Focus* Index

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

The Message of the Black Vote in 1986

Now that voters have cast their ballots and the final results of the 1986 midterm elections have been posted, a new kind of campaign is under way as politicians and the press seek to interpret the election results. Putting a "spin" on election results is an old game, but one with great significance because it determines who is ultimately perceived as the "winners" and the "losers."

This year the spinners, those who tilt or manipulate election results to their own advantage, have been especially active, seeking to influence political decisions over the next two years and to shape the environment for the 1988 presidential election.

The Democratic spin suggests that their recapture of the U.S. Senate by a 55 to 45 seat margin puts them in an excellent position to defang the Reaganites during the next two years and to recapture the White House in 1988. The Republican spin suggests that the midterm elections were decided on state and local and not national issues and therefore have few implications for the outcome of the 1988 presidential election.

The spin that blacks put on the 1986 election suggests that they are a major factor that both parties must reckon with. It is a spin with considerable substance.

In assessing the significance of the black vote in 1986, the key question is whether black voters provided the margin of support that made the difference in some key elections. By this yardstick, as reported in this issue, the black vote was critical in giving Senate control to the Democrats and in electing more blacks to public office, including three new members of the Congressional Black Caucus. Although blacks supported the losing gubernatorial candidates in Texas, Florida, and California, they preferred the winning Democrats in Pennsylvania, Michigan (against a black GOP candidate) and stemmed the tide of Democratic losses in other states. In sum, the tally sheet for black voters includes a host of key victories and a few tough losses—not a bad take, in betting terms.

Yet, some pundits have begun to put their own "spin" on these results and to question the importance of the black vote. It is as if black voters have been felled by an election-night neutron bomb, which leaves their vote intact but makes them invisible in the aftermath of victory.

What these pundits seem to be saying—indeed encouraging—is that black voters, by virtue of their overwhelming support of Democratic candidates in 1986, have made themselves the "Typhoid Mary" of American politics. This spurious logic seems to suggest that Democrats, who need to win the Southern white vote in 1988, value blacks only "in the booth in the back in the corner in the dark" (in the words of Flip Wilson's Geraldine) while Republicans offer only a reluctant courtship toward the black vote.

This reasoning, to be charitable, demeans the sophistication and enlightened self-interest of the black vote and encourages bi-partisan racism. By voting overwhelmingly Democratic, blacks demonstrated as much pragmatism as partisanship, a stance other groups have taken and continue to take without being painted as "Typhoid Mary." When Republican candidates offer as much, if not more, to blacks than Democrats, they can expect black support. When Democrats become complacent about black support, they run the risk of defections or low turnout. The 1988 presidential election may well determine which road blacks will take.

Meanwhile, the task for black voters is to make sure that those who won with our votes now heed their voices. Unless the concerns of blacks are now placed on the agendas in Congress and in state and local legislatures, they could be provoked next time around into voting with their ballots or on their bottoms.

Eddie N. Williams

PRESIDENT

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. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens
MANAGER OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES/Patricia Roberson

EDITOR, *Focus*/Sherille Ismail
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*

Workfare Is No Panacea for Ills of Poverty

Few May Benefit, But Not the Large Underclass

by William O'Hare

The White House is soon expected to release a report on welfare reform that President Reagan called for in his State of the Union address in 1986. Though the report's content is not yet known, the welfare reform idea most frequently mentioned both inside and outside the government is workfare—a term whose meaning has changed over the years.

Originally, workfare referred to a punitive program that required all welfare recipients to perform work at minimum wages in exchange for benefits received. This is the type of program President Reagan tried unsuccessfully to implement when he was governor of California in the early 1970s. Opponents often called the idea "slavefare."

Over the past few years, however, workfare has come to encompass a broad range of work and welfare programs that are often voluntary rather than mandatory and that typically include education, training, job search assistance, childcare, and transportation aid. Rather than being punitive, the goal of the newer programs is to help welfare recipients find and keep jobs.

It is not known at this time which of these or other versions of workfare the administration will push, but it can be said that workfare in any form will not significantly reduce either poverty or welfare dependency. Many analysts, myself included, support efforts to increase education, training, and job search assistance, but those who see workfare as a panacea for our poverty problem are likely to be disappointed. More importantly, implementation of a workfare program may lead people to believe, mistakenly, that we have solved the poverty problem or have taken a major step in that direction.

Dr. O'Hare is associate director of research for social policy at JCPS.

Only A Few Will Benefit

A look at some numbers reveals the limited impact workfare can be expected to have in reducing poverty. In 1985, 20 million adults were living in poverty (including 9 million "working poor") but only 3.5 million families received AFDC (Aid to Families With Dependent Children), the program that is typically tied to workfare (though recipients of food stamps and other welfare benefits are included in some workfare models.) Thus, even if workfare were fabulously successful and the number of AFDC recipients were cut in half (which no one expects), it would reduce the number of adults in poverty by only 5 to 10 percent.

Workfare's impact on welfare dependency would also be minimal. About half of the women who receive AFDC payments need welfare for less than a year; for these women, AFDC provides temporary support for getting through hardships brought on by major events such as divorce or sudden unemployment. These AFDC recipients leave the program after a relatively short time and would probably benefit more from higher payment levels in their period of need than from the workfare program.

Of the group of welfare mothers who stay on welfare for more than a year, many would not be expected to work because they have small children to care for. Furthermore, many long-term welfare mothers are high-school drop-outs with little or no work experience and would therefore require extensive education and training assistance before they could get off the welfare rolls and assume private sector jobs. But programs offering that kind of extensive assistance go far beyond what workfare usually provides.

Once you remove those who are likely to leave welfare soon anyway, those with young children, and those who require a heavy investment, the group for whom a workfare program is likely to make a major difference is relatively limited.

> *Workfare programs may boost earnings, but "have virtually no impact on exit rates from AFDC."*

The evidence to date suggests that workfare-type programs (like ET in Massachusetts and GAIN in California) do help welfare recipients obtain jobs and increase their earnings, but the impact is not large. A recent evaluation of new workfare programs in San Diego, Baltimore, and two counties in Arkansas indicates that workfare programs boost the likelihood of employment by about 6 percentage points and raise earnings by 10 to 36 percent, but they have virtually no impact on exit rates from AFDC. Workfare may initially cost more than welfare but, because a program participant's earnings will rise and welfare benefits will be reduced, the costs to government ultimately will be lower. This type of workfare program will be helpful, but it won't perform miracles.

Workfare and the Underclass

Workfare applies only to those who already receive benefits. What about the large group of long-term poor (primarily single, young, black men) who typically receive no government benefits at all? There is widespread agreement that many are so poorly educated and lacking in skills that they have no realistic prospects of finding employment without intensive training and assistance.

How well is a workfare-type approach likely to succeed with this group? The best evidence we have on this topic comes from a Supported Work Demonstration Project conducted by the Manpower Development Research Corporation (MDRC). For about five years in the late 1970s, MDRC focused on four groups whose problems are among the most intractable in our society: long-term welfare mothers, ex-addicts, problem youth (young school drop-outs who often had criminal records and/or histories of delinquency), and ex-offenders.

People in these four groups typically have multiple problems associated with long-term poverty, and they form the core of what many would call an American underclass (see, for example, Ken Auletta's 1981 book, *The Underclass*). If a program of intervention could succeed with these groups, it could probably succeed with almost any other group one can think of.

Not surprisingly, minorities constituted a disproportionate share of these groups. All but 5 percent of the long-term AFDC mothers in the demonstration project were black or Hispanic, as were 6 out of every 7 ex-addicts, 9 out of every 10 ex-offenders, and about 19 out of every 20 people in the problem youth group.

The MDRC project tried to create a bridge between the dependence-inducing environment in which members of the four groups typically lived and the world of self-sufficiency represented by a job in the private sector. The project did this by providing intensive training and counseling under very structured and heavily supervised circumstances. In the words of the MDRC Board of Directors, "The supported work program provided individuals with severe employment problems with work experience of a year or so, under conditions of gradually increasing demands, close supervision, and work in association with a crew of peers." (The Board of Directors, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, *Summary of Findings of the National Supported Work Demonstration,* 1980, p.1).

A punitive workfare approach will not work with this group because they receive no government benefits.

Because of the importance of the MDRC project in shaping the kinds of welfare policies that are likely to enjoy support, analysts and observers waited patiently for the results of these efforts to be reported. What have been the results? Most observers would agree with the assessment of Martha Ritter and Sally Danziger that "after five years of operation and evaluation, the results were mixed." They were mixed largely in terms of who was likely to benefit from such an approach.

One group clearly benefited most from the approach used by the Supported Work Demonstration Project: long-term welfare recipients (AFDC mothers, many of whom became parents as teenagers). Following their involvement in the program, their earnings increased and their welfare dependency declined. Furthermore, these positive effects continued even after the experiment, with the special support it offered, had ended.

The results of this segment of the project were so positive that some states incorporated elements of the supported work program into the workfare policies they initiated in the early 1980s. For example, Massachusetts implemented a program entitled ET (Employment and Training) Choices and California began a program called GAIN (Greater Avenues for Independence), both of which offer education and training but, unlike the MDRC program, the two states do not offer the intensive, day-to-day supervision and extensive assistance that proved crucial to the success of the MDRC effort.

Though long-term welfare mothers benefited, the other groups in the supported work experiment showed no such gains. The ex-addicts showed a few positive effects, but the assistance that had been provided had almost no positive effects on the problem youths and the ex-offenders.

To the extent that the Supported Work Project identified the target groups that would benefit from its model program of governmental intervention, the project was a valuable experiment. Another benefit of the project was the wealth of data that was collected and maintained—particularly since the data concern groups about whom there is little information from general sources like the Census Bureau.

Perhaps the single most important result of the Supported Work Project was a better understanding of just how deep-rooted the problems of the underclass are and how difficult it will be to develop a government program that is able to have much impact on this group, particularly young unattached males. A punitive workfare approach will not work with this group because they receive no government benefits and the Supported Work Demonstration Project shows that even intensive training and support are not likely to make much of a difference. For this portion of the underclass, radical new solutions must be found.

1986 Elections: Major Implications for Black Politics

by Linda Williams

Black voters played a crucial role in enabling the Democrats to recapture the U.S.Senate. The question now is what will blacks get for their loyal support? Will the Senate be more responsive when it acts on issues important to blacks? Will the Democratic party treat blacks more favorably or continue to accuse them of running white males out of the party? Will both parties be more likely to frame an appeal to blacks' interests which, as opinion polls show, are increasingly congruent with the interests of whites on a number of key issues? This article explores these and several other questions conerning the implications of the 1986 election results.

Impact on the Senate Races

The big story of 1986 for black politics was the impact of the black vote in the Democrats' lopsided recapture of the U.S. Senate, with its critical implications for judicial appointments, budgetary priorities, and a wide variety of domestic and international policies (especially relations with South Africa). With the Democrats getting more white votes in 1986 than Mondale won in 1984, their advantage among black voters was the critical factor in at least four Senate races (Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and North Carolina) and, according to CBS and NBC exit polls, in Nevada and California as well. Black voters also signficantly boosted the margin of victory of Democratic senatorial candidates in several other states—especially Maryland and Florida. (See table below.) In short, the black vote, though unable to stop the pro-Reagan tide in 1980 and 1984, was the decisive factor in effectively dealing a major blow to President Reagan and the GOP in 1986 and putting the Democrats on a more even footing for beginning the 1988 presidential race.

Will the Senate Be Responsive?

The Democratics are more likely than the Republicans to favor a more active role for the federal government. Although it is true that several committees will be chaired by Southern Democrats who are only barely less conservative (or, in some instances, more conservative) than the Republicans they are replacing, in general it looks as if the Democratic-controlled Senate will be essentially more moderate than the 99th Senate— with moderate and moderate-conservative Democrats replacing conservative Republicans in Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Nevada, and North Carolina and a liberal Democrat replacing a moderate- liberal Republican in Maryland.

Blacks will benefit from the new moderation as well as from the new chairmen of two committees that control presidential nominations and key legislation of particular interest to blacks: Sen. Joseph Biden (D.-Del.) will replace Sen. Strom Thurmond (R.-S.C.) as chair of the Judiciary Committee, and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D.-Mass.) will replace Sen. Orrin Hatch (R.-Utah) as chair of Labor and Human Resources.

For blacks, the new Democratic Senators may not have been their first choice, but they appear to be far more acceptable than most of the Republicans they replaced. As Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) president Ann Lewis has pointed out, all of the Democratic replacements had higher liberal ratings (where comparable ratings were available) than their defeated Republican opponents; all had liberal ratings over 50 percent; and all campaigned on the issue of a strong role for government in solving the nation's social and economic woes.

(Continued on next page).

The Black Vote and the U.S. Senate, 1986

State	*Winner*	*% Black Vote*	*% White Vote*	*% Black of Actual Electorate*	*Winner's % of Total Vote*
Alabama	Shelby-D	88	38	22	51
Calif.*	Cranston-D	96	44	7	51
Florida	Graham-D	80	52	10	55
Georgia	Fowler-D	82	39	24	51
Louisiana	Breaux-D	85	39	29	53
Maryland	Mikulski-D	87	51	18	61
Nevada	Reid-D	71	46	11	51
N.C.	Sanford-D	88	42	16	52

*Data from NBC/*Wall Street Journal* exit poll. All other data from CBS/*New York Times* exit polls.

Dr. Williams is a senior research associate at JCPS.

Public Wants Activist Government

Even before November's electoral evidence, Gallup polls had found a surge of public support for a more active federal government. When asked whether the federal government has too much power, only 28 percent in 1986 thought so—down from 38 percent in 1982; 24 percent thought the federal government was using the right amount of power—up from 18 percent in 1982; and 41 percent thought the federal government should use its powers more vigorously—up from 30 percent in 1982.

So if you link these trends with the Democrats' Senate gains among constituencies favorable to proactive government, it is easy to understand Senate Democratic Leader Robert Byrd's apparent decision to suspend Gramm-Rudman deficit targets and push new programs in education, science, the environment. Not only has Gramm-Rudman lacked substantial credibility with the public, but poll after poll illustrates the extent to which the electorate favors *increasing* federal outlays in popular areas like education, science, health, and the environment. Thus blacks and whites may not only be viewing the same issues as their most important concerns, as reported in the last issue of *Focus,* but they may also be coming to more agreement on the role of government in resolving these issues.

Redistricting in 1992

Although black votes for Democratic gubernatorial candidates were just as numerous as for senatorial candidates, black voters had far less impact on gubernatorial races than on senatorial races. For example, 91 percent of blacks voted for the failed candidacy of Democrat William Baxley in Alabama; 90 percent voted for defeated incumbent Democrat Mark White in Texas; not surprisingly, 94 percent of blacks voted for defeated challenger Tom Bradley in California; in Illinois, 81 percent voted for Adlai Stevenson, who lost; and even in Michigan, where William Lucas, a black Republican, was on the ticket, 79 percent of blacks voted for the Democratic victor, incumbent Governor Jim Blanchard. Although black voters boosted the margins of victory of several Democratic gubernatorial candidates, they were decisive in only one gubernatorial race, namely in Pennsylvania where Robert Casey received only 46 percent of the white vote but defeated Bill Scranton by winning 82 percent of the black vote. In general, white voters were not as divided in their preferences for gubernatorial candidates as they were for senatorial candidates, and this factor reduced the influence of the black vote in most gubernatorial races.

The GOP won an additional eight statehouses, and they understandably proud of these results. But a big caveat is in order. There's very little evidence that control of statehouses gives a party a leg up for the next presidential election.

Gramm-Rudman lacks credibility with the public, which favors increasing federal outlays for education, science, health, and the environment.

Finally, from the standpoint of controlling 1991 congressional reapportionment (a major GOP goal) the GOP won't have any more big-state governors' mansions in January than it did in 1971 or 1981, two redistricting years about which the GOP has bitterly complained. Couple this with the GOP loss of state legislative seats (the GOP lost roughly 180 state legislative seats and now hold the same percentage of state legislative seats that it holds of U.S. House seats—41), and it is easy to see that the GOP's repositioning at the state level, at least for the moment, is pretty poor. Admittedly. all the big-state governorships and most state legislative seats will be up for grabs again in 1990, but the Democratic pickup of three additional states where they control both houses, and the Republican loss of two, give Democrats something to brag about at the state level as they plan for the coming reapportionment battles.

Will Democrats Be More Responsive?

At least some Democrats seemed to have awakened to the importance of the black vote in this election. For example, Senator Joe Biden (D-Del.) said on election night that the Democrats can't win in 1988 unless they can maintain the 1986 multi-racial coalition, and Senator-elect John Breaux (D-La.) promised to remember that he could never have won without the black vote. Nevertheless, most Democrats have been noticeably silent on the subject of black political influence. Perhaps the silent majority of Democratic leaders agree with some journalists who are making blacks the heavies in the Democrats' attempts to get their act together. Eight days after the election, one liberal *Washington Post* columnist wrote that in 1988 a heavy black vote for the Democratic candidate "may produce negative side-effects it did not have in this year's reduced electorate." Or, as a Raleigh, North Carolina associate news editor put it, "If black political leaders read too much into the returns of 1986 and do not fashion their agenda with an eye toward winning the next election, they could contribute to a rupturing of the Democratic coalition of which they are a vital part." Apparently no matter what blacks do for the Democrats—including aiding, if not determining, the party's recapture of the Senate—they will be projected as "Typhoid Mary."

(Continued on page 7)

November-December 1986

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER

Inside This Issue

- **Sixty-three percent of the national electorate sat out the 1986 midterm elections, but black voters in some key states turned out in greater proportions than whites.**
- **Four new members joined the Congressional Black Caucus, representing the Mississippi Delta, Atlanta, Baltimore, and New York.**
- **Black candidates gained only one statewide seat and five seats in state legislatures; they lost in gubernatorial races in California and Michigan.**
- **Across the nation, Boston voters defeated (3-1) a referendum to create a separate city composed of minority neighborhoods; Mississippi black leaders are meeting to assess the implications of Mike Espy's election to Congress; and South Carolinans are digesting the fact that black women made up 30 percent of all newly registered voters.**

Some Good News on Voter Turnout

CURTIS GANS, head of the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate, says of the low turnout in 1986 that the voters "voted with their bottoms—they sat it out." Fewer than 4 out of 10 Americans (37.3 percent) went to the polls—the lowest turnout since 1942, when America was at war. **The black turnout nationwide was only 31 percent, though it was considerably higher in some key races (see below). . . . The encouraging news is that the gap between black and white turnout stayed about equal to what it was in the 1984 presidential election year (7 points versus 6 points), which means that it surged dramatically in mid-term elections**—from a gap of 11 points in 1982 to 7 points in 1986. **More encouraging news is that in several important statewide races, the 1986 black turnout equaled** (e.g., Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina) **or exceeded** (e.g., Louisiana, Nevada, Pennsylvania) **the white turnout. Every indication is that the size of the black vote will continue to grow in 1988.** Thus, black voters will be well-positioned in 1988 to determine, in many states, which presidential candidate will receive the state's electoral votes. . . . **Overall, 86 percent of blacks voted for the Democratic candidate in their congressional districts, and 80 percent or more supported Democratic candidates in close senatorial and gubernatorial contests.**

Black Caucus Has Four New Members

Four new faces will join the Congressional Black Caucus in the 100th Congress, including one, MIKE ESPY (D-Miss.), who became the first black congressman from Mississippi since Reconstruction. With the reelection of all 19 members who again sought office, the CBC will now have 23 members—a record high. Besides Espy, the other new members are JOHN LEWIS (D-Ga.), KWEISI MFUME (D-Md.), and FLOYD FLAKE (D-N.Y.). . . . Espy, at 32 and now the youngest member of the CBC, won his predominantly black district after another black candidate, ROBERT CLARK, had failed to do so in 1982 and 1984. The difference in 1986, according to Espy and state Senator HENRY KIRKSEY, was that whites did not mobilize against Espy's candidacy; they sat out the election. **Espy relates the story of white voters who told him they disliked his opponent and could not bring themselves to vote for a black candidate but indirectly supported his candidacy by not voting for anyone. While whites may have helped Espy by staying home, he clear-**

ly was boosted by a large black turnout, which was organized by busloads of volunteers associated with the National Black Leadership Roundtable and by successful efforts of the nonpartisan National Coalition on Black Voter Participation. . . . **In Atlanta, JOHN LEWIS coasted to an easy 3-1 victory over the Republican candidate, journalist PORTIA SCOTT. Though Lewis ran strongly among all segments of the black community, his support among whites dropped from 87 percent in the runoff primary to 47 percent in the general election.** As Spelman College political science professor MARILYN DAVIS said, "White voters were less willing to support John Lewis when JULIAN BOND was not his opponent and when there was a Republican candidate on the ballot.". . . **The other two new CBC members won seats previously held by blacks: FLOYD FLAKE replaced ALTON WALDON** (who was in office for only three months as a replacement for his deceased predecessor, the late Rep. Joseph Addabo) in New York's 6th district; **and KWEISI MFUME replaced former Representative PARREN MITCHELL, who retired and ran unsuccessfully as Maryland's lieutenant governor candidate.** Mfume defeated a black Republican candidate, ST. GEORGE CROSSE. . . .

Two other unsuccessful candidates who had been given a good chance of winning were FAYE WILLIAMS in Louisiana's 8th district and state Senator BOBBY SCOTT in Virginia's 1st district. In interviews with *TrendLetter,* both candidates reflected on their campaigns. **Williams, who lost because of white crossover voting in this 88 percent Democratic district, was unable to benefit from the unusually high black turnout (67 percent)—a backlash against GOP "ballot security" efforts. In explaining her defeat, Williams cited a sharply negative campaign by her opponent after the primary:** she was accused of supporting drug use because she had worked as counsel to the National Football League Player Relations Committee; she was called "un-American" because her campaign manager was an Arab-American; and she was "made to look like a criminal" by a local newspaper, which brought up an incident from her past in which she was a victim. Williams attributed the negative campaign to the Republican National Committee and said of her opponent that "it's hard to believe the CLYDE HOLLOWAY I saw in the last few weeks was the real person." Williams also said that some black male state legislators in Louisiana did not work hard on her campaign and indicated they seemed to believe a black male should win a congressional seat before a black woman. . . . **In Virginia, BOBBY SCOTT attributed his loss to the difficulty of unseating an incumbent and to the Republicans' superior voter turnout effort:** "They had a phone bank with 25 phones going every night. I just couldn't compete with that." He was pleased, however, with the 60 percent black turnout—very high for an off-year election without any statewide races to draw people to the polls. **Next on the agenda for Scott is to be reelected to his state senate seat when his term expires next year.** As the incumbent, he expects no difficulty in winning. . . . **Apart from Williams and Scott, two other black congressional candidates—both Republicans—were soundly defeated: LAMAR KEELS, in the 4th district of Arkansas, and RON CRUTCHER in the 3d district of Ohio.**

Though the CBC now numbers 23, **Rep. CARDISS COLLINS remains the only black female in Congress. Moreover, black females, although they vote in much higher numbers than black males, were not well represented among the unprecedented number of black congressional candidates this year:** they accounted for only 1 out of every 7 blacks who ran for seats in the U.S. House. There is a growing feeling in the black community that electing more black females to Congress should be a top priority on the coming agenda of blacks for 1988.

Statewide Office-Holders

There are still no black governors. Los Angeles Mayor TOM BRADLEY, a Democrat, lost his second bid to become California's top state official, and Republican WILLIAM LUCAS also lost in Michigan, with Congressman JOHN CONYERS and Detroit Mayor COLEMAN YOUNG leading the opposition to Lucas's conservative campaign. Race-based voting is still a factor in statewide election results as was demonstrated by a question NBC News put to voters in its exit polls in California and Michigan. NBC asked voters if their state was ready to elect a black for governor. Only 40 percent of whites in Michigan and 52 percent in California agreed that it was. Statewide offices remain the most difficult offices for blacks to win. . . . **Only six blacks (all Democrats) won statewide offices in the 1986 election. Five were incumbents: ROLAND BURRIS, the state comptroller in Illinois; RICHARD AUSTIN, the secretary of state in Michigan; REUBEN ANDERSON, a Supreme Court judge in Mississippi; Dennis Archer, a Supreme Court judge in Michigan; and JAMES LEWIS, the state treasurer in New Mexico in 1985.** (Judge Archer and Mr. Lewis had been

appointed to their positions before the elections, but were first elected in November.) **The one new statewide officeholder-elect, FRANCISCO BORGES, was elected state treasurer in Connecticut.**

Despite Democratic successes in state legislative races, however, black candidates did not fare particularly well. In 1982 (perhaps as a reflection of favorable redistricting after the 1980 Census), **blacks gained 45 additional state legislative seats; in 1984, blacks gained only 7 additional state legislators; and this year, blacks had a net gain of only 9 state legislators.** This is an area for black politicos to set their sights on in 1988 and 1990 if they want to increase their influence following the 1990 reapportionment battles.

Across the Nation

Alabama

REUBEN DAVIS (a school teacher) and CHRIS MCNAIR (a state representative) have become the first blacks ever elected to the Jefferson County Commission. Davis will represent District 1 and McNair will represent District 2.

District of Columbia

Mayor MARION BARRY won a third term by 61 percent to 33 percent over his closest opponent, Republican CAROL SCHWARTZ. Schwartz, who is white, defeated the mayor in two wards with a high white concentration. **It was the first time since the District was granted home rule in 1974 that the vote was racially split.** Ninety percent of blacks voted for Barry and 85 percent of whites voted for Schwartz.

In other races, strong bi-racial coalitions supported city council President DAVID CLARKE (who is white), D.C. Delegate WALTER FAUNTROY, School Board Member-elect WILMA HARVEY in Ward 1, and several other city council members—by wide margins of 75 percent of the vote or above.

The National Black Leadership Roundtable (NBLR) held a press conference two days after the November election to assess the election results, demonstrate unity among black leaders, and plan a battle for U.S. Rep. CHARLES RANGEL (D-N.Y.) to be elected majority whip of the House. Rangel's chief competitor is Rep. TONY COEHLO (D-Calif.). Coehlo is widely viewed as leading, but Rangel's staff and the NBLR point to a closing of the gap.

Florida

NATHAN PETERS, JR., became the first black elected county commissioner in Gulf County. When he was a city commissioner, he filed the lawsuit that resulted in the creation of single-member districts for the county commission. His district is 63 percent black and he won 62 percent of the total vote.

Maryland

LEMUEL CHESTER II, a 39-year-old Cambridge drug and alcohol counselor, became the first black to be elected to an Eastern Shore county's governing body. Chester handily defeated his Republican opponent, the Rev. KELFORD JACKSON, a Cambridge black Baptist minister, by a more than 3-to-1 margin, to represent the county's predominantly black 2d district. He has pledged to improve housing, crack down on illegal drugs, and promote economic development. . . . **Two Howard University law school professors won key posts: ISIAH (IKE) LEGGETT became the first black elected to the Montgomery County Council; and ALEX WILLIAMS became the first black state's attorney for Prince Georges County.**

Massachusetts

Blacks voted 3 to 1 and whites voted 4 to 1 to defeat a nonbinding secession referendum (better known as the Mandelaville propopostion—named after South African leader Nelson Mandela) for the Roxbury section of Boston. Most political pundits claim that the secession referendum was disproportionately supported by lower-income black Bostonians and disproportionately rejected by middle-class blacks who felt that working within the system was more advantageous to

(Continued on next page)

black interests and who also did not want to pay the high taxes that would be required to support "Mandelaville." Others say that despite the failure of the Mandelaville proposition, it has not only served to demonstrate the frustrations of many black Bostonians but also has elicited an agreement by Mayor RAY FLYNN to deal more constructively with the problems of Roxbury. **Some observers say the defeat of the referendum, which was actively supported by former state legislator and Boston mayoral candidate MEL KING, demonstrates the eclipse of King's influence with blacks.** They point to other black leaders close to Mayor Flynn (e.g., council president BRUCE BOLLING) as the heirs-apparent to King among blacks.

Michigan

Rumor has it that **former Congressman Charles Diggs will run again for his old seat (13th district, in Detroit) in 1988 after the expected retirement of the incumbent, 77 year-old Congressman George Crockett.** The problem is nobody checked with Crockett, who told *Trendletter,* "it is news to me. I'll be here as long as my health holds out—and my parents lived to a ripe old age."

Diggs, once the dean of the state's U.S. House delegation and the powerful head of two committees, **was convicted in 1978 for illegally diverting more than $60,000 of his congressional employees' salaries to pay his personal and congressional bills.** He has now served his sentence and is free to seek office.

Mississippi

Blacks in Mississipi are organizing a statewide meeting to assess the meaning of the ESPY victory, to set a legislative agenda for 1987, and to prepare for state legislative, county, and mayoral races in 1987. Planners hope to determine whether or not there will be an ongoing statewide black organization. **Blacks in the state are also heavily supportive of a lawsuit brought under Sections 2 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act by state Sen. HENRY KIRKSEY aimed at securing the creation of single-member districts for 20 chancery court districts and 20 circuit court districts.** Currently, there are 40 circuit court judges in the state, and only one (who was appointed) is black; there are 39 chancery judges, and none is black.

New Mexico

Former Bernadillo County Treasurer JAMES LEWIS has become the first black statewide elected official in this state. Lewis, a native of the state, was appointed to the office of state treasurer by outgoing Hispanic Governor TONY ANAYA in December 1985. He handily defeated his Republican opponent, PAUL DONISTHOYSE, by 58 percent to 42 percent. New Mexico is only 2 percent black.

South Carolina

This year, although South Carolina gained only a relatively small number of new registrants, black women made significant voter registration increases. The state registration total grew from 1.2 million in 1982 to 1.3 million in 1986. **Out of every 10 additional registrants, 4 were white women, 3 were black women, 2 were white men, and 1 was a black man.** Black women constituted 30 percent of the overall increase, which was more than the combined increase for white and black men (25 percent). **Blacks compose only 27 percent of the voting-age population in the state, but the total number of black women registrants is now over half the total number of white male registrants.**

Tennessee

State Rep. LOIS M. DEBERRY has become the first female House Speaker Pro Tem. Ms. DeBerry has been a state legislator since 1972.

Texas

Winning 3 of every 4 votes cast, South Dallas civic activist EDDIE BERNEICE JOHNSON, vice-president of Governmental and Community Affairs for the Visiting Nurse Association of Texas, became the first black elected to represent Dallas in the state senate since Reconstruction, and the second black woman to serve in the state senate (after former congresswoman and state senator BARBARA JORDAN, who represented Houston). Johnson will represent the 23d Senate district.

Compiled by: Linda Williams, Senior Research Associate, and Alfred Baltimore, Roster Clerk.

Black Politics In the Post-Reagan Era

Major elements of the opinion-making community (especially the media) are already beginning to suggest that the post-Reagan era has begun. Here are some of the principal dynamics that will affect blacks:

1) Democrats will run Congress reasonably secure in the belief that their control will continue for the rest of the decade. This is likely to make them somewhat more ambitious to legislate reforms favored by blacks and a large segment of other Americans—especially in the area of education. Almost nothing will be done, however, about civil rights policy, barring a mighty uprising from blacks in the streets and a significant lobbying campaign. Heavy participation at the ballot box was not enough, since Democrats seem to see the 1986 election results as a centrist not as a liberal victory. Despite the great influence of the black vote, the Democrats will be more concerned about keeping a large proportion of the white (especially southern white) vote. It is likely that major elements of both parties will try to curb their ideological wings on the left and right as part of a new and critical competition for a re-emerging political center.

2) Black Republicans will step up their criticisms of their party—especially attacking any future programs such as the backfiring Republican "ballot integrity" project which sought to knock black voters off the voter rolls and made blacks acutely aware that the Republican party was still much more foe than friend. Clarence Thomas, black head of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), has already held a news conference criticizing the Republicans for ignoring the black vote. Wise Republicans will be more likely to make some specific appeals to at least try to more successfully split the black vote—especially in the South.

3) Ronald Reagan's governmental views and beliefs—perceived by the white electorate asbenefiting the United States in the early 1980s but bearing less relation to contemporary national needs—will play a diminishing role in 1987-88. With the press on the attack with continued revelations about his foreign policies, Reagan's approval rating will start to decline among all groups—and especially among blacks.

4) Both parties will move away from the old Reagan agenda debate and toward the new issues and independent postures likely to be necessary for success in 1988. With the Democrats' recapture of the Senate, both parties are on more even footing as they turn towards 1988 and every single group's votes will generate more interest.

Blacks, who will be more than 10 percent of the national electorate in 1988, will find themselves at least a bit more courted by Republican contenders—especially moderates. If the Democrats move too far to the right some blacks may try a third party or independent route or may find the Republicans to be more attractive.

5) The 1987 local races (especially mayoral races) may also influence how blacks vote in 1988. The race to watch will very likely be the Chicago mayoral election in April. If national party Democrats remain silent on the fate of incumbent Harold Washington, they may suffer in black support.

In conclusion, the black vote again showed clout in 1986. The turnout gap between blacks and whites was lower than in 1982. It helped not only to elect more blacks and recapture control of the Senate for the Democrats, but to establish a more equal starting point for both parties for 1988. The point now is to see what each party does with this equal footing vis-a-vis black America.

(Continued from page 6)

Thus, the continuing crisis for black politics is the nature of black influence within the two-party system. Black voters played a significant role in Democratic fortunes in 1986, but so far have received little or nothing for it but dire warnings. The most critical question for black politics in 1986 remains: How are blacks to increase their influence in a party to which they give 90 percent of their votes in national elections and rarely under 80 percent in other elections? And at least one of the most critical questions for the Democratic party is: How can it win—especially in the all important South where blacks compose 20 percent or more of the total voting-age population in every Deep South state and at least 10 percent in the Border states—if it alienates the black vote or even depresses black turnout?

After all, Democratic presidential candidates have received a majority of the white vote only once (1964) since 1948, and the 1986 results suggest that while the Democrats may be able to regain a substantial proportion of white voters they are not yet likely to win the majority of white votes in many states, especially in the South. In short, if the Democratic party wants to win in 1988 (and, of course, it does) it must be capable of putting together a coalition that includes at least a substantial proportion of whites (say, 40-45 percent) and maintain its nearly unanimous black support. At the same time, it must appeal enough to blacks to produce an enthusiastic black electorate that turns out in high numbers.

Thus, like it or not, in 1988 the fortunes of the Democratic party will be tied to the black vote. Blacks need to start now deciding that no matter whom they support in 1988, they have a bottom line for what they want in return for their support. ■

Index to Volume 14
January to December 1986

Subject Index

	Month	Page
Business		
Black Business in Transition	June-July	6
JCPS Parley Clarifies Issues in Controversial Set-Aside Debate	Oct.	8
Mayor Morial Co-Chairs Privatization Council	Feb.	12
Civil Rights		
The Crisis in Black America	Feb.	4
Green Light on Affirmative Action	Aug.	5
Mixed Signals on Affirmative Action	May	6
Our Rights Have Been Snatched Away (Perspective)	March	2
Demographics		
Black Percentage of U.S. Population Up in 1984	March	11
Census Bureau Report Profiles Black Population	May	8
Education		
BU Eases First-Year Stress to Graduate More Black Doctors	June-July	4
A Crisis of Faith in Education?	Sept.	3
"Effective Schools" Reforms Get Mixed Grade	June-July	5
School Vouchers: Who Would Benefit?	Jan.	5
Employment		
Black Unemployment: Current Trends	April	6
Jobless Rate for Black Grads Rises to Peak in 1982, Drops	Aug.	8
The Family		
Female-Headed Families Decline, But Remain at Alarming Level	Nov.-Dec.	12
Proposed Senate Committee on Families and Youth	Feb.	12
Federal Budget and Taxes		
How Tax Reform Affects Blacks	Feb.	5*
Senate Considers Fiscal Safety Net for Needy Communities	Aug.	8
Taxes, the Budget, and the Poor	Jan.	4
Health		
Infant Mortality Rate Increases Among Poor	March	11
Ohio Task Force Targets Minority Health	March	12
Pollution and Black Neighborhoods	Feb.	3
Housing		
Unique Coalition Awaits Outcome of Test Case	Aug.	3
Income and Wealth		
Blacks and Welfare: Sorting Out the Facts	March	5*
Northern Money, Southern Homes	June-July	3
Wealth Data Puts Black-White Gap in Sharp Focus	Aug.	4
Workfare Is No Panacea for Ills of Poverty	Nov.-Dec.	3
International Relations		
Involvement in Foreign Policy Vital to Blacks (Perspective)	May	2
Joint Center		
Charles U. Daly Joins JCPS Board of Governors	May	8
Duke Law Professor Named 1987 JCPS Distinguished Scholar	March	11
Focus Has New Look, New Feature (Perspective)	June-July	2
Ford Foundation President to Speak at JCPS Dinner	Jan.	8
Ford Foundation President's Speech Stresses Education	April	8
High Court Cites JCPS Book in Key Voting Rights Case	June-July	8
JCPS and Miller Brewing Company Unveil Paintings of Famous Black Politicians	Jan.	8
JCPS Annual Dinner Reminder	Feb.	12
JCPS Distinguished Scholars Program: Applications Invited	Oct.	8
JCPS Launches Associates Program (Perspective)	April	2
JCPS Launches Policy Institute for Black Public Officials	Sept.	8
JCPS Publication Explores Differences in Black and White Political Attitudes	Feb.	12
New Deputy Director of Research at JCPS	Nov.-Dec.	12
New Joint Center Publication on Black Economic Progress	Jan.	8
New Up-Dated JCPS Publications Now Available	June-July	8
Political Participation		
Black Electorate Has Become More Independent, Less Predictable (Perspective)	Sept.	2
Black Political Opinion	March	4
The Black Vote and the '86 Senate Races	April	4
Black Voters Have Mainstream Views, May Be Less Loyal to Democrats (Perspective)	Oct.	2
'86 Elections Are Critical for Blacks	Aug.	6
Getting On-Line	March	3
JCPS/Gallup Poll Reflects Changing Views on Political Issues	Oct.	3
The Message of the Black Vote in 1986 (Perspective)	Nov.-Dec.	2
New Government Role Will Boost Voter Registration (Perspective)	Aug.	2
1986 Elections: Major Implications for Black Politics	Nov-Dec.	5
"The Rainbow is Emerging"	May	3
Some Good News on Voter Turnout	Nov.-Dec.	TL 1
Public Officials		
Across the Nation	June-July, through Nov.-Dec.	TL 3

*Special Report

	Month	Page
Black Caucus Has Four New Members	Nov.-Dec.	TL 1
Black Caucus Rises to Leadership in Congress	Sept.	TL 1
Black Elected Officials in the United States, January 1986 (chart)	Sept.	TL 5
Black Political "Firsts"	Aug.	TL 2
Blacks in the GOP	June-July	TL 2
Incumbents Up, Challengers Down	June-July	TL 2
Jesse Jackson's Endorsements	June-July	TL 1
Michigan Republicans Choose Lucas for Governor	Aug.	TL 1
More Blacks Running Statewide	Sept.	TL 2
National Poll Has Mixed Message for Jesse Jackson	Oct.	TL 1
New Black Presidential Appointee	April	8
Old Friends Now Foes in Atlanta	Aug.	TL 2
Sharon Pratt Dixon: Rising to the Top in the DNC	April	3
Statewide Office-Holders	Nov.-Dec.	TL 2
Testing the Appeal of a Non-racial Election Strategy	Oct.	TL 2
Upset in Atlanta: Lewis Defeats Bond	Sept.	TL 2
Religion		
Blacks and the Religious Right Have Few Common Interests	Sept.	6
Black Christian Group Launches TV Station	May	8
Tributes to Black Achievers		
The King We Should Remember	Jan.	3
Perspective (black history month)	Feb.	2
Perspective (Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday)	Jan.	2
Voting Rights		
Justice Official Signals Voting Law Change, Then Backs Off	Sept.	8
Retreat on Voting Rights?	May	4*

Author Index

Author	Article	Month	Page
Alston, Denise	"Effective Schools" Reforms Get Mixed Grade	June-July	5
Bullard, Robert D.	Pollution and Black Neighborhoods	Feb.	3
Burbridge, Lynn	Black Unemployment: Current Trends	April	6
	How Tax Reform Affects Blacks	Feb.	5*
	Jobless Rate for Black Grads Rises to Peak in 1982, Drops	Aug.	8
	Taxes, the Budget, and the Poor	Jan.	4
Culbert, Arthur J.	BU Eases First-Year Stress To Graduate More Black Doctors	June-July	4
Davis, Deborah, and Linda F. Williams	Sharon Pratt Dixon: Rising to the Top in the DNC	April	3
Dorn, Edwin	School Vouchers: Who Would Benefit?	Jan.	5
Garrow, David	The King We Should Remember	Jan.	3
Harris, Fredrick, and Linda Williams	JCPS/Gallup Poll Reflects Changing Views on Political Issues	Oct.	3
Holman, M. Carl	Unique Coalition Awaits Outcome of Test Case	Aug.	3
Jackson, Jesse	"The Rainbow is Emerging"	May	3
Little, Rory K.	Green Light on Affirmative Action	Aug.	5
Longmyer, Kenneth	Involvement in Foreign Policy Vital to Blacks	May	2
Loury, Glenn C.	The Crisis in Black America	Feb.	4
McFate, Katherine	Blacks and Welfare: Sorting Out the Facts	March	5*
Miller, Ray	Ohio Task Force Targets Minority Health	March	12
O'Hare, William	Northern Money, Southern Homes	June-July	3
	Wealth Data Puts Black-White Gap in Sharp Focus	Aug.	4
	Workfare Is No Panacea for Ills of Poverty	Nov.-Dec.	3
Parker, Frank R.	Retreat on Voting Rights?	May	4
Robinson, Vernon L.	Getting On-Line	March	3
Suggs, Robert E.	Black Business in Transition	June-July	6
Tatel, David S., and Elliot M. Mincberg	Mixed Signals on Affirmative Action	May	6
Wharton, Clifton R.	A Crisis of Faith in Education?	Sept.	3
Williams, Eddie N.	'86 Elections Are Critical for Blacks	Aug.	6
Williams, Linda F.	Black Political Opinion	March	4
	The Black Vote and the '86 Senate Races	April	4
	Blacks and the Religious Right Have Few Common Interests	Sept.	6
	1986 Elections: Major Implications for Black Politics	Nov.-Dec.	5
Williams, Linda F., (and Deborah Davis)	Sharon Pratt Dixon: Rising to the Top in the DNC	April	3
Williams, Linda F., (and Fredrick Harris)	JCPS/Gallup Poll Reflects Changing Views on Political Issues	Oct.	3

*Special Report

Name Index

Abernathy, Ralph, Jan., p. 6
Abernathy, Ralph III, Sept., p. TL 3
Abramson, Paul, Oct., p. 7
Addabbo, Joseph, June-July, p. TL 4; Aug., pp. TL 1, TL 2
Allen, Walter, Sept., p. 4
Anaya, Tony, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Anderson, John, March, p. 10
Anderson, Reuben, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Archer, Dennis, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Auletta, Ken, Nov.-Dec., p. 4
Austin, Richard, April, p. 7; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2

Babbitt, Bruce, Oct., p. TL 1
Bachrach, George, Aug., p. TL 4
Baker, Ella, Jan., p. 6
Baker, Howard, March, p. 10
Baliles, Gerry, Oct., p. TL 2
Banistor, Bruce, Oct., p. TL 3
Barnes, Michael, Aug., p. TL 4
Barry, Marion, Aug., p. TL 3; Sept., p. TL 3; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Barthelemy, Sidney, June-July, p. TL 3; Sept., p. 2
Bateman, Herb, June-July, p. TL 3; Sept., p. TL 4
Bates, Timothy, June-July, p. 6
Baxley, William, Nov.-Dec., p. 6
Benn, Mack, Jr., Aug., p. TL 2
Bethune, Mary McLeod, Jan., p. 8
Biden, Joseph, Oct., p. TL 1; Nov.-Dec., pp. 5, 6
Blackmun, Harry, May, p. 6
Blanchard, James, June-July, p. TL 4; Aug., p. TL 1; Sept., p. 6; Nov.-Dec., p. 6
Bolling, Bruce, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Bond, Christopher, April, p. 5
Bond, Julian, April, p. 5; June-July, p. TL 3; Aug., pp. TL 1, TL 2; Sept., pp. 2, TL 1, TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Borges, Francisco, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Bradley, Bill, Oct., p. TL 1
Bradley, Tom, June-July, pp. TL 1, TL 3; Aug., p. 6; Sept., pp. 2, TL 3; Oct., pp. TL 1, TL 2; Nov.-Dec., pp. 6, TL 2
Bradshaw, Thornton F., Jan., p. 8
Branch, William McKinley, April, p. 4; June-July, p. TL 2
Breaux, John, April, p. 5; Oct., p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. 6
Brennan, William, May, p. 6; June-July, p. 8
Brimmer, Andrew, Jan., p. 8
Brooke, Edward W., Jan., p. 8
Brown, Charles L., Jan., p. 8
Brown, George, Sept., p. TL 2
Broyhill, James, Aug., p. TL 4
Bullock, Larry, June-July, p. TL 3
Burger, Warren, May, p. 6
Burke, Yvonne, Aug., p. TL 4
Burks, Mary Fair, Jan., p. 6
Burns, Clarence "Du", Sept., p. TL 2
Burris, Roland, April, p. 7; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Bush, George, March, p. 10; Sept., p. 7
Bush, Prescott S., Jr., Feb., p. 12
Byrd, Robert, Nov.-Dec., p. 6
Byrne, Jane, June-July, p. TL 3

Campbell, John, Aug., p. TL 4
Carroll, Earl, Oct., p. TL 3
Carter, Jimmy, March, p. 9; April, pp. 3, 5; Aug., p. 7; Sept., pp. 6, 7
Casey, Robert, Nov.-Dec., p. 6
Cavanagh, Thomas E., Feb., p. 12
Celeste, Richard F., March, p. 12
Chambers, Albert, Aug., p. TL 2
Chester, Lemuel II, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Chisholm, Shirley, Aug., p. TL 2
Chrysler, Dick, Aug., p. TL 1
Clark, Robert, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 1
Clarke, David, Aug., p. TL 3; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3

Clay, Bill, Sept., p. TL 2
Clyburn, Jim, Aug., p. TL 4; Sept., pp. TL 2; TL 3
Clymer, Adam, March, p. 4
Coehlo, Tony, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Coleman, Eric, Aug., p. TL 2
Collins, Cardiss, June-July, p. TL 2; Aug., p. TL 3; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Conyers, John, Sept., p., TL 1; Oct., p. TL 3; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Creedon, John J., Jan., p. 8
Crosse, St. George, June-July, p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 4; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Crutcher, Ron, June-July, p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Culp, Jerome M., March, p. 11
Cuomo, Mario, Aug., p. 2; Oct., p. TL 1

Daly, Charles U., May, p. 8
Danziger, Sally, Nov.-Dec., p. 4
Davis, Danny, June-July, p. TL 2
Davis, Marilyn, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Davis, Reuben, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Days, Drew S. III, Oct., p. 8
DeBerry, Lois M., Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Dellums, Ron, June-July, p. TL 2; Aug., p. 6; Sept., p. TL 1
Delpit, Joseph A., Oct., p. TL 3
Demerson, Elisha, June-July, p. TL 4
Dent, Andrew, Sept., p. TL 4
Denton, Jeremiah, Feb., p. 12; April p. 4
Deukmejian, George, June-July, pp. TL 1, TL 3; Sept., p. TL 3; Oct., p. TL 2
Dieto, Richard, Aug., p. TL 2
DiGenova, Joseph, Oct., p. TL 4
Dixon, Alan, April, p. 4
Dixon, Arrington, April, p. 3
Dixon, Julian, June-July, p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 1
Dixon, Sharon Pratt, April, pp. 3, 7, 8
Dole, Robert, March, p. 10
Donisthoyse, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Douglas, Jan, April, p. 5; June-July, p. TL 3; Aug., p. TL
Douglass, Frederick, June-July, p. 6
DuBois, W. E. B., April, p. 2
Durenberger, David, Aug., p. 8
Dymally, Mervyn, June-July, p. TL 2

Eagleton, Thomas, April, p. 5
East, John, Aug., p. TL 4
Eaves, Reginald A., Oct., p. TL 3
Edelman, Marian Wright, March, p. 11
Edwards, Don, Sept., p. 8
Eisenhower, Dwight, April, p. 3
Espy, Mike, June-July, p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 4; Oct., p. TL 4; Nov.-Dec., pp. TL 1, TL 4
Evans, Rowland, Sept., pp. 6, TL 3

Falwell, Jerry, Sept., p. 7
Farris, Milton, Aug., p. TL 3
Fauntroy, Walter, Feb., p. 9; Aug., p. 3; Sept., pp. TL 2, TL 3; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Feinstein, Dianne, Oct., p. TL 1
Field, Mervyn, June-July, p. TL 3
Filer, John, Jan., p. 8
Flake, Floyd, June-July, p. TL 4; Aug., p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 4; Nov.-Dec., pp. TL 1, TL 2
Fletcher, Isiah, June-July, p. TL 2
Flynn, Ray, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Ford, Kenneth, May, p. 2
Foster, Clyde, Feb., p. 11
Foster, Marie, Jan., p. 6
Fowler, Wyche, April, p. 5
Frank, Preston, Oct., p. TL 4
Franklin, Webb, Sept., p. TL 4
Fraser, Douglas A., Jan., p. 8
Fullilove, Mindy T., June-July, p. 4

Gans, Curtis, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 1
Garrett, David, April, p. 5
Garvin, Clifton C., Jan., p. 8
George, Gary, Sept., p. TL 2
Gibbs, Geoffrey Taylor, Oct., p. TL 3
Gibbs, James, Oct., p. TL 3
Gibbs, Jewell, Oct., p. TL 3
Gibson, Kenneth, June-July, p. TL 4
Golar, Simeon, Aug., p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 4
Goldwater, Barry, Oct., p. 5
Goode, Wilson, March, p. 11
Gray, William H., Jan., p. 8; June-July, p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 1
Greadington, Barbara, Sept., p. TL 3
Griffin, Mary, June-July, p. TL 2
Groff, Regis, Sept., p. TL 2

Haley, Alex, June-July, p. TL 2
Haley, George, June-July, p. TL 2
Hall, Ethel, Aug., p. TL 2
Hall, Katie, June-July, pp. TL 1, TL 2
Handless, Richard, Aug., p. TL 1
Handy, John, June-July, p. 6
Harris, Patricia Roberts, April, p. 3
Hart, Gary, March, p. 10; Sept., p. 7; Oct., p. TL 1
Hart, Peter, June-July, p. TL 3
Harvey, Wilma, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Hatch, Orrin, Nov.-Dec., p. 5
Hawkins, Augustus, June-July, p. TL 2
Hayden, Andrew, Aug., p. TL 3
Hayes, Charles, June-July, p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 2
Heckler, Margaret, March, p. 12
Heflin, Howard, April, p. 4
Heinz, John, April, p. 8
Hightower, Michael, Oct., p. TL 3 R
Hill, Cynthia, D., May, p. 7
Hill, Robert, Aug., p. 3
Hill, Ronald, Sept., p. TL 4
Holloway, Clyde, Oct., p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Holloway, Wendell, Aug., p. TL 4
Hoover, Herbert, Oct., p. 3

Iacocca, Lee, Oct., p. TL 1

Jackson, Kelford, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Jackson, Jesse, March, p. 10; April, p. 7; June-July, p., TL 1; Aug., pp. 2, TL 4; Sept., pp. 6, 7; Oct., pp. 2, 3, 6, TL 1, TL 2
Jackson, Jimmie Lee, Jan., p. 3
Jackson, Lindburgh, Aug., p. TL 2
Jackson, Roy, June-July, p. TL 1
James, Hulbert, Aug., p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 4
James, Sharpe, June-July, p. TL 4
Jefferson, Mildred, June-July, p. TL 2
Jefferson, William, June-July, p. TL 3
Jenkins, Andrew, June-July, p. TL 4
Johnson, Charles, April, p. 5; June-July, p. TL 3; Aug., p. TL 2
Johnson, Eddie Berneice, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Johnson, Lyndon, Jan., pp. 3, 6; May, p. 8; Oct., pp. 5, 7
Johnson, Pete, June-July, p. TL 2
Johnson, Vernon D., Nov.-Dec., p. 12
Jones, Reginald H., Jan., p. 8

Jordan, Barbara, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Jordan, Hamilton, April, p. 5
Jordan, Raymond, Jr., Oct., p. TL 4

Kean, Thomas, March, p. 10; June-July, p. TL 4; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Keels, Lamar, June-July, p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Kemp, Jack, March, p. 10; Aug., p. 3
Kennedy, Edward, March, p. 10; Sept., p. 7; Nov.-Dec., p. 5
Kennedy, John, May, p. 8
Kennedy, Joseph II, June-July, p. TL 4; Aug., p. TL 4
Kennedy, Robert, June-July, p. TL 4; Aug., p. TL 4
Killens, Carson, Sept., p. TL 3; Oct., p. TL 2
King, Colbert I., April, p. 8
King, Gwendolyn S., April, p. 8
King, Martin Luther III, Aug., pp. TL 1, TL 3; Sept., p. TL 3; Oct., p. TL 3
King, Martin Luther, Jr., Jan., pp. 2, 3, 6; Feb., p. 2; April, p. 4; Sept., p. TL 1; Oct., p. 7
King, Mel, June-July, p. TL 4; Aug., p. TL 4; Oct., p. TL 4; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Kinney, Theodore, June-July, pp. TL 1, TL 2
Kirby, Robert E., Jan., p. 8
Kirkland, Jean, Sept., p. TL 4
Kirkland, Lane, Jan., p. 8
Kirksey, Henry, Nov.-Dec., pp. TL 1, TL 4
Koch, Ed, Sept., p. TL 4
Kweli, Kujaatele, Aug., p. 3

Leggett, Isiah (Ike), Oct., p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Leland, Mickey, June-July, p. TL 2; Sept., pp. TL 1, TL 2
Levin, Carl, April, p. 4
Levison, Stanley, Jan., p. 6
Lewis, David, Jan., p. 2
Lewis, James, Nov.-Dec., pp. TL 2, TL 4
Lewis, John, April, p. 5; June-July, p. TL 3; Aug., pp. TL 1, TL 2; Sept., pp. 2, TL 1, TL 2; Nov.-Dec., pp. TL 1, TL 2
Liuzzo, Viola, Jan., p. 3
Lomax, Michael, Oct., p. TL 3
Long, Cathy, Oct., p. TL 2
Long, Russell, April, p. 5
Lowery, Joseph, Feb., p. 9
Lucas, William, June-July, p. TL 4; Aug., pp. 6, TL 1; Sept., pp. 2, 6, TL 3; Oct., p. TL 3; Nov.-Dec., pp. 6, TL 2, TL 4

Mabus, Ray, Oct., p. TL 4
Malcolm X, Oct., p. 7
Malveaux, Julianne, Nov.-Dec., p. 12
Mandela, Nelson, Oct., p. TL 4; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Manning, Walter, June-July, p. TL 2
Marsellus, Howard, Oct., p. TL 3
Marshall, Arthur, Sept., p. TL 4
Marshall, Thurgood, May, p. 6
Mathias, Charles, June-July, p. TL 2
Mathis, Peter, Sept., p. TL 4
Mattingly, Mack, April, p. 4
McDonald, Laughlin, May, p. 5
McDowell, Cleve, Aug., p. TL 2
McNair, Chris, Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Meese, Edwin, Jan., p. 7
Mfume, Kweisi, Sept., p. TL 4; Nov.-Dec., pp. TL 1, TL 2
Milliken, William, Aug., p. TL 1; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Mitchell, Clarence III, June-July, p. TL 3; Sept., p. TL 4
Mitchell, Michael, June-July, p. TL 3; Sept., p. TL 4
Mitchell, Parren, June-July, pp. 7, TL 3; Aug., p. TL 4; Sept., pp., TL 1; TL 2; TL 4; Oct., p. 8; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Mizelle, Johnnie, Aug., p. TL 2
Molpus, Dick, Oct., p. TL 4
Mondale, Walter, March, p. 9; April, p. 7; Oct., p. 5; Nov.-Dec., p. 5
Moore, Douglas, Aug., p. TL 3
Moore, Ed, Oct., p. TL 4
Moore, Evelyn, Aug., p. 3
Moore, Jerry, Aug., p. TL 3
Moore, W. Henson, April, p. 5
Morial, Ernest N., Feb., p. 12
Morris, Milton D., Aug., p. 8
Moses, Robert Parris, Jan., p. 6
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick, Feb., p. 12

Nash, Diane, Jan., pp. 6, 7
Newman, Jack, Aug., p. 2
Nix, Robert N. C., Jr., Jan., p. 8
Nixon, E. D. Jan., p. 6
Nixon, Richard, Oct., p. 3
Novak, Robert, Sept., pp. 6; TL 3

O'Connor, Sandra Day, May, p. 6; Aug., p. 5
O'Malley, Peter, April, p. 3
O'Neill, Thomas P. (Tip), Feb., p. 10; June-July, p. TL 4
Owens, Russell, Sept., p. 8

Parker, Frank R., March, p. 11; June-July, p. 8; Sept., p. 8
Parks, Rosa, Jan., p. 3
Paul, Willie, Aug., p. TL 2
Payne, Donald, June-July, pp. TL 1, TL 2, TL 4
Pendleton, Clarence, Sept., p. TL 2
Percy, Charles, April, p. 4
Peters, Nathan, Jr., Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Pinkett, Flaxie, April, p. 3
Pittman, Ed, Oct., p. TL 4
Poitier, Sidney, Jan., p. 8
Powell, Lewis, May, pp. 6, 7
Pratt, Carlisle, E., April, p. 3
Priest, Russell, Aug., p. TL 2
Pryde, Paul, Aug., p. 3

Rangel, Charles, April, p. 7; Sept., p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Rattley, Jessie, Aug., p. TL 2
Reagan, Ronald, Jan., p. 5; Feb., pp. 4, 5, 7, 10; March, pp. 2, 4, 9, 10; April, pp. 3, 5, 7, 8; May, pp. 3, 4, 7; Aug., pp. 3, 6, 7, 8; Sept., pp. 6, 7, TL 1, TL 2; Oct., pp. 3, 5, 6, 7, TL 3; Nov.-Dec., pp. 3, 5, 7
Reeb, James, Jan., p. 3
Reed, Adolph, Oct., p. TL 1
Rehnquist, William, May, p. 6
Reid, Milton, Jan., p. 6
Reynolds, Barbara, Feb., p. 9
Reynolds, William Bradford, March, p. 2; May, pp. 4, 5; Sept., p. 8
Ritter, Martha, Nov.-Dec., p. 4
Robb, Charles, Oct., pp. TL 1, TL 2
Robertson, Pat, Aug., p. TL 1; Sept., p. 7; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 4
Robinson, Amelia Boynton, Jan., p. 6
Robinson, Jo Ann Gibson, Jan., p. 6
Rodino, Peter, June-July, pp. TL 1, TL 4
Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, Oct., p. 3
Rostenkowski, Dan, Feb., p. 7
Rousakis, John P., June-July, p. TL 1
Russell, John, April, p. 5
Rustin, Bayard, Jan., p. 6

Sachs, Steven H., June-July, pp. 7, TL 3; Aug., p. TL 4; Sept., p. TL 2
Sanders, Hank, Aug., p. TL 3
Sanders-Castro, Judith, May, p. 5
Sanford, Terry, Aug., p. TL 4
Savage, Gus, June-July, p. TL 2; Sept., p. TL 1
Schaefer, William, June-July, p. TL 3; Sept., p. TL 2
Schwartz, Carol, Aug., p. TL 3; Sept., p. TL 3; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Scott, Portia, June-July, p. TL 2; Aug., p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Scott, Robert, June-July, p. TL 3; Sept., p. TL 4; Oct. p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Scranton, Bill, Nov.-Dec., p. 6
Sessions, Jefferson III, April, p. 5
Shea, Steven, June-July, p. 4
Shelby, Richard, April, p. 4
Sherrod, Charles, Jan., p. 6
Shivers, Clarence, Jan., p. 8
Shuttlesworth, Fred, Jan., p. 6
Simms, Margaret, Nov.-Dec., p. 12
Simon, Paul, April, p. 4
Skinner, Elliott, Feb., p. 2
Spaulding, William R., Sept., p. TL 3
Spencer, James R., Oct., p. TL 4
Steinberg, Melvin, Sept., p. TL 2
Steinem, Gloria, Aug., p. TL 2
Stevens, John Paul, May, p. 6
Stevenson, Adlai, April, p. 3; Nov.-Dec., p. 6
Stokes, Carl, June-July, p. TL 4
Stokes, Louis, June-July, p. TL 2
Suggs, Robert, Feb., p. 8; Oct., p. 8
Sullivan, Louis, June-July, p. 4
Swinton, David, June-July, p. 6

Talmadge, Herman, April, p. 4
Taylor, Ron, June-July, p. TL 2
Taylor, Samuel, April, p. 4; June-July, p. TL 2
Thomas, Clarence, Nov.-Dec. p. 7
Thomas, Franklin A., Jan., p. 8; Feb., p. 12; April, p. 8
Thomas, Harry, Sept., p. TL 3
Thomas, Johnny, Oct., p. TL 4 R
Thompson, W. Reid, April, p. 3
Thornburgh, Richard, April, p. 8
Thurmond, Michael, Sept., p. TL 3
Thurmond, Strom, Nov.-Dec., p. 5

Usry, James, June-July, p. TL 4

Vaughan, James, May, p. 8
Visclosky, Pete, June-July, p. TL 1
Voinovich, George, March, p. 10
Vrdolyak, Edward R., Aug., p. TL 3

Waldon, Alton R., Jr., June-July, p. TL 4; Aug., pp. TL 1, TL 2; Sept., p. TL 4; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Warner, John, Oct., p. TL 4
Washington, Harold, March, p. 11; June-July, pp. TL 2, TL 3; Aug., p. TL 3; Nov.-Dec., p. 7
Waters, Maxine, Aug., p. TL 2
Watson, Ralph, Sept., p. TL 4
Weissman, George, Jan., p. 8
White, Byron, May, p. 6
White, Mark, Nov.-Dec., p. 6
Wiesner, Jerome, B., Jan., p. 8
Wilder, L. Douglas, April, p. 7; Sept., p. 2; Oct., p. TL 2
Willie, Charles, Jan., p. 6
Williams, Alex, Sept., p. TL 4; Oct., p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 3
Williams, Eddie N., Jan., p. 8; March, p. 11; Sept., p. 8
Williams, Faye, April, p. 5; Aug., pp. TL 1, TL 3; Sept., pp. TL 3, TL 4; Oct., p. TL 2; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2
Williams, Terry, Sept., p. TL 2; Oct., p. TL 4
Wilson, Chuck, Oct., p. TL 3
Wilson, Flip, Nov.-Dec., p. 2
Winston, Michael, March, p. 11
Woods, Harriett, April, p. 5
Woodson, Robert, Aug., p. 3

Yood, David, Aug., p. TL 2
Young, Andrew, Jan., p. 6; Aug., p. TL 2
Young, Coleman, June-July, p. TL 4; Oct., p. TL 3; Nov.-Dec., p. TL 2

FEMALE-HEADED FAMILIES DECLINE; BUT REMAIN AT ALARMING LEVEL

The growth rate of families maintained by black women has declined significantly since the mid-1970s, according to the Commerce Department's Census Bureau. Such families grew 41 percent from 1970 to 1975; the growth dropped to 19 percent in the 1980s.

The rate of increase among white female householders also has slowed since 1975, but at a lesser rate than for blacks, the report shows. The white rate dropped to 15 percent in 1980-1985, from 25 percent in 1970-1975.

While growth rates have fallen, the number and proportion of families maintained by women have risen since 1970. For blacks the total rose from 1.4 million to 3 million and for white families from 4.1 million to 6.9 million. Women maintained 44 percent of black families in 1985, up from 28 percent, while women maintained 13 percent of white families, up from 9 percent.

The nation had an estimated 6.8 million black families in 1985, of which 51 percent were married-couple families. Black families totaled 4.9 million in 1970.

The number of white families increased from 46.2 million to 54.4 million in 1970-1985. A husband and wife were present in more than four out of five white families in 1985.

Copies of the final report, *Household and Familiy Characteristics: March 1985,* P-20, No. 411, are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C. 20402.

The data in this report come from a survey, and are subject to a margin of error that would not be present in a full census of the population. ■

BLACK POLITICS CONTEST

The Committee for the Status of Blacks of the Western Political Science Association is sponsoring a black politics paper contest.

Papers on black politics (national or international) or other issues of concern to the black community are invited. Two prizes will be awarded: $200 to the first-place winner, $100 to the second-place winner. Winners will be announced at the annual WPSA meetings in Anaheim, California, March 26-28, 1987. Entrants do not need to attend the meeting to enter the contest.

Send papers to (or for further information contact) Professor Vernon D. Johnson, Department of Political Science, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Wash., 98225. ■

NEW DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AT JCPS

Dr. Margaret Simms, an economist, has joined the Joint Center as deputy director of research. Dr. Simms received her doctorate from Stanford University, and taught at Atlanta University from 1972 to 1976, when she was named chairperson of the economics department. In 1977 and 1978 she was a Brookings Economic Policy Fellow at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. She then joined the Urban Institute as a senior research associate in 1979, and was appointed director of the Institute's Minorities and Social Policy program in 1981. Since 1983, Dr. Simms has also served as editor of the *Review of Black Political Economy.* She has written numerous scholarly papers and policy reports and, most recently, was co-editor (with Julianne Malveaux) of *Slipping Through the Cracks: The Status of Black Women.* ■

FOCUS

Joint Center for Political Studies

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

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.

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested