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During the 12 months before the Nov. 7 elections, black leaders put forth an extraordinary effort to enhance growing black political power and to achieve a degree of organization which would have a continuing influence on the political system as a whole. No less than seven national caucuses were held, plus many other meetings and activities, including intensive voter education and registration. All were calculated to solidify and expand black political power.

While it may be much too early to begin a hard assessment of the overall effect of these efforts, the results of political participation in the recent election may provide a basis on which to begin.

The election wrapup in this issue of Focus points to gains in congressional seats, state legislatures and local offices. It also points out that only 41 percent of the black voting age population went to the polls. This is 14 percentage points lower than the national turnout, which was the lowest since 1948.

The Focus article suggests some reasons for low black turnout. However, in the wake of blacks' most intense political year and in view of much big talk about black politics, it is disappointing that blacks did not show a greater force at the polls. Strategy might have dictated that the time for a massive turnout is precisely when the general turnout is low.

Unfortunately, we may never know how many black candidates at the state and local level and how many other candidates supportive of black interest might have won had the black turnout been substantially higher. Even if the vote had not made the difference in the case of preferred candidates, it would cause those who won to pause and ponder. While this is little to hope for, sometimes it is the best you can get.

Unless black politics is to be a game of self-deception an oral tranquilizer—we had better begin contemplating the value of numbers in politics the number of votes for and the number against at all levels. After all, black political power is power only when it is used. We cannot let the cry “black politics” become a verbal virtue which takes the place of a do-able deed.

The question now, however, is what lessons were learned and where do we go from here in terms of strategy, tactics and organization. It is a question the JCPS will deal with in coming months.

President
the first black president of the nation's largest group of urban officials in 1974. The 11-member nominating committee, whose report was approved by the entire delegation to the League’s annual meeting in Indianapolis on Nov. 29, by 5-to-3 vote, picked Bradley as their choice for first vice president.

The first vice president usually becomes president the following year.

In addition to Bradley, six blacks serve on NLC’s board of directors. Three are incumbents, in the second year of two-year terms. They include Highland Park, Mich., Mayor Robert Blackwell; Gary Mayor Richard Hatcher, and Camden, N.J., City Councilman Elijah Perry. The three newly elected board members are East Orange, N.J., Mayor William S. Hart; Dayton, Ohio, Mayor Charles McGee and George Phipps, Mayor of Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Bradley, who narrowly lost the last Los Angeles mayoralty race to Sam Yorty, again has announced that he will run for that post in 1973.

- New officers were elected by the National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials (NBCLEO), meeting at the National League of Cities annual convention in Indianapolis, Nov. 26-29. East Orange, N.J., Mayor William S. Hart replaced Gary Mayor Richard Hatcher as NBCLEO’s chairman; Richmond, Va. Vice Mayor Henry Marsh was elected vice chairman (and chairman-elect). The post of second vice chairman went to Atlanta Vice Mayor Maynard Jackson. Pontiac, Mich., Mayor Pro-Tempore Charles M. Tucker Jr., is the new secretary-treasurer for the organization.

- For the first time in the 30-year history of U.S. public housing, a local metropolitan housing authority may have to close its doors. On Nov. 9, the board of commissioners of the St. Louis Housing Authority voted 5-to-0 to close down all conventional public housing in that city by May 1, 1973. As a result, more than 25,000 people, most of them black, will be left without homes. Lack of federal subsidy is the reason given by the authority for its action.

Norman V. Watson, assistant secretary for housing management of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, said St. Louis is one of 3,000 cities sharing in a $100 million operating subsidy being held up by the Office of Management and Budget because of a new formula setting guidelines for distribution to local housing authorities. In addition to a portion of the stalled HUD funds, another $1.6 million subsidy is earmarked for the St. Louis authority.

While HUD spokesmen think this will forestall an actual St. Louis shutdown before the deadline, Frank Boykin, chairman of the local authority’s board of commissioners, said he doubted any additional subsidy would be enough to keep the city’s projects operating through the year.

- The 2,000-member National League of Cities has slated Los Angeles City Councilman Tom Bradley to be
In October of this year, the general revenue sharing bill was signed into law. Formally known as the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-512), the revenue sharing act provides $30.2 billion to be distributed directly to state and local governments for use as they see fit, within certain broad guidelines.

At the same time, the legislation accomplishes two other purposes. It permits the federal government to collect and return a state’s individual income taxes, if the state wishes, and it places a limit of $2.5 billion on federal expenditures for social services.

Revenue sharing is a new philosophy of distributing federal funds to states and localities. Under general revenue sharing, the many restrictions in use which exist under categorical and block grants are largely done away with. Instead, the emphasis is on permitting states and localities a much greater say in how money dispensed by the federal government is used.

At the same time, this raises questions as to how certain protections, particularly with respect to civil rights, will be enforced under revenue sharing. While the initial amount to be dispensed under revenue sharing is small, it may be the first step in a major alteration in federal-state-local relations. For these reasons, the JCPS is presenting information on the details of revenue sharing.

The total $30.2 billion appropriation has been made for the legislation’s five-year period. As with federal program expenditures, the money comes from income tax payments, but the $30.2 billion will be held in a separate Revenue Sharing Trust Fund in the U.S. Treasury Department.

Because the payments are available based on a formula, there is no need to apply for funds on a competitive basis, but only to submit basic forms showing facts about the eligible governmental unit to the Treasury Department. Then payments will be made directly to states and localities on a quarterly basis, after an initial lump-sum is sent out for 1972. There are strict record-keeping requirements on use of the money.

While governmental units can bank on receiving the amounts allocated, it should be remembered that the President could cut back on the amount shared or the law could be changed by Congress during the five years. For these reasons, caution would dictate spending the funds on capital projects which are non-recurring, visible and permanent.

The most important restriction on use of revenue sharing money, and the one which black elected officials will want to keep in mind, is that funds going directly to localities must be used for certain broad purposes: Public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, social services for the poor and aged, and financial administration. This restriction does not apply to money going directly to states. Also, revenue sharing funds cannot be used as matching funds for other federal grants.

If funds are used for capital expenditures, there are even fewer restrictions than for other purposes. The revenue sharing money can be used for any purpose permitted by state or local law.

While the idea of revenue sharing is simple, the implications are enormous. For instance, little federal control means that the variety of civil rights laws and administrative protections will not be available. State and local protections, although they are often less effective, will be more crucial.

Also, there are more subtle ways in which revenue sharing may tend to draw benefits away from minority communities unless care is taken in their use. For instance, revenue sharing money may be used for an activity of little need or interest to blacks, such as beautifying a municipal golf course rather than paving streets in low-income areas. Or in another situation, revenue sharing funds could be used in a non-discriminatory program (e.g., a subsidy to a bus company), but this would release local funds to be used in a discriminatory manner (e.g., building segregated housing in a city with no fair housing law).

These sorts of new potential problems mean that black elected officials must take a new look at how public funds are spent. Most important, it means that they must thoroughly learn the local and state appropriations process, the “how,” “where” and “why” of decision-making on how the people’s money is spent.
The JCPS will soon publish a booklet describing in more detail how the program works. At this time there are several other points to bring out about revenue sharing.

The District of Columbia will have to go through more channels to spend its revenue sharing dollars than any other jurisdiction. It will have to have the approval of the mayor, the city council, the Office of Management and Budget and the U.S. Congress. If the District has no immediate need for its revenue sharing funds, which is highly unlikely, then it can make short-term investments in U.S. Treasury bonds.

All other jurisdictions can invest in certificates of deposit, municipal bonds or virtually anything allowed by local law.

Once the decision is made to spend money on a certain project, there is little chance it can be changed by appeal. Only if it does not comply with state or local law or if, in very few cases, the Treasury Department rules the use does not comply with the act’s broad purposes, will the decision be overturned. Good accountants and good lawyers at the local level will help in seeing that the money is actually used for desirable purposes. Elected officials who have specific program proposals to present will have a head start in seeing that the money is used to the benefit of the black community.

The primary civil rights safeguard which remains available for use with revenue sharing funds is Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. That section contains prohibitions against using any federal funds for a program or project in which discrimination is practiced. But this is a very general provision which has proven difficult to enforce, and it is further complicated by the revenue sharing regulation’s requirement that governors are responsible for securing compliance. The federal government cannot act until after the state has been given a reasonable opportunity to comply.

This means that a closer look must be taken at state and local civil rights laws and enforcement procedures, as well as federal administration of Title VI, to see whether they meet the demands of revenue sharing.

Another important aspect of revenue sharing which merits black elected officials’ attention is the act’s provision that states may change the allocation formula for localities within each state once during the life of the act. Under a compromise between House and Senate versions, states are placed by Congress under either the Senate formula, which combines population, tax effort and poverty factors, or the House formula, which has the two additional factors of urbanization and state income tax.

When the time comes for state legislatures to consider changing the formula, the key question will be the weight to be given to the poverty factor as against the others.

It should also be noted that only incorporated areas are eligible to share in revenue sharing funds. Thus, an unincorporated area can either incorporate or become annexed to an incorporated area to receive funds.

The effect of the $2.5 billion limitation on federal outlays for social services will be that such funds will be distributed to each state on the basis of population rather than on the basis of need. This distribution means that some states will receive far less than they requested, while others will get more. States with larger numbers of poor people in urban areas will be seriously hurt by the resulting cutbacks in planned program and services.

To prevent even the hint of corruption, the revenue sharing law makes up for the no-strings policy by providing that each jurisdiction receiving funds publish in the local press a statement outlining how they were spent. Treasury officials also have reminded jurisdictions that they must, by law, alert the news media that the statements are being published.

The extra precautions are necessary because — unlike most federal grants with myriad regulations, requirements and red tape, there is virtually none for revenue sharing.

To keep up with sharing rules and requirements read the Federal Register, which can be purchased from the Government Printing Office or obtained at larger libraries.
The Congressional Black Caucus, the 13 blacks currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives, was founded in 1969 with the goal of representing the legislative needs of black and other minority citizens of the United States. In June of 1971 and 1972, the Caucus held gala fund raisers to finance their endeavors. Since November, 1971, it has called conferences or hearings on racism in the armed services, national health, black business, racism in the media, minority education, national priorities, Africa and governmental lawlessness. The Caucus' activities culminated in the presentation of a "Black Bill of Rights" at the Democratic National Convention in August, 1972. Since that time, little has been heard from the group, causing some to wonder about its current status. Focus went to Rep. Louis Stokes (D-Ohio), the present Caucus chairman, for clarification:

Q: The Congressional Black Caucus, without an executive director or an office and apparently inactive as a body since late summer, is rumored to be lacking funds and sustaining some serious rifts among the membership at this time. Some outside observers, among them Mayor Richard Hatcher, of Gary, Ind., have urged that the Caucus "change its focus." As Caucus chairman, what is your response to all of this?"

S: Well, I think that it's general knowledge that we are seeking a new executive director, because we have written to many prominent persons in key spots around the country asking that they assist us in the selection of a new one. Our last executive director, Howard Robinson, left at the end of September. So we are in the process, now, of trying to select a new one. We have had numerous applicants for the job. We have interviewed many of those whom the screening committee, that we have set up, felt merited the personal interviews. Out of the screening committee, several persons have been referred over to the full Caucus for further screening. So we are in that process that any organization undergoes when it's seeking a new director -- and particularly the kind of man that we must necessarily have for a group of this type. Of course, consequently, it takes a little time to select a person.

In the meantime, we have now been able to secure space like other groups on the Hill, such as the Democratic Study Group and others, in official quarters on Capitol Hill. We will now be housed in the Congressional Hotel, along with groups such as DSG and special committees of the Congress, etc. This is something we have been fighting for since we began -- to get official status and recognition of the Congressional Black Caucus in permanent quarters provided by the Congress. So we will be moving in there. And now, of course, in the process of selecting a new executive director, we want to afford him the opportunity to select his own personnel. So our staff is now reduced to two people. It will be the new executive director's job to replace the current staff. Under our by-laws, the size of the staff will be about six people.

Now, with reference to Mayor Hatcher's comment that we "should change our focus": I think we agree with him. We have undergone our own examination and our own evaluation. This self-analysis came about as a result of my appointing a subcommittee, which was chaired by Congressman Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.). The Dellums committee report to us suggested that the Caucus, instead of trying to be all things to all people, now try to focus in on the one specific area where we possess the greatest expertise: To try and bring relief to black, poor, disadvantaged people through the legislative process. As a consequence of his report, we have decided to have no further conferences; no further ad hoc hearings, such as those we conducted on racism in the military and government employment, etc., because those hearings and those conferences have developed for us sufficient background material needed to be able to focus on legislative problems and put a black perspective on that legislation. Now our job is to forge that legislation and get it passed by Congress.

Q: And your answer to the other part of the question, which was: Aren't there now some serious rifts among some of the present members?"

S: I say to you categorically that there are no breaches or rifts in the Caucus today. We, as a result of the last Presidential campaign, underwent the kind of political strife that occurs in any organization -- such as has occurred in the Democratic Party, for instance. We are no different than anyone else politically, because we all have to do certain things with reference to our own political situations. After the Democratic convention, I called the entire Caucus together and, in so doing, I sat down individually with some of the members. We had candid discussions with reference to any problems that had developed during the primary campaigns. Immediately thereafter, the entire group came back together and has worked solidly as a unit since. I am very proud of them. These are high caliber people we have in that Caucus. They put the problems of the people they have to represent above any kind of petty differences that may have developed from time to time.

Q: Do you anticipate the three new black members of Congress becoming members of the Caucus as well?

S: I would certainly think so; we are looking forward to the three of them joining us and giving us that much more strength. They are three very talented and highly-skilled people. The fact that we will now have 16 as opposed to 13, and as opposed to the original nine, demonstrates our continued growth. I think the focus is on 16 of us bound together collectively working on problems that relate to poor and disadvantaged minority people in this country. This gives us an even greater hope that in the new Congress we can anticipate more, until someday hopefully, we can have the 43 black members of this Caucus that we should have if black people are to have proportionate representation in the Congress.
Gains in the number of black elected officials and in the sophistication of black voters in many parts of the country were the story of black participation in the 1972 election, despite a low voter turn-out.

Three new black faces will appear in the U.S. House of Representatives next term, and 23 more than there were last year will serve in the nation's state legislatures.

Meanwhile, although black voters stayed predominantly in the Democratic column for the Presidential race, they showed they knew how to split their tickets when it seemed to be in their interests.

The three new members of Congress are Yvonne Brathwaite Burke of Los Angeles, Barbara Jordan of Houston and Andrew Young of Atlanta. All are Democrats. Jordan and Young, both of whom won election in districts with less than 45 percent black populations, will be the first black members of Congress from the South since Reconstruction.

With the re-election of all incumbent black congressmen and of U.S. Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.), the new members bring the number of blacks in the 93d Congress to 17 [Included in this total is George Collins, recently deceased -- see page 3].

Another strong bid for a seat in Congress failed narrowly, as Tennessee State Sen. J. O. Patterson of Memphis received 44 percent of the vote in his bid to unseat incumbent Republican Rep. Dan Kuykendahl. Patterson will retain his seat in the state legislature.

State legislative races brought several notable "firsts," as the number of black legislators rose to 229 in 39 states. Arkansas became the last Southern state to elect blacks to its legislature, as three house members and one senator, all Democrats, became the first black legislators in the state's history.

In Minnesota, B. Robert Lewis, a Democrat-Farmer-Labor member, became the state's first black senator and Ray Pleasant, a Republican, was chosen the first black house member since 1898. Both were elected in mostly-white suburbs of Minneapolis-St. Paul. In Portland, Maine, Gerald Talbot was chosen that state's first black legislator.

William McCoy of Portland, Ore., became that state's first black representative, while Monroe Swan of Milwaukee is the first black member of the Wisconsin state senate. Other notable legislative victories include those of Lois DeBerry, first black woman member of the Tennessee legislature, and of 25-year-old Joseph Rhodes, Jr., who last year made news as an outspoken member of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest and this year won a legislative seat in Pittsburgh. The Massachusetts legislature gained a father son team, as Royal Bolling Jr. joined his father, incumbent Royal Bolling Sr., as a state house member from Boston.

The 179 black state legislators elected this year from 32 states include 76 "new faces," members who were not in the previous legislature. Some 104 incumbents were reelected this year, and another 49 hold seats in seven states which did not hold elections this year.

Both in legislative and Presidential races, most black voters chose Democratic candidates. All but five of the black legislators elected this year are Democrats. According to a JCPs survey of predominantly black inner-city precincts and wards in 24 major cities, 87 percent of the voters in those areas voted for the Democratic Presidential candidate, Sen. McGovern, while 13 percent went for President Nixon.

Nevertheless, there are signs that point to increasing independence on the part of black voters. The most striking are the instances of black ticket-splitting. In Chicago, Boston, Norfolk, Memphis and Wilmington, Del., among other cities, blacks split their votes to have influence on key local races.

In Chicago, while voting for Sen. McGovern, many Southside and Westside wards leaned heavily toward incumbent Republican Sen. Charles Percy. They also helped defeat Democrat Edward V. Hanrahan, the incumbent Cook County state's attorney, running with support of Mayor Daley's machine. Blacks gave 55 percent of their vote to Republican Bernard Carey. Hanrahan incurred the wrath of the black community for his role in a 1969 raid by state's attorney's police in which two members of the Black Panther Party were shot to death.

Blacks also helped defeat conservative Democratic Congressmen Louise Day Hicks in Boston and Earle Cabell in Texas. In Jackson, Miss., 76 percent of the voters in heavily black precincts voted against Democratic Sen. James O. Eastland, while supporting McGovern by a nine-to-one margin. Eastland was re-elected, however.

Also pointing toward an increase of black voter selectivity is the apparent slight boost in President Nixon's share of the black vote between 1968 and 1972. The JCPs survey this year, showing him receiving 13 percent of the vote in inner-city black wards, probably slightly understates his actual level of support because the pressure of time prevented inclusion of suburban areas.

The JCPs estimates that in 1968, Mr. Nixon received roughly 10 percent of the vote against Sen. Humphrey. This is based on an extrapolation of figures from two nationwide samples, one by the Gallup Poll, the other by NBC News. These samples did include suburban areas.

Some political observers say Mr. Nixon has somewhat increased his support among black middle class, professional and suburban voters. The editor of the Cleveland Call and Post, for example, asserted that the 5,000 blacks who voted for Mr. Nixon in that city are "part of a growing black middle class with changing attitudes.

The most pervasive factors affecting the black vote, however, appear to have been apathy, lack of interest in either candidate and a feeling that the result was a foregone conclusion.

The JCPs estimates that the black voter turnout was about 14 percentage points lower than the national overall turnout this year, and was lower than the black turnout in recent Presidential elections. The overall turnout this year is estimated at 55 percent of voting age Americans. The JCPs has concluded from statistical calculations and assessments of local observers that only 41 percent of the blacks of voting age voted this year.

In 1968, according to U.S. Census Bureau data, 69
percent of the national voting age population and 58 percent of blacks of voting age cast ballots.

Preliminary findings of two other national organizations, which asked not to be identified pending publication of their final reports, give higher estimates for black voter turnout. One sets it at 47 percent; the other at 58 percent of black voting age population. Figures from the Census Bureau, regarded as most authoritative, will probably be released in late December or early January.

On a different basis, a comparison of voter registration figures and the total vote in major city sample precincts studied by the JCP shows that about 58 percent of black registered voters in those cities went to the polls Nov. 7. This is a decrease from 1968 when, according to Census Bureau estimates, 87 percent of black registered voters in major cities voted.

Returns in races at the local level were incomplete at press time. In one of the more interesting local races, however, Mrs. Erma Henderson defeated Jack Kelley for a vacant seat on the Detroit City Council, returning the number of black city council members to three of that nine-member body. One black councilman had died earlier in the year. The Henderson-Kelley race was particularly noteworthy because the councilman was selected by an at-large vote in the entire city. In a similar situation in 1969, Mayor Roman Gribbs narrowly defeated a black candidate, Richard Austin, in the mayoralty race.

Other successful local black candidates include Ernest Morial of New Orleans, who was elected to the state circuit court of appeals and became the first Southern black to win a post of that importance since Recon-