

# IN THE NATION

## EMPLOYMENT

### A step for Humphrey-Hawkins

By Bonnie Potter

WASHINGTON

**T**HE HUMPHREY-HAWKINS FULL Employment bill passed the House of Representatives on March 16 without further dilution of its major employment provisions—even with the addition of 30 amendments. But the bill will have to fend off several crippling amendments in the Senate—and might conceivably not even come up on the Senate floor before Congress adjourns in September.

As passed by the House the newest incarnation of Humphrey-Hawkins calls for a general 4 percent unemployment rate by 1983, establishes for the first time in law the "right of every American to useful employment," and sets out procedures for attaining these goals.

The President would have to submit to Congress annually numerical goals for employment, unemployment, production, real income and productivity, along with the programs to achieve these targets.

The Federal Reserve would then be required to submit to Congress its annual

People have no idea what we're up against in this Congress, say full employment lobbyists.

monetary policies, and explain their consistency, or lack of consistency, with the President's program.

Finally, the House and Senate Budget committees would review the administration and Federal Reserve programs, and submit their own recommendations as part of the first concurrent budget resolution.

Critics complain that this latest version of the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, known as HR50, is too watered down to do any good. They say that 4 percent is too high an unemployment target, that the bill details no new programs or appropriations and provides too many loopholes—such as a provision allowing the President to "recommend modifications in the numerical goals and timetables" after the first three years of enactment.

Economist Bob Lekachman is unnerved by the bill's deference to inflation as "a major national problem requiring improved government policies," while former UAW economist Nat Weinberg decries the absence of the original bill's more extensive, participatory planning procedures.

"But people have no idea what we're up against in this Congress," says Jerry Tucker, a UAW lobbyist.

The heavily criticized 4 percent unemployment target almost became 8 percent during the House vote.

An amendment offered by New York Rep. Otis Pike would have changed the way unemployment statistics are computed. The amendment would have excluded strikers, those who had been unemployed for less than four weeks, those who have

jobs waiting, those who were seeking part-time work, and those who had quit their last jobs. Pike's theory was that those who "are not terribly unhappy being unemployed" should be excluded from unemployment figures. His amendment was defeated by five votes.

The bill's stated goal of reducing inflation was almost quantified as a 3 percent target, and the lack of new spending requirements was almost calcified into a balanced budget requirement.

According to AFL-CIO lobbyist Joe Uehline, the only damaging amendment that did pass gave the budget committees primacy over the Joint Economic Committee (JEC) in laying out congressional employment goals. As reported out of committee, the bill would have required the JEC to report an annual concurrent resolution detailing congressional goals for employment and economic growth before resolutions were submitted by the budget committees as part of the congressional budget process. But an amendment submitted by New York Republican Barber Conable reverses that order, with the JEC now submitting a "privileged" amendment to the budget committee's resolution.

Humphrey-Hawkins supporters sided with the JEC in this dispute over committee turf because the JEC has traditionally dealt with broader economic policy issues, while the budget committee is viewed more narrowly as an appropriations committee, primarily interested in matching programs to money rather than to goals.

Of the other amendments added to the bill, most were of minor importance, according to UAW lobbyist Tucker. Amendments that add the handicapped and veterans to targeted unemployment groups or insure the availability of daycare centers should not, he says, dilute the bill or decrease its chances of passage.

But only half the battle is over. A mighty battalion of lobbyists representing over 25 organizations from the AFL-CIO through the National Urban League, ADA, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Farmers Union and the National Council of Churches will troop up to the hill for the bill's Senate mark-up April 10, and begin once more the process of fending off the crippling amendments sure to be added on the Senate side.

Is their enormous effort worth the mouse that many think HR50 has become? The lobbyists seem to think so.

Jane O'Grady, a former Clothing and Textile union lobbyist who now lobbies for the AFL-CIO, points to the "little" things the bill has to offer—an airing of Federal Reserve Board policies, a focus of national attention on employment problems as well as on an unemployment figure well below 6 percent. "With everyone applauding a drop in unemployment to 6.1 percent," she says, "we were getting dangerously close to public acceptance of a 6 percent unemployment figure."

According to Ellen Vollinger, one of the three staffers for the Full Employment Action Council, chaired by Murray Finley and Corretta Scott King, Humphrey-Hawkins must be seen as only a first step. Vollinger hopes the coalition will stay together to keep on pressuring Congress to come up with the programs necessary to make the 4 percent unemployment goal realizable.

And as far as Jerry Tucker is concerned, "Humphrey-Hawkins may not contain everything we want, but how many rounds can you sit out waiting for the millennium? A Humphrey-Hawkins," he says, "doesn't come around very often."

Bonnie Potter is a reporter in Washington, D.C.

## PRISONS

### Alabama activist fights for his life

MOBILE, ALA.—Just three days before he was to go to the electric chair, a black prison activist here won a 60-day stay of execution from the Alabama Supreme Court. Lawyers for Johnny Harris, who has changed his name to Imani, hope to use the 60 days from the March 7 stay to challenge the conviction that made Imani liable to the death penalty and to mobilize public support to stop his execution.

Imani was one of five black prisoners charged with killing a guard during a Jan. 18, 1974, prison rebellion at the G.K. Fountain Correctional Center near Atmore, Ala. The guard and a prisoner died after an assault on the prisoner protest by the warden and guards. Prison activists say that the dead prisoner, Chagina (George Dobbins), a leader in the protest, was murdered by prison guards in an ambulance en route to the Mobile General Hospital.

Imani was convicted and sentenced to die by an all-white, all-male jury in Bay Minette, Ala., on Feb. 28, 1975. Attorney General William Baxley, who prosecuted the case himself, asked the jury to convict Imani even if they didn't believe that he actually killed the guard, for which there was no direct evidence. "It is enough if you are convinced that he participated in the riot in which the guard was killed," Baxley argued.

Three other prisoners—known as the Atmore-Holmon Brothers—were given sentences from 31 years to life. A fourth was found dead in his cell—allegedly a suicide—before he could stand trial.

Imani, the first person scheduled for execution in Alabama since 1964, was sentenced under a Civil War-era statute that mandates an automatic death sentence for a prisoner serving a life sentence who is convicted of first degree murder.

Imani's supporters charge that his death sentence is a "political execution" in which "a man who neither intended nor committed murder has been sentenced to die simply on the basis of participating in a protest of prison conditions that were themselves later declared by the federal courts as 'unconstitutional' and 'cruel and unusual punishment'."



Tom Gardner  
Bob Allison of Louisville, one of Imani's lawyers, argues against execution before the Alabama Supreme Court. The court gave them 60 days to make a case.

In addition to continuing to challenge the murder conviction, Imani's lawyers are challenging the original sentence that put Imani in jail, received in 1970 in Birmingham. At that time Imani was charged with four robberies of very small amounts and one rape, charges that under Alabama law at that time could have resulted in a death sentence. Imani argues that his court-appointed lawyers failed to prepare his defense or even to call his alibi witnesses prior to his trial. Instead, he says, his lawyers told him that he could choose to plead guilty to the crimes, which he argues he did not commit, and receive a plea-bargained life sentence or he could go to trial and face the electric chair. Faced with no defense, Imani pled guilty and was given five life sentences by the judge. Imani later tried to appeal these sentences on his own from prison, but the appeal was dismissed with no hearing or investigation.

The Alabama Supreme Court has given

Imani and his lawyers 60 days to challenge his original sentences. It also gives them 60 days to bring Imani's case to public attention. The lawyers point out that last year the media kept a ghoully deathwatch over Gary Gilmore, but let Imani come within 72 hours of the electric chair without a word. In fact, a CBS Reports show aired only three days before Imani was due to be executed offered a special update on the death penalty a year after Gilmore's execution without a word about Imani.

The case has begun to attract some attention. Some coverage has appeared in the international press. Amnesty International is looking into the case and several members of the Congressional Black Caucus have expressed their concern to Alabama state officials. There have also been public protests in Alabama and other states. A defense fund has been established to aid in the case and to help pay legal costs. (Imani Defense Fund, Box 424, Atlanta, GA 30301.)



## ANTI-APARTHEID

# Protests greet Davis Cup games

By Craig T. Canan

NASHVILLE

**T**HIS SERIES OF PROTESTS WILL effectively isolate South Africa in the international sports arena and probably prevent the racists from playing in the Davis Cup for many years to come," said Dennis Brutus, chairman of the International Committee to End Apartheid Sport, at the end of a series of protests March 17-19 in opposition to South Africa's participation here in Davis Cup playoffs.

W.E. Hester, president of the U.S. Tennis Association, appeared to concur. Hester said that as a result of ever-increasing protests over the South African participation his organization "will not support South Africa in future Davis Cup tournaments." Hester said that the Davis Cup nations could remove South Africa with a 75 percent vote, and that the USTA would not block such an attempt as it has in the past.

Numerous protests have been organized here since it was announced that Vanderbilt University would sponsor the Davis Cup games between the U.S. and South Africa. Three days of protests accompanied the games themselves, highlighted by a rally of more than 6,000.

The protests focused on American corporate involvement in South Africa and on Vanderbilt's role in supporting the South African apartheid system through stock investments, as well as through its decision to host the tennis tournament.

David Huet-Vaughn, chairman of the Tennessee Coalition Against Apartheid (TCAA) told one protest, "If these corporate investments were withdrawn, the people of South Africa would have a genuine chance for winning their own liberation. As long as these corporations remain there supporting that regime, the people of southern Africa will continue to be oppressed and continue to live in slavery.... And so long as that is the case, then those who own shares in these corporations, and those corporations themselves, are implicated in this violence against the South African people."

## From all over nation.

The first day of the matches, March 17, over 3,000 people marched and rallied against apartheid in a demonstration sponsored by the TCAA and the Student Coordinating Committee, umbrella organizations of student, community and civil rights groups.

Students marching from Fisk University, Peabody Teachers College, Meharry Medical School, Scarritt College, Tennessee State University and Vanderbilt joined other protesters already picketing ticket sales at the Vanderbilt gym, shouting chants like "Chancellor Heard [of Vanderbilt], what's the word? Nashville's not Johannesburg!"

Demonstrators came from all over the nation, including contingents from Chicago, Denver, Boston, Atlanta, Ohio, New York, Florida, North Carolina and even California.

The enthusiastic picketing resulted in less than 15 percent of the 9,600 capacity gym being filled; only 1,200 spectators crossed the picket lines.

"It's not just a tennis match that we're protesting," said John Trautfeld, a part-time chicken rancher from Knoxville, Tenn. "We're protesting what we see happening to the oppressed majority in South Africa. We're demonstrating for freedom and democracy in South Africa."

Sporadic snow flurries made the picketing difficult, but Arthur Washington of Denver appeared to reflect the picketers' feelings when he said: "I just thought of the brothers in Soweto, South Africa, struggling for freedom and that gave me energy through the snow and cold."

**U.S. Tennis Association officials said that because of the protests they would not support future South African participation in Davis Cup games.**

While about a quarter of the demonstrators maintained picket lines at all four gym entrances, the remainder held a rally in the parking lot.

John Pike, chairman of the Student Coordinating Committee, told the crowd: "The Davis Cup protest is helping bring into focus the fact that it is the corporations here in the U.S. that are responsible for the economic problems the people of South Africa are having. Look at the Board of Trustees of Vanderbilt University and look at where Vanderbilt's endowment funds are invested. You'll see that the same people who are exploiting people in South Africa are the ones who are running Vanderbilt University."

"The mobilization that has taken place around the Davis Cup is going to provide the basis for a continuing effort to bring the university to sell stock in corporations doing business in South Africa," Pike concluded, adding that he feels there is a good chance that the divestiture movement at Vanderbilt will be successful.

Attempts to discourage potential protesters proved unsuccessful. Prior to the demonstration, hundreds of windows in late-model cars in black sections of Nashville were broken. The Ku Klux Klan announced that it would bring its forces to the demonstration, and an International Anti-Apartheid Conference at Meharry Medical College March 10-12 received several bomb threats. Local police, in addition, arrested or harassed people posting leaflets about the demonstration.

## A lower priority for NAACP.

On the second day of the matches, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) joined forces with the TCAA in a three-mile march from the state capitol to a park near the gym.

NAACP director Benjamin Hooks said that the march was not as large as originally predicted, simply because the NAACP had deemphasized it as a priority. "We could have organized busloads, caravans and plane loads of people to come to Nashville," Hooks said. "However, we decided that representatives of the chapters marching would make the point."

NAACP representative Charles Kimbrough told IN THESE TIMES that a national board meeting shortly before the demonstration had decided to "devote more resources to our energy campaign, and less to the Davis Cup."

After the march reached the park, many of the protesters, primarily those associated with the TCAA, marched to the gym to continue to picket the matches and urge spectators to boycott the games. Once again demonstrators outnumbered the approximately 1,400 spectators.

There were fewer pickets on the final day of the matches, March 19, as many demonstrators had to return home. Nonetheless, some 200 local people maintained a picket line.

One protester entered the matches and opened a banner in the middle of the playing court. Jerry Hornsby, a copy editor for the Nashville morning paper, told the spectators that "these matches are disruptive. Everyone attending is a racist and



Protests, like the faculty march above, began in Nashville almost as soon as it was announced that Vanderbilt would host the games, uniting students and faculty at all the schools in Nashville.

has blood on their hands for supporting white domination in South Africa." Hornsby was led from the court by police, but was later released without charges.

Dennis Brutus concluded a final rally by saying, "We have successfully made our point. The marches and pickets have fulfilled their function and we have helped win a victory. We will continue to organize, continue to struggle."

Brutus mentioned specifically an anti-apartheid conference to be held later in the year and a demonstration against an award that the National Conference of Christians and Jews has announced they will present to Vanderbilt Chancellor Alexander Heard on April 11 as "humanitarian of the year."

John Pike reported that "because of

the pickets, attendance for the matches all three days was just over 4,000." Vanderbilt had earlier said that it needed sales of at least 4,000 tickets every day to break even. The USTA, however, has reportedly released Vanderbilt from its \$50,000 guaranteed from ticket sales, so that the main loss to the school is a loss of prestige.

"We had people come in from all over the country and this is indicative that there is enough interest to begin a national coordination of locally-based anti-apartheid groups," Pike said. "We believe that the Davis Cup protest marks the beginning of a national popular movement against apartheid in South Africa, racism in the U.S., and the corporate system that is responsible for both."

Craig T. Canan is a writer in Nashville.

# Miners tire, but still out

Continued from page 3.

displayed during the strike as both a victory and an optimistic sign about the union's future. They deeply resent the way the mass media often depict coal miners as ignorant, violence-prone mountain men who are more concerned about their anachronistic customs than about the nation's welfare.

"I'm doing this for everybody," Gene Dunn emphasizes proudly. "Most miners feel that way. If they break one union, the companies will do the same to others. If they get us down, they'll bust those people working in factories next."

Dewey Christian agrees: "The AFL-CIO, the Autoworkers and the Steelworkers know that we are the granddaddy of the labor movement. If we fail, they know that they're next on the list."

It's in this framework that the miners understand the food, clothing, money and expressions of solidarity flowing to them from unions and other sources. The food and monetary donations have not been large enough to allow them to hold out indefinitely—in some places contributions have actually heightened divisions and resentments—but they have buttressed the miners' determination to keep going.

"All this support has helped morale terrifically," says Bobbie Regan, a member of Local 1750 in Morgantown, W.V. and a leader of the Miners for a Fair Contract. "The solidarity from other unions keeps miners from getting totally disgusted with the negative image of them

pushed by the media. It really helps to know labor is behind them."

Events during the strike have also alienated many miners from two far-away leaders: Arnold Miller and President Jimmy Carter. In the Charleston area, where Miller lived and worked for many years, miners seem reluctant to dump all the union's problems on his shoulders. They do concede that he's done a pitiful job, and that his union position is weaker than ever.

"This whole thing has hurt Arnold Miller very badly," says Spangler. "I don't blame him for everything. But he won't have the full power of the previous years. He's on a teeter-totter right now."

Carter is regarded no more highly. Many miners realize that his refusal to seize the mines is the result of corporate and political pressures. "I voted for Carter last time, but I won't again," vows Dunn. "He did the coal generation dirty this time. If he seized the mines, he would have seen all the money the companies are making. But Carter doesn't want to get on the money-men. He just wants to get after the low-class people."

While the miners may end up with a weak contract and go through another three years of frequent wildcats, the strike may have strengthened the union internally in the long run. "This strike has brought us back into unity," declares Ernest Moore, vice president of District 29 and a state legislator. "Coal miners have always been a group of people who took care of each other. Now we're stronger than we ever have been."