

UCLA

Volume II. 1986-87 - Minorities in the Post-Industrial City

Title

Ethnic Officeholders and Party Activists in Los Angeles County

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8cp4b4j2>

Authors

Guerra, Fernando J.
Marvick, Dwaine

Publication Date

1986-05-01

Notice:

This working paper was printed by the Institute as a means for disseminating the research findings of Institute and University-related scholars. The text is provided in order to facilitate academic discourse and is free to use for personal academic purposes utilizing proper citation. Copyright of the information contained within lies with the authors, and requests for use other than personal research purposes must be directed to the authors.

ETHNIC OFFICEHOLDERS AND PARTY ACTIVISTS
IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Fernando J. Guerra and Dwaine Marvick

About the Authors:

Fernando Guerra is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Loyola Marymount University. Dwaine Marvick is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

A version of this paper was presented at the Conference on Minorities in the Post Industrial City, held in May, 1986 at UCLA. Ten of the papers presented at the conference are available through the ISSR Working Papers Series.

INTRODUCTION

This inquiry into ethnic participation in Los Angeles party politics starts with a look at the comparative success in gaining public office that representatives of five minority status groups have had since 1960. Specifically, the success in winning significant political office by candidates who are Latino, Black, Jewish, Asian and/or women has been quite different. It has been much more rapid for Jews than for Blacks, who in turn have outpaced Latinos, while Asians have had little success throughout the 27-year period. Further, women not linked to these ethnic communities have not done as well as women from ethnic communities in gaining public office.

In 1960, ethnic minorities held 5 percent of the most significant elective positions in Los Angeles County. By 1986, the ethnic communities of Los Angeles (Latino, Black, Jewish and Asian) provided 54 percent of the individuals holding the most significant elective positions. What developments in Los Angeles have led to this inclusion of ethnic minorities into the governing circles? By exploring some trends associated with the political inclusion of minorities in the elective arena, it is hoped that lines of inquiry will emerge which can help explain this phenomenon.

The examination of minority representation in the elective arena of Los Angeles County would have to take into consideration over 2,000 positions. These positions are at the federal, state and local level. With Los Angeles County

having 84 cities, 95 school districts, and 45 special districts that elect governing bodies, most of the 2,000 positions are at the local level. The elective arena of Los Angeles County also includes numerous judicial and party positions. Of these 2,000 positions, 100 emerge as significant because of the resources they control, the number of constituents served, and their use as stepping stones to higher office by individual office holders. The 100 most significant elective positions in Los Angeles County are as follows: the 16 U.S. House of Representatives; the 14 California State Senate; the 30 California Assembly; the five Supervisors, District Attorney, Sheriff and Assessor of Los Angeles County; the Mayor, City Attorney, Controller and 15 Council members of the City of Los Angeles; the seven Los Angeles School Board members; and the seven Los Angeles College Board members. Due to reapportionment or, in one case, the creation of a governing body, these significant positions have not always totaled 100: From 1960 to 1961 there were 77 positions; from 1962 to 1965, 80 positions; from 1966 to 1968, 93 positions; from 1969 to 1981, 100 positions; and from 1982 to 1986, 96 positions.

Before the decade of the 1960s minorities holding a significant position were few. As throughout the nation, changes occurred in the 1960s in Los Angeles that prompted increased minority representation. As Figure 1 shows, beginning in the early 1960s minorities gained significant positions at an ever-increasing rate. The Black community was the initial recipient of this increased representation. Blacks outdistanced Latinos and Jews to such an extent that one could label the early and mid-1960s, politically speaking, the "Black takeoff" stage. Blacks continued to gain significant positions through the 1970s. However, their gains were not as large during the latter stage; it was the Jewish community that enjoyed increased representation throughout the 1970s. Jewish representation in the 100 significant positions tripled during this stage, thus the label "Jewish takeoff." By the 1980s, Black representation had stabilized, not gaining any additional positions through the first half of the decade, Jewish gains continued but at a lesser pace and Latinos more than doubled their gains. Thus, the 1980s can be labelled the "Latino takeoff" stage.

What follows is an examination of the trends associated with Latinos, Blacks and Jews gaining significant elective positions in each of the three stages. Asians are excluded from further analysis because of their lack of success. Specifically, the focus is on whether the positions gained were in districts which were at least one-third minority, recently reapportioned, vacant, or previously held by a like minority. In discussing these trends associated with minorities gaining significant elective positions in Los Angeles County, the election of each minority to a position that he or she had not previously held will consist of a case. Thus, an individual elected to an assembly, state senate and congressional position will be considered three times.

Black Takeoff. 1960-1967

Together, Latinos, Blacks and Jews, held four significant elective positions in Los Angeles County in January, 1960. This consisted of 5 percent of the 77 significant positions then available. This 5 percent was well below the combined percent of the population for the three groups in Los Angeles County. Of the seven known minorities to have held a significant elective position during the first six decades of the 20th century, four were doing so in 1960.

The number of significant positions held by Latinos, Blacks and Jews would more than triple from 1960 to 1967. Minorities holding significant positions jumped from four in 1960 to 17 in 1967. Blacks gained over half of the 14 positions. The net gain of eight significant positions by Blacks (from one to nine) outdistanced the net gain of four (from one to five) by Jews and one (from one to three) by Latinos. Although there were 17 positions held by January 1968, 21 minorities had held significant positions at one time during this period.

Three minorities who held a significant position between 1960 to 1967 were defeated. Thus, some minority setbacks were experienced.

The few minority setbacks were mainly experienced by the Latino community. In 1961, Charles Navarro vacated his City Council position for the Controller's position. The Council appointed a non-minority replacement that was defeated by a Black in 1963. In 1962, Edward Roybal vacated his City Council position for a congressional position. Again, the City Council chose to appoint a replacement, this time a minority, but not a Latino. A Black was appointed and reelected, even though he faced a challenge from a viable Latino candidate in 1963. Thus, Latinos went from two City Councilmen in Los Angeles to none in the first three years of the 1960s. Though the two Latino Councilmen did not lose, but actually advanced to higher office, no apparatus or network existed in the Latino community to maintain their representation on the City Council. Not until late 1985, 23 years later would another Latino serve on the Council.

Latinos also suffered setbacks in the California Assembly. In 1962, Philip Soto and John Moreno, both local Council members, became the first Latinos from Los Angeles County to be elected to the Assembly in the 20th century. They were the first in all of California since the election of Miguel Estudillo of Riverside County in 1907. John Moreno would be defeated in his first reelection attempt. The Latino vote was split in the Democratic primary. Moreno and another Latino candidate actually received over 50 percent of the vote, but it cannot be assumed that the votes for the other Latino candidate would have gone to Moreno. Philip Soto did survive his first reelection attempt, but lost the following election. His loss has been attributed to boundary changes of his district by the 1966 reapportionment. In 1964, Soto had emerged victorious by 2,178 votes in the general election. Facing the same opponent in 1966, he lost by 4,309 votes. Both of the Assembly districts would eventually revert to the Latino community; Soto's position would be recaptured in 1972 and Moreno's in 1980. Late in this period of increased minority representation, a Latino was elected to the LAUSD board. The election of Julian Nava in 1967 was significant in many respects. He was the first Latino elected to the School Board and he defeated an incumbent in an at-large election. His vote total, over two million, was actually the largest ever received by a victorious Latino candidate in the United States up to that time. Of the five Latinos to win a significant elective position which they had not previously held, three did so in a minority district; four in a recently reapportioned district; four won vacant positions; none had previously been held by a Latino; and three of the positions would continue to be held by Latinos at the end of the first stage.

For Jews this period saw only gains and no losses. Though a Jew was defeated during this period, it was to a fellow Jew. Rosalind Wyman was the only Jew holding a significant position in 1960. In 1965, she was defeated by Ed Edelman, who was joined on the Council that same year by Marvin Braude. Anthony Bielensohn was elected to the Assembly in 1962. He was joined there by Jack Fenton, who defeated Latino John Moreno in the 1964 Democratic primary. With the expansion of State Senate positions in 1966, Bielensohn moved to the Senate and was replaced in the Assembly by a fellow Jew, Alan Sieroty. There were six cases of individual Jews gaining positions that they previously had not held. Of these six cases, five were in minority (Jewish) districts, three in recently reapportioned districts, three in vacant positions; two had previously been held by Jews; and all the positions (five) would continue to be held by Jews at the end of the first stage.

The first period has been labeled the Black takeoff for good reason. In the beginning of the period only one Black held a significant position. This was Assemblyman Augustus Hawkins, who vacated his position for Congress in 1962. Mervyn Dymally and F. Douglas Ferrell were elected to the Assembly during the same election. Dymally himself would advance to higher office. He was elected to the State Senate when it was reapportioned in 1966. His vacated Assembly

position was captured by a Black, William Greene. The increase of 13 State Senate positions in the county created numerous opportunities. With many Assemblymen vacating their positions for the Senate, these Assembly positions were left vacant. One of these was captured by Yvonne Brathwaite (Burke), the first Black woman in the California State Legislature. Also in the 1966 election, Leon Ralph replaced F. Douglas Ferrell.

The most impressive Black gains were at the city level. Blacks went from no representation in 1960 to holding three positions, or one-fifth of the Council, by 1963. As mentioned before, a Black was appointed to fill Ed Roybal's vacated seat in January, 1963. The rationale was to give Blacks, a larger portion of the city's population than Latinos at the time, representation on the Council. However, other districts had larger Black populations. It seemed certain that Blacks would gain one or two of these positions and achieve representation in the April, 1963 election. Roybal's vacated district contained the largest concentration of Latinos at the time, and was the only potential Latino district. By appointing a Black, Gilbert Lindsay, Latinos were excluded from the Council. The other two Blacks to join Lindsay on the Council were Tom Bradley and Billy Mills. The Black community also won representation on the LAUSD Board in 1965, with the election of Reverend James Jones. There were 11 cases of Black individuals gaining a position that they previously had not held. Of the 11, ten were in minority districts; ten in a recently reapportioned district; nine in a vacant position; three had previously been held by a Black; and all the positions (nine) would continue to be held by a Black from the end of the first stage.

In examining the initial takeoff stage, what generalizations can be made? Minorities who gained positions did so in minority districts that either became vacant or were recently reapportioned, or both, and once a position was captured by a minority, it remained in minority control. This is especially the case with Blacks, almost always the case with Jews, and somewhat less so with Latinos.

Jewish Takeoff. 1968-1979

The number of significant elective positions held by Latinos, Blacks and Jews during the Jewish takeoff stage, 1968-1979, would increase from 17 to 42. Of the 25 positions captured by these three groups, Jews would account for 17, or over two-thirds, of the gains. While Jewish representation increased from five to 21 positions, Blacks continued to increase their representation from nine to 15 positions, and Latinos only had a net gain of two additional positions by the end of this stage. This gain for Latinos is disappointing, not only when compared to the continued Black gains and the phenomenal Jewish takeoff, but because Latinos had gained up to eight positions in the middle of this stage. Even though this stage is the longest of the three being considered, 12 years compared to eight years for the Black takeoff stage and seven years for the Latino takeoff stage, Black or Latino gains for any 12 year stretch cannot come close to matching the 17 position gain of the Jewish community from 1968 to 1979. It would take the Black community all 27 years being considered by this study to gain 16 positions.

This second stage started out slowly for all three groups. For the first three years, from January, 1968 to January, 1971, Jews would gain only two positions. However, one of those individuals gaining a position would be important in setting up future Jewish gains. The election of Henry Waxman to the Assembly was the start of a very effective network which would not only lead to the election of numerous Jews to various positions at all levels, but the election of other minorities and non-minorities, as well. Donald Newman was also elected in the late 1960s, becoming the first Jew to win a School Board seat by defeating the only Black on the Board.

After this slow start, having gained two positions in three years, Jews would gain at least two positions in each of the next five years. On the first of January, 1971, there were seven Jews holding a significant position: Anthony Bielensohn in the State Senate; Jack Fenton, Alan Sieroty and Henry Waxman in the Assembly; Ed Edelman and Marvin Braude in the Council; and Donald Newman on the School Board. By January 1971, Joel Wachs on the Council and Monroe Richman and Arthur Bronson on the College Board would increase the total to ten. The total would increase to 12 by January 1973 with the election of Baxter Ward to the County Board of Supervisors and Howard Berman to the Assembly. By January 1974, the total would increase to 14 with the election of Alan Robbins to the State Senate and Burt Pines as City Attorney.

By January, 1975, the total increased by two once again to 16; Henry Waxman vacated his Assembly position for Congress with Herschel Rosenthal taking the vacated Assembly spot; Tom Bane was also elected to the Assembly, having previously served from 1958 to 1964, when he had not yet converted to Judaism. Also, Ed Edelman had vacated his Council position for the Board of Supervisors. By January, 1976, Edelman's Council position had been filled by Zev Yarozlavsky and Ira Reiner was elected to the College Board, bringing the number of Jews holding significant positions to 18.

For the first time in five years, Jews would not gain two positions. By January, 1977, a domino effect led to the 19th Jewish position: Bielensohn was elected to Congress and replaced in the State Senate by Alan Sieroty, who had earlier replaced Bielensohn in the Assembly. This left an Assembly position vacant that was now held by Mel Levine. Also, by January 1977, Howard Hiller had replaced Donald Newman on the School Board. By January 1978, Ira Reiner moved to the City Controller's Office from the College Board and the first Jewish woman since Rosalind Weiner-Wyman would hold a significant position: Bobbi Fiedler on the School Board and Joy Picus on the Council, bringing the total to 21. From January, 1978 to January, 1979, for the first time since 1968, there would be no increase of Jews holding significant positions. This dry spell would only last for one year; in July, 1979, the election of Hal Bronson to the Council increased Jewish representation to 23. Also in 1979, Roberta Weintraub replaced Howard Miller on the School Board when he was recalled.

What is impressive about the Jewish takeoff stage is not only the increase in representation, but also the fact that no incumbent Jew was ever defeated in a general election. There were 24 cases of individual Jews gaining positions that they had not previously held. Of the 24, only eight were in minority (Jewish) districts; six in recently reapportioned districts; 14 in a vacant position; six had previously been held by a Jew; and all but one would continue to be held by a Jew at the end of the second stage. The only exception was the College Board office vacated by Ira Reiner when he became Controller. However, his replacement, Rick Tuttle, is part of the network that has led to the election of numerous Jews in significant positions.

The Black gains during the Jewish takeoff stage continued, but not at the previous pace. Between January 1968 and January 1972 there was no increase in the number of Blacks holding significant positions. In July 1969, Kenny Washington was one of the original seven to win a position in the recently constituted LACCD Board of Trustees. There was no increase, however, because of the defeat of Black School Board member James Jones by Donald Newman during the same election. Thus, by January 1970, Black representation in significant positions remained at nine. By January 1973, there would be an increase of two. With the election of Yvonne Burke to Congress, Julian Dixon replaced her in the Assembly. Frank Holoman also won an Assembly position. Holoman defeated a one-term incumbent for a position previously held by the then Speaker Jesse Unruh. By January 1974, the Black total increased by one to a total of 12. This 12th position was significant; Tom Bradley vacated his Council position for Mayor of Los Angeles--the top elective post of the 100. David Cunningham replaced him in

the Council. By January 1975, the total remained at 12, with some personnel changes taking place: Mervyn Dymally was elected to the Lt. Governor's position--not one of the 100 significant positions of Los Angeles County, but definitely a higher office. Nate Holden was elected to the State Senate. He was not replacing Dymally, but gaining a newly created Black district by the 1974 reapportionment. Dymally's State Senate position was yet to be filled. Assemblyman Holoman ran against Holden, Curtis Tucker filled his vacated Assembly position. Though Black gains began to increase, it was not at the same rate as in the previous stage. Nonetheless, by January 1975, the Black Community of Los Angeles not only held 12 significant positions in the County, but two of the most significant positions in the State of California--Mayor of Los Angeles and Lt. Governor.

Mervyn Dymally's replacement in the State Senate was Assemblyman William Greene, whose Assembly position was filled by Teresa Hughes. There were further changes throughout the 1975 as well. Gwen Moore replaced the retired Kenny Washington on the College Board. Robert Farrell replaced Billy Mills on the Council when Mills took a position on the Superior Court. Finally, Diane Watson restored Black representation on the School Board. The gains in 1975 brought the total of Blacks holding significant positions to 14 by January 1976. This total would remain the same for the next four years, though there were some personnel changes. In December 1976, Leon Ralph retired and was replaced in the Assembly by Maxine Waters. In 1978, Congresswoman Yvonne Burke ran for California Attorney General against then State Senator George Deukmejian and lost. Assemblyman Julian Dixon replaced her in Congress and was replaced in the Assembly by Gwen Moore. Marguerite Archie then filled Moore's vacated College Board position. Further, Nate Holden had vacated his State Senate position to run for Burke's vacant congressional position, but was defeated by Dixon. Diane Watson filled the vacant State Senate position. Finally, Fr. Lewis Boehler was appointed to replace Watson on the School Board. These musical chairs did not produce one additional Black position. In all, seven individuals found themselves with a new or no position by January 1979.

In July 1979, Rita Walters was elected to the School Board. She did not actually replace Boehler, who retired after a brief stay. The School Board was shifting from at-large to district elections for the first time. Unless there was a malapportionment, this would guarantee Black representation on the School Board. Blacks had earlier lacked representation from July 1969 to July 1975 in the at-large system. The last year of this second stage of increased minority representation also saw the return of Yvonne Burke. She was appointed to the County Board of Supervisors by Governor Brown to fill a vacancy. She was the first Black and woman to hold a Supervisor's position in Los Angeles. She had also been the first woman from Los Angeles County to hold a congressional position. The total thus increased to 15 Blacks holding significant positions by January 1980.

There were 21 cases of individual Blacks gaining positions that they had not previously held; 14 in minority districts, nine in recently reapportioned districts, 19 in a vacant position, 14 previously held by Blacks. All positions gained by Blacks would continue to be held by Blacks at the end of the second stage. Thus, the only setbacks were at the individual level, not for the Black community as a whole.

Unlike the Jewish and Black communities, which mainly saw gains in representation, the Latino community experienced both gains and losses in this second stage, beginning with the election of Alex Garcia to the Assembly. This was followed by the election of J. William Orozco to the College Board in July 1969. By January 1970, Latinos held five significant positions. The election of Richard Alatorre and Joseph Montoya to the Assembly in 1972 increased Latino representation to seven positions by January 1973. In 1974, Alex Garcia moved to the State Senate and Art Torres filled the vacated Assembly position. By January

1975, Latinos holding significant positions peaked at eight. It remained at eight until July 1977 with the retirement of Charles Navarro from the City Controller's position. In 1978, Montoya moved to the State Senate; his Assembly position was not captured by a Latino. In 1979, J. William Orozco was defeated in his reelection bid for the College Board and Juliam Nava retired from his School Board position. The number of Latinos holding significant positions was down to five by January 1980.

While Latinos actually gained five positions during this stage, the net gain was only two. The Latino community was unable to replace retiring or advancing office holders. Only Orozco's at-large College Board position was actually lost by the defeat of an incumbent. Montoya's Assembly position was not held when he advanced to the State Senate. There was an inherent difficulty in holding City Controller Navarro's position, which was at-large. Nava's position, also at large when he held it, should have been preserved. Nava's retirement was a result of the School Board shifting to district elections. While Blacks maintained and actually secured representation from this, it had the reverse effect for Latinos. A non-Latino was able to win in the supposedly Latino district. Thus, the eight positions held by Latinos at their peak may have been partly artificial, with three of those positions being at-large in non-Latino districts.

There were seven cases of individual Latinos gaining positions which they had not previously held: six in minority districts, three in recently reapportioned districts, six in vacant positions, and one previously held by a Latino. Four would continue to be held by Latinos at the end of the second stage.

Of the 52 cases where a minority individual gained a position he or she had not previously held, 41 were a recently reapportioned district, a vacant position, or both. Of the 11 which were neither, eight were Jewish. Of the 52 cases, 28 were in minority districts. Of the 24 which were not, 16 were Jewish. Thus, a new pattern begins to emerge. Though in general minorities are still dependent on recently reapportioned or vacant positions in minority districts, this is increasingly not the case for Jews. The 1970s is the Jewish decade, because they are not bound to minority districts that are vacant or recently reapportioned.

Latino Takeoff. 1980-1986

The number of significant positions held by Latinos, Blacks and Jews in the 1980s would increase by nine, from 42 to 51. Of these nine, six would be gained by Latinos and three by Jews. While the positions gained by Latinos are only three more than Jews, it more than doubled Latino representation, moving it from five to 11. Of the three stages of increased minority representation, the Latino takeoff stage has produced the least number of total positions gained by the three groups and by the lead group. However, as of 1986, it is not clear whether this stage has peaked. It is likely that this stage will continue into the mid-1990s.

The third stage began with the election of Marty Martinez, a Monterey Park Councilman, to the Assembly in 1980. He defeated an incumbent, Jack Fenton, who had initially defeated a Latino. This brought the number of Latinos from Los Angeles County in the Assembly to three. The big year for Latinos was 1982. Because it was a reapportionment year, numerous opportunities would be available. For the first time, Latinos were able to take advantage of these opportunities. Due to its population growth, California was apportioned two additional congressional districts. With Latino Richard Alatorre, the head of the Assembly Committee with the task of drawing the new district, the Latino community was assured of at least one more congressional position. As it turned out, both Marty Martinez and Esteban Torres joined Roybal in Congress. Martinez's vacated Assembly position was gained by Montebello School

Board member Charles Calderon. Also in 1982, Assemblyman Art Torres challenged incumbent state Senator Alex Garcia in a bitter primary battle and won. Torres' vacant Assembly position itself produced a bitter battle. Gloria Molina, the first Latina in the California State Legislature and the first to hold a significant elective position in Los Angeles County, won it. The net gain from all of this was only two positions. However, positions that had been vacated by Latinos were maintained. This was something Latinos were unable to do in the previous two stages.

Latinos holding significant positions increased to nine with the election of Larry Gonzales to the School Board. He defeated an incumbent, which Latinos were unable to do four years earlier. In 1985, a second Latina was to hold a significant position: Leticia Quesada was appointed to the College Board to fill a vacancy. Also in 1985, Richard Alatorre left the Assembly for the Los Angeles City Council. After 23 years and numerous attempts, Latino representation was finally restored. Alatorre's Assembly position would be filled by Richard Polanco, bringing the total number of Latinos holding significant positions to 11.

There were ten Latino individuals who gained positions they had not previously held: nine were in minority districts; six were in recently reapportioned districts; seven were in vacant positions; and Latinos previously held four.

For Blacks, the third stage of increased minority representation was less fruitful than the previous two. It began in 1980, with the return of Mervyn Dymally, who gained the third Black congressional position. Dymally had been defeated for reelection as Lt. Governor in 1978. There was no increase, however, because Yvonne Burke was defeated in her attempt to keep the supervisorial position to which she had been appointed. It was not a Black district.

For the next five years there would be no Black gains or losses. All 15 Black incumbents would continue to win reelection. Every position, except Mayor Bradley's and Marguerite Archie-Hudson's at large College Board position, are in districts where Blacks would be expected to replace incumbents. Thus, it appears that Black representation has peaked at 15. There is a 16th possibility in the form of an Assembly position. Edward Waters, son of Assemblywoman Maxine Waters, won the Democratic nomination in a heavily Democratic, though not Black, district.

For Jews, the third stage began with the gain of a third congressional position by Bobbi Fiedler. Tom Bartman filled her School Board position. Richard Katz became the fifth Jewish Assemblyman from Los Angeles County. These two gains were offset with the defeat of Jack Fenton and Baxter Ward. In 1981, Ira Reiner moved to his third significant position when he replaced fellow Jew Burt Pines as City Attorney. In July 1981, Howard Finn was elected to the City Council, Alan Gerschman to the School Board, and Lindsay Conner to the College Board. This increased Jewish significant positions to 25.

The 1982 reapportionment opportunities saw Howard Berman and Mel Levine leave the Assembly for Congress. Neither of their two Assembly positions would immediately be filled by a Jew. In 1982, Herschel Rosenthal replaced Alan Sieroty upon the latter's retirement from the Senate. Burt Margolin would fill Rosenthal's vacant Assembly position. All this movement did not lead to an increase in Jewish significant positions. In 1983, Jackie Goldberg's election to the School Board increased the Jewish total to 26. In 1984, Ira Reiner would capture his fourth significant position, vacating the City Attorney position for District Attorney. In 1985, Tom Bartman retired from the School Board, decreasing the total to 25. However, he would be appointed to the School Board to fill a vacancy in 1986. Also in 1986, Terry Friedman would win the Democratic nomination to gain Howard Berman's old Assembly seat; Congresswoman Bobbie Fiedler would vacate her position in a run for the U.S. Senate Republican nomination; and Howard Finn's Council position would be lost with his death.

There were 14 Jewish individuals who, between 1980 and 1986, gained positions they had not previously held: three were in minority districts; seven were recently reapportioned; ten were in a vacant position; and a Jewish representative had previously held four.

Of the 25 cases of Latinos, Blacks or Jews who gained a position between 1980 and 1986 not previously held, 21 were in a recently reapportioned district, a vacant position, or both. Of the four that were not, two were Jews, one Latino, and one Black. Of the 25, 14 were in minority districts. Of the 11 which were not, all were Jewish. Thus, minorities are still dependent on reapportionment and vacant positions in the 1980s. Unlike the previous stage, this is also the case for Jews. However, while Blacks and Latinos are still dependent on minority districts, Jews continue to win in non-Jewish and non-minority districts.

By September, 1986 there were 51 significant positions held by Latinos, Blacks or Jews. The top position of Major was held by Black Tom Bradley. At the county level, Supervisor Ed Edelman, District Attorney Ira Reiner, and Sheriff Sherman Block, all Jews, held positions. Los Angeles County's congressional delegation included five Jews: Henry Waxman, Anthony Bielson, Howard Berman, Mel Levine, and Bobbie Fiedler. This would decline to four with Fiedler running for the United States Senate nomination. There were three Latino Congressmen: Ed Roybal, Marty Martinez, and Esteban Torres. There were also three Blacks: Augustus Hawkins, Julian Dixon and Mervyn Dymally. In the State Senate each of the three groups held two positions: Jews Alan Robbins and Herschel Rosenthal, Blacks Bill Greene and Diane Watson, and Latinos Joseph Montoya and Art Torres. In the Assembly there were four Blacks: Curtis Tucker, Teresa Hughes, Gwen Moore, and Maxine Waters (with Edward Waters having won the Democratic nomination in the 54th); and three Latinos: Gloria Molina, Charles Calderon and Richard Polanco. In the City Council there were five Jews; Marvin Braude, Joel Wachs, Zev Yarozlavsky, Joy Picus, and Hal Berson (this is down one with the death of Howard Finn in August, 1986); three Blacks: Gilbert Lindsay, David Cunningham, and Robert Farrell; and one Latino, Richard Alatorre. On the School Board there were four Jews: Robert Weintraub, Tom Bartman, Alan Gershman, and Jackie Goldberg; one Black, Rita Walters; and one Latino, Larry Gonzales. On the College Board there were three Jews: Monroe Richman, Arthur Bronson and Lindsay Conner; one Black, Marguerite Archie-Hudson; and one Latina, Leticia Quesada.

Asians. 1960-1986

There should be mention of Asians elected to significant positions. Asians are an identifiable minority and have only been excluded from analysis due to their lack of success in gaining significant positions. As far as can be determined, Alfred Song, of Chinese background, was the first Asian to gain a significant position in Los Angeles County, when he was elected to the California Assembly in 1962. He had previously served on the Monterey Park City Council. In 1966, like many other Assemblymen, he vacated his position for the State Senate. In 1978, he was defeated in the Democratic primary for his fourth term in the Senate by Latino Assemblyman Joseph Montoya. In 1972, Paul Bannai, of Japanese ancestry, was elected to the Assembly, serving until 1980. Thus, for six years, 1972-78, there were two Asians holding a significant position.

At the local level, Tony Trias, of Pilipino ancestry, was appointed in 1980 to fill an unexpired term on the School Board. He was defeated for reelection in 1983. In 1985, Michael Woo, of Chinese ancestry and an aide to Senate majority leader Dave Roberti, was elected to the Los Angeles City Council. He became the first Asian to ever serve in that body. Between 1960 and 1986 only four Asians held significant positions. At no time did more than two hold positions simultaneously. Further, for five years, 1960 to late 1982, and 1983 to 1985, there was no Asian representation at all.

Women. 1960-1986

Women holding significant elective positions have increased from three in 1960 to 18 in 1986. As Figure 2 shows, most of this increase occurred during the 1970s, during which time they increased from four to 16. During the 1960s they actually decreased from three to one before increasing to four. In the 1980s, they initially lost a position, gained three by 1983, and lost one by 1986. This resulted in a net gain of one, from 16 to 17, for the 1980s.

One of the most interesting aspects of women elected to significant positions is the degree to which Blacks, Jews and Latinas have contributed to the success of women. Women from these three groups constitute the majority of women elected from late 1974 to the present. In other words, Anglo women as a group have not done too well in the elective arena of Los Angeles County.

Discussion

Why have Jews been so successful, Blacks somewhat successful, and Latinos not as successful in capturing positions of elective significance in Los Angeles County? This paper cannot answer this question; however, it does provide some suggestive leads. The inclusion of minorities has been structured by vacancies, reapportionment, and minority districts. But why do some minority groups take greater advantage of this than others? The ability of minorities to utilize these advantages is constrained by prior formation of the active stratum. Not only must the political geography be conducive for minority inclusion, but effective minority candidates and campaign activists must be available, too. Therefore, it is important to investigate the backgrounds and beliefs of those who are the eligibles and activists.

Apart from the question of how effective the various minorities-status groups have been in supporting and advancing political careers for their own spokesmen and leaders, it matters also whether their grooming and sponsorship has come from Republicans, Democrats, or from group coalitions of various kinds. Since notably different track records have characterized various groups of elective office-seekers in Los Angeles county in the years 1960 through 1985, further analysis of their selection as candidates and of the campaign events that highlighted each step in their political careers is needed to clarify, among other things, the relative significance of ethnic community support, on the one hand, and sponsorship by partisan leaders and resources, on the other.

Most of that analysis must await monographic treatment. Only certain suggestive leads can be examined here. Still, to explore some of the ways in which ethnic and partisan subcultures are interrelated, one presently available point of ingress is to examine the participation patterns and attitudes of Los Angeles party activists who have specific ethnic and religious affiliations. Using interview data with Democratic and Republican activists, gathered periodically since 1968, it is possible to compare the attitudes and participation levels of Blacks, Hispanics, Jews, Catholics, and Protestants under notably contrasting political conditions. Moreover, within each of these ethnic and religious categories it is possible to distinguish party organizational activists from those who have (also) sought and/or held elective public office.

To anticipate our findings, three significant contrasts can be observed--in income levels, ideological stance, and ethnic-religious affiliation. Overall, annual incomes are about \$7,000 higher for Republicans than Democrats. Other social characteristics vary more by ethnic and religious types regardless of party.

Ideologically, most Republicans call themselves conservatives; the rest say they are moderates. Most Democrats consider themselves liberals; and, again, the rest call themselves moderates. But, as we shall see, "moderate" means something

quite different in terms of issue preferences, when Republicans and Democrats use the term. Not only when we look at minority-sensitive issues, but also when questions of defense, environment, and inflation are raised, the minority activists in both parties are distinctive.

In Los Angeles, it has often been said that the rival major parties differ more in terms of religious composition than ethnicity. Only in a relatively small number of legislative districts do Blacks and Latinos respectively dominate the grassroots party machinery of both parties and also control non-partisan city politics in those locales. Otherwise, Jews appear to dominate the Democratic apparatuses in many districts of Los Angeles, while Protestants wield power disproportionately in local and district-level Republican units.

On some counts--certain policy questions, campaign tactics, and political beliefs--ethnic groups do register quite distinctively. Nevertheless, it is clear that on most counts the behavior and outlook of party activists do not vary systematically either along ethnic or religious lines. Rather, certain ideological, programmatic and stylistic hallmarks of Democratic and Republican Party life are present regardless of the ethnic or religious composition of the party's local organizational roster. Evidently, political subcultures can largely--though not entirely--override ethnic and religious socialization patterns, at least on the range of questions here to be examined. It is to such an analysis that we now turn.

UCLA Party Activist Project

Since 1968 the UCLA Party Activist Project has been studying those who serve on the Los Angeles county committees of the two major parties. We have not been studying what these committees do, but what kinds of people serve on them. Indeed, for our research purposes, the two major party county committees are simply legally-prescribed composite structures that are convenient grids for sampling equivalent rosters of Republican and Democratic party activists. However, a word about the political significance of the two county committees is necessary.

Whether the work of either party's county committee is important today or has been so in the past is a rather complicated question. The two major parties are not alike. Each in the past has developed a county-level organization that was influential in fundraising, candidate recruitment, and campaign coordination. Today, the county committee is at best a rather unwieldy unit, which many feel is too large and too faction-ridden to provide effective coordination for the various campaigns mounted throughout the county every two years. In practice, moreover, these campaigns are independently mounted by those directly involved at the district and locality levels of party life.

By law, all parts of Los Angeles County are represented on each party's county committee. Each of the (currently) 31 Assembly districts sends a delegation of seven, elected at primary time for two-year terms. In both parties, it is not uncommon for ten to 15 people-- many of them presidents or active figures in local party clubs--to compete for the county committee member positions. In a number of districts, rival slates recurrently are fielded by intraparty factions. Turnover is substantial; in 1978 and 1980, for example, approximately 40 percent of the incumbents who sought re-election were not successful--which is a higher attrition rate than most aspirants for state or national legislative office face.

For academically oriented research purposes, the county committees do provide an excellent sample frame. In 11 surveys since 1963, the UCLA project has used the rosters of the Republican and Democratic county committees as legally prescribed composite assemblies that are convenient grids for sampling equivalent sets of rival party activists. Not only does this sample frame guarantee geographic diversity, but it also reflects (with equivalent weight

built in for each party) the varied patterns of apathy, rivalry, and complacency to be found in different localities. In other words, politically sure territory, doubtful areas, and lost terrain are represented in each party's roster in due proportions.

Political Complexion

Our surveys show that under one-third in each party describe their home district as Republican territory, while nearly three-fifths say they live in Democratic terrain. Only about one-tenth consider their home district to be competitive ground.

As Table 1 discloses, Blacks and Latinos are much less likely than their fellow activists to think of their home districts as Republican terrain, and much more likely to report living in Democratic strongholds. When pre-1976 responses are contrasted with those made from 1976 on, there are signs that some activists in both groups are changing their minds; that is, they are slightly less likely to view their neighborhoods as sure territory for Democrats, either because they live in less segregated areas now, or because loyalty to the Democratic party is seen as having declined somewhat.

In Table 1 and all other tables in this paper, non-Black and non-Latino activists are grouped by religion. Of course it is not their religious beliefs that prompt us to make this classification. Just as growing up in a Black or Latino neighborhood probably shapes the outlook of those ethnic activists, so also it seems worthwhile to look for patterns of behavior and belief that reflect the secular and subcultural features of Jewish, Catholic and Protestant

Table 1. Ethnic Representation and Party Dominance in Los Angeles Assembly Districts.

	How Activists Characterize Their Home District			N
	Republican %	Competitive %	Democratic %	
Blacks	8	6	86	:100 198
Latinos	17	10	74	:100 155
Jews	28	10	62	:100 429
Catholics*	33	9	58	:100 417
Protestants*	37	14	49	:100 1290
All Respondents	30	12	58	:100 2966

*Anglo only

Table 2. How Party Activists Characterize the Ethnic Composition of Home District.

	Republicans				Democrats			
	Size of Ethnic Blocs				Size of Ethnic Blocs			
	Large %	Small %	None %	Cases	Large %	Small %	None %	Cases
Blacks	63	33	4	57	51	44	6	173
Latinos	45	55	0	46	50	45	5	119
Jews	25	58	17	45	28	52	20	361
Catholics*	28	55	17	224	28	57	15	197
Protestants*	28	58	14	1116	24	61	15	699
All Respondents	30	56	14	1488	30	56	14	1548

*Anglo only

Table 3. Ethnic Composition of Districts Where Ethnic and Religious Activists Work.

	Districts Considered		Districts Not Considered	
	Ethnic Enclaves %		Ethnic Enclaves %	
Blacks	56		44	: 100 230
Latinos	47		53	: 100 165
Jews	26		74	: 100 406
Catholics*	25		75	: 100 421
Protestants*	25		75	: 100 1815
All Respondents	26		74	: 100 3036

*Anglo only

life styles which are part of the early family and neighborhood socialization experiences of activists with such affiliations. The categories do not overlap; that is, Blacks and Latinos are not also included in the Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish subgroups.

Ethnic Enclaves

Only 14 percent of our informants say their home districts have no minority voter blocs. Certain Assembly districts (roughly one-fourth) are overwhelmingly Black or Latino in Los Angeles County, and delegations from these areas add quite a few Blacks and Latinos to each party's county committee. At the same time, it is rare for the makeup of a seven-person district delegation to reflect the presence of minorities proportionately. About 30 percent in each party say their legislative district includes large minority voter blocs. But much larger proportions of Black and Latino activists in both parties report that their home districts have such an ethnic character. However, not all minority-status party activists agree that their home district is an ethnic enclave. Table 2 summarizes the picture, as assessed by individual activists; Table 3 reports the ethnic character (as generally agreed) of the home districts in which activists work.

Asked to appraise the ethnic composition of their home district, about a third of the 3,000-plus party activists in our 1968-83 database said that it included large minority enclaves. For seven districts out of the 31 in Los Angeles County, our informants agreed to that description by better than two to one. Table 2 shows that large percentages of the Blacks in both parties (63% R, 51% D) considered the legislative district in which they were active to include a large minority community. Almost as segregated were the Latinos in both parties, nearly half of whom (45% R, 50% D) said that large minority blocs characterized their home district. No significant differences on this count seem to mark the response patterns of Jews, Catholics or Protestants among our activist-informants.

Using this as a basis for classifying localities, it can be said that in both parties, three-fourths of the activists worked in districts that were not generally considered by activists to have large minority voting blocs. During the years before 1976, about one-fifth in each party, during the earlier years, and more than a quarter in the years surveyed from 1976 on were active in districts not generally thought of as ethnic enclaves.

Of course, even within districts generally considered Black or Latino enclaves, some Republican and some Democratic activists disagreed with this appraisal. However, in both the early and later periods, a stable three-fourths of the activists in both parties who lived in such districts did agree with the prevailing judgment. Table 3 reports the distributions.

Age, Marital Status, Gender, Years of Residence

The two-party organizations in Los Angeles County both draw heavily upon middle-aged, middle-class men and women whose voluntary commitment to party work both during and between campaigns, is often both constant and great, although their ranks have thinned in recent years. In each party, more than half are married with dependent-age children. About three-fourths are men. On average, both committees are getting older. In the years before 1976, the average Republican was 47 and the typical Democrat was 44. Since 1976, the age of a typical worker has jumped three years in both parties.

On average, they have lived for more than 30 years in California and for more than 17 years at their current address. Los Angeles County for years has experienced a constant influx of newcomers, but the party activists of both parties--in ethnic enclaves as well as in more diversified neighborhoods--are long-time residents.

SES, Education, Income, and Occupation

Whatever their ethnic or religious community status, a clear majority of party activists in Los Angeles are comfortably well-off middle class citizens. Except for Blacks, Republicans enjoy middle to high incomes; except for Blacks, Democrats earn significantly less than their Republican counterparts of all types. But the average Black Republican activist earned \$25,000 a year while his Democratic counterpart earned \$32,000, which was not much different from the income of Protestant or Catholic Democrats. Something like the reverse was true of Republican Latinos, with a \$10,000 edge, and of Jewish Republicans, with a \$15,000 edge over their Democratic counterparts.

Both recently and in the earlier years, about two-fifths of our Republican activists compared with half of our Democrats are college graduates. In both periods, Democrats and Republicans are equally likely to have gone on to graduate or professional schools. In both parties a mix of executive and professional jobs predominate, with Republicans slightly less likely to be doctors or lawyers, and a bit more likely to hold executive posts. Few sales or clerical workers and even fewer blue-collar workers are active in either party.

Political Participation

For the most part, these men and women who make up the organizational cadres of the two major parties in Los Angeles County are volunteers. For ethnic minorities as well as majoritarian stock, more than half say they are very active in the grassroots clubs that exist in virtually every neighborhood. During campaign weeks, in all parts of the county, activists in both parties average about 17 hours a week of campaign effort. Moreover, as Table 5 shows, these activists have been constant for many years in their partisan work; 17 is the average number of years of active party participation.

Still, it should be noted that politics in Southern California is not entirely an unpaid hobby for the activists. About one-fourth of the Republicans acknowledge having held a paid government job at some time; a closer look shows this to be true for only 17 percent of the Jews but for 55 percent of the Blacks in organized Republican ranks. Only 33 percent of Democratic Blacks could match them, but otherwise about 30 percent of the Democratic activists reported having held paid governmental jobs.

Ethnic Composition of Rival Major Parties

Table 6 summarizes the composition of rival major party ranks in Los Angeles, by time period, in terms of the five ethnic/religious groups found in both parties. It further subdivides each of these groupings into those who

Table 4. Social Characteristics of Los Angeles Activists.

A. Life Cycle Characteristics of Ethnic and Religious Types, by Party:

	Age (Average)		Years in in Calif.		Years at Address		Women Married w Children			
	R. D.	D.	R. D.	D.	R. D.	D.	R. D.	D.		
Blacks	54	46	33	27	24	15	29	32	62	56
Latinos	44	45	35	33	17	18	20	28	60	74
Jews	43	42	31	29	12	14	26	26	33	51
Catholics*	44	44	31	31	15	16	30	20	52	49
Protestants*	50	48	35	32	18	17	29	28	59	51
All Respondents	49	45	34	30	17	17	29	27	57	53

*Anglo only

B. Socio-economic Status Characteristics of Ethnic Activists, by Party

	High Full Income		Exec/Prof.		SES		College (000's)		Occupation		Cases	
	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.
	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Blacks	56	45	40	43	25	32	36	52	63	184		
Latinos	58	21	33	21	36	26	50	39	52	124		
Jews	65	70	42	59	54	40	71	72	51	380		
Catholics*	58	51	41	41	41	33	68	68	245	212		
Protestants*	53	55	39	48	41	32	62	60	1203	742		
All Respondents	62	54	39	47	40	34	62	61	1614	1643		

*Anglo only

Table 5. Political Participation of Ethnic and Religious Activists.

	High Full		Very Active in		Ever		Active Hours/week		Local Party		Paid Cases	
	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.	R. D.
	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Blacks	25	19	21	20	59	71	55	33	63	184		
Latinos	12	15	17	22	64	51	31	33	52	124		
Jews	15	16	16	16	61	53	17	24	51	380		
Catholics*	14	17	17	17	53	49	28	35	245	212		
Protestants*	16	18	17	18	53	54	24	30	1203	742		
All Respondents	16	17	17	18	54	55	26	30	1614	1643		

*Anglo only

Table 6. Ethnic and Religious Composition of Party, by Time Period and Public Office Records.

	Republicans			Democrats			
	1968-74	1976-83	All	1968-74	1976-83	All	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Blacks	5.1	1.9	3.4	9.0	10.4	9.7	
Latinos	4.0	2.2	3.1	9.9	4.4	7.0	
Jews	2.4	4.7	3.6	24.5	25.6	25.1	
Catholics*	13.0	18.4	15.8	12.3	14.0	13.2	
Protestants*	75.5	72.9	74.1	43.3	45.6	45.0	
(*Anglo only)	(Cases:)	(791)	(837)	(1628)	(820)	(886)	(1706)

A: Among Those Who Never Sought or Held Public Office

	Republicans			Democrats		
	1968-74	1976-83	All	1968-74	1976-83	All
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Blacks	7.1	3.1	2.9	9.0	16.8	10.4
Latinos	3.0	2.6	2.7	9.9	5.6	6.6
Jews	2.0	5.7	3.9	24.5	23.7	26.5
Catholics*	16.8	25.1	16.8	12.3	15.1	11.9
Protestants*	71.1	63.4	73.8	43.3	38.8	44.6

(*Anglo only) (Cases:) (482) (529) (1011) (420) (505) (925)

B: Among Those Who Have Sought or Held Public Office

	Republicans			Democrats		
	1968-74	1976-83	All	1968-74	1976-83	All
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Blacks	4.4	1.5	4.4	9.0	8.1	9.0
Latinos	4.4	2.0	3.7	9.9	4.0	7.6
Jews	2.5	4.2	3.1	24.5	26.3	23.4
Catholics*	11.8	15.9	14.1	12.3	13.6	14.7
Protesta	76.9	76.4	74.7	43.3	48.0	45.3
(*Anglo only) (Cases:)	(309)	(308)	(617)	(400)	(381)	(781)

have sought and/or held elective public office and those who have never done so, thus distinguishing what will be called "office seekers" from "organizational activists."

The ethnic makeup of the two major parties is sharply different, with only token representation of Blacks, Latinos and Jews in the Republican Party, where three-fourths are Protestant Republicans, while the Democratic ranks give significantly larger representation to Jews (26 percent) and Blacks (10 percent). Within each party the profiles of ethnic and religious representation are remarkably constant, whether one is comparing the early and later time periods or whether one is seeking to contrast party activists who have personally sought public office or never have done so. Among Republicans, the activists ranks are overwhelmingly Protestant, with (Anglo) Catholics the only substantial alternative. Only 3 or 4 percent are Blacks, Latinos or Jews.

Quite different is the makeup of the Democratic roster. Twice as many Blacks and Latinos and about the same proportion of Catholics as among Republicans are found. The (Anglo) Protestant ranks still predominate, although they are less than a majority, and Jews account for almost one in every four active Democrats.

Essentially, it is the absence of noteworthy differences in Table 6 that calls for comment. Apparently the ethnic-religious composition of the major party activist rosters in Los Angeles County is quite stable over several decades. Not only is this true of each party's office-seekers then and now, but it also holds for those party organizational personnel who have never sought public office.

Tables 7 and 8 probe the party office and public office patterns more closely, looking at the records of those ethnic activists in each party who have ever (a) held neighborhood club (seven in every 10) or district committee (four in every 10) party organization offices and (b) ever sought School Board, City Council, or legislative public office (true for about one in every eight, on all three counts).

In the Republican party, voluntary organizational officeholding at the neighborhood level is discernibly higher for Anglo Protestants and for Latinos than for the other types, while among Democrats only the Blacks are somewhat under-represented as club leaders.

The composition of party councils at the legislative district level shows discernibly high Latino figures and somewhat diminished representation for Blacks in both major parties. As much as anything, this is probably a structural consequence of the way Los Angeles party organizations have long been fashioned to fit Assembly-district boundaries.

As for public office seeking, Table 8 shows that--for School Board posts, City Council seats, and state legislative or congressional offices alike--both parties have in their activist ranks about one in every eight who have aspired to incumbency. In seeking office at the non-partisan School Board and municipal government levels, Catholic Democrats are distinctively strong, and Latinos

also, while Blacks and Jews in both parties are relatively less likely to try for such public posts.

When the two parties are contrasted in terms of the ethnic and religious affiliations of the legislative aspirants among their activist ranks, it is noteworthy that Blacks and Latinos are substantially more likely to have run under Republican auspices while Protestants and Catholics have proportionately better chances of Democratic sponsorship. On the one hand, this may reflect a willingness to sponsor Blacks and Latinos in certain "lost" districts where no Republican has much chance to win; on the other hand, it may reflect an unwillingness among Democrats to back minority candidates in the kind of ethnically diverse districts in which mainstream nominees have a good chance to win.

Patterns of Political Socialization

Table 9 discloses that, for our composite 1968 through 1983 samples of major party activists, one in every five Republicans and Democrats alike grew up in a family environment in which the parents were active in party affairs and/or active in community affairs. The rest were reared in less politicized

Table 7. Party Office Holding Records Among Ethnic and Religious Activists.

	Held Local		Held District		Would Accept		Party Office		Party Office		Key Party		Post Cases	
	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Blacks	59	60	34	26	48	68	56	166						
Latinos	72	78	52	47	45	53	50	120						
Jews	64	76	40	49	62	38	58	428						
Catholics*	60	76	34	43	40	39	257	225						
Protestants*	77	75	44	45	40	38	1207	767						
All Respondents	69	74	43	44	43	43	1628	1706						

*Anglo only

Table 8. Public Office Records Among Ethnic and Religious Activists

	Sought School-		Sought City		Sought Legis-		Board Office		Council Office		lative Office		Cases	
	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Blacks	7	10	7	10	28	6	56	166						
Latinos	16	18	16	18	24	10	50	120						
Jews	8	12	8	12	10	14	58	428						
Catholics*	11	25	11	25	11	17	257	225						
Protestants*	12	15	12	15	13	20	1207	767						
All Respondents	12	15	12	15	14	16	1628	1706						

*Anglo only

Table 9. Patterns of Political Socialization Among Ethnic and Religious Activists.

	Parents Active		Parents Active		Friends Active		Active	
	in Party Work	In Civic Work	in Org.	Politics	Cases			

R. D. R. D. R. D. R. D.
 % % % % % % % %

Blacks	35	28	51	28	50	39	56	166
Latinos	9	24	6	25	23	17	50	120
Jews	4	16	11	16	9	19	58	428
Catholics*	20	20	20	22	22	12	257	225
Protestants*	19	10	20	20	19	20	1207	767
All Respondents	19	20	21	21	20	21	1628	1706

*Anglo only

Table 10. Denial of the Efficacy of Manipulative Campaign Tactics.

In my home district, it is poor tactics to.

Personalize the choice

Emotionalize the choice

Countersmear

Negativize the choice

Stress self-interest

INDEX (Avg.)

Cases

	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.	R.	D.
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Blacks	48	43	48	49	46	36	67	43	41	44	50	45	56	166
Latinos	40	40	46	52	70	63	47	49	65	51	54	51	50	120
Jews	38	37	48	48	37	43	35	37	41	36	40	40	58	428
Catholics*	46	32	60	46	58	43	45	48	61	48	54	42	257	225
Protestants*	45	37	55	50	55	51	46	44	55	45	51	45	1207	767
All respondents	45	37	55	49	55	49	47	43	55	43	51	44	1628	1106

*Anglos only

homes. A similar pattern emerges when we look at the current friendship circles of party activists; again one in every five in both parties report having friends who are also active in politics. Party activists, in other words, typically live in a social context where most of their daily associates are not greatly interested in politics, much less actively participating in it. And most activists were reared in similar contexts of lukewarm political concern.

When the differences among ethnic and religious types are examined, however, some noteworthy points emerge: first, Catholics and Protestants in both parties reflect the 1 in 5 ratio closely; second, Blacks in both parties are most likely to have been reared in politicized homes; their, Republican Latinos and Jews tend to report apolitical parental examples, while their Democratic counterparts (especially Latinos) more frequently had activist parents; fourth, Republican Jews are notably unlikely to have politically active friends, while Blacks in both parties are just the opposite. Finally, although these differentials suggest interesting lines of inquiry, it should be noted that most party activists in all categories appear to have rather impoverished histories of political socialization and to spend the bulk of their daily lives with apathetic citizens.

Appraisals of Manipulatory Tactics

Regularly since 1968, the UCLA Party Activist Surveys have included a battery of questions asking informants to assess how well various controversial campaign tactics are likely to work, if directed at the local Republican and Democratic voters in their home legislative district.

Several points emerge when these data are examined. Table 10 reflects only the down side of the picture, by reporting what percentages of our activist informants deny that personalizing, negativizing, counter-smearing,

Table 11. Partisanship and Ideology Among Ethnic and Religious Activists

	Self-Styled Self Characterization of Ideology:											
	Strong Partisan Republicans				Democrats							
	Cases	Csv	Mod	Lib	Cases	Csv	Mod	Lib	Cases	Csv	Mod	Lib
	%	%	R.	D.	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Blacks	49	61	56	166	16	70	14:	56	7	33	60:	166
Latinos	57	49	50	120	63	37	0:	50	7	43	50:	120
Jews	45	45	58	428	52	40	8:	58	1	21	78:	428
Catholics*	47	50	257	225	63	36	1:	257	5	50	45:	225
Protestants*	52	48	1207	767	64	33	3:	1207	4	32	64:	767
All Respondents	51	49	1628	1706	62	35	3:	1628	4	33	63:	1706

*Anglos only

emotionalizing and stressing self-interest rather than community needs would be efficacious campaign tactics where they live. Among Republican activists, an average of 51 percent deny that such tactics would work, while a slightly lower level of tactical rejection (44 percent) comes from our Democratic informants. Jews in both parties are somewhat more likely to assess such tactics as effective ones. Latinos are especially negative about the use of counter smears as a way of meeting rival charges; Republican Blacks do not like the idea of stressing the rival's bad record instead of one's own performance and plans. Apart from these special points, the pattern that Table 10 discloses is remarkably alike for each party and for each manipulative tactic: namely, a substantial level of negative evaluations on count after count.

Partisanship and Ideology

Among party activists, one might suppose that feelings of strong partisanship would be widespread. Since 1968, the UCLA surveys have included a self-anchoring 8-point scale ranging from "strong" to "weak," and our informants have been asked to rate themselves. Perhaps surprisingly, only about half in each party rate themselves at the strongest end of the scale. As Table 11 shows, with minor variations the same proportions are found when a breakdown by ethnic and religious types is made. Jews are a little low (45 percent) and Democratic Blacks rather high (61 percent), but these levels may simply reflect vagaries in our samples. More surprisingly, perhaps, no substantial findings have come from a systematic effort to establish whether strength of partisanship among party activists works in ways analogous to its importance in guiding the political behavior and outlook of ordinary voters.

From our data, it does not significantly help to predict greater levels of participation or involvement, more substantial conformity to party norms, heightened acceptance of the modal political stands espoused by one's party, or any of a range of similar propositions keyed to the notion of partisanship in the voting behavior literature. Further analysis may cause revision of such a conclusion, but evidently once activated as a party worker, a different set of dynamics takes over, shaping how active one is, how zealous, how orthodox, how militant. Asking party activists to rate their own partisanship does not produce a variable that has great analytical power.

Table 12. Public Issue Preferences Among Ethnic and Religious Activists by Affiliation with Ideological Party Wing.

A. Want the federal government to do more about nuclear disarmament:

	Republican Conservatives	Republican Moderates**	Democratic Moderates**	Democratic Liberals
	%	%	%	%
Blacks	(8) 56	(47) 61	(59) 79	(90)
Latinos	24 (29)	25 (16)	51 (57)	78 (58)
Jews	19 (26)	29 (28)	74 (88)	89 (323)
Catholics*	15 (151)	35 (86)	56 (110)	88 (97)
All respondent	21 (820)	39 (516)	62 (429)	87 (776)

B. Want federal government to do more about controlling the cost of living:

	Republican Conservatives	Republican Moderates**	Democratic Moderates**	Democratic Liberals
	%	%	%	%
Blacks	-- (8)	79 (47)	80 (59)	88 (90)
Latinos	62 (29)	69 (16)	74 (57)	86 (55)
Jews	31 (26)	59 (28)	68 (88)	85 (323)
Catholics*	49 (151)	68 (86)	78 (110)	82 (97)
All respondents	44 (810)	58 (516)	75 (429)	86 (776)

C. Want federal government to do more about cutting defense spending:

	Republican Conservatives	Republican Moderates**	Democratic Moderates**	Democratic Liberals
	%	%	%	%
Blacks	(8) 52	(47) 56	(59) 65	(90)
Latinos	12 (29)	64 (16)	41 (57)	83 (58)
Jews	8 (26)	17 (28)	55 (88)	87 (323)
Catholics*	6 (151)	21 (86)	50 (110)	80 (97)
Protestants*	11 (596)	16 (339)	48 (191)	87 (208)
All respondents	10 (810)	23 (516)	48 (429)	83 (776)

D. Want federal government to do more to stop air and water pollution:

	Republican Conservatives	Republican Moderates**	Democratic Moderates**	Democratic Liberals
	%	%	%	%
Blacks	(8) 85	(47) 73	(59) 87	(90)
Latinos	44 (29)	72 (16)	71 (57)	90 (58)
Jews	42 (26)	50 (28)	82 (88)	93 (323)
Catholics*	29 (151)	60 (86)	74 (110)	87 (97)
Protestants*	37 (596)	44 (339)	73 (191)	92 (208)
All respondents	36 (810)	51 (516)	77 (429)	92 (776)

E. Want federal government to do more to expand opportunities for the poor:

Republican Republican Democratic Democratic
 Conservatives Moderates** Moderates** Liberals

% % % %

Blacks (8) 86 (47) 89 (59) 94 (90)
 Latinos 43 (29) 56 (16) 71 (57) 90 (58)
 Jews 19 (26) 48 (28) 67 (88) 92 (323)
 Catholics* 22 (151) 36 (86) 61 (110) 90 (97)
 Protestants* 18 (596) 31 (339) 66 (191) 87 (208)
 All respondents 20 (810) 40 (516) 69 (429) 91 (776)

F. Want federal government to do more to desegregate housing and schools:

Republican Republican Democratic Democratic
 Conservatives Moderates** Moderates** Liberals

Blacks (8) 77 (47) 80 (59) 87 (90)
 Latinos 17 (29) 47 (16) 45 (57) 67 (58)
 Jews 0 (26) 21 (28) 44 (88) 81 (323)
 Catholics* 6 (151) 19 (86) 26 (110) 66 (97)
 Protestants* 4 (596) 12 (339) 41 (191) 74 (208)
 All respondents 5 (810) 22 (516) 44 (429) 77 (776)

G. Want federal government not to do more to get tough with urban violence:

Republican Republican Democratic Democratic
 Conservatives Moderates** Moderates** Liberals

% % % %

Blacks (8) 22 (47) 30 (59) 34 (90)
 Latinos 10 (29) 19 (16) 34 (57) 55 (58)
 Jews 11 (26) 34 (28) 33 (88) 54 (323)
 Catholics* 24 (151) 24 (86) 34 (110) 52 (97)
 Protestants* 24 (596) 26 (339) 35 (191) 52 (208)
 All respondents 24 (810) 26 (516) 33 (429) 58 (776)

*Anglos only

**includes a few liberals/conservatives

Quite different is the consequence of asking party activists to characterize themselves ideologically. As Table 11 dramatically shows, Republicans call themselves "conservatives" rather than "moderates" by two to one margins, and rarely use the term "liberal"; Democrats choose "liberal" by a similar margin and avoid the word "conservative." Each party has two remarkably stable ideological wings.

Looking at the ethnic breakdown introduces a few wrinkles worth mentioning. Among Republicans, Jews are somewhat less likely to call themselves conservatives, and Blacks are decidedly unlikely to do so, but there are relatively few of either type in that party. Among Democrats, it is Anglo Catholics and Latinos that tend to call themselves moderates almost as frequently as liberals, while nearly 80 percent of the Jews choose the word "liberal" to describe themselves.

Issue Preferences

In each survey since 1968, the Los Angeles activists were asked what role the federal government should take in coping with various policy issues. On question after question, each ideological type--both the dominant wing and its moderate counterpart in each party--has a distinctive pattern of issue preferences that runs across foreign and domestic, defense, environmental, economic, and social welfare foci.

As the breakdowns in Table 12 for each of seven questions show, a fourfold spectrum of emphasis on the desirability of federal intervention persists. Overall the ideologically dominant wings in each party are almost as different from their party's moderate wing as one party's moderates are from the other party's moderates. The ideological cleavages within each party appear to be almost as marked as the gulf between their moderates.

The various issues summarized in Table 12 can be divided into a set of three minority-sensitive questions and a set of four mainstream problems. Specifically, the latter focus on nuclear disarmament, defense spending, environmental pollution, and the cost of living--issues that have ideological overtones not distinctively keyed to minority status. The minority-sensitive questions are somewhat different--opportunities for the poor, desegregation of schools and housing, and not trying to solve inner-city problems by getting tough with urban violence.

In analyzing responses, two points deserve special attention. First, in every case, the ideological slope as one moves from Republican-Conservative to Republican Moderate to Democratic-Moderate to Democratic-Liberal is discernible, although it is strongest for Jews and Protestants, somewhat foreshortened for Catholics and Latinos, and notably high and almost flat for Blacks. Second, in every case, including the Blacks, there is less enthusiasm for the leftist response on the minority-sensitive questions than on the mainstream issues.

CONCLUSIONS

This article has made an inventory of the elective success achieved in seeking significant offices by Blacks, Jews and Latinos during 25 years of Los Angeles history, from 1960 to 1985. Each minority in turn has had its takeoff decade, during which it was initially able to elect its own spokesmen and women from minority enclaves as open seats or newly created seats became available, and cumulatively each minority has then been able to retain those seats when incumbents left, by replacements from the same ethnic community. Only in the Jewish case, however, has the takeoff pattern also involved breaking out of the minority-enclave mold, and augmenting its ranks by winning seats where an elected representative is only incidentally seen as a minority-group spokesman or woman.

Turning to party activists, there is clear evidence that Blacks and Latinos work largely in districts that are minority enclaves, and which also are seen as Democratic strongholds. Regardless of ethnic or minority affiliation, activists in Los Angeles are middle-aged, middle class men and women, married and long settled in their communities. In both parties, they are well educated, often in professional or executive occupations, and with typical incomes of \$35,000 to \$45,000. But it is perhaps noteworthy that Democratic activists have typically been somewhat poorer--averaging \$7,000 a year less than their Republican counterparts.

From the ranks of Republican and Democratic party workers, about one in five have aspired to local School Board or City Council seats, or have run for the state legislature or Congress. Of our activist informants, substantial majorities in all ethnic and religious types have held voluntary party club offices, and about two in every five have served at the translocal district level of party affairs.

Only a minority of our informants (1 in 5) grew up in politically attuned family environments. For the rest, their parents were neither active in party politics nor in civic affairs. As for their current daily associates, the same ratio applies; only one in five say most of their friends are also active in politics. Again, the patterns disclosed for ethnic and religious minorities are not strikingly different from those of majority stockmen and women.

In compositional terms, it has often been noted that the rival parties in Los Angeles differ more along religious than ethnic lines. Only in the seven or eight Assembly districts out of 30 that are either largely Black or largely Latino do activists and elected officials with appropriate ethnic credentials dominate the grassroots party machinery of both parties and also control the nonpartisan municipal politics of the area.

Ideologically it is abundantly clear that each party has a dominant wing flanked by a smaller moderate wing. Across the party ideological space from Republican conservatives through moderates to Democratic liberals there is clear evidence of ideological consistency on a range of persistent domestic and foreign issues. Perhaps the most surprising pattern apparent is one that shows a slightly weaker ideological pattern on three "minority-sensitive" questions than is to be found on four "mainstream problems." This is true across all five ethnic and religious categories used in the present analysis.

On some counts, such as specific policy issues, campaign tactics or office-seeking focus, the different ethnic groups do register quite distinctively. Still, it is necessary to say that on most counts neither the behavior nor the outlook of party activists seem to vary systematically either along ethnic or religious lines. Rather, certain ideological, programmatic and stylistic hallmarks of Republican and Democratic Party life are present. As noted earlier, evidently political subcultures can largely override ethnic and religious socialization patterns, at least on the range of questions reviewed here.

Requests for ordering copies of this paper should be submitted to:

Working Papers
Institute for Social Science Research
UCLA
Box 951484
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1484

or email: issr@issr.ucla.edu