

# American Enterprise Institute

*The Project on Fair Representation*

**Edward Blum**  
Visiting Fellow  
American Enterprise Institute  
1150 Seventeenth St. NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.862.5800

## **Executive summary of the Bullock-Gaddie expert report on California**

**By Edward Blum**

California is only partially subject to the preclearance requirement of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Two counties, Monterey and Yuba, became subject to preclearance following the adoption of the 1970 amendments to the legislation. This first extension of the original Voting Rights Act introduced a second trigger which covered two California counties because they had a test or device as a prerequisite to voting and fewer than half of the voting age citizens had either registered or turned out to vote in the 1968 presidential election.

The 1975 extension of the Voting Rights Act included a third trigger mechanism and this caught three California counties, one of which, Yuba, was already subject as a result of the 1970 extension of the legislation. The 1975 standards broadened the definition of a test or device as a prerequisite to voting to include the availability of election materials in languages other than English. Kings, Merced and Yuba counties came under the provisions of the 1975 act because more than five percent of their voting-age citizens belonged to a single language minority group as of November 1, 1972.

Minority success at the polls has grown steadily since 1972. The four covered counties are represented by four state senate and five state assembly districts. Yuba County is wholly contained in state Senate District 2 (12 percent Hispanic population) and Assembly District 3 (8.4 percent Hispanic population, 4.7 percent Hispanic registration) neither of which elects Hispanic legislators. Merced County is wholly in Senate District 12 (49 percent Hispanic -- the district also takes in part of Monterey County) and Assembly district 17 (39.4 percent Hispanic population, 27.11 percent Hispanic registration); neither of which elect Latino representatives. Kings County is entirely within Senate District 16 (63.2 percent Hispanic) represented by Dean Florez, and Assembly District 30 (55.7 percent Hispanic population, 39.9 percent Hispanic registration) which elects Nicole Parra. Monterey County is divided between two Senate districts: 12, noted above, and 15, which is 24.4 percent Hispanic by population and elects a Latino Republican, Abel Maldonado. Monterey is also part of two Assembly districts. Assembly District 27 (15.6 percent Hispanic population, 8.4 percent Hispanic registration) elects an Anglo while District 28 (54.1 percent Hispanic population, 37.7 percent Hispanic registration) elects Simon Salinas. Two of four Section 5 counties are currently in districts that send Latinos to the state Senate and Assembly.

# An Assessment of Voting Rights Progress in California

Prepared for the Project on Fair Representation  
American Enterprise Institute

Charles S. Bullock III  
Richard B. Russell Professor of Political Science  
Department of Political Science  
The University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602

Ronald Keith Gaddie  
Professor of Political Science  
Department of Political Science  
The University of Oklahoma  
Norman, OK 73019

## *An Assessment of Voting Rights Progress in California*

The Golden State is one of those only partially subject to the preclearance requirement of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Two counties (Monterey and Yuba) became subject to preclearance following the adoption of the 1970 amendments to the legislation. This first extension of the original Voting Rights Act introduced a second trigger which covered two California counties because they had a test or device as a prerequisite to voting and fewer than half of the voting age citizens had either registered or turned out to vote in the 1968 presidential election.

The 1975 version of the Voting Rights Act included a third trigger mechanism and this caught three California counties. One of these, Yuba, was already subject to preclearance as a result of the 1970 version of the legislation. The 1975 standards broadened the definition of a test or device as a prerequisite to voting to include the availability of election materials in languages other than English. Kings, Merced and Yuba counties came under the provisions of the 1975 act because more than five percent of their voting-age citizens belonged to a single language minority group as of November 1, 1972. Moreover, the registration and election materials in the counties were printed only in English and fewer than half of the voting-age citizens had registered or voted in the 1972 presidential election.

The four California counties subject to preclearance contain only a small fraction of California's population. At the time of the 1970 census, the largest of the four, Monterey, had a quarter of a million residents. The population of Merced was slightly above 100,000 while Kings' population was 64,610 and Yuba had the smallest population, 44,736. The 2000 Census showed substantial growth in each county with their populations being: Merced 210,554; Monterey 401,762; Kings, 129,461; Yuba, 60,219. Even with the growth experienced by these four counties, as of 2000 they accounted for less than 2.5 percent of California's population.

The 2000 census showed two of the four California counties subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act to have fewer than 100,000 citizens of voting age. The largest of these, Monterey had 217,069 voting age citizens while Merced had almost 110,000 voting age citizens. At the other extreme, Yuba County had only 37,332 voting age citizens and Kings County had almost 80,000 voting age citizens.

As has become true for the state, in three counties, Anglos comprised less than half of the total population. In Monterey, almost 47 percent of the total population was Latino. Latinos also constituted approximately 45 percent of the population in Merced and 44 percent in Kings County. Only in Yuba County did Anglos make up most of the population with Latinos accounting for only approximately one in six residents. Asian-Americans, another group protected by Section 5 of the 1975 Voting Rights Act made up less than ten percent of the population in any of the four counties. The numbers of American Indians and Alaska natives are even smaller in each county. African Americans accounted for less than ten percent of the population in any of the four counties and in three of the counties were less than five percent of the residents.

## Minority Registration and Turnout

California does not maintain registration or turnout records by race or ethnicity. However the U.S. Bureau of the Census conducts large surveys after each general election and beginning with 1980 these data provide estimates of registration and turnout by ethnicity for each state. The information on registration and turnout are self-reported and consequently tend to over-report the actual levels of political involvement. The Census Bureau figures, while probably inflating estimates of participation, provide the best available data on California political activity and can be used for comparative purposes across time and across states on the assumption that the inflation is of similar magnitude across time and space. Moreover, these surveys were the basis for the kinds of estimates that the Census Bureau used in determining whether registration or turnout rates for jurisdictions were so low as to make them subject to the trigger mechanisms included in the 1965, 1970 and 1975 Voting Rights Act.

Table 1 provides the Census Bureau estimates for registration in California from 1980 through 2004 for Latinos, African Americans and whites. Figures are not provided for individual counties and therefore only the state-level figures are available. We can only assume that the patterns for the state are similar in the counties subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The share of the California Latino voting age population that reported registering shows little fluctuation between 1980 and 2004. The pattern in Table 1 shows a slight decline from approximately 30 percent registration down to approximately 25 percent registrants from 1988 through 1994 and then a gradual return to approximately 30 percent reporting being registered since 2000. Over the last quarter of a century, the share of the Latino age-eligible population reporting being registered varies between 24.4 percent in 1988 and 30.9 percent in 1984.

(See Table 1)

White registration rates declined over the last two decades. After peaking at 64.1 percent in 1984, the figures drift downward, bottoming out at 51.8 percent in 2002 before rebounding to 56.4 percent in 2004. These figures for the most recent presidential election are more than five percentage points below the registration rate in 1980. The registration of only 51.8 percent of whites in 2002 is more than eight percentage points lower than in the first mid-term election in the time series. One of the factors that impact the figures for whites is that they include most of the Spanish-surname population of California. While it is now possible to separate non-Hispanic whites from other whites, that separation is reported by the Census Bureau only beginning in 1998. Therefore in order to maintain comparability throughout the time period, figures in Table 1 include white Latinos along with Anglos.

Figures for black registration show a range from 53.3 percent in 2002 to almost 70 percent in 1988. The figure for 2002 is an outlier since at least 60 percent of the African American voting-age population reports being registered in other years. Since the low 2002 percentage is bracketed by much higher figures, it would not be surprising if the

53.3 percent resulted from a bad sample. In presidential election years, from 61.5 to 69.5 percent of African-American adults report having registered. The 67.9 percent of the African-American adult population registered in 2004 is the second highest figure for the last quarter century. Beginning with 1990, mid-term figures are typically a few percentage points lower than in the adjacent presidential years.

After the first year in the time series, a larger proportion of California's black than white population reported registering to vote. The greatest disparity comes in the most recent election when 67.9 percent of the African Americans but only 56.4 percent of the whites had registered.

At the bottom of Table 1 are national registration figures. A comparison of the Latino figures in the two halves of the table show that Latinos in California register at lower rates than in the nation as a whole. For the first four presidential elections in Table 1, the registration rate for Latinos nationwide runs approximately 10 percentage points higher than in California. In the three most recent presidential elections, the disparity has narrowed and is only four percentage points in 2004. The difference in mid-term elections tends to be smaller than in the earlier presidential elections with the least difference occurring in 2002. For most mid-term elections, the rate of Latino registration nationwide is about six percentage points greater than in California; but in 2002, the difference drops to 3.6 points.

Part of the explanation for disparities observed between national figures and those for California is the Golden State's location along the border with Mexico. Since the figures reported here are for all voting age residents and do not exclude non-citizens, a state in which the non-citizen population is larger will almost certainly have a smaller share of its Hispanic population on the registration rolls. Controlling for the presence of non-citizens and calculating the registration percentage as a share of Latino citizens narrows but does not eliminate the disparity between the registration rate nationwide and in California. Among citizens, 55.4 percent of the Latinos of voting age are estimated to have registered in California in 2004; the comparable national figure is 57.9 percent. With 55.4 percent of the Latino voting age citizens registered to vote, the figure is very close to the 56.4 percent for whites. However if the Latino citizen registration figures are compared with that for whites, excluding Hispanics a sizeable gap remains since in 2004, 70.9 percent of the non-Hispanic whites had registered.

African Americans generally register to vote at higher rates in California than nationwide. In only three election years (1984, 2000 and 2002) did a larger share of the black population nationwide than in California report being registered. The disparities are often small and in some years would be within the sampling error. The largest difference for the three years comes in 2002 when 58.5 percent of blacks nationally compared with 53.3 percent in California registered. On the other hand, in 1982 and 1988, the registration rates of blacks in California are at least five percentage points above the national figure. In the most recent election 3.6 percentage points more blacks reported being registered in California than nationally.

The share of the Latino voting-age population in California that reports having voted peaks in 1984 at 26.1 percent. The figures in Table 2 show a drop in the share of the Latino population that voted that bottoms out at 17.8 percent in 1990. Thereafter, the proportion of Latinos voters falls below 20 percent only in 2002 when it dips to 17.3 percent. In the two most recent presidential elections, a quarter of the Latino age-eligible population went to the polls. The only year in which a higher proportion of the Latinos voted came in the 1984 presidential election when 26.1 percent of the Latinos cast ballots.

(See Table 2)

The disparity between the turnout rates for Latinos and whites in California has declined. Through the 1996 election, the turnout rate for whites typically ran about 30 percentage points above the Latino figure and in 1992 it reached 35 percentage points. In the four most recent elections, the difference has dropped to as little as 19.2 percentage points in 2002 before rising to 25.7 points in 2004.

Black turnout follows the typical seesaw pattern, rising in presidential years before dipping two years later. From 1984 – 1996, black turnout in presidential years ran between 56.1 and 58.4 percent. In the first year, 1980, 53.7 percent of African Americans reported voting. The highest percentage of black participation comes in 2004, 61.3 percent. In mid-term elections, a declining share of blacks has voted. The high point for mid-term elections comes in 1982 when 53.3 percent of African Americans voted. The figure slides to 48.8 percent in 1986 and drifts on down to 42 percent in 1990. After stabilizing for three mid-term elections, the bottom is reached in 2002 when little more than a third of the black adults report voting.

African Americans have voted at higher rates than whites in each of the five most recent presidential elections. In the Bush-Kerry election, blacks turned out at a rate ten percentage points higher than whites. In mid-term elections, blacks voted at higher rates than whites in 1982 and 1986. African Americans and whites turned out at the same rate in 2002. Otherwise the white voting rates that for blacks in mid-terms.

The comparison of the upper with the lower halves of Table 2 shows that in most elections, Latinos have turned out at a higher rate nationwide than in California. The largest differences occur prior to 1994. In the 1988 and 1992 presidential elections the national Latino turnout rate is at least eight percentage points higher than in California. In the two most recent presidential elections, 2.4 - 3 percentage points more Latinos voted nationwide than in California. Only in 1994 and 1998 did slightly higher percentages of the California than the national Latino population go to the polls.

Once the figures are adjusted so that the denominator is the Hispanic citizen population, then the difference between participation rates in California and nationwide is essentially eliminated. In the 2004 presidential election, the turnout rate for Latino citizens was 46.9 percent in California compared with 47.2 percent nationwide. When Latino citizen participation rates are compared with those for non-Hispanic whites in California a gap of almost 18 percentage points remains. In 2004, 64.6 percent of the Anglo citizens voted

compared with less than half of the Latino citizens.

In all but two elections, California African Americans voted at higher rates than did blacks nationwide. The greatest difference came in 1982 when 53.3 percent of California's African Americans voted compared with 43 percent nationwide. Differences of at least six percentage points occurred in 1988, 1994 and 1996. In the most recent election, African Americans in California voted at a rate more than five percentage points above the national figure. The figure for black voting nationwide exceeded that in California in two of the three most recent elections. In 2000, the national figure is 1.5 percentage points above that for California while in 2002, national African-American participation was 39.7 percent compared with 36.5 percent in California.

In the four counties subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, in 2000 at least 61 percent of the age-eligible had registered with 74 percent of the eligible registering in Monterey. A second part of the trigger considers whether at least half of the age-eligible voted. The 2000 presidential election participation rates show that in none of the four counties did most of the age-eligible turnout. The 50 percent threshold comes closest to being reached in Monterey where 48.7 percent of the adult citizens cast ballots. In Kings and Yuba, turnout was only approximately 41 percent of the age eligible. A total of thirteen California counties had turnout rates below 50 percent. Kings and Yuba had the lowest rates of participation in the state.

OLS regression estimates of voter turnout in 2000 in the four Section 5 counties and the rest of the state reveal differences in Hispanic and Anglo voter turnout across the covered counties and in comparison to the rest of California. The technique, using tract-level data, produced no reliable turnout estimates for African-Americans in the covered counties, but indicated a 46.4 percent turnout rate among African-Americans in the rest of the state. Anglo white turnout was estimated at 66.1 percent in Merced County, 79.8 percent in Kings County, 67.4 percent in Yuba County, and 66.1 percent in Monterey County, compared to 60.8 percent Anglo turnout in the rest of the state. Hispanic turnout was estimated at 11.0 percent in Merced County, 29.8 percent in Kings County, 20.0 percent in Yuba County, and 16.1 percent in Monterey County, compared to 12.6 percent for the rest of California. These estimates are based on voting age population data and likely underestimate the rate of turnout among the citizen-eligible Hispanic population.

### **Election of Minority Officials**

#### *Minorities in Congress*

California has a very diverse congressional delegation. In the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, the delegation had among its 53 House members, six Latinos, four African Americans and two Asian Americans.

The six Latinos, including sisters Loretta and Linda Sanchez, all come from southern California. Three of the four African Americans also come from southern California while both of the Asian Americans come from the northern part of the state. None of the

minorities serving in the U.S. House come from any of the four counties covered by Section 5 of Voting Rights Act.

In addition to the above groups represented in the delegation, four of its members are of Portuguese descent.<sup>1</sup> All of these members represent parts of the agriculturally rich Central Valley and three of them came to Congress after 2002. Two of these members, Richard Pombo and David Munes, are Republicans while Dennis Cardoza and Jim Costa are Democrats. Cardoza represents much of Merced County while Costa has Kings County in his district. According to the 2000 census, the 20<sup>th</sup> district, which is represented by Costa, is 63 percent Hispanic origin. The 18<sup>th</sup> represented by Cardoza and California's 21<sup>st</sup> District represented by Munes were each approximately 43 percent Hispanic origin at the time of the last census.

Of the six districts represented by Latinos, all are between 58 percent and 77 percent Hispanic origin. Lucille Roybal-Allard, who succeeded her father in the House in 1992, represents the most heavily Hispanic district (77 percent Hispanic origin).

Unlike the districts that have elected Latinos, all of which have populations that are predominantly of Hispanic origin, none of the four California districts currently represented by an African American is even plurality black. The heaviest black concentration is found in Maxine Waters' 35<sup>th</sup> District that was 34 percent black at the time of the 2000 census. Barbara Lee's 9<sup>th</sup> District and Juanita Millender-McDonald's 37<sup>th</sup> District were each approximately a quarter black. In the Waters' and Millender-McDonald districts, a plurality of the population is of Hispanic origin with Hispanics accounting for 47 percent of the population of the 35<sup>th</sup> District.

Continued population shifts, turnover of personnel and perhaps the next redistricting may result in Latinos winning additional districts both in the Los Angeles area and in the Central Valley.

### *State Legislative Representation*

The first modern Latinos elected to the California legislature were Phil Soto and John Moreno, both elected in 1962. Soto represented La Puente for four years, while Moreno spent two years representing Los Angeles. Following a hiatus of Latino representation, Alex Garcia (D-Los Angeles) was elected to the Assembly in 1968 and was joined in 1970 by Peter Chacon (D-San Diego).<sup>2</sup> In 1972, three more Latinos were elected to the State Assembly: Joseph Montoya, Ray Gonzales, and Richard Alatorre. Aware of their unified strength, the five Latinos serving formed the Chicano Legislative Caucus in 1973. As indicated in Table 3, Latino state legislators increased from just seven members in the early 1980s to 27 of 120 members (22.5 percent in each chamber) by 2003. While 2004

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael Barone with Richard E. Cohen, *The Almanac of American Politics, 2006* (Washington, DC: National Journal, 2005), p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> [http://democrats.assembly.ca.gov/LatinoCaucus/history\\_purpose.htm](http://democrats.assembly.ca.gov/LatinoCaucus/history_purpose.htm)

Census Bureau estimates place the share of the state's voting age population that is Hispanic at 31.2 percent, the share of the citizen voting age population is much smaller – 21.4 percent. Thus the share of Hispanic state legislators slightly exceeds the Hispanic share of citizen adults.

(See Table 3)

Latino power was evident prior to the 21<sup>st</sup> century, however, as the Latino caucus wielded substantial power within the legislative Democratic Party. In 1996, the Assembly named Cruz Bustamante the first Latino Speaker, and Antonio Villaraigosa became the first Latino Majority Floor Leader. In the Senate, Charles Calderon became the first Latino Senate Majority Leader. Joe Baca had previously served as the first Latino Assembly Speaker pro tempore in 1995. By 1998, Latino members gained leadership positions in both chambers, as Antonio Villaraigosa was elected Speaker of the Assembly, and Richard G. Polanco, became Majority Leader of the Senate. Of the twenty-four Latino senators and assemblymembers in 2005, nineteen either chair a standing committee or hold a major leadership position, including Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez.

According to the Democratic Latino Caucus, Hispanic interests have had a strong advocate in the legislature through Latino legislators:

Many point to Assembly Member Alatorre's leadership in formulating the 1980 reapportionment plan as a turning point for the Chicano Caucus. Alatorre ensured that the reapportionment plan protected seats for Democratic majorities in Congress, the State Senate, and the State Assembly, and laid the groundwork to ensure that legislative seats were drawn to increase Latino representation. Earlier Supreme Court decisions based on the Voting Rights Act of 1965 ensured that several legislative districts were drawn to increase Latino representation. Also of great importance in this decade was the election of Gloria Molina to the State Assembly in 1982, the first Latina elected to the State Legislature.<sup>3</sup>

During the 2001 redistricting, the Latino Caucus independently hired professional consultants

to monitor and evaluate the reapportionment plan developed by the Legislature to ensure that the plan reflects the growing Latino population in California. Caucus Members met with consultants to review the individual characteristics of each district. The Latino Caucus effectively utilized this information to assist members in determining the outcome of the final reapportionment plan that was adopted by the Legislature.<sup>4</sup>

A consequence of these efforts is that, of the 57 legislative Hispanic Democrats who served in the Assembly or Senate since 1962, 43 were initially elected subsequent to the 1991 redistricting round (see Table 4).

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

(See Table 4)

The four covered counties are represented by four state senate and five state assembly districts. Yuba County is wholly contained in state Senate District 2 (12 percent Hispanic population) and Assembly District 3 (8.4 percent Hispanic population, 4.7 percent Hispanic registration) neither of which elects Hispanic legislators. Merced County is wholly in Senate District 12 (49 percent Hispanic -- the district also takes in part of Monterey County) and Assembly district 17 (39.4 percent Hispanic population, 27.11 percent Hispanic registration); neither of which elect Latino representatives. Kings County is entirely within Senate District 16 (63.2 percent Hispanic) represented by Dean Florez, and Assembly District 30 (55.7 percent Hispanic population, 39.9 percent Hispanic registration) which elects Nicole Parra. Monterey County is divided between two Senate districts: 12, noted above, and 15, which is 24.4 percent Hispanic by population and elects a Latino Republican, Abel Maldonado. Monterey is also part of two Assembly districts. Assembly District 27 (15.6 percent Hispanic population, 8.4 percent Hispanic registration) elects an Anglo while District 28 (54.1 percent Hispanic population, 37.7 percent Hispanic registration) elects Simon Salinas. Two of four Section 5 counties are currently in districts that send Latinos to the state Senate and Assembly.

#### *Local Hispanic Elected Officials*

The last twenty years have witnessed a dramatic increase in Latino representation, especially in municipal government. Table 5 reports that the number of Latinos elected in California increased from 460 in 1984 to 757 by 2000. Latinos holding city offices grew from 168 in 1984 to 308 by 2000, and Latino school board members increased from 222 to 330 by 2000 (down from a peak of 393 in 1992). County officials more than doubled from 8 to 19.

(See Table 5)

Current Latino elected officials in the Section 5 counties are not numerous. Merced and Monterey counties each have one Latino county supervisor (our of a total of five each). The assessor of Merced County is also Hispanic. These are the only minorities currently holding elective office in the four counties.

### **The Racial and Ethnic Structure of California Voting**

In the United States, there is a general racial and ethnic structure to the behavior of voters. Anglo whites are more prone to vote for Republicans than are African-Americans or Latinos. In California this division is observed, though the division does not result in the type of extreme division seen in some other Section 5 states. Most often in major elections California Anglos, Latinos, and African-Americans all express majority preferences for Democratic candidates.

Table 6 presents Voter News Service exit polls from 1992 through 2002. In nine of fourteen elections the Democratic candidate attracted at least a plurality of white voters along with solid majorities of Latinos and African-Americans. In two of the remaining instances the Republican candidate attracted only a plurality among whites. In two other contests the Republican nominee polled a narrow majority -- less than 52 percent -- of the white vote. The only Republican to receive landslide support from Anglos, Gov. Pete Wilson, got 58.7 percent of the white vote in 1994. According to exit polls, Latinos cast more than 70 percent of their votes for Democrats in all but three contests (US Senate 1994, President 2000 and Governor 2002), while African-American cohesion dipped below 80 percent Democratic just once (US House 1996).

(See Table 6)

Racial differences cropped up in the 2003 gubernatorial recall when more than 58 percent of the whites voted to remove Democrat Gray Davis, compared with just 27.9 percent of blacks and 43.1 percent of Hispanics (see Table 7). The exit poll data from the replacement election (held on the same ballot) showed 48 percent of Anglo voters preferred the Republican Arnold Schwarzenegger, 27.3 percent voted for Hispanic Democrat Cruz Bustamante, with the remaining 19.8 percent of the Anglo vote scattered. Black voters cast 53.6 percent of their ballots for Bustamante, 15.7 percent for Schwarzenegger, and 17.4 percent scattering, while over 13 percent did not cast a gubernatorial ballot. Hispanics cast 55.1 percent of ballots for Bustamante, 24.3 percent for Schwarzenegger, and 15.7 percent scattering, while fewer than 5 percent did not express a preference. The lower cohesion among Hispanics and African-Americans, prompted in part by the very large candidate field in the replacement election, contributed to Schwarzenegger's plurality victory.

(See Table 7)

Estimates of Anglo and Hispanic candidate preferences in the Section 5 counties as reported in Table 8 were made using 2000 election data collected by David Lublin and Steven Voss.<sup>5</sup> The presidential, congressional and state legislative contests are included in these returns. The four counties display three different ethnic voting patterns.

(See Table 8)

In Kings and Yuba counties Hispanic and Anglo voters had opposing preferences in all contests analyzed. Anglos preferred Republicans at all levels of office, while solid majorities of Hispanics supported Democrats for statewide and district legislative offices. The African-American population in these counties is too small to yield reliable estimates.

A second pattern emerges in Merced County where whites and Hispanics differ in the nationalized statewide contests for President and US Senate, with Hispanics

---

<sup>5</sup> David Lublin and D. Stephen Voss. 2001. "Federal Elections Project." American University, Washington, DC and the University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.

overwhelmingly favoring the Democrats and Anglos giving majorities of 66.4 percent and 53.5 percent to Republicans for President and the Senate respectively. In the US House and Assembly contests, more than 60 percent of the Anglos joined with a nearly unanimous Hispanic electorate in supporting the Democrats.

Monterey County displays a third pattern, and one more akin to the exit poll results in Table 6, with Anglos and Hispanics rallying behind the Democratic nominees in four of five contests. The sole exception, a state Senate election, saw 80 percent of Latinos voting Democratic while more than two-thirds of Anglos supported the Republican.

The bottom of Table 8 presents estimates for California exclusive of the four Section 5 counties. In all four sets of contests Democratic nominees polled overwhelming majorities among Latino and African-American voters. A plurality of Anglos joined in supporting Sen. Diane Feinstein's (D) reelection. In the presidential election a plurality of California Anglos backed George Bush. In elections to the US House and the California Assembly Anglo majorities cast GOP ballots.

The proportion of Anglos preferring Republicans in the two down-ticket was greater statewide than in Merced and Monterey Counties, but less than in Yuba. Fewer Anglos statewide than in Kings County voted Republican for Congress. In Assembly contests Anglo voters in Kings behaved much like those statewide. In every Section 5 county except Monterey whites gave more support to George Bush and to GOP Senate candidate Tom Campbell than they did statewide.

### **Conclusion**

The four California counties subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act contain only a tiny share of the Golden State's population. Because of the small proportion of California's population that lives in the four counties of interest, it is risky to make projections from statewide data to one of the counties or to the four as a collectivity. On the other hand, the information on participation for the four counties is often limited. Much of what appears in this report reflects statewide results that need not apply to the Section 5 counties.

As of 2000, most of the voting age population of these counties has registered; however in none did most adults vote. The Census Bureau estimates are that statewide 46.4 percent of all adults voted in the year of the Bush –Gore contest. The estimates from the Census Bureau can be adjusted to remove non-citizens and when that is done, the participation rate for citizen adults statewide rises to 57.9 percent. A comparable adjustment might lead to the conclusion that most citizen adults participated in the 2000 presidential election in the Section 5 counties.

Although California has large contingents of Latino and African-American members of Congress, state legislators and local officials, minorities hold few offices in the Section 5 counties.

The voting behavior in the Section 5 counties varies. In Monterey, Anglos tend to unite with Hispanics in supporting Democrats. In Merced, Latinos and Anglos vote Democratic down ticket but split along partisan lines in the 2000 presidential and US Senate elections. Kings and Yuba returns show Anglos consistently voting Republican while Hispanics are strong supporters of Democrats. The pattern of ethnic voting witnessed in Monterey comes closest to approximating the behavior statewide where in most recent high profile elections, the winning Democrats mobilized a broad coalition consisting of Latinos, African Americans and Anglos.

TABLE 1: REPORTED REGISTRATION BY RACE IN CALIFORNIA, 1980-2004

	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
CALIFORNIA													
Latino	27.0	29.2	30.9	26.9	24.4	25.7	25.4	24.9	28.7	27.9	29.5	29.0	30.2
White	62.1	60.3	64.1	59.6	60.7	57.0	60.5	58.4	58.9	54.3	54.8	51.8	56.4
Black	61.5	64.4	65.8	65.5	69.5	62.4	64.0	60.0	66.3	60.9	61.9	53.3	67.9
NATIONAL													
Latino	36.3	35.3	40.1	35.9	35.5	32.3	35.0	31.3	35.7	33.7	34.9	32.6	34.3
White	68.4	65.6	69.6	65.3	67.9	63.8	70.1	64.6	67.7	63.9	65.6	63.1	67.9
Black	60.0	59.1	66.3	64.0	64.5	58.8	63.9	58.5	63.5	60.2	63.6	58.5	64.3

Source: Various post-election reports of the U. S. Bureau of the Census

TABLE 2: REPORTED TURNOUT BY RACE IN CALIFORNIA, 1980-2004

	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004
CALIFORNIA													
Latino	22.8	22.4	26.1	19.8	19.4	17.8	20.9	20.6	22.6	21.4	24.5	17.3	25.6
White	55.9	51.1	58.2	47.3	53.4	44.8	55.9	49.1	51.1	43.0	48.7	36.5	51.3
Black	53.7	53.3	57.6	48.8	58.4	42.0	56.1	43.7	56.7	42.4	52.0	36.5	61.3
NATIONAL													
Latino	29.9	25.3	32.6	24.2	28.8	21.0	28.9	20.2	26.7	20.0	27.5	18.9	28.0
White	60.9	49.9	61.4	47.0	59.1	46.7	63.6	47.3	56.0	43.3	56.4	44.1	60.3
Black	50.5	43.0	55.8	43.2	51.5	39.2	54.0	37.1	50.6	39.6	53.5	39.7	56.1

Source: Various post-election reports of the U.S. Bureau of the Census

TABLE 3: LATINO STATE LEGISLATORS IN CALIFORNIA, 1973-2005

<b>Year</b>	<b>Senate</b>	<b>percent</b>	<b>House</b>	<b>percent</b>
1973	0	0.00	5	6.25
1985	3	7.50	4	5.00
1987	3	7.50	4	5.00
1989	3	7.50	4	5.00
1991	3	7.50	4	5.00
1993	3	7.50	9	11.25
1999	7	17.50	17	21.25
2003	9	22.50	18	22.50
2005	9	22.50	18	22.50

Source: Various volumes of *The National Directory of Latino Elected Officials* (Los Angeles: NALEO Educational Fund); <http://democrats.assembly.ca.gov/LatinoCaucus>.

TABLE 4: DEMOCRATIC, LATINO STATE LEGISLATORS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1962

**Latino Members of the Assembly, December 2005:**

Juan Arambula 2004 - Present  
 Joe Baca Jr. 2004 - Present  
 Rudy Bermúdez 2002 - Present  
 Ronald S. Calderón 1998 - Present  
 Ed Chavez 2000 - Present  
 Hector De La Torre 2004 - Present  
 Joe Coto 2004 - Present  
 Dario Frommer 2000 - Present  
 Cindy Montañez 2002 - Present  
 Gloria Negrete McLeod 2000 - Present  
 Pedro Nava 2004 - Present  
 Fabian Núñez 2002 - Present  
 Jenny Oropeza 2000 - Present  
 Nicole Parra 2002 - Present  
 Lori Saldaña 2004 - Present  
 Simón Salinas 2000 - Present  
 Alberto Torrico 2004 - Present  
 Juan Vargas 2000 - Present

**Latino Members of the Senate, December 2005:**

Richard Alarcón Senator 1998-present  
 Gil Cedillo Assembly, 1997-2002, Senator 2002-present  
 Denise Ducheny Assembly, 1994-2000, Senator 2002-present  
 Martha Escutia, Assembly, 1992-1998, Senator 1998-present  
 Liz Figueroa Assembly, 1994 - 1998, Senator 1998-present  
 Dean Florez Assembly, 1998 - 2002, Senator 2002-present  
 Deborah Ortiz Assembly, 1996-1998, Senator 1998-present  
 Gloria Romero Senator 2001-present  
 Nell Soto Senator 1998-present

**Previous Latino Members of the Legislature:**

Manny Diaz Assembly, 2000-2004  
 Marco Antonio Firebaugh Assembly, 1998 - 2004  
 Lou Correa Assembly, 1998-2004  
 Sarah Reyes Assembly, 1998-2004  
 Richard G. Polanco Assembly, 1986-1994, Senator 1994-2002  
 Thomas Calderón Assembly, 1998 - 2002  
 Tony Cardenas Assembly, 1996 - 2002  
 Sally Morales Havice Assembly, 1996 - 2002  
 Hilda Solis Assembly, 1993 - 1998  
 Martin Gallegos Assembly, 1994 - 2000  
 Antonio Villaraigosa Assembly, 1994 - 2000  
 Cruz M. Bustamante Assembly, 1993 - 1998  
 Joe Baca Assembly, 1992 to 1998, Senator 1998 - 1999  
 Louis Caldera Assembly, 1992 - 1997  
 Diane Martínez Assembly, 1992 - 1998  
 Grace Napolitano Assembly, 1992 - 1998  
 Xavier Becerra Assembly, 1990 - 1992  
 Lucille Roybal-Allard Assembly, 1987 - 1992  
 Chuck Calderón Assembly, 1982-1990, Senator 1990-1998  
 Gloria Molina Assembly, 1982 - 87  
 Matthew Martinez Assembly, 1980 - 1982  
 Ruben Ayala Senator 1974 - 1998  
 Art Torres Assembly, 1974 - 1982, Senator 1982 - 1994  
 Joseph Montoya Assembly, 1972-1978, Senator 1978-1990  
 Ray Gonzáles Assembly, 1972 - 1974  
 Richard Alatorre Assembly, 1972 - 1985  
 Peter Chacón Assembly, 1970 - 1992  
 Alex García Assembly, 1968-1974, Senator 1974-1982  
 John Moreno Assembly, 1962-1964  
 Phillip Soto Assembly, 1962-1966

Source: <http://democrats.assembly.ca.gov/LatinoCaucus>.

TABLE 5: NUMBER OF LATINO ELECTED OFFICIALS IN CALIFORNIA,  
SELECT YEARS BETWEEN 1984-2000

Year	Total	County	Municipal	School Board
1984	460	8	168	222
1986	466	7	154	251
1989	580	15	180	293
1991	617	13	173	349
1992	682	14	194	393
1999	762	20	296	338
2000	757	19	308	330

Source: Various volumes of *The National Directory of Latino Elected Officials* (Los Angeles: NALEO Educational Fund).

TABLE 6: RACE AND VOTE CHOICE IN CALIFORNIA ELECTIONS, EXIT POLLS, 1992-2002

<b>Year</b>	<b>Office</b>	<b>Race</b>	<b>Democrat</b>	<b>Republican</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>N</b>
2002	Governor	White	37.4	49.1	11.8	1455
		Black	89.3	4.5	5.6	178
		Hispanic	67.8	19.5	11.3	113
2002	US House	White	41.1	51.5	3.8	1434
		Black	89.6	6.4	1.7	173
		Hispanic	70.8	22.9	4.5	424
2000	President	White	48.3	47.2	4.3	933
		Black	88.2	10.8	0	102
		Hispanic	69	25.1	5.9	171
2000	Senate	White	50.1	45.3	4.6	896
		Black	88.8	10.2	1	98
		Hispanic	71.5	24.8	3.6	165
1998	Senate	White	54.4	42.4	3.1	417
		Black	91.3	8.7	0	23
		Hispanic	70.2	27.2	2.4	420
1998	Governor	White	57.1	40.2	2.6	420
		Black	87.5	12.5		24
		Hispanic	85.4	14.6		82
1998	US House	White	54.3	43.9	1.7	403
		Black	95.8	4.2	0	24
		Hispanic	77.2	19	3.8	79
1996	President	White	50.2	36.9	7.9	861
		Black	84.8	9.7	4.2	165
		Hispanic	76.8	16.2	5.1	198
1996	US House	White	52.9	44.4	2.6	799
		Black	78.3	21.1	0.7	152
		Hispanic	78.6	18.7	2.7	187

TABLE 6 (Continued)

<b>Year</b>	<b>Office</b>	<b>Race</b>	<b>Democrat</b>	<b>Republican</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>N</b>
1994	Senate	White	46.2	49.3	4.5	872
		Black	83.8	14.3	1.9	105
		Hispanic	68.9	21.4	9.7	103
1994	Governor	White	37.9	58.7	3.4	886
		Black	82.9	16.2	1	105
		Hispanic	77.5	20.6	2	102
1994	US House	White	44.6	51.8	3.6	85.5
		Black	91.3	6.7	1.9	104
		Hispanic	70.5	22.9	6.7	105
1992	President	White	45.1	31.9	22.9	824
		Black	90.3	4.5	5.2	155
		Hispanic	78.3	10.8	10.8	120
1992	Senate	White	51.4	40.1	5.7	807
		Black	88.6	5.4	1.3	149
		Hispanic	70.1	17.9	8.5	117

TABLE 7: RACE AND VOTE CHOICE IN THE 2003 CALIFORNIA GUBERNATORIAL RECALL ELECTION

Year	Office	Race	Schwarzenegger	Bustamante	Others	N
2003	Governor	White	48	27.3	19.8	2857
		Black	15.7	53.6	17.4	293
		Hispanic	24.3	55.1	15.7	486
2003	Recall		Yes	No		N
		White	58.4	40.1		2866
		Black	27.9	70.4		297
		Hispanic	43.1	52		490

TABLE 8: ECOLOGICAL REGRESSION ESTIMATES OF RACIAL PREFERENCES  
IN SECTION 5 COUNTIES OF CALIFORNIA, 2000

<b>Merced</b>		<b>Democrat</b>	<b>Republican</b>	<b>Other</b>
President	White	31.2	66.4	2.4
	Black	47.1	<0	52.9
	Hispanic	>100	<0	<0
US Senate	White	41.0	53.5	5.5
	Black	32.4	<0	67.6
	Hispanic	91.6	<0	8.4
US House	White	61.0	38.8	0.2
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	93.8	<0	6.2
Assembly	White	61.5	38.5	---
	Black	<0	<0	---
	Hispanic	99.1	0.9	---
State Sen.	White	---	---	---
	Black	---	---	---
	Hispanic	---	---	---
<b>Kings</b>		<b>Democrat</b>	<b>Republican</b>	<b>Other</b>
President	White	23.1	73.2	3.4
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	84.6	12.9	2.5
US Senate	White	42.8	51.6	5.5
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	84.6	12.9	2.5
US House	White	27.8	70.4	1.8
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	79.2	18.4	2.4
Assembly	White	45.1	54.9	---
	Black	<0	>100	---
	Hispanic	>100	<0	---
State Sen.	White	---	---	---
	Black	---	---	---
	Hispanic	---	---	---

<b>Yuba</b>		<b>Democrat</b>	<b>Republican</b>	<b>Other</b>
President	White	29.5	65.9	4.7
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	>100	<0	<0
US Senate	White	33.7	59.2	7/0
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	89.8	<0	10.2
US House	White	22.5	74.1	3.4
	Black	>100	<0	<0
	Hispanic	90.9	<0	9.1
Assembly	White	29.0	66.0	5.0
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	>100	<0	<0
State Sen.	White	32.0	64.2	3.8
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	>100	<0	<0
<b>Monterey</b>		<b>Democrat</b>	<b>Republican</b>	<b>Other</b>
President	White	47.6	44.9	7.5
	Black	<0	<0	>100
	Hispanic	84.1	15.3	0.6
US Senate	White	48.6	44.6	6.7
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	81.6	10.5	7.7
US House	White	56.3	36.6	7.0
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	90.1	8.6	1.3
Assembly	White	51.2	42.6	6.2
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	68.5	31.4	0.1
State Sen.	White	25.6	69.3	5.1
	Black	<0	<0	<0
	Hispanic	80.4	17.0	2.6

<b>Rest of CA</b>		<b>Democrat</b>	<b>Republican</b>	<b>Other</b>
President	White	45.1	49.1	5.8
	Black	97.9	<0	2.1
	Hispanic	>100	<0	<0
US Senate	White	48.4	44.0	7.6
	Black	95.2	<0	4.8
	Hispanic	91.3	<0	8.7
US House	White	38.1	56.4	5.5
	Black	98.2	<0	1.8
	Hispanic	85.6	3.6	10.8
Assembly	White	39.0	55.5	5.5
	Black	95.0	<0	5.0
	Hispanic	98.3	1.7	<0