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*Introduction: Racial Realignment as a Process*

For almost a century after the Civil War, race liberals supported the Republican Party, while those most hostile toward civil rights were Democrats. Today, these positions are reversed—race liberals have made their home in the Democratic Party, while race conservatives have effectively used the resources of the Republican Party to scale back federal programs that provide assistance to African Americans and other racial minorities. My research is focused on the process of transformation—*when*, *how*, and *why* the parties shifted their views on civil rights in the twentieth century. A thorough investigation of the process affords me the opportunity to assess how realignment occurs, not just the state or national level, but in a federal system in which forces from both sites converge to produce partisan change. Moreover, examining the process of racial realignment furthers our understanding of the complex relationship between voters and their representatives and how much consideration politicians give to constituent preferences.

 This paper will focus on the voters and their response to the changing nature of race issues from the 1946 until 1972.[[1]](#footnote-1) In the 1940s, California voters were asked to approve a Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC) and a state housing commission, which would construct desegregated public housing units. These economic civil rights issues—fair employment and fair housing—were rejected overwhelmingly by Republican partisans, in addition to half of the Democrats in the electorate. This trend would continue on a subsequent fair housing measure, Proposition 14, in 1964. It would not be until 1972, when busing first appeared on the California ballot that Democratic voters displayed liberal preferences on racialized ballot initiatives.

The main finding here is that Republican voters consistently displayed conservative preferences on civil rights, despite the shifting nature of race policies. As a base, Democrats became more liberal over time. I argue that this was the result of not only the changing substance of civil rights issues but also of partisan sorting on the part of race conservative Democrats who, by 1972, switched to the Republican Party, which better represented their views on race.

*Proposition 11 (1946) and Proposition 14 (1948): Fair Employment and Housing*

Not only was Proposition 11 (1946) the first economic civil rights initiative in California, it was the first civil rights bill that directly impacted the growing population of African Americans.[[2]](#footnote-2) It called for the establishment of a state Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC). This proposition explicitly outlawed discrimination in employment on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.[[3]](#footnote-3) The debate surrounding FEPC also raised issues regarding employer control of the workplace. The compulsory nature of the proposed FEPC law, many Republicans argued, would add to the already cumbersome restrictions on business and to the growing regimentation of employers.[[4]](#footnote-4) Proposition 11 overlaid this partisan New Deal economic issue onto civil rights and the push for ending discrimination in the workplace. Liberal and African American groups supported it, in addition to many Democratic state officials. Conservative groups and businessmen opposed it, while Republican politicians remained largely ambiguous on the issue. Proposition 11 was defeated by a margin of 70% to 30%. If partisan voters were adhering to a conservative economic ideology, more so than racial preferences, Republicans should not have supported the passage of Proposition 11. On the Democratic side, if economic preferences were the primary voting dimension, then Democratic voters should have supported FEPC. If, however, Democrats were being motivated by race concerns, then we would observe a more divided Democratic base on these blended race and economic issues.

Proposition 14 in 1948 was California’s first fair housing initiative. It would establish a State Housing Agency with the authority to issue state bonds to finance low-cost public housing in California. The language of the proposition further mandated that housing constructed under the program be open to all Americans without discrimination or segregation, and forbid discrimination in the employment of persons hired to build any project so financed.[[5]](#footnote-5) By the 1940s, the provision of low-cost housing California was widely perceived to be a “Negro” issue.[[6]](#footnote-6) Proposition 14 also tapped into a salient New Deal-era concern—the role of the state in the provision of public goods for the market. The proposed law called for state intervention in the economy and placed restrictions on the employer-hiring prerogative in the construction industry. As they did for Proposition 11 in 1946, Democratic politicians and African Americans pushed for Proposition 14’s passage, while conservatives and businessmen were joined by realty organizations to form the opposition. On the issue of fair housing, Republicans were ambiguous, as they were on FEPC. Both fair housing and FEPC came before the legislature and while Democrats were overwhelmingly supportive, the Republican Party in the Assembly and Senate was divided on these economic civil rights issues in the 1940s.

Proposition 14 was defeated by the same margin as Proposition 11—70% to 30%. As with Proposition 11, Republicans should have overwhelmingly opposed Proposition *14, if they are being constrained by New Deal ideology*. If economic ideology was driving Democratic voters, even those who might not have fully supported racial equality, should not have abandoned their party on Proposition 14. That is, most Democrats should have supported Proposition 14, *if they were being constrained by New Deal ideology,* as it would have created low-cost public housing and jobs for blue-collar workers.

*Ballot Proposition Dataset, 1946 and 1948*

To compile the dataset to gauge partisan division in the electorate on Propositions 11 and 14, I contacted the California State Archives in Sacramento to request rolls of microfilm from each of the November elections under observation. I then transferred the handwritten precinct returns from microfilm to paper so I could hand-enter both the proposition returns and candidate races into a spreadsheet. I used statewide candidate races as my measure of partisanship in the electorate, since the partisan composition for precincts was not published. Using candidate races was imperative, since they allowed me to assess a percentage of Democratic and Republican supporters who were supporting and opposing the ballot propositions.

In 1946, there were two competitive statewide candidate races—the lieutenant governor race between Goodwin Knight (R) and John Shelley (D) and the attorney general race between Fred Howser (R) and Pat Brown (D). There were 2,578,313 individual ballots cast in the lieutenant governor’s race and 2,466,253 individual ballots cast for attorney general. Both Republicans won with 56% of the vote. For 1946, I entered results for all three races for 15,336 precincts.

In 1948, there was only one competitive race available—the presidential race between President Truman (D) and Thomas Dewey (R). President Truman won 50.4% of the vote while Dewey received 49.6%.[[7]](#footnote-7) I collected and entered the precinct-level returns (there were 16,950 precincts in 1948) for president and the yes and no votes for Proposition 14. There were 3,792,557 ballots cast for president in California, not including the 188,742 cast for third-party candidate Strom Thurmond. My analysis was not impacted by the Thurmond votes, so I omitted them from the discussion. There were 3,400,741 cast for Proposition 14, which was overwhelmingly defeated—only 30% of Californian voters supported public housing in the state. In the upcoming sections, I provide discuss King’s method of ecological inference and provide findings that support my argument.

*Ballot Proposition Election Returns and Ecological Inference Methodology*

In order to derive results from all the data I gathered above, I needed to find an alternative to ordinary least squares (OLS) regression since OLS regressions produce averages, not exact measures. Thus, I turned to ecological inference analysis, which allowed me to make inferences about the aggregate data to determine the partisan rates of support for each proposition. Ecological inference methodology has improved significantly since the discovery of ecological fallacy in 1950, which maintains that we cannot assume that statistics that apply to a group are representative of individuals within that group.[[8]](#footnote-8) To remedy the ecological fallacy problem, I use one of the more recent methods of ecological inference—Gary King’s methodology—that makes use of subunit (*n)*, or in my case, precinct turnout.[[9]](#footnote-9)

*King’s Ecological Inference*

 Gary King introduced a method for ecological inference that incorporates information about precinct-level bounds to estimate aggregate quantities of interest. Because it systematically uses this information, it is more robust to aggregation bias than the previous methods. Because they account for each precinct’s voter turnout, [[10]](#footnote-10) King’s estimates are more accurate estimates of possible rates of support for each proposition. Comparing King’s estimates to Goodman’s, Goodman’s analysis both over- and underestimated partisan levels of conservative support for the racialized initiatives (Table A).

 King’s ecological inference model consists of assumptions built on the basic accounting identity in which *T*i and *X*i are observed. βib and βiw are the quantities of interest, for *i*=1,…,*p* precincts:

*T*i = βib *X*i + βiw(1*- X*i).

βib andβiw are not constant over precincts. They are at least partly dependent upon one another. Despite this dependency, the two can vary and often do as together they do not have to sum up to 1. In my case, βib will give the percentage of Republican support or opposition to a given proposition and βiw reveal the Democratic support or opposition. Independently, each can take on any percentage between 0 and 1. So, in the case of Proposition 11, 88% of Republicans and 50% of Democrats opposed the measure. βib and βiw can each fall between 0 and 100 percent.

 In the case of the ballot proposition data, *T*i is the independent variable—percent support for the conservative position in each precinct and *X*i is the dependent variable—percent Republican support for the ballot propositions in each precinct. The probability density model includes *N*i, where *N* accounts for each precinct’s turnout in the election. To estimate the parameters, I used Gary King’s program, *EI: A(n R) Program for Ecological Inference,*[[11]](#footnote-11) to estimate levels of support for each initiative among Democratic and Republican voters. I also used the program to derive 80% confidence intervals for both the Goodman and King estimates. King proposes 80% confidence intervals over the commonplace 95% when using ecological inference. Since the normal posterior (or sampling) distribution does not apply in most cases when using ecological inference since the number of Democratic and Republican turnout can vary dramatically precinct-to-precinct, producing a wide variance in which the +-2 standard errors would no longer be approximately the 95% confidence interval. It is much more common for the estimates to fall within the 80% confidence interval,[[12]](#footnote-12) which is why King’s R program for ecological inference only employs 80% confidence intervals and why I used them in my tables. In the following subsections, I look discuss and analyze King’s estimates in context of state and national events to establish a comprehensive narrative of voter behavior in the California electorate shortly after World War II.

*Results: Propositions 11 (1946) and 14 (1948)*

 In 1946, when asked whether or not they wanted to establish a state fair employment practices commission, akin New York’s FEPC that also had enforcement powers to fine employers found in violation of policy,[[13]](#footnote-13) Californians overwhelmingly rejected the proposal by a margin of 3 to 1. Table A shows that 88% of Republicans and 50% of Democrats voted no on Proposition 11, a 38-percentage point gap.

 While the policy in question in 1948 dealt primarily with housing, Proposition 14 contained an anti-discrimination clause in the hiring of workers and renting to tenants of public housing. Thus, the core tension remained in 1948 as it did in 1946 with Proposition 11. The partisan results of Proposition 14 reveal that 94% of Republican voters opposed fair housing measures; 46% of Democrats also opposed Proposition 14 (Table A).

Figure A provides scatterplots of the data for the three initiatives observed in this chapter. The main pattern is the positive relationship between the Republican proportion of precincts and their level of opposition against civil rights. In the case of Propositions 11 and 14, the higher percentage of support for the Republican candidate, the higher the likelihood that those voters would oppose FEPC and fair housing, respectively.

This partisan pattern of strong Republican conservatism and Democratic ambiguity on civil rights reemerges in 1964, which highlights the consistency of partisanship on race in the electorate. Though no other economic civil rights measure would appear on the ballot in the 1950s, it was a pivotal decade in which California Republicans would realign on race. Whereas Democratic legislators were unified on a race liberal position as early as 1945 and would continue to support race liberal policies into the 1950s, the Republican Party in California underwent dramatic changes. Because of the end of cross-filing in 1959, moderate Republicans disappeared and were replaced by race conservatives who would unite the party against the incoming tide of race liberal legislation. After being overtaken by a majority of Democrats and a liberal governor in 1958, Republicans in California, for the first time, universally opposed civil rights measures in 1959—a trend that would continue into subsequent decades. Understanding the shift in bipartisan to partisan support for and opposition to civil rights measures in the California government is critical to understanding the process of racial realignment. It was not until the 1950s that California’s Republican representatives would align with their constituents on civil rights. This alignment between Republican state level actors and voters would then lay the foundation for Barry Goldwater to take the national party to the right on race.

*Proposition 14 (1964) and Proposition 21 (1972): Fair Housing and Busing Bans*

 In addition to choosing between Johnson and Goldwater for president in the 1964 election, Californians had to decide whether or not to overturn the Rumford Fair Housing Act, which had passed through the legislature in 1963 on a partisan vote. Although neither presidential candidate took a stand for or against Proposition 14, it was still a highly salient and contentious issue. Advocates framed the issue as one that hinged on freedom—freedom of property owners to decide to whom they wanted to sell their property. In a letter written to Governor Brown who came out against Proposition 14, one Californian summed up the sentiments that several property owners had: “Your rights end where my property begins.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Another related theme among Proposition 14 supporters was anti-communism. Though not affiliated with the central campaign—the Committee for Yes on Proposition 14—several groups sent out alarmist literature to voters that called the Rumford law “a Nazi-type, Commie-type law because it is just such a coercive edict.”[[15]](#footnote-15) While most on the pro-Proposition 14 side avoided blatantly racist language, one group called the California Committee for Equal Rights for the White Race, stated that the election of Goldwater and the passage of Proposition 14 would put an end to the trend of “forcing the white man to accede to the Negroes’ wish.”[[16]](#footnote-16) Opponents of Proposition 14 called out such tactics and claimed that the defeat of Proposition 14 was necessary to guarantee equality in the housing market.

 Despite the polarizing nature of the Proposition 14 campaign, partisanship remained muted among Democratic voters. Republicans voted overwhelmingly in favor of Proposition 14, as they had on the two previous economic civil rights proposals: Propositions 11 and 14 in 1946 and 1948, respectively. Democrats remained consistent in their ambiguity on economic civil rights—as with the 1940s propositions, Democratic voters were almost evenly split on Proposition 14 in 1964. These results are significant for two key reasons. First, they reveal a continuous pattern of Republican conservatism and Democratic ambivalence on economic civil rights that had been present in the 1940s. This stability suggests that voters are not solely dependent on elite cues, as they were able to vote in consistent patterns across time, despite mixed signals within the state and national parties. Second, when comparing this pattern of partisanship in the electorate to the partisan breakdown of votes on Proposition 21—the state’s anti-busing initiative, I observe that Democratic voters become more liberal from 1964 to 1972 when Proposition 21 appeared on the ballot. I will argue that the increase in liberalism from Proposition 14 and Proposition 21 can be explained by the exodus of race conservative Democrats into the Republican Party after 1964. Goldwater’s campaign, and the subsequent conservative campaigns run by Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan revealed that the national party was becoming the party of racial conservatism, thus attracting more and more conservative Democrats in the late 1960s and 1970s.

In addition to examining Proposition 14 (1964) to determine if the California electorate was consistent in the partisan behavior on economic civil rights across time, I will also examine a 1972 initiative that proposed banning busing in the state—Proposition 21. Proposition 21 would be the last racialized initiative to appear on the ballot before the ascent of Ronald Reagan and the national tide of conservatism took over the country. Proposition 21 would add a section to the California Education Code that would state: “No public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or be required to attend a particular school.” Further, it would repeal the section that established policy that “racial and ethnic imbalance in pupil enrollment in public schools shall be prevented and eliminated.” It also repealed sections that required school districts to report racial imbalances and take action to remedy them.[[17]](#footnote-17)

This ballot initiative is significant because it allows me to determine partisan behavior on an issue substantively different from the previous racialized propositions. Whereas the other initiatives had a strong economic component that precluded Republicans from supporting civil rights, such as fair housing and fair employment laws, Proposition 21 was mainly a race issue. Though its defenders tried to avoid blatantly racist language, the opposition was portrayed the proposition as a segregationist proposal.

*Proposition 14 (1964): Fair Housing and the Persistent Pattern of Partisanship*

Like Propositions 11 (1946) and 14 (1948), Proposition 14 (1964) also combined New Deal and race dimensions. If passed, Proposition 14 would prohibit the state from “abridging right of any person to decline to sell, lease, or rent residential real property to any person he chooses.”[[18]](#footnote-18) It would nullify the Rumford Fair Housing Act, A.B. 1240, which passed in the legislature the previous year. The law prohibited landlords from discriminating against prospective tenants because of their race.

In 1964, California realtors and many conservative groups, including the John Birch Society and the California Republican Assembly, brought Proposition 14 to California voters.[[19]](#footnote-19) A prime example of an economic civil rights issue that blended New Deal commitments and race, advocates of Proposition 14 wanted to overturn the Rumford Fair Housing Act that forbade owners and landlords from discriminating against prospective buyers and tenants because of their race. If passed, owners who practiced discriminatory practices in selling their homes would not be penalized, thereby sanctioning racial discrimination in real estate practices. Economic conservatives would argue that homeowners had the right to sell, or not to sell, their property to whomever they wanted. In the case of Proposition 14 (1964), if partisan voters were being constrained by their New Deal ideology, Republicans should vote in large numbers in favor of the proposition. On the other hand, Democrats should vote against the initiative, as they would be less adverse to government intervention in the marketplace, given their liberal economic views.

*Proposition (1972): Busing and the Completion of Racial Realignment*

Forced integration issues, such as busing, posed a new type of civil rights issues to the public. Unique to post civil rights issues, compared to economic civil rights, was the growing disenchantment with what many white Americans believed to be aggressive demands on the part of militant civil rights advocates. An overwhelming majority of white Californians supported the *Brown* decision and school integration in general.[[20]](#footnote-20) However, many viewed court-mandated, “forced integration” via busing as going too far, requiring homogenous white communities and cities, like Pasadena, to integrate when they have no minority population. This bred resentment among whites and created a hotbed for African American students, who would often face not only disgruntled parents but also a hostile student body.[[21]](#footnote-21)

 The primary argument in favor of Proposition 21 can be seen in the conservative Pasadena Star-News. The editor of the paper claimed that “black, white, Chicano and others…are asking for a return to neighborhood schools” and that they “are pleading for an end to forced busing as much as is legally permissible.”[[22]](#footnote-22) Most proponents tried to stay away from overtly racial language. Rather than forcing school integration via busing, some supporters of Proposition 21 espoused a gradualist view that school integration will come in time, when employment and housing becomes more integrated over time.[[23]](#footnote-23) Opponents of Proposition 21 called it a “segregation amendment” to the California Education Code and unconstitutional.[[24]](#footnote-24) It was also attacked as racist. Opponents claimed that Proposition 21 claimed to be “absolutely color-blind, but its consequence would be to freeze hundreds of thousands of black, Mexican-American and other minority children in the inferior segregated schools to which they are now assigned.”[[25]](#footnote-25) In the campaign against Proposition 21, critics accused supporters of peddling a “hate/segregation” amendment that would make California like Mississippi.[[26]](#footnote-26)

*Ballot Proposition Dataset, 1964 and 1972*

To determine partisan rates of behavior in the electorate on the 1964 and 1972 racialized initiatives, I used precinct-level election returns for the proposition races and statewide candidate contests to determine a baseline of partisanship within each precinct. In 1964, there were two candidate races—the contest for president between Lyndon Johnson (D) and Barry Goldwater (R) and the race for senator between Pierre Salinger (D) and George Murphy (R). There were 6,248,545 individual ballots cast for president that year. President Johnson was elected with 59% of the vote to Goldwater’s 41%. George Murphy defeated Pierre Salinger for Senate by a margin of 51% to 49%, with 6,177,482 ballots cast for that race. There were 6,054,452 ballots cast for Proposition 14—the initiative that sought to overturn the Rumford Fair Housing Act of 1963. Proposition 14 passed by a wide margin—65% to 35%. There were 29,505 precincts in 1964.

In 1972, there were no statewide races. Thus, my gauge for partisanship in the California electorate in 1972 is the presidential contest between Richard Nixon (R) and George McGovern (D). There were 7,763,906 ballots cast for president. President Nixon won California with 55.8% of the popular vote to McGovern’s 44.2%. There were 7,541,312 ballots cast for Proposition 21. Proposition 21 passed by a margin of 61% to 39%. I created a dataset with the precinct-level vote totals for these races in order to determine the partisan rates of support for the ballot propositions in the California electorate.

*Results: Propositions 14 (1964) and 21 (1972)*

 When examining the partisan composition of the Proposition 14 vote, a familiar pattern emerges—Republicans were overwhelmingly supportive of repealing the Rumford fair housing law, while Democrats were divided in their vote. Ninety-two percent of Republicans and 47% of Democrats approved of Proposition 14 (Table B). The absolute levels of conservatism and thus the partisan divide on Proposition 14 (1964) looked identical to the other two new civil rights propositions—Proposition 11 (1946) and 14 (1948). In all three cases, Republican conservatism was over 88% and Democratic opposition was between 46% and 50%. Republicans were consistent in their conservative preferences on economic civil rights propositions, from 1946 to 1964.

Not much changed in 1972 with regard to Republican conservatism on Proposition 21. As with the economic civil rights ballot initiatives, California Republicans overwhelmingly supported the anti-busing ban, at a rate of 85%. Democrats, however, compared to their split responses to the economic civil rights initiatives—Proposition 11 (1946), Proposition 14 (1948), and Proposition 14 (1964)—were more liberal on Proposition 21, with only 29% of Democrats supporting the anti-busing measure (Table B). This is a particularly curious finding—why were Democrats *less* conservative on an anti-busing measure that, unlike the previous racialized initiatives—removed New Deal considerations? We would expect that on a race issue, like busing that did not have a New Deal component, conservatism would increase relative to the economic civil rights propositions that might have constrained some race conservative Democrats to vote in line with elected officials who were supporting issues like FEPC and fair housing in previous decades.

 Proposition 21, unlike previous integration battles waged during the *Brown* era in the 1950s, was not simply a school integration issue. It sought to stop court-ordered busing that brought African American students into neighborhoods with a small or non-existent minority population. It was the issue that epitomized the post civil rights era. On such issues that forced integration on white Americans, the electorate displayed an increased level of partisanship, relative to the economic civil rights propositions. So far, the highest level of partisanship on the three other racialized ballot initiatives examined thus far was on Proposition 14 (1948)—49-percentage points. However, it was the last proposition examined here—Proposition 21—that revealed the largest partisan divide in the California electorate—56 percentage points.

By the time forced integration issues emerged in the late 60s, rank-and-file Republicans transitioned from the party opposing economic civil rights based on ideological considerations to the party that accepted and openly adopted a strategy that would attract race conservative Democrats into the party fold. In 1972, Democrats, for the first time, displayed liberalism on a racialized issue. The difference in partisanship can be seen in Figure B, which depicts the scatterplots for the 1964 and 1972 ballot propositions. By comparing Propositions 14 and 21, the racialized initiatives, we see less of a concentration in the middle of the plot and a more even distribution on the 1972 initiatives, demonstrating a more polarized electorate than was evident in 1964. The final ballot proposition in this analysis thus reveals the largest partisan separation on all civil rights initiatives but more importantly, it shows California Democrats decreasing in their conservatism on race issues—a break from the previous pattern of a divided Democratic base established in previous decades.

*Conclusion*

The decline in conservative attitudes among Democrats was the final step in the racial realignment. Whereas Republicans had exhibited a consistent level of conservatism on economic civil rights at the ballot box beginning in 1946, Democrats were much slower to align their economic ideology and their racial ideology. It took Democrats considerably longer in large part because race conservative Democrats did not begin to leave the party until 1964, when the Goldwater campaign aligned with state-level Republican politicians and voters to create a new Republican Party driven by its conservative wing. With the alignment of the elites in the Republican Party and the decreased influence of race moderates, like Earl Warren and Nelson Rockefeller, race conservative Democrats finally had a party that mirrored their views on civil rights and would join the Republican ranks—a process that began in 1964 and continued throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s. Carmines and Stimson (1989) were thus correct in placing emphasis on the 1964 election, at least when it came to driving race conservative Democrats out of the Party and into the Republican fold.[[27]](#footnote-27) It was this wedge issue—race—that “sharply highlighted and permanently deepened the polarization between the parties on racial issues.”[[28]](#footnote-28) Not only would the Republican Party become embedded to race conservatism, as much of its strategy nationally depended on attracting disaffected Democrats into their base, but the Democratic Party would be able to fully embrace race liberal policies, with a majority of their voters’ support.

Though Barry Goldwater began to steer the national party to the right in 1964, the exodus of race conservatives from the Democratic Party was not instantaneous. Between 1964 and 1972, several events occurred that encouraged these Democrats to leave the party, including urban race riots, the rise of the Black Panther movement and increased demands of black civil rights groups and race liberals, which led to the emergence of the forced integration issues—busing and affirmative action. It was on these issues that Republican members of Congress would fall in line with the rest of the Republican Party and adopt race conservative preferences when they first appeared on the legislative agenda in the early 1971. The move in Congress served to solidify the move to the right on race that the state and national parties had adopted in the late 1950s and 1960s.

In addition to the polarization in Congress, presidential candidates in the 1970s and 1980s would increase the parties’ separation on race issues. Perhaps the final impetus race conservative Democrats needed to switch their party allegiances came in the 1972 presidential contest between George McGovern (D) and Richard Nixon (R). McGovern embodied a full liberal ideology, including ending the war in Vietnam to massive spending to reduce unemployment among minorities and the poor, and was to the far left of Nixon.[[29]](#footnote-29) Nixon’s appeal to the “silent majority” undoubtedly attracted the last remaining race conservatives from the Democratic Party and thus finalized the process of racial realignment. Nixon was able to capitalize on Goldwater’s vision in 1964 and win the presidency by appealing to the white working class and bringing many former Democrats into the Republican Party.

The realignment of race and party in the 20th century has had long-term implications for each of the parties. Republicans and Democrats at the state and national levels of government have to address and confront race issues not only in their campaigns but also when they are in office. The shift in positions on race has had a long-term impact, constricting the positions Democrats and Republicans can take on contemporary race issues, such as drug laws, stand-your-ground, and stop-and-frisk legislation. Further, since racial inequality is linked to a difference in the educational resources available to white and minority neighborhoods, education has remained racialized, just as it had been when busing was introduced in the early 1970s. Similarly, affirmative action in higher education has also been an enduring race issue on which members of the two parties often take polarizing views. Given the longevity of these issues and the salience of race in American society, it is probable that the two parties will stay divided on race well into the 21st century.

**Table A.** *Goodman’s Regression Coefficients and King’s Ecological Inference Estimates for Conservative Support on Propositions 11 and 14*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Republican Voters | Democratic Voters |
| **Proposition 11 (1946)** | **%NO** | **(80% c.i.)** | **%NO** | **(80% c.i.)** |
| Goodman’s Coef. | 90.7% | (80.5-97.5) | 46.3% | (32.5-59.3) |
| Ecological Est. | 88.1% | (89.7-96.1) | 50.2% | (31.1-48.1) |
| **Proposition 14 (1948)** | **%NO** | **(80% c.i.)** | **%NO** | **(80% c.i.)** |
| Goodman’s Coef. | 100% | (87.5-100) | 38.8% | (28.1-41.2) |
| Ecological Est. | 94.0% | (90.7-99.7) | 45.5% | (39.1-48.1) |

**Figure A.** *Scatterplots of Conservative Support, Proposition 11 and Proposition 14*



**Note:** Scatterplots were created using R.

**Table B.** *Goodman’s Regression Coefficients and King’s Ecological Inference Estimates for Conservative Support on Proposition 14*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Republican Voters | Democratic Voters |
| **Proposition 14 (1964)** | **%YES** | **(80% c.i.)** | **%YES** | **(80% c.i.)** |
| Goodman’s Coef. | 100% | (82.3-98.7) | 38.8% | (28.5-46.4) |
| Ecological Est. | 91.9% | (91.0-99.4) | 47.2% | (39.1-51.0) |
| **Proposition 21 (1972)** | **%Yes** | **(80% c.i.)** | **%Yes** | **(80% c.i.)** |
| Goodman’s Coef. | 83.4% | (79.7-97.6) | 30.8% | (20.3-47.0) |
| Ecological Est. | 84.8% | (86.1-98.1) | 29.1% | (28.6-48.4) |

**Figure B.** *Proposition 14 and Proposition 21 (1972), Scatterplots of Conservative Support*

**** 

**Note:** Scatterplots were created using R.

1. The larger project integrates the findings on voter behavior presented here with behavior in the California Legislature and Congress, in addition to the shifting dynamics within the national Democratic and Republican Parties. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Two other civil rights issues appeared on the 1946 ballot that had implications for Japanese Americans. Proposition 15 sought to strengthen California’s Alien Land Law that made it impossible for Japanese immigrants and their children to own land. It was overwhelmingly defeated. The other, Proposition 16, passed and thus struck the poll tax, which targeted the land-less Japanese from the law. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. “Fair Employment Practices Act,” California Ballot Measures Database, UC Hastings, <http://library.uchastings.edu/cgi-bin/starfinder/1295/calprop.txt>, Accessed September 22, 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Proposition 11’s provisions mirrored the national FEPC legislation that Republicans expressed concerns over. See Senator Taft’s comments on the national FEPC bill. Robert Taft, “Congressional Record,” 79th Congress, 1st session, Vol. 91, Pt. 1 (February 5, 1945), 782. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. “Housing,” California Ballot Measures Database, UC Hastings, <http://library.uchastings.edu/cgi-bin/starfinder/1304/calprop.txt>, Accessed September 22, 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Public housing was widely perceived as a race issue. Elites saw it as such: “…today it is a matter of great concern because in our dealing with the housing problem…we find that the greatest part of our problem relates to the condition of the Negroes.” Robert Taft, “Congressional Record,” 79th Congress, 2nd session, Vol. 92, Pt. 1 (February 9, 1946), 1194; Voters also saw the connection between race and public housing: San Mateo County hosted a conference on civil rights—public housing included—prior to the 1948 election. Further, “the question of public housing was to be located closely connected with the question of whether the residential segregation of Negroes was to be maintained. Race appeared again and again in the deliberations of those who supported public housing and of those who opposed it.” From “Jim Crow Army Scored Here,” *San Mateo Times* (April 5, 1948), 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. While using a presidential election as my proxy for partisanship is not ideal because presidential contests tend to attract weaker partisans and independents to the polls, it is the only available measure of partisanship. Since the results for the 1948 racialized initiative were similar to the 1946 and later the 1964 racialized propositions, the larger electorate in 1948 did not seem to influence partisan rates of support for and opposition to economic civil rights proposals. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Robinson, W.S. 1950. “Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individuals,” *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 15, No. 3, 355. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
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