THE INFLUENCE OF THE BLACK LEGISLATORS IN THE
OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of
The Ohio State University

By

Freddie Charles Colston, B.A., M.A.

* * * * * * *

The Ohio State University
1972

Approved by

Kendall B. Riley
Adviser
Department of Political Science
Copyright by
Freddie Charles Colston
1972
Dedicated
to
My Daughter
Deirdre Charisse Colston
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several individuals made significant contributions to the preparation and writing of this dissertation. Without their help, this project would not have been a success. First and foremost, the author expresses deep gratitude to Professor Randall B. Ripley for his role in the completion of this research; his advice, assistance and frequent encouragements were invaluable. It was Professor Ripley who initially suggested that I explore the possibility of doing a research project in the area of legislative politics and he offered expert commentary throughout all stages of the project. Professors John R. Champlin and Lawrence J. R. Herson likewise read the material and recommended improvements.

Mrs. Mary Walters, librarian in The Ohio State University Library, Circulation Department, is due credit for reading portions of this research and for suggesting valuable editorial comments.

Sincere appreciation is also expressed to the legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives who gave of their time and knowledge on legislative affairs while responding to the author's interview questions. My understanding of the legislative process was enhanced immensely as a direct result of their kind cooperation. Thanks, likewise, is conveyed to
the numerous clerical workers in Cleveland, Dayton and Cincinnati newspaper offices whose courteous and cooperative assistance aided the author in data collection for this research project. For similar reasons, gratitude is expressed to helpful individuals who are employed by the Ohio and Western Reserve historical societies for their succor in the task of completing this study. Furthermore, special appreciation is extended to the personnel in The Legislative Service Commission, The Governor's Office, The Secretary of State's Office, and The Ohio Legislative Reference Bureau who contributed greatly to the author's efforts while collecting the pertinent data for this study.

Any omissions, miscalculations and imperfections found in this research project, however, are solely the author's responsibility.
VITA

March 28, 1936. . . .  Born - Gretna, Florida

1959. . . . . . . . . B.A., Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia


1966. . . . . . . . . M.A., Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia

1966-1968 . . . . . Instructor, The Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia

1968-1971 . . . . . Teaching Associate, Department of Political Science, The Ohio State University

Fellow, The Southern Fellowships Fund, Atlanta, Georgia

1970. . . . . . . . . Lecturer, Summer Session, Department of Political Science, Ohio Dominican College, Columbus, Ohio

1971-1972 . . . . . Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Benedict College, Columbia, South Carolina

1972. . . . . . . . . Lecturer, Summer Trimester, Department of Political Science, Franklin University, Columbus, Ohio

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Political Science

Studies in Political Theory. Professor David Spitz, Professor David Kettler and Professor John Champlin
Studies in Public Law. Professor Francis Aumann

Studies in American Government. Professor Randall B. Ripley
CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. ........................................ ii
VITA ......................................................... iv
LIST OF TABLES ........................................... ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION: THE RESEARCH DESIGN ................. 1
    The Purpose and Nature of the Study ................ 1
    Definition of Terms .................................. 14
    Significance of the Study ............................ 16
    Methodology .......................................... 18
    Outline of the Chapters .............................. 22

II. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE OHIO HOUSE
    OF REPRESENTATIVES AND BLACK MEMBERSHIP ........... 28
    The Early Legislature ................................ 28
    The Constitution of 1851 and Later
    Developments .......................................... 33
    Black Membership in the Ohio House of
    Representatives: The Pre-Contemporary
    Group .................................................. 39

III. THE BLACK LEGISLATORS: SOME INDIVIDUAL
    CHARACTERISTICS. ..................................... 49
    Ecological Origins .................................... 49
    Political Socialization ................................ 53
    Political Recruitment .................................. 55
    Constituency .......................................... 59
    Role Perception ....................................... 64

IV. THE BLACK LEGISLATORS AS AN INFORMAL GROUP
    IN THE OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES .............. 80
    The Informal Group Configuration .................... 88

vi
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. (continued).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Legislators: Their Status as an Informal Group.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Legislators and Legislation in the 109th General Assembly</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Legislators and Group Norms</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Perceptions of the White Legislators about the Black Legislators' Status as an Influential Group.</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BLACK LEGISLATORS AND THE POLITICAL PARTIES</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Parties in Ohio</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Legislators and the Parties in the House of Representatives</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Legislators as a Voting Bloc.</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Legislators and Interest Groups</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Legislators, The Governor, and His Staff</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Legislators and the State Bureaucracy</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. CONCLUSION</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Evidence Related to the Hypotheses</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Characteristics of the Black Legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for Future Research</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTENTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX D</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX E</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX F</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

TABLE                                      Page

1. Pre-Contemporary Black Legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives .... 41

2. The Black Legislators' Length of Residence in the Districts They Represent .... 51

3. Occupations of the Fathers of the Black Legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives .... 52

4. Background Data on the Contemporary Black Legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives .... 69

5. Standing Committees in the Ohio House of Representatives .... 84

6. Party Loyalty Scores .... 125

7. Frequency of Dissent among Black Legislators .... 133

8. An Evaluation of 10 Bills before the Ohio House of Representatives during the 1971 Session .... 134


10. Interest Groups Ranked as Powerful in the Ohio House by the Black Legislators .... 148

11. Interest Groups Ranked as Powerful in the Black Legislators' Districts .... 150

12. State Departments Ranked Favorably by the Black Legislators .... 171

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE RESEARCH DESIGN

The Purpose and Nature of the Study

The primary purpose of this research is to explore an application of the "informal group approach" to a study of the legislative behavior of a racial group in a state legislature; specifically, it focuses on the ten contemporary black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives, and attempts to ascertain, in the process, the extent to which this group exerts influence on the deliberations and policy outcomes of the Ohio General Assembly. It seeks, in addition, to delineate some of the ecological and demographic characteristics germane to the black legislators, along with the kind of activities and concerns that embrace their attention. Since the core of the study evolves around the black membership of the House during the regular session of the 109th General Assembly, beginning on January 4, 1971 and ending on December 22, 1971, the bulk of the research is absorbed with that group and time period, but occasional references are directed, often in survey form, to situations, circumstances and individuals--particularly those who held
office during the decade of the 1960s—that are useful for explanatory purposes.

Legislatures function to referee group conflict growing out of disputes over the allocation of scarce resources in a society; they deliberate on issues and formulate public policies, i.e., they are prime participants in the authoritative allocation of values. Performance of these functions enable legislatures to occupy a strategic institutional position in democratic political systems where public officials are elected to office by the citizenry in free elections; in fact, it has been suggested that, "Of all the political institutions, none is more vital to the process by linking governors and governed in relationships of authority, responsibility and legitimacy, than the modern legislature." \(^1\) Therefore, some understanding of its ethos and functioning is essential for procuring insights into the process of government and its place in society. Occasionally students of politics, observing the legislature as a political entity, are content to focus on institutional arrangements and the hierarchy of authority delegated by written constitutions, but it is the spirit of this investigation that the legislature as an institution exists physically only in the persons called "legislators." \(^2\) The policies that are decided by the legislature and how they are decided cannot be separated from the behavior of the legislators themselves. This study thereby posits credit-
ability in the informal group approach as one useful means of pursuing an examination of the behavior of those men called legislators.

The most visible feature of the internal organization of legislative bodies are the structures of leadership, committee and party. Equally important, however, but not so visible, are the informal unofficial organizations, committees, friendship and/or cliques with which legislators relate. Such groupings as those are functional to the preservation of the legislature and are manifested in forms like friendship cliques, social groups, policy groups, and state delegations. Political scientists have for a long time employed this approach as a rewarding technique for inquiring into legislative behavior. As early as 1933, Garland C. Routt engaged himself in research on the behavior of eleven senators in the Illinois State Legislature. He observed the interactions which took place between those senators, and regarding their behavior, he noted: "Personal contacts between human beings lie at the very heart of all problems of government and society. Nowhere is this personal factor more evident or more important than in the political activity which determines the content and administration of laws." His work gave attention to the utility of considering the influences of certain personal and human factors in analyzing a legislative assembly, i.e., he viewed the work of the legislature as very much entrenched in per-
sonal relations. In the same year, John C. Russell directed attention to racial groups as a unit of analysis for investigating a state legislature. The work was conducted in New Mexico and the subjects were two distinct racial groups, the Anglos and the Spanish-Americans or natives. The Spanish-Americans were the people of Spanish descent, although the group had intermarried with members of several Indian tribes, and the Anglos were all the others, which were included, English, German, Scandinavian, Polish, or other descent; they were customarily referred to as Anglos by the natives. Russell derived six conclusions from his observation of the two racial groups. They were:

... First, the Spanish-Americans as a group had lost out in the Senate, the 1937 session having only three. In the House they were still an important group. Second, although the record showed that for the most part the Spanish-Americans had been Republicans, the political parties were probably in a state of flux. Third, issues likely to provoke racial difficulties were avoided by both groups and political parties. Fourth, the awareness of social responsibilities in holding political office did not seem to rest heavily on the natives, but the same was true for many of the Anglos as well. Fifth, the Spanish-Americans as a group were jealously guarding their old traditions and resented any interference with them. Sixth, if the Anglo population had continued to grow, the natives would have found themselves more outnumbered than they were.

Any political scientist or other interested observer wishing to do research on the New Mexico Legislature at the time in which Russell wrote would have had to consider the regionalism illustrated in his analysis; such factors would
have been essential for securing a lucid understanding of legislative behavior in the New Mexico Legislature. Even though the dated study did not deal specifically with blacks as a racial group, as the present project does, it provides a similar conceptual framework, and it lends a sense of mission to the research undertaking.

Since the two earlier studies, a number of political writers, especially during the 1950s, have resorted to a sociological theory of politics which viewed the group as the basic political form and the legislature as the referee of this group struggle—as previously noted—and formalizing the victories of the winning coalition. However, the group theorists paradigm of American politics really dates back to a pioneering work by Arthur F. Bentley, published in 1908. The writers of the 1950s symbolize a revitalization of Bentley's earlier labors. One of the leading exponents of the group theory school who viewed the legislature as a human aggregation, was David Truman. He asserted:

... A legislature has its own group life, sometimes as a unit, perhaps more often as a collection of subgroups or cliques. It has its own operating structure, which may approximate or differ sharply from the formal organization of the chamber. When a man first joins such a body, he enters a new group. Like others, it has its own standards and conventions, its largely unwritten system of obligations and privileges. ...
Truman's analysis was geared primarily toward illustrating the accessibility of legislative assemblies to the influence of various group interests; the informal group approach is wedded to this hypothesis.

Legislative social groups have been examined with frequency in the Congress of the United States. One such unfolding of the drama of informal groups stems from the work of Charles L. Clapp, who conceived of them in these terms:

... the opportunities they provide for mingling informally with colleagues and getting to know them better, for sharing common experiences, for relaxing from the persisting strains of an arduous, demanding job constitute important socializing factors which are difficult to ignore in an assessment of the influences on a congressman. As one member commented, "In this very large group which is the House, the smaller groups which rise and decline through the years are valuable for several reasons, psychological and social. They give a little more air of friendliness, support, and confidence to what is a rather strenuous life. And they are a vehicle of learning." 12

Prayer breakfast groups, in both the House and the Senate, drawing together membership from the two parties, meet weekly for breakfast and prayer. The bonds of friendship between the members of these groups are very strong—often expressing themselves in the manner of legislative cooperation. 13 The "gym groups" are also influential in Congress—these are the gentlemen who get together for physical exercise by engaging in athletic competition. This group has been considered one of the most influential in the
House. The gym, with its informal atmosphere provides opportunities for Congressmen to meet and discuss pending political matters—in other words, much legislative business is transacted in the gym. To this list of informal groups we could add the Democratic Study Group which organized the liberal Democrats for the purpose of advancing a more liberal program, and the various classes of entering freshmen congressmen, which began as the 86th Club, the 87th Club, etc. The freshmen groups serve to indoctrinate and educate new members, who otherwise would be stray sheep wandering in the wilderness; in this fashion, they facilitate an educational function by keeping the novice congressman informed on pending legislation.

The membership and group life of the legislative committees have similarly been subjected to systematic treatment. In an article on a congressional committee, Ralph K. Huitt gave three reasons for the importance of the standing committee as a discrete unit of analysis for studying informal group behavior. The reasons are: (1) they are decision-making agencies of crucial importance; (2) they provide a point of focus for the political process, i.e., they are miniature legislatures; and (3) each house is a human group with a leadership hierarchy, a hierarchy of influence and set of norms which control more or less the behavior of its members. His conceptual framework viewed committee members as judges representing the general
interests, presiding over the public debate of special interests, and committee members themselves were also seen as participants in the struggle of contending groups, one phase which was the public hearing. Huitt ascribed three functions to the public hearing conducted by committees: transmitting, propaganda, and catharsis--these were used as hypotheses in the case study of the hearings on the continuance of OPA before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in the Spring of 1946. For Richard F. Fenno, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representa-
tives furnished an intriguing subject for examination. The study covered the period between 1947 and 1961, aiming to provide an understanding of appropriations politics in Congress and suggests this methodology for studying the activities of any other committee in Congress. The Appropriations Committee was viewed by Fenno as a prototype of a political system itself (or more adequately a political subsystem), faced with many problems, one which was to achieve its goal and maintain itself. It dealt specifically with the problem of self-integration. Fenno then cited five characteristics that helped to explain the degree of inte-
gration achieved by the Appropriations Committee. They were: (1) the existence of well articulated and deeply rooted consensus on committee goals or tasks; (2) the nature of the committee's subject matter; (3) the legislative orientation of its members; (4) the attractiveness of the
committee for its members; and (5) the stability of the committee's membership. In the final analysis, Fenno's scheme established the extent of self-integration of a committee as the key cueing device in assessing its effectiveness. Thus, the stability of the Appropriations Committee was attributed to its success with self-integration. These two studies showed that the standing committee can, and has been used as an effective unit of analysis in examining legislative behavior in Congress. In other words, committees have role expectations, group norms and processes whose knowledge can lead to a broader understanding of legislative behavior in the larger body. And because they are small groups, their activities are quite amenable to empirical investigation.

State and regional delegations in Congress provide an additional point of departure for an investigation of informal groups in Congress. Again, David Truman contributed. He observed the activities of the New York State delegation in the House of Representatives and resolved that large state delegations have been known to provide information, advice and voting cues to their members. He estimated that the state delegation as a group within the confines of the legislative party, may have valuable consequences for determining the influence of an informal group in a legislative assembly such as the House of Representatives; moreover, the state delegation as a unit of analysis affords
the opportunity to observe interactions between legislators in the group and determine the extent to which these interactions affect each other's choices in the decision-making process in Congress.

Still another research project involving New York congressman was materialized by Alan Piellin which took the form of a case study depicting the behavior of the New York Democrats in the House of Representatives; he evaluated the approach in the following terms:

... By providing the new member with a social and political home away from home, by offering him valuable conceptions of the national legislative process, and his role in it, the group performs important functions for the individual.19

Returning to state legislatures, patterns of interpersonal relations in the Wisconsin State Legislature symbolized the chief preoccupation of a study conducted by Samuel Patterson.20 His investigation revealed friendship cliques established to the extent that their existence was recognizable to other members of the assembly; through his research he was able to explicate and plot the relationships between friendship patterns, leadership and seating proximity, as they related to the formation of the political attitudes exhibited by members of the Wisconsin Legislature. An additional investigation on impersonal relations in a state legislature was carried out by Stephen V. Monsma,21 who directed his efforts toward the 1964 session of the Michigan House of Representatives. He interviewed, between
January and May, 1964, one hundred and five of the one hundred and ten members of the House of Representatives. The research effort aimed to demonstrate and distinguish "how" primary and secondary informal relations can be identified among legislators and the means by which a study of these relations can be useful in understanding the legislative system. In order to uncover primary relations he asked the legislators, "Now, who are some of your closest friends in the House--I mean the members you see most often outside the chamber, at lunch or dinner or parties and other social gatherings?" To determine the secondary relations, the question was: Could you name five or six members of the House with whom you frequently discuss proposed legislation? The chief hypothesis was, interpersonal relations in a legislative system could function to increase the effectiveness and the efficiency of the legislative system by elevating legislators who are especially knowledgeable, skillful, and conscientious to positions of influence, while relegating legislators who are especially inept and lacking in conscientiousness to the periphery of the legislature. His findings strongly supported this hypothesis. The legislators who were placed at the center of the legislative system were the ones who were more conscientious, possessed a high degree of skill and ability and were more influential than the ones placed at the periphery of the legislative system.
This survey of previous studies portraying the "group" nature of legislative life is by no means exhaustive, but merely suggests a frame of reference for the proposed study, and concurrently attests to the soundness of the research undertaking. The informal group approach is derived from this paradigm of the legislative system. However, any examination of the legislative behavior of informal groups must consider the internal and external forces, e.g., groups and individuals, that affect their behavior.

In the internal structure (within the confines of the legislature itself), groups form because of interpersonal relations, and may take the form of social groups, cliques, friendship groups, committee delegations, state and/or regional delegations and policy groups, etc. On the other hand, external groups and forces also have an important impact on legislative decision-making, especially because of the accessibility of the legislature to group interests from the outside; consequently, constituency groups, interest groups, the bureaucracy, the governor and his staff, and political party groups, interact in the legislative system configuration.

The present research project, utilizing the case study approach, and adopting a racial group as the primary unit of analysis, is a pioneer effort with respect to the ilk of informal groups, particularly as it relates to the Ohio General Assembly. Therefore, many of the ideas, premises,
generalizations, etc., included in this project are both exploratory and eclectic. To date, no racial group has been studied in the Ohio House of Representatives. This study, then, is characterized by four major hypotheses that are stated as follows:

1. The nine black Democratic members of the Ohio House of Representatives constitute an informal group; the one black Republican, because of the distinct nature of his constituency, is a deviate from this pattern. Further, esprit de corps exists among the nine Democratic members and their informal organization serves as a means of socializing the members into the larger body; similarly, the informal grouping functions as a source for the dissemination of information of mutual interest to members of the group.

2. Race is a factor affecting the behavior of the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives.²²

3. The increase in the number of blacks in the Ohio House of Representatives has effectuated an increase in the volume of legislation categorically beneficial to black citizens in Ohio.

4. The black legislators do, in fact, exert influence on the public policies which emerge from the Ohio General Assembly.
Definition of Terms

Influence,\textsuperscript{23} for the present investigation is defined in these terms: A influences B to the extent that he gets B to do something that B would not have otherwise done. Stated in this fashion, influence becomes a relationship among individuals, groups, etc.; likewise, influence is a relationship between political actors wherein one actor induces another actor to act in some way he would not act otherwise. Influence can be exercised in a legislative assembly through cooperation, bargaining, bloc voting, logrolling, persuasion, etc. A model of influence in the legislature can be considered in three different dimensions, for example, influence based on individual personality, influence based on institutional position, and influence predicated on an organizational power-base. In the first instance, the emphasis is on the personality of the individual legislator, that is, some lawmakers are affable, industrious, skilled in oratory, personable, honest, etc.—these personality traits, along with related ones, enable the individual legislator exhibiting them to persuade others to his advantage. In the institutional position dimension, the center of attention is on the power and prestige invested in positions of leadership in the legislature, of the kind exercised by the top leadership echelon, for example, the speaker, the majority and minority floor
leaders, whips and committee chairmen; these positions place
the holder in strategic positions to wield influence. The
organizational power-base dimension of influence entails
the influence exhibited by a voting bloc--or potential--of
a legislative informal group and/or influence that is
generated by virtue of the support of a powerful community
based political organization which may be recognized as a
force to be reckoned with. Thus, party candidates running
for office in state and local elections may find it exped-
ient to solicit the endorsement of a strong community based
political organization, in order to boost their chances of
winning these elections.

The indices of influence utilized for purposes of this
study entail: *(1) the black legislators' perception of
their own influence individually and as a group; (2) the
perception of the black legislators' influence as viewed by
their white colleagues in the House; (3) the relationship
of the black legislators with their respective political
parties; (4) the bloc voting potential of the black legis-
lators; and (5) the black legislators' relationships with
interest groups, the governor and the bureaucracy, as such
relationships can be generated to the extent that political
rewards and benefits are reaped by them.

An informal group, in the framework of this study, is
an aggregation of individuals whose existence as an organ-
izational entity is not specified in official regulations
and organizational charts. Informal groups grow usually out of face-to-face relations and may develop in a variety of social situations—the state legislature is the case in point. Sidney Verba assessed the significance of these face-to-face relations in these words:

... If we are to understand the political process, greater consideration must be given to the role of face-to-face contacts. Primary groups of all sorts mediate political relations at strategic points in the political process. They are the locus of most political decision-making, they are important transmission points in political communications, and they exercise a major influence on the political beliefs and attitudes of their members.24

Hence, a study of informal groups provides insights that are relevant to an understanding of the process of government itself. Such a consideration enables one to look beyond the formal structures and examine the roles these groups play in the legislative process.

Significance of the Study

An abundant supply of literature, in recent years, has been published on state legislatures, but little of this literature, to date, has treated the general behavior, such as problems, achievements, role perceptions, influence, etc., of a group of black legislators in a state legislature.25 And none has been published on black legislators in the Ohio Legislature. In the publications that do mention black membership in state legislatures, the emphasis is usually
on the lack of black representation rather than on their legislative behavior.26 Yet, black elected officials are becoming a growing force in American politics.27 Within the decade of the 1960s, due to the Voting Rights Bill and other civil rights gains brought on by the black social revolution in progress, the American political scene witnessed a significant increase in the number of black Americans holding public office. For example, a survey recently conducted by the Joint Center for Political Studies of Washington, D.C. estimates there are 1,860 black citizens holding public office in the United States in 1971; of these, 198 are state legislators.28 The State of Ohio claims 12 of these--10 representatives and 2 senators.

Nevertheless, prior to now, political writers and the literature in political science have been prone to neglect the problems and prospects of black politicians; consequently, they have been assigned a second class rank in the literature.29 But the trend is now beginning to move in the opposite direction; however, there is still a need for the construction of a theoretical framework providing interested persons the opportunity to acquire greater insight into the behavior of a racial minority in a legislative assembly. Then too, black politics as an academic discipline is still in the embryonic stage--the research of the nature outlined here contains possibilities for engendering a broader view of this virgin area. As a result, the research on the ten
black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives
purports to contribute to a wider understanding of this
subject area.

Methodology

The principal tools for collecting information for the
project utilize the following: (1) interviewing; (2)
examining news accounts of the legislative activities and
careers of the black legislators procured from newspaper
morgues; (3) monitoring newspapers on legislative develop-
ments, particularly those relating to black legislators
during the 109th General Assembly; (4) collecting informa-
tion from historical societies, libraries and government
agencies and/or offices, and (5) direct observation of the
black legislators on the floor of the House, and in com-
mittee hearings. In the preliminary stages of the work,
a structured questionnaire was completed for securing infor-
mation from the ten black legislators, and a different one
for their white colleagues. Initial contact with the black
legislators came through a written memo sent early in
January, 1971, just after the session began, explaining the
author's intentions to engage in the research undertaking.
Shortly afterwards, each black legislator was contacted by
telephone as a follow-up procedure and for purposes of
scheduling appointments for the interviews to follow. Be-
cause of the exploratory and pioneering nature of the project,
the interviewing of the black legislators had to be an in-depth venture. The interviewing of the black legislators actually began during the last week of March and was completed in mid-May. The interviews ranged in time from a minimum of 2 hours to a maximum of 3 hours and 45 minutes, with the average one running approximately 2 hours and a half, depending on the amount of leeway the legislator's time schedule permitted, and his willingness to discuss in-depth, some of the questions posed to him. In most instances the completion of the interview took from two to three different meetings; only in a couple of cases did one meeting suffice.

Then came the interviewing of the white colleagues of the black legislators; 16 were selected for purposive sampling. These interviews took about one-half hour to complete, again, depending upon the leeway in the legislator's time schedule and his willingness to elaborate on the questions. Interviewing these legislators aimed to determine their perception of: the black legislators as a group; their influence, and the existence of other informal groups in the House of Representatives. Criteria devised for the random sampling involved interviewing one Democrat and one Republican from each county delegation containing black legislators, e.g., Franklin, Cuyahoga, Hamilton, Montgomery and Lucas; Hamilton County was an exception to the rule because the only two Democrats are black, so two
Republicans had to be selected. Seniority and seating contiguity were also a part of the criteria. Seniority was considered as a significant variable because of the tendency for those with greater seniority to have greater experience pertaining to the legislative process and there, too, was the likelihood of them having more knowledge about the behavior of the black legislators than their newer colleagues. Seating contiguity was found functional in a small number of cases where county delegations sat together; seating contiguity has been established as a distinctive variable in interpersonal relations in the legislative chamber, e.g., friendships develop and voting cues may be given; further, one Democrat and one Republican was selected from counties containing no black legislators in their delegations—the two did not hail from the same county and seniority again was the determining factor in their selection.

In addition, the top leadership of both parties was encompassed in the interview configuration, for example, the Speaker, the Majority Floor Leader, the Minority Floor Leader, and the Assistant Minority Floor Leader composed this group. With the exception of the chairman of the Health, Education and Welfare Committee, chairmen of committees were not distinctly considered as a group but rather allowed to pop-up unplanned; in other words, a few of the legislators interviewed also happened to hold committee
chairmanships. The chairman of H.E.W. was picked because of the interests of black legislators in welfare programs and the tendency for blacks living in poverty stricken areas to receive public assistance. Thus, the sixteen interviews were completed during the first week in June.

Newspaper morgues were visited in Cleveland, Dayton and Cincinnati where background information on the careers of the black legislators as reflected in the news was gathered. Among those visited were: The Plain Dealer, The Cleveland Daily News, The Call and Post (Cleveland), The New Dayton Express, The Dayton Journal Herald, The Dayton Daily News, The Cincinnati Enquirer, The Cincinnati Herald, The Cincinnati Post and Times Star. The Columbus Dispatch's morgue was not available for public research purposes.

Articles were received from The Toledo Blade through telephone contact; additionally, the author regularly monitored news accounts on the black legislators and other legislative developments in the course of the 109th General Assembly, appearing in The Call and Post, The New Dayton Express, The Cincinnati Herald and The Columbus Dispatch--these were subscribed to by the author.

The Ohio Historical Society and the Western Reserve Historical Society were valuable sources, especially for securing the information needed for the historical analysis of black membership in the Ohio House of Representatives.
The Ohio State University Library, The Cincinnati Public Library and The State Library were found useful for similar reasons. Government agencies and offices represented another valuable source for compiling materials on the black legislators, e.g., The Legislative Service Commission, The Legislative Reference Bureau, The Office of the Secretary of State, and The Governor's Office. Journals and bulletins of The House of Representatives proved also to be valuable research tools for the project.

Outline of the Chapters

Chapter II entails a brief survey of the historical background of the Ohio House of Representatives, including in the process a stress on the origin and development of black membership in the House. In Chapter III individual characteristics of the ten contemporary black legislators are encompassed (e.g., age, tenure, party, occupation, education, etc.). The black legislators are pictured as an informal group in Chapter IV; their perception of their own influence as an informal group is attended to, along with the perception of their status as an informal group with influence as seen by their white colleagues in the House.

Discussed in the next two chapters are indices of the influence exhibited by the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives. Accordingly, in Chapter V, the
black legislators' relationship with the political parties, as a variable determining the nature of their influence, is the main focus of these efforts. An attempt is made in this chapter to deal with the standing of the black legislators as a potential voting bloc in the House. Chapter VI explores three additional indices of the black legislators' influence— their relationship with interest groups in the state; their relationship with the governor, his staff and with the state bureaucracy. And finally, Chapter VII consists of a set of conclusions drawn from the research project; specifically, there are attempts to draw from the behavioral characteristics of the black legislators in the Ohio House as an informal group and formulate definitive remarks on the nature and extent of the influence of the black legislators as exercised in the House.
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10. While it is realized there exists within the profession a significant amount of ferment over the nature of group theory, the author does not intend to jump on the bandwagon, but simply adopts a pro-group theory position. Perception by the members of the group and those outside the group constitute validity in the realm of this research.


13. Ibid., p. 39.


22. The main rationale for examining this variable in the study is to try and determine the intent which racial discrimination, so problematic in the society at-large, is duplicated in a legislative assembly. For scrutiny of a broader treatment of this variable as a factor in studying black legislative behavior see: Robert T. Perry, "The Black Legislator: A Case Study of the House of Representatives of the Missouri 75th General Assembly" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, forthcoming).

23. The concept of influence in the discipline of political science is the subject of much controversy. The term is sometimes used very loosely, in a manner vague and indeterminate. Part of the difficulty lies with the fact that much of what is included in a legislator's behavior contains a large class of actions among which are the often mentioned "back-room deals," secret interchanges, communications by tone and gesture, etc.—forever inaccessible to any observing analyst. See: John C. Wahike, "Behavioral Analysis of Representative Bodies," in Austin Ranney (ed.), Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1962), p. 132. Therefore, when one attempts to quantify the concept of influence in concise terms, difficulties abound because of these sometimes obscure factors. Yet, in spite of the problems, it is still feasible to adopt a working model, which is what is done in the case in point. The application of the concept as used here endeavors to avoid all of the technical pitfalls of the usage of the term; no distinction is made between the concepts of influence and power as some studies do; for example, see: Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), Chapter V and passim. But for our purposes, the two terms are considered one and the same. Source drawn from for the construction of this model of influence include: Robert A. Dahl, Modern Political Analysis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963); see also an article by the same author, "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, II (July, 1957), 201-218; Randall B. Ripley, Power in the Senate (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969), p. 4; Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz, "The Two Faces of Power," American Political Science Review, LVII (December, 1962), 947-952. The latter source takes the position that power has two important dimensions one must consider in assessing its impact—-one dimension evident in terms of the outcome of the overt decision-making process, the other demonstrated in the capability of individuals and groups in preventing issues or contests from arising that could threaten their interests.

25. Although this scarcity exists, there is now beginning to develop, but still not enough, a body of literature attempting to deal with the problems and prospects of black elected officials, some of which are state legislators. One can gain much insight into the behavior of black officeholders through examining this emerging literature, most of which is written by blacks. For example, in this category see: Mervyn M. Dymally (ed.), *The Black Politician: His Struggle for Power* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1971). The editor of this publication is a California State Senator and most of the writings contained therein were written by black officeholders; Hanes Walton, Jr. and Leslie Burl Mclemore, "Portrait of Black Political Styles," *The Black Politician*, II (October, 1970), 9-13; Mack H. Jones, "Black Officeholders in Local Governments of the South: An Overview" (paper presented at the 66th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Los Angeles, California, September 6-12, 1970).


28. See James E. Conyers, *A National Survey of Black Elected Government Officials in the United States* (Terre Haute, Indiana: Department of Sociology, Indiana State University, 1971). The information contained within the publication is in the form of a questionnaire Dr. Conyers sent out to the 1,860 black officeholders in the United States. His research is conducted under a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation in preparation for a book on black officeholders in the United States. See also: Joint Center for Political Studies, *National Roster of Black Elected Officials* (Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political Studies, 1971); *The Columbus Dispatch*, April 29, 1971.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND BLACK MEMBERSHIP

The Early Legislature

Beginning with the Northwest Ordinance in 1787, the first representative body in Ohio was established as the General Assembly. Three important stages of government were written into the pages of the Northwest Ordinance which stated:

1. While the population was less than 5,000 free white males, government was to be in the hands of a governor, a secretary and three judges, all of whom were to be appointed by Congress, later by the President of the United States.

2. When the population reached 5,000, there was to be a legislative assembly of two houses, the lower house to be elected, the upper house to be chosen by Congress. The Governor was to retain an absolute veto over all legislation. A nonvoting delegate to Congress was to be selected.

3. When the population reached 60,000 the territory could apply for admission to statehood.

Aside from these features of the ordinance, it encouraged religion, morality and public education. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude were to be permitted in the territory and no more than five, nor less than three states could be carved out of the Northwest Territory—Ohio became one of these states.
Elected in 1798, the first General Assembly met in Cincinnati, in February, the same year, and again in September of 1799. Twenty-two citizens composed the membership in the first territorial assembly. The territorial system lasted for three years and on October 2, 1802, thirty-five men were elected as delegates to a Constitutional Convention for preparing a constitution for Ohio. Convening on November 1, 1802 in Chillicothe, the aim of the delegates was to present a constitution to Congress that could meet the requirements for statehood and admittance to the Union; thus, the Constitution of the State of Ohio was ratified by Congress on February 17, 1803—Ohio became the seventeenth state to join the Union on March 1, 1803. The Ohio Legislature had its home at Chillicothe from 1803-1810, and again from 1812-1816; it was at Zanesville from 1810-1813 and established permanently at Columbus in 1816. Two elective houses made up the General Assembly—a House of Representatives and a Senate—and annual sessions were to be scheduled; representation in the two houses was apportioned among the counties or districts according to their white male population (above 21 years old). The constitution delegated all legislative powers to the General Assembly and was said to be the "voice of the people" asserting itself through elected representatives in the form of legislation. Under the new constitution the General Assembly consisted
of thirty representatives and fifteen senators. Within one year after the meeting of the General Assembly, the number of representatives was to be fixed by the legislature after each enumeration and apportioned among the counties according to the number of white male inhabitants over 21 years of age in each; however, the total number was not to be less than twenty-four nor more than thirty-six until the number should reach 22,000. Representatives were required to be at least 25 years of age and elected annually; the age qualifications for senators was thirty years and their elections were scheduled biennially, one-half being elected each year.

On the other side of the picture, blacks in Ohio in 1802 were legally free, but little more. Black citizens had under the Constitution virtually no political existence and no political rights. In fact, the so-called "Black Laws" passed by the state legislature in 1804 and 1807 symbolized this condition of political impotence, i.e., those laws aimed to severely restrict the rights of black persons in Ohio. The law passed in 1804 by the state legislature declared:

... That no Negro or mulatto should be allowed to settle in the state unless he could furnish a certificate from some court in the United States of his actual freedom. The blacks already living in the state must register before the following June with the county clerk giving the names of their children. For each name a fee of twelve and one-half cents was to be charged. No white man could employ a Negro for
one hour unless the Negro could show a certificate of freedom, and any violation of this law was subject to a fine of from ten to fifty dollars. The same penalty was attached to harboring or hindering the capture of a fugitive slave. Besides this penalty the white man employing the Negro was obliged to pay fifty cents per day for his services to his owner, if one should appear. 10

In 1807 the law was amended to provide more stringent measures, viz., a black individual was required to give bond of $500 as a guarantee of good behavior and raised the $50 to $100 for hindering the capture of a Negro. 11 Another law of 1829 prohibited black children from entering public schools and also barred blacks from all institutions, asylums and poor houses. These laws may be summed up briefly:

a. Negroes were forbidden to enter the state (we say forbidden because it was virtually impossible for them to fulfill the entrance requirement which included a $500 bond).

b. They were debarred from the militia.

c. They could not under existing conditions send their children to school.

d. They could bear no witness against a white man, no matter what were the circumstances.

e. They were tried by juries of white men.

f. They could not work unless they carried their certificates of freedom. 12

These were the "Black Laws" which served to work all manner of evil on black persons in Ohio for nearly a half century. Much of the hostility exhibited by whites toward blacks in Ohio during this period stemmed from the competition for
jobs, among other possible reasons; in other words, whites were of the opinion that blacks migrating into the state in large numbers would hinder them from securing the available supply of jobs. Signs of this sentiment were vividly shown when Governor Trimble declared in 1832 that the increase of Negroes in the state was a threat to Ohio, and a committee of the Ohio House of Representatives reported that the free Negro presented "a serious political and moral evil" and tended to degrade white labor. Thus, whites saw the increase in the black population in Ohio as a threat to their status and power; therefore the "Black Laws" were resorted to as a controlling force on the social, economic and political aspirations of black people. Realizing their condition under the "Black Laws" in Ohio, many blacks began to assemble their efforts in order to improve their status and to fight with the aid of the more liberal whites, the battle for justice and equality in Ohio. It was this type of situation that brought on the repeal of the Black Laws along with the achievement of the suffrage for black persons in Ohio—but the victory came later in time; suffrage for blacks in Ohio was achieved in 1869, while the "Black Laws" were repealed in 1876. Having examined the early stages of the development of representative assemblies in the State of Ohio, it is necessary to probe into another significant stage of historical development—the Constitution of 1851.
The Constitution of 1851 and Later Developments

During this time period, the General Assembly had virtually no restrictions on its power to tax, incur debts, or grant special privileges and charters. This situation provided a means for the exploitative opportunities and weaknesses that accompanied much of the settlement and industrial expansion of the State of Ohio. Changes were needed; therefore, in June, 1851, the voters approved a new constitution submitted by the General Assembly. By the provisions of this constitution, the General Assembly continued to exist as a bicameral body but its sessions were reduced from annual to biennial. Except in 1885, however, annual sessions were held until 1895. Since 1895, biennial sessions have been held as required by the Constitution. The governor was not given the veto power until the Constitution was amended in 1903 for that purpose, but the assembly remained supreme in terms of the enactment of legislation.

According to the Constitution of 1851, the membership of the House of Representatives was to be determined by dividing the size of the state by the number 100; each county that had a population equal to at least one-half a ratio was granted a representative in each session during the decennial period. Two representatives were granted to those counties with a full ratio and three-fourths over;
and counties with three times the ratio were allotted three representatives; counties too small in population to warrant a representative were combined to form representative districts. In an attempt to "keep politics out" in the determination of equitable apportionment for the two houses, the Constitution provided that an ex-officio board composed of the governor, the auditor and the secretary of state become empowered to meet after the announcement of the results of the Federal census and decide whether the number of senators and representatives to be elected in each county and in each biennium showed congruence with the constitutional formula; however, criticisms about fair apportionment flourished at this time period, and were continued until the reapportionment revolution precipitated by the Baker v. Carr decision in 1962. This decision caused Ohio to adopt a new apportionment plan in 1966 which provided for a House of Representatives comprising 99 members and a Senate containing 33 members. This marked the culmination of the drive for reapportionment that had been generated in Ohio shortly after the activation of the Constitution of 1851.

Returning now to the sequential analysis, it is important to note that the Constitution adopted in 1851 has not since been totally rewritten; nevertheless, some changes were made in constitutional conventions coming afterwards. Accordingly, a third constitutional convention
was convened in 1873-1874. Columbus was the site wherein
the convention was initiated, but again, its work was com-
pleted in Cincinnati. There was less a demand for change
in the basic state laws than there had been at the conven-
tion in 1851. A special election was called to vote on
the revised document in August, 1874; however, it was de-
feated by a vote of more than 250,000 to 102,000.17

Another convention, for constitutional purposes, was
convened in 1903; at this time forty-one proposed amend-
ments were submitted to the voters. Thirty-three of these
were approved. Powers of the legislature were limited
through these amendments by:

1. Giving the people powers of initiative
   and referendum

2. Authorizing the Governor to veto separate
   items on appropriations measures

3. Limiting the business conducted in special
   sessions to the items identified by guber-
   natorial proclamations, and

4. Transferring to the Governor the power to
   remove public officials and the veto
   power.18

Nine years later in 1912, delegates were summoned to
still another constitutional convention. A number of
strong-minded men were found in this convention begin-
ing its work in January and completing the proceedings in the
late summer of 1912. This convention decided not to "re-
write" the constitution but rather to submit a total of
forty-one proposals on which the people voted.19 If
approved, these proposals would have become amendments to the state constitution. Much more distrust for the legislature characterized the amendments than did the original constitution and the 1851 revisions. A total of forty-one proposals were submitted to the voters, eight of which were defeated. Included among those defeated were the abolition of capital punishment, the use of voting machines and the right of women to vote. Among the key provisions approved by the voters were the initiative and referendum.

The discussion of constitutional developments in Ohio up to this point leads to a confirmation that slight changes occurred in the Ohio Constitution after its inception in 1802-1803. Most of these changes were gradual and came as a direct result of an increasing population in the state and the concurrent development of industrialization throughout the middle and latter part of the 19th century. As these environmental changes occurred, modifications in the state's laws had to keep pace.

Our attention is now reverted to the historical situation pertaining to blacks in Ohio around 1851 and shortly thereafter. Black Ohioans had looked upon the state's "Black Laws" with a great deal of contempt, and it was because of this sentiment among black Ohioans that a movement containing white allies had begun to gain momentum around 1846. In fact, the State Convention of Colored Men of Ohio had busied itself since its beginning in 1835 with
petitioning the legislature, and it was now launching strong efforts for the repeal of these laws. However, by 1850 black individuals in Ohio had attained only second class citizenship; they did not have the right to use public property, and did not have the right to vote or hold public office. Black suffrage was discussed in the Constitutional Convention of 1851 but intermittent objections were raised and a resolution limiting the suffrage to white males was carried by a vote of 66 to 12. Nevertheless, Ohio was not alone in its disfranchisement of black individuals in the course of this period in American history, for during the period between the Constitutional Convention in 1787, held in Philadelphia and 1865, only Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island and Massachusetts permitted blacks to vote on equal terms with whites. All the other states at one time or another barred black Americans from the polls. Nonetheless, free blacks in New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and other states protested very loudly against their disfranchisement.

Although some blacks enjoyed the right to vote before the Emancipation Proclamation and the Fifteenth Amendment, no black man was elected to any important office except John Mercer Langston who was elected clerk of Brownhelm Township, Lorain County, Ohio in 1855. He then became the first black to win elective office in the history of the United States, but with the termination of the Civil
War there came an expansion of the suffrage for blacks, and new opportunities to fill both high elective and appointive office. Consequently, the right to vote for many blacks came only after the passage of the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments; while aimed primarily at the South, these amendments affected, or were to affect, the entire nation politically—there were several Northern states in 1867 that denied the suffrage to black people. Included in this category were the states of Michigan, New York, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas and Ohio. While blacks were holding public office on several levels in politics and government in the South, they were not similarly situated in the North, with the exception of Massachusetts, the first state to elect blacks to its legislature. Edward G. Walker and Charles L. Mitchell were thus elected to the Massachusetts State Legislature in 1866; three years later in Ohio, the suffrage was extended to blacks (1869), after having been defeated by a popular vote on a constitutional amendment in 1867. When the Fifteenth Amendment was first presented in the Ohio General Assembly, it was not ratified—after a short period this refusal was reconsidered and the amendment passed through the Senate by a slender margin of 19 to 18. Therefore, it was by a margin of one vote that blacks won the suffrage in Ohio. A year later in 1870, black delegates attended the Republican State Convention for the first time in Ohio. Consequently, these are the
events that contributed toward setting the stage for the 
election of blacks in Ohio to the state legislature—to 
become a reality within the decade thereafter.

Black Membership in the Ohio House of Representatives: 
The Pre-Contemporary Group

Seventy-seven years after Ohio became the seventeenth 
state and eleven years after suffrage was granted to black 
Ohioans, the first black legislator, George Washington 
Williams, an attorney from Hamilton County, took his seat 
in the Ohio House of Representatives. He was elected in 
1879 and took office in 1880. Williams was one of nine 
Republicans, but the only black legislator comprising the 
Hamilton County delegation; when he became a member of the 
Sixty-fourth General Assembly in 1880, the Republicans held 
the majority in the House with 69 of the 114 member legis-
lature. This partisan breakdown further symbolized the 
strength of the Republican party in Ohio at the time when 
black voters became wedded to the party. This union was 
created because of the existing image of the Republican party 
as "the party of Lincoln," who issued the Emancipation 
Proclamation verbally freeing 4 million slaves; thus, it was 
no great surprise that the first black legislator came from 
the Republican ranks. As earlier noted, blacks had been 
first permitted to attend the Republican State Convention as 
full-fledged delegates in 1870. Furthermore, the first
27 black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives were Republicans. The pre-contemporary group—those who served in the House in the past but are not current members—contained 26 Republicans out of a total of 30 in this group. Only in recent times (the 1960s) has the partisan picture changed directions, as will be discussed later in the chapter. Since George Washington Williams was elected in 1880, black legislators have served intermittently in the Ohio House of Representatives to date. Table 1 illustrates this representation.

It is revealed in Table 1 that the largest number of black legislators to serve at any one time, save the 107th General Assembly (1967-1969), was three; for example, three black legislators served together in the House in the years 1886, 1894, 1896, 1942 and 1946—the 1967 membership numbered 9 and represented a departure from the trend, but it is not clearly illustrated on the table due to the fact that some of those members are included in the contemporary group, composed of those ten black legislators who are members of the Ohio House in 1971. Thus, it can be confirmed that the black membership in the House did not reach group proportions until the 1960s when the advent of reapportionment augmented black representation in that body.

In the occupational groups listed in Table 1, attorneys lead with 43 per cent, i.e., 43 per cent of all black legislators who served in the Ohio House in the past
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64th</td>
<td>George Washington Williams</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1880-1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th</td>
<td>John P. Green</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1882-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th</td>
<td>Jere A. Brown</td>
<td>Carpenter and Joiner</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1886-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th</td>
<td>Robert Harlan</td>
<td>Horseman</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1886-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th</td>
<td>Benjamin W. Arrett</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1886-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68th</td>
<td>William H. Copeland</td>
<td>Market Master</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1888-1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70th</td>
<td>George H. Jackson</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1892-1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st</td>
<td>Samuel B. Hill</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1894-1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st,</td>
<td>Harry C. Smith</td>
<td>Editor-Publisher</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1896-1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd</td>
<td>William H. Clifford</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1894-1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1898-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd</td>
<td>William H. Farham</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1896-1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd</td>
<td>William R. Stewart</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1896-1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1898-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>George W. Hays</td>
<td>U.S. Court Crier</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1902-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1904-1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83rd</td>
<td>H. T. Eubanks</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1904-1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1909-1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84th-87th</td>
<td>A. Lee Beatty</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1919-1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88th</td>
<td>Harry E. Davis</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1921-1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1925-1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1923-1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1927-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th, 95th</td>
<td>Perry B. Jackson</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1929-1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91st</td>
<td>Chester K. Gillespie</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1933-1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1943-1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94th</td>
<td>R. P. McClain</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1935-1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th</td>
<td>David D. Turpeau</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1941-1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1943-1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1947-1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th</td>
<td>Sandy F. Ray</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1943-1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96th</td>
<td>Jacob Ashburn, Sr.</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1945-1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97th</td>
<td>Francis E. Young</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1947-1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97th</td>
<td>William B. Saunders</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1947-1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99th-100th</td>
<td>Frederick Bowers</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1951-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1953-1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99th-101st</td>
<td>A. Bruce McClure</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1951-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1953-1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1955-1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105th, 106th</td>
<td>Carl B. Stokesb</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1963-1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1965-1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1969-1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107th-108th</td>
<td>Thomas E. Hill</td>
<td>Salesman-Printer</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1967-1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1969-1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107th-108th</td>
<td>Phillip M. DeLaine</td>
<td>Ex-Policeman</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1967-1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1969-1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Information on the 30 black legislators included in the pre-contemporary group came from a number of sources. Some of the more important ones are: Charles H. Wesley, Negro Americans in Ohio: A Sesquicentennial View (Wilberforce: Central State College, 1953); James H. Rodabaugh, op. cit.; Luella G. White, et al., "Distinguished Negroes in Ohio," Negro History Bulletin, V (May, 1942), 174-176, 184-186; an autobiography by John P. Green, Fact Stranger Than Fiction (Cleveland: Riel Printing Company, 1920), especially chapter 8; William J. Simmons (ed.), Men of
TABLE 1 (continued)


b Now Mayor of Cleveland, he was one of the most influential black legislators to serve in the House during the 1960s.
were attorneys. This factor jibes with the trend in state legislatures which has shown a tendency for lawyers to predominate in the membership because of their special training, skills and the prevalent public view that the legal profession is the most legitimate source of public leadership. Clergymen came next representing only 13 per cent of the pre-contemporary group; this may be somewhat of a surprise given the traditional role of the black minister as a political leader; the remainder of the professions show a scattering devoid of any special significance in terms of occupational trends. In addition, the two largest urban counties in Ohio accounted for the largest percentage of the group; Cuyahoga County supplied 43 per cent and 40 per cent came from Hamilton County. And Republicans constituted 87 per cent of the group’s membership, with the Democrats accounting for only 13 per cent. Thus, the data contained in Table 1 enables one to gain a clearer view of some of the characteristics of black legislators who served in the House in past years.

This chapter has treated some of the historical factors that accounted for the emergence of black representation in the Ohio House of Representatives. For this purpose the early legislative developments, along with black suffrage and political participation were delineated; these efforts provide essential background data for treatment of the ten contemporary black representatives in the House of Representatives.
Footnotes for Chapter II


6. Rose, op. cit.


15. Griffin and Smith, op. cit., p. 18. The General Assembly was able to prohibit this alteration for more than forty years by the method of holding an adjourned session in the alternate years when regular sessions had not been scheduled.


17. Ibid.


22. Ibid., p. 418.


CHAPTER III
THE BLACK LEGISLATORS: SOME INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

Ecological Origins

There have been numerous tabulations of the occupation, age, income level and similar characteristics of members of various legislative bodies in the United States; this work is rooted in the presumption that the legislator's behavior is influenced by his social background.¹ The social characteristics of constituencies have also been found to play a major role in shaping the behavior of the legislator. Therefore, this chapter aims to explore the background characteristics of the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives, giving attention to such factors as place of birth, father's occupation, the legislator's occupation, age, constituency, residence in district, role perception and other similar characteristics. In essence, the efforts in this chapter are directed at determining: Who are the black legislators? Where do they come from? What kind of constituencies do they represent? What are their socio-economic characteristics?

The typical American legislator is usually a "local boy," and legislative careers in the United States are
usually closed to newcomers in the community. A small
town or rural heritage and long residence in the community
tend to confer representative legitimacy upon aspirants
to legislative office in this country.\textsuperscript{2} The ten black
legislators in the Ohio House fit most of this pattern,
except their heritage reflects more of an urban setting
than the above stipulations. Their places of birth reveal
a scattered picture, e.g., 40 per cent were born in the
Midwest; 40 per cent in the South; 10 per cent in the
Central United States; and 10 per cent in the East. In
growing up, the interview information revealed that 80 per
cent spent this time living in the city, and the same per-
centage in the Midwest. Only 10 per cent spent most of
their time growing up in a small town; and 10 per cent grew
up in the South. This data shows evidence of the tradi-
tional black migration characteristic of the black popula-
tion since the early 1900s, i.e., 40 per cent of the black
legislators were born in the South, but apparently migrated
to the Midwest at an early age. All of the black legis-
lators are long-time residents of their district, as is
shown in Table 2. The results recorded below were derived
from responses to an interview question asking: How long
have you lived in your district?

It has been hypothesized, in addition, by students of
legislative politics that the political recruitment process
in the United States gives very disproportionate weight to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residence in the District</th>
<th>Number of Legislators</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of your life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighty per cent of your life or over 30 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

those who come from middle class and upper middle class family backgrounds. The most frequently employed method to test this thesis has been through an examination of the occupation of the fathers of legislators.

Table 3 reveals a picture of the black legislator's family background that deviates from the norm characterizing most white legislators in the same category. The average black legislator in the Ohio House came from more humble origins wherein the socio-economic status of the family was somewhat lower—the blue collar working class has the largest percentage of the occupations listed in Table 3. None of the high status professions like law, medicine, teaching, engineering, etc., are listed among the occupations of fathers of the black legislators. It can be
TABLE 3

OCCUPATIONS OF THE FATHERS OF THE BLACK LEGISLATORS IN THE OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortician</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

appropriately deduced that the typical black legislator grew up with modest economic resources, and does not duplicate the white prototype in the middle and upper middle class described by Matthews and others who have examined the family backgrounds of legislative decision-makers. Then too, this economic predicament is indicative of the plight of the largest percentage of black Americans who have for a long time experienced a low socio-economic status because of racial discrimination. Only the 20 per cent listed as morticians may be considered anywhere near the middle class economic level due to the volume of business handled by practitioners of this profession, thus enabling them to live above the subsistence level. But still, the picture is one which reflects rearings from humble origins. In addition, the average black legislator came from a
relatively large family averaging approximately 6.1 persons; this factor helps to further explain the economic environment surrounding the black legislator's family background with greater insight. Consequently, the middle class and upper middle class are not overrepresented among the black legislators.

**Political Socialization**

Political socialization refers to the process by which one becomes inducted into the prevailing political culture. It is concerned with the ways in which a person "comes to terms" with the roles and norms of the concentric political worlds--local, regional, and national--into which he passes as he grows up. Further, it focuses on memorable experiences--in the family, school and primary group context of childhood and in some cases adulthood--that fashion ideals and give insight into the political aspects of life. Most often, the family environment provides an opportunity for the politicization of the individual, even though some legislators develop their interests in politics as adults, and some perhaps only after they have been elected to office; most begin to develop political interests at a time when they are greatly influenced by their families. Participation in school politics or engaging in the study of politics in school may lead to the
development of lasting political interests. Others become interested in politics through involvement and participation in the activities of a political party, or campaign work, lobbying, or through other civic activity. Still others are influenced by great events—wars, depressions, or impressive presidential elections—which may cause one to become interested in politics; participation in athletics may also foster political interests.

Black legislators in the House were asked, "When did you become interested in politics?" Their responses reflect the normal ingredients of the socialization process. The responses of five black legislators contain the following remarks:

A. My interest in politics grew out of college athletics starting back in the 1930s. and I were good athletes, and we went from place to place meeting people—that's what politics is, you know, meeting people. In addition, my athletic scholarship required me to work as a page in the Ohio House of Representatives where I gained a great deal of insight into the nature of politics.

B. As a teenager around 19 years of age, I had a high-school teacher who was running for the State Senate in Ohio; I used to help him distribute campaign materials, and I then became interested in politics.

C. As a kid around 10 or 12 years old, I used to attend political rallies in my neighborhood where beer and hotdogs were served. I was excited by these rallies and likewise the mystics of politics.
D. At 21 years of age, it became time for me to register to vote and choose a party. I then became interested in politics.

E. When F.D.R. was President during the 1930s, I can recall very vividly the charity lines, i.e., going with my mother to get food; the older folk were always talking about how F.D.R. was going to bring the country away from the bread lines. I always remembered that.

These remarks clearly illustrate the importance of formative experiences in the home, school, and community that are agents contributing to the induction of the individual into the political culture.

Political Recruitment

Recruitment of candidates for political office is another key variable to scrutinize in the process of unraveling the individual background characteristics of the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives. Our primary concern is with the factors accounting for the black legislator reaching his decision to seek a seat in the state legislature, i.e., the motives of the candidate are explored. When one looks for a model of political recruitment, the work of James David Barber provides a useful frame of reference. Barber established three fundamental elements of political recruitment: motivation, resources, and opportunities; accordingly, a political candidate for public office may find it expedient to ask
himself the following questions before reaching a decision to run for political office: 6

1. Do I want to? (motivation)
2. Can I do it? (resources)
3. Do they want me? (opportunity)

The first question depends upon the characteristics of the position being sought, for example, an individual who is already involved in politics, say in his own neighborhood or city, but not the holder of a political office, may become motivated to run for the state legislature as a base of operations. If an individual is already in public office he will have to choose between running for a higher office or remaining in the present office and continuing to serve in that capacity. There is a wide range of motives that may underlie a candidate's rationale for pursuing public office; however broad the range may extend, an appraisal of this dimension is a lucrative undertaking for engendering understandings relative to a candidate's political career.

In the second case, relating to the question "Can I do it" the potential candidate weighs his available resources for the job. He attempts to determine whether he possesses certain skills mandatory for the political office he seeks. A candidate who possesses laudable oratorical skills could consider this skill as an asset for the political office he
desires to be elected. If an individual has been an outstanding athlete and thus became a well-known personality in the community wherein he is running, this resource may very well augment his chances for winning the election. Hence, the person's perception of the demands of the office on the resources possessed by him will be an important consideration in his reaching a decision.7

The third question: Do they want me? pertains to perceived available opportunities. Contained therein are the desires and wishes of party leaders, friends, civic organizations, and/or the general public. Then the candidate carefully weighs his chances of winning the office he seeks—he observes the ebb and flow of the political tides. Calculations along these lines will depend a great deal on the peculiarities of the political system within which the candidate is to be selected including the community's population, stability, party balance and political values.8 As a result, Barber contends, if anyone of these factors are missing the potential candidate stands a chance of not being recruited. A knowledge of these three variables are essential for gaining insight into political recruitment.

The responses of the black legislators given to a question about their political recruitment jibes with Barber's model. Specifically, they were asked, How did you
reach your decision to seek a seat in the state legislature? Representative responses included:

A. A lady professor from [North Carolina Central University] in Durham, North Carolina came to ____ to speak at a benefit for the ____ party, and she told everyone what a good job I had been doing in Iran setting up a program in athletics, etc. She spoke of how I had spread a good image for America and Ohio; she said, "This is the kind of person you should have in the state legislature or in Congress." Afterwards the county chairman of the ____ party called and asked me to run. I thought about it for a while, and then I decided to run.

B. Around 1967, after I finished playing professional basketball, I became active in politics on the local level. There was some indecision in choosing a viable candidate from my district--this influenced me. I had kicked the idea around a lot before deciding. The party endorsement was strong and the [newspaper] adopted the position that "we need a black politician representing us from this area." So I decided to run.

C. I became aware of the duties of a state legislator while campaigning for ____ who was running for office on that level. And I became aware of my own chances of winning a seat with the appearance of the one man, one vote decision in the reapportionment cases.

D. It took a great deal of soul searching. The decision was based on the philosophy that I could better serve the people whom I had been working with in politics, already, by seeking a seat in the legislature.

E. When reapportionment came I had about 18 years of active work in politics, e.g., at
the precinct level and with voter registration drives, etc., I then decided to run.

The above statements fit into Barber's model; some overlap with respect to categorization into motivation, resources, and opportunity, but isolation of these distinct variables can be realized through close examination.

In addition to the preceding material, it is essential to note the sources of support black legislators received in their campaign for seats in the legislature. For example, the black legislators received their greatest support from labor unions, 50 per cent; the parties, 50 per cent; civil rights groups, 40 per cent; and grassroots community organizations, 40 per cent. Labor unions have been prone to support civil rights legislation for a long time and their support of the black legislators is indicative of this continued alliance. The parties, too, gave strong support to the black candidates; the backing of civil rights groups and grassroots community organizations was to be expected, and the results verified this expectation. Significantly, the study found further that professional organizations and newspapers did not lend a great deal of support to the campaigns of black legislators.

Constituency

Legislative studies have shown that constituency exerts a dominant influence on the behavior of the typical
representative. Therefore, in order for one to gain insight on the external variables affecting the behavior of the legislator in the decision-making process in the legislative assembly, heavy consideration must be given to constituency factors. Each individual legislator elected represents a distinct geographical district with its own demographic characteristics; if the legislator expects to be reelected, he must consider the demands, requests, interests, etc., of those from the constituency that elected him. Most frequently there is a tendency for a legislator's social attributes to almost invariably reflect the social values of his constituency. Both the local party and the constituency tend to select representatives who mirror the dominant social values of their district. Therefore, the evidence promulgated through studying state legislatures confirm such social characteristics as race, religion, ethnic and national origin tend to determine who the representatives from a given constituency will be. Consequently, it becomes very clear, based on the patterns of residential segregation existing in the society at large, that the black legislator is a product of the predominantly black constituency. The black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives basically conform to this pattern, save for a few variations.

According to the interview data, seven of the nine black Democrats in the Ohio House represent predominantly
black districts, viz., the range of the numerical black majority in these constituencies range from 60 to 90 per cent. In addition to these seven Democrats, one constituency represented by a black legislator has an equal black-white ratio of 50 per cent, and in another the white population is in the majority, the breakdown is 55 per cent white and 45 per cent black. On the other hand, the lone black Republican hails from a district 95 per cent white and 5 per cent black. Further, the constituencies represented by the nine black Democrats are urban areas, thus reflecting the concentration of blacks in the "inner city," while the district represented by the black Republican is suburban in composition.¹³

Precise socio-economic statistics pertaining to the geographical districts encompassed in the Ohio House of Representatives are unavailable and inaccessible for utilization in this research; this is one of the major problems one encounters in studying the state legislature. There is no facsimile of the compilation of pertinent socio-economic data for national congressional districts; there is a significant need to similarly compile such data for state legislatures. Nevertheless, given the nature of problems characterizing most American cities, it can be sufficiently ascertained that the nine black Democrats, especially based on interview data, come from districts wherein poverty, welfare, unemployment and residential
segregation are significant factors to contend with. Some of the major interests of black constituents as identified by the black legislators in the course of the interviews are listed below. They were asked, "How would you rank some of the major interests of your constituents?" The top ranking interests included:

1. Better housing
2. Improved educational facilities
3. Unemployment
4. Police protection
5. Increased welfare payments
6. Police community relations
7. Recreational and cultural activities
8. Transportation for the black community
9. Health services
10. General urban problems

Hence, these interests constitute the kind of issues black legislators most often have to concern themselves with; they are the most frequently articulated interests of the constituencies represented by the black legislators. The listing, particularly the items related to housing, unemployment and welfare, symbolize major problems facing black urban dwellers. Of particular significance is the fact that the black unemployment rate (nationally), is always double the white rate, and in some cities, the unemployment rate is several times greater among blacks. For example, the unemployment rate among blacks in the Hough area of Cleveland is usually five times the rate for the city as a whole.15
In order to keep in tune with the pulse of the constituencies they represent, the black legislators maintain much contact with their constituents. Regular speeches are made in their districts, and they receive mail from their constituents (varying with the issues involved), and most of their contact with constituents is informal in nature. Holding "open house" is one of the tactics employed by black legislators to find out constituency interests. This entails conducting open meetings periodically allowing constituents to express their interests and present grievances. Another tactic employed by the black legislators is contacting constituents on a one-to-one basis, by going to the bars, churches, etc., or simply "conversing on the streets." Frequent attendance at neighborhood meetings is still another means of "finding out" what the people in their district want. But like all politicians who wish to be reelected, the black legislators consider a knowledge of their constituent's opinions very imperative in determining the way they will vote on a given issue. In the words of one black legislator, this position was explicated when he averred, "I wouldn't vote for anything that wasn't good for my constituents." (Thus, constituency factors weigh heavily on the behavior of the black legislator in the decision-making process.)
Role Perception

How the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives view their roles in the legislature is fruitful for exploration in the present investigation. Role analysis has been utilized by political scientists as a fundamental unit for the analysis of the political behavior of a group such as the one under present scrutiny. Possibly more than any other concept in the social sciences, the concept of role furnishes a model of the legislator (as an acting human individual), consistent with the basic understanding of individual and group psychology. It supplies a model of the legislature as an institutionalized human group logically incorporating the model of the individual legislator and relating the behavior of legislators to problems of legislative structure and functions—these are traditional concerns for students of the legislative process.

For purposes of the current research, social role is defined as an organized pattern of expectancies that relate to the tasks, demeanors, attitudes, values and reciprocal relations to be maintained by persons occupying specific membership positions and fulfilling definable functions in any group. The basic concern of this attentiveness to role analysis in the office of the legislator is a clearly recognizable position, since legislators and many other persons in society associate certain norms of behavior with
these positions. To study the role of the legislator then is to study a particular set of norms that underlie relevant legislative behavior.18

The concept of role is additionally functional to the problem of defining boundaries of the legislative system and may be said to set the limits of the legislative role system. Since there are present boundaries, actors in the legislative system become prone to role conflict. This happens because:

Many relationships are not structured unipolar roles alone. In most cases, a role is at the core of several other roles making for a network of roles that can be very complex. A legislator is a "colleague" to his fellow legislators, "representative" to constituents, "friends" (or enemy) to lobbyists, "follower" to his party leader, "informant" to the press, and so on. Whatever role is taken, simultaneously or seriatim, what emerges is a very intricate structure of relations in which one role is implicated in several others.19

Any study of legislative roles should wisely consider the various role conflicts in analyzing legislative bodies.

Significantly, legislators begin to acquire role orientations only at the initiation of their legislative careers.

In these regards, it has been maintained that:

Each legislator to be possesses some sort of "role" potential," according to the attributes, roles and other personal characteristics shaped by such demographic variables as age, sex, ethnic group, religion and socio-economic status, and by such "ecological variables" of his salient environments, particularly his state and his legislative district, as size and density of population, political character and socio-economic character.20
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conflict with his personal judgment or principles; and the politico is the legislator who assumes both the role of the trustee and delegate at one time or another and seeks to reconcile the two different orientations. In the author's estimation, A and B approximate the delegate role; B and D are trustees, while C symbolizes the politico role. Nonetheless, the interview data showed a tendency among the black legislators to lean toward the delegate role—it is seemingly the dominant among these gentlemen. And they also reflect the image of the politicians who is significantly "people oriented"; in other words, they mirror the politician who honestly and enthusiastically endeavors to represent the interests of the people in their districts. Since the needs of the black community are numerous due to centuries of racial oppression and discrimination, the black legislator has to perform a number of additional roles for his black constituents such as those of counselor, social worker, domestic relations arbitrator, etc. In essence, this means the black legislator is expected by his constituents to perform whatever services need to be performed.

Attention is now directed to other individual characteristics of a more specific nature. Encompassed within is background data relating to the district, county, age, party, tenure, occupation, and education of the contemporary group of black legislators. It is shown in
Table 4 that the black legislator is a product of the predominantly urban counties in Ohio and likewise those containing the largest percentage of black citizens in their boundaries. Data on age in the table registers 49.1 years as the average age of the black legislators; the average number of terms served by the black legislator is 2, and three of the black legislators are serving their freshman terms. A majority among the contemporary black legislators is held by the Democratic party due to the concentration of blacks in urban areas—one of the sources of strength of the party, and reapportionment reversed the trend previously favoring black Republican membership in the House. Professions represented in the table don't give dominance to any one group, and coupled with the annual salaries received from their legislative chores, amounting to $12,750 annually, it can be surmised that the black legislators are located in the middle income bracket. Significance can also be attached to the fact that attorneys are not represented within the group; the possible reason for this is their potential for finding "greener pastures" elsewhere. All of the black legislators have had some college training, with six completing four years of college; three are business college graduates, one attended college, and six had some graduate school training; consequently, the educational dimension characteristic of the group is typical of other legislators in
**TABLE 4**

BACKGROUND DATA ON THE CONTEMPORARY BLACK LEGISLATORS
IN THE OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator</th>
<th>District and County</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David D. Albritton</td>
<td>85, Montgomery</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher-Coach; Insurance Agent</td>
<td>Graduate: Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phale D. Hale</td>
<td>63, Franklin</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>Graduate: Morehouse College; Gamson Theological Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Lee James</td>
<td>46, Cuyahoga</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Retail Food Distributor</td>
<td>Graduate: Bethany College; Western Reserve University; Fenn College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Jones</td>
<td>78, Lucas</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>Graduate: Knoxville College; University of Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Mallory</td>
<td>72, Hamilton</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Graduate: Central State University; Xavier University; University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. J. McLin, Jr.</td>
<td>88, Montgomery</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mortician</td>
<td>Graduate: Cincinnati School of Embalming; attended Virginia Union University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator</td>
<td>District and County</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Rankin</td>
<td>69, Hamilton</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>Graduate: Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Smith</td>
<td>42, Cuyahoga</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Real Estate-Insurance</td>
<td>Graduate: Diamond Business College, Fenn College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ike Thompson</td>
<td>41, Cuyahoga</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>Attended: Cleveland State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Thompson, Jr.</td>
<td>44, Cuyahoga</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate-Insurance</td>
<td>Graduate: Cleveland Engineering Institute; Fenn College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Age as of January 1971.

Number of terms served; the blank spaces represent those serving their freshman term in the House.
similar categories. Data of the nature supplied in Table 4 enables one to acquire greater insight into the behavior of these legislators.

Two other notable variables apply to our survey of the individual attributes of the black legislators. They are the individual black legislator's perception of his own influence and his perception of race as a factor affecting his behavior in the legislature. In the first instance, a definition of influence has already been constructed in Chapter I. Here we need simply to ascertain the extent to which black legislators feel they exercise influence.

Representative samples appear below:

A. It's difficult for a minority within a minority to exercise influence. You have to identify allies and enemies. You have to constantly articulate the needs and interests of your constituents through an educational process. Some of my colleagues don't understand the meaning of welfare, e.g., welfare is nothing more than a mother with an infant child who needs help, i.e., you have to educate your colleagues.

B. Yes, influence is used through one's position, i.e., the power to persuade with votes through an organizational power-base in the community. The value of your vote in the House is important--other legislators seek it. This is influence.

C. I represent a voice, i.e., a segment of the state that is demanding to be heard. I pair off with legislators of unlike views and try to convince them to adopt my views.
D. Yes, I use influence to get jobs; black legislators have to supply pressures to get jobs for blacks. We have had to fight to get black persons in cabinet posts.

E. Every representative is influential because he controls a vote. Your influence becomes greater when you establish creditability and integrity with other members of the House.

All of the black legislators viewed their position in the legislature as one wielding influence, only with the understandable exception of one freshman who noted, "Not at this point, I am only a freshman." In addition to the above manifestations of the influence exercised by individual black legislators, there are also positions of influence held by black legislators in the House. The black Republican is the sole black committee chairman and he has the most seniority of any black legislator. Both contribute to his use of influence. Another black legislator is a minority whip, a position considered to symbolize influence, especially with party members. Two black legislators are secretaries of committees on which they hold membership, but they didn't consider these positions very influential. And for the first time, a black legislator has been appointed as the governor's advisor on minority group affairs; this position is vested with considerable influence. Based on the aforementioned reasons, we can affirm that the black legislators do exercise influence in the Ohio House.
Concerning "race" as a factor affecting legislative behavior, the attempt is to ascertain whether the legislature duplicates the racial situation existing in the society at-large. Seventy per cent of the black legislators felt their racial identity did affect their behavior as legislators. The question asked was: Does race hamper your effectiveness as a legislator? Sample responses appear below:

A. Yes, in the spirit in which I act; if I were white, I could and would be able to accomplish more.

B. In my opinion, no. I believe that facts outweigh race. I try to find the factual elements underlying issues; I don't protect the racial thing. There are other situations more important.

C. Any person who shows up is thrown into a black bag, i.e., blacks are hampered anywhere in the country, so the legislature is no exception.

D. There is no question that it does.... Because one is in the legislature doesn't make him any fairer. He renders decisions based on peoples' wishes in his district.

E. It's not to the degree that it is in the total society. In politics, I have a vote and it doesn't make any difference whether I am black or white--they want my vote.

On the other hand, all 16 of the white legislators were asked the same question; 75 per cent contended race was no barrier to the black legislators in the House; the other 25 per cent saw race as a barrier. A representative set of responses were:
A. In past years, yes; but now, no. Blacks and whites in the legislature are all alike--it's beautiful!

B. I would say this--if there were a black running for the position, he would be on even keel with anyone else. But there would be some members who would react negatively because he's black. How many? I don't know.

C. Race is no problem in the House. But I realize that the problem is serious in the society as a whole.

D. Race is not a barrier on the floor. There is less prejudice and discrimination in the legislature than anywhere else.

E. Race is no barrier to any group. In practical politics, you have to be with the majority.

F. I don't see any barrier in the House. There may be some discrimination in private clubs in the city.

G. Race could be considered a barrier. If there was a position open and one white man ran against one black member, the white would win.

H. Yes, only with a prejudiced legislator, i.e., the same as it is on Main Street, U.S.A. How many? I don't know.

I. There are three groups that are despised in American society: blacks, Catholics, and Jews. I think that it's a strike against you if you're born black, and if you're poor, that's another strike. It doesn't always come out, but it's there.

These disparities and suspicions shown in these analyses symbolize the racial conditions existing in American society as a whole; election to the state legislature does not rid the individual of his existing biases and prejudices, for the legislature is merely a microcosm of the
larger society. The range of racial myths, suspicions and tensions apparent in the larger society are likely to find way into the legislative halls, but the extent to which race is a factor is not the same as in the larger society—the role of the legislator puts him in a position in which he is expected to behave toward others in a fair and tolerant manner. He cannot succumb to blatant acts of racism that are likely to occur in society at large. Hence, the evidence found in the investigation leads to the conclusion that the state legislature is not completely free from racial discrimination; in other words, the black legislators conceive race to be a factor in their relations with colleagues and subsequently this image affects their behavior in the legislative chambers. Black legislators have sometimes been denied privileges accorded to their white colleagues in private clubs in the city.

The spirit of the efforts exerted in this chapter point to the contention that in order to understand the legislative behavior of a particular group of decision-makers, one needs to examine background factors such as county, district, age, tenure, party, and education; since the average black legislator comes from a constituency that is urban, Democratic, and has a heavy concentration of black inhabitants, it is expected that he will direct a great deal of his attention to issues appertaining to this set of conditions. This is not to say that the black
legislator will not be concerned with a host of other issues, as is any other legislator, but issues pertinent to the black community are likely to receive wide attention from these individuals—especially the nine black Democrats.

In the chapter that follows, the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives will be treated as an informal group; among the dimensions delineated will appear some of the issues the black legislators have dealt with as a group during the 109th General Assembly.
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CHAPTER IV

THE BLACK LEGISLATORS AS AN INFORMAL GROUP IN
THE OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Ohio House of Representatives, like similar representative bodies, reflects a "group life" and encompasses a set of group norms. Informal groups are consequently nurtured within the chamber's environment. Legislators who possess similar interests, constituencies, political ideologies, professional skills, committee memberships, socio-economic backgrounds, etc., have a tendency to identify with informal groups that symbolize these distinct characteristics. As a consequence of these factors, the main purposes of this chapter are to sketch the fundamental structural and procedural dimensions of the House; to ascertain the black legislators' status as an informal group and give attention to the kind of issues and projects with which these legislators are involved.

Within the House of Representatives the black membership includes 9 Democrats and 1 Republican. Accordingly, this membership constitutes 10.1 per cent of the total House membership; and the 9 black Democrats also comprise 20 per cent of their party's membership. The lone black Republican accounts for only 2 per cent of the Republican party's
membership in the House. Comparatively, blacks make up approximately 9 per cent of the population of the State of Ohio, while there is slightly in excess of 10 per cent black membership in the House.

The leadership echelon in the Ohio House of Representatives consists of the Speaker, the party leaders and the committee chairmen. In this hierarchy, the Speaker is the hub of leadership activity in the House; he maintains liaison with the Governor (when he is of the same party) and the state party chairman. He can control the calendar through the Rules Committee and keep tab on and influence committee action through the chairmen.\(^2\) Selection for this prestigious position is usually determined by a majority party caucus soon after the election in November preceding the legislative session. He usually has vast opportunities to determine the fate of legislation through his choice of committee appointments, i.e., he may be under considerable pressure from organized groups to pack certain committees with members sympathetic to those interests.\(^3\) Similar circumstances may enable a strong presiding officer . . . to place on certain key committees men who can be depended on to support the party, faction, or interests to which the presiding officer belongs.\(^4\) Aside from his formal control over the appointment of committees and assignment of bills to them, the Speaker in some states exercises considerable power in presiding over the House; specifically, the Speaker on occasion may recognize some members and
ignore demands for a roll call, or exercise wide discretion in judging voice votes. In the absence of the Speaker, the Speaker Pro Tempore exercises all of his rights, duties, privileges and responsibilities. The Speaker and Speaker Pro Tempore are assisted in the performance of their leadership responsibilities by the Majority Floor Leader and the Assistant Majority Floor Leader.

The Majority Floor Leader often assists the Speaker in planning committee assignments and developing legislative strategy; on the floor he manages the administration's bills. Chief spokesman for the minority party is the Minority Floor Leader; he is assisted in mapping party strategy by the Assistant Minority Leader and the Minority Whip; these are chosen by the minority party prior to the opening of the legislative session.

Standing committee chairmen and permanent subcommittee chairmen form the remainder of the leadership strata in the House. As in most legislative bodies, the bulk of the work in the House is done in standing committees, consequently these committees take on added significance. All members in the House serve on some committee, most serve on at least two; the Speaker, majority and minority floor leaders serve on the Rules Committee and are ex-officio members of all other committees in the House. Assignment to these committees by the Speaker is usually predicated on the interests, qualifications, seniority and party affiliation of the
legislators. Where possible, the party leaders try to fulfill members' desires for assignment; since the Republican party is in the majority in the House in the 1971 House of Representatives, all committee chairmen and vice-chairmen are Republicans. Minority representation on committees corresponds to the proportion of the total membership constituted by the minority party. Table 5 lists the standing committees in the Ohio House during the 109th General Assembly and their black membership.

The most significant factor emerging from the table is that the largest percentage representation of blacks on any committee is on Health, Education and Welfare; this results from both interest and necessity because of the significant percentage of blacks receiving public assistance. Black legislators also indicate a keen interest in the problems of the city. This helps account for their relatively large representation on the committees on Local Government and Urban Affairs; the Committee on State Government has ranking black representation for similar reasons. Black legislators are underrepresented on the Finance Appropriations, Reference, and Rules Committees. A black member served for the first time during the 108th General Assembly on the Rules Committee, but he was not reappointed in the 109th General Assembly since he supported the losing candidate for the minority leader position in the Democratic party. Consequently, the winner of the contest decided to select his
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees and Chairmen</th>
<th>No. of Members</th>
<th>No. of Black Legislators</th>
<th>Per cent Black Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Commerce and Labor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard A. Knight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee on Agribusiness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Natural Resources</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Creasy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance-Appropriations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd George Kerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Education and Welfare</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Murdock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Transportation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon M. Scherer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance, Public Utilities and Financial Institutions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Netzley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Cooperation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David D. Albrightanb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees and Chairmen</th>
<th>No. of Members</th>
<th>No. of Black Legislators</th>
<th>Per cent Black Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph P. Tulley</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government and Urban Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Thorpe</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith McNamara</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Kurfess</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Manning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee on Elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick N. Young</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways and Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. W. Lampson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The only black chairman.
own man, thus eliminating black membership from this com-
mittee. 7

The Rules Committee and the Reference Committee, be-
cause of their functions and powers, are rated the most
influential in the House. The Rules Committee is chaired
by the Speaker and is basically a "screening committee";
bills referred to the House are sent to this Committee for
placement on the agenda. As a result, it can determine the
life or death of a bill. Upon investigation, one finds
that the Reference Committee is basically an innovation of
the Ohio House of Representatives. As far back as 1921,
the House of Representatives of the Ohio General Assembly
established a committee of eight members (now eleven),
whose duty it was to scan all bills introduced for the
purpose of determining whether they were frivolous or irrele-
vant, not introduced in good faith, or duplications of
existing law. 8 The Reference Committee still performs this
function in the Ohio House. In the process, it relieves
the Speaker of this chore he would otherwise have to per-
form, and power in this committee is virtually exercised
by the chairman, who has the power to control the com-
mittee's agenda. Generally, the committee reviews proposals,
ascertains content and assigns them to an appropriate stand-
ing committee without too much ado. 9 For these reasons,
black membership on these committees would enhance their
influence.
Bills introduced in the House require three readings before passage, and a majority vote of those present and voting is necessary for the successful passage of a bill before the Ohio House of Representatives. Each bill introduced in the House is referred to the appropriate standing committee before it eventually goes on the floor for a vote. It is the standing committee's function to hold public hearings, amend and favorably report or eliminate a bill. When referred to the appropriate standing committee, the following action may be taken on a bill:

(1) postpone consideration indefinitely, thereby defeating it;
(2) recommend passage of the bill as introduced;
(3) offer amendments and recommend passage after adoption of the amendments;
(4) recommend a substitute bill; or
(4) allow a bill to die in committee without any action.

In addition to the standing committees, subcommittees, conference committees and joint committees or investigating committees are employed to perform special tasks designated by the House.

The House also possesses the sole power of impeachment, and a majority of the membership must agree in the procedure; after impeachment action is taken in the House, it becomes the duty of the Senate to conduct a trial. A two-
thirds vote is necessary for conviction.

**The Informal Group Configuration**

The interview data confirmed the existence of informal groups in the Ohio House of Representatives. Fifteen of the white legislators queried about informal groups acknowledged their existence in the House. These informal groups include occupational groups such as teachers, lawyers, farmers, etc.; ideological groups (liberals and conservatives); county delegations (especially Cuyahoga and Hamilton—they are the largest two counties); committee members (Judiciary, etc.); leadership strata (committee chairmen and advisors to the Speaker); geographical groups (urban, rural and suburban), and a racial group (the black legislators). As is readily observable, identification with these informal groups overlap, i.e., a legislator may be associated with more than one informal group. Basically, these groups become apparent when there is legislation affecting their interests pending in the House. One legislator made the point when he stated, "There are several informal groups; we don't identify them as such, but we know they're out there." They usually assemble privately without a great deal of fanfare, but may voice their sentiments, pro or con, on issues affecting them, without publicly revealing the group's identity as such. From an examination of the informal group configuration, it is
concluded that the teachers are pro-school legislation; the conservatives are anti-welfare; the liberals are pro-legalized abortion, pro-civil rights legislation, pro-18-year-old voting, etc. The farm group was once referred to as "The Cornstalk Brigade"—this group existed in the House a few sessions before the current 109th General Assembly; they represented the rural and farming interests, but their group strength declined due to the impact of reapportionment which reduced their numbers. The county delegations are known to assemble frequently when there is legislation before the House pertinent to their interests, and so do the urban, rural and suburban legislators—they are invariably contained already in the county delegations. The members of the Judiciary Committee, who are mostly lawyers, skilled in legal principles, are drawn together because of the group's possession of legal expertise. And the black legislators, due to a long history of racial discrimination existing in the society at large, feel impelled to assemble as an informal group to protect and oversee "black interests." 12 Hence, we can identify the black legislators as one of the several informal groups within the informal group configuration characteristic of the Ohio House of Representatives.
The Black Legislators: Their Status as an Informal Group

Foundations for the black legislators' status as an informal group are traceable back to 1967 during the 107th General Assembly when the size of the black membership reached meaningful proportions for the first time in the history of the Ohio House of Representatives. Representatives David Albritton and Carl Stokes were the only blacks in the previous general assembly, but with the adoption of the new plan of reapportionment, seven other black legislators were elected in 1966 and took office in 1967. There were then 9 black legislators in the House; another black legislator was elected in 1968 increasing the number to 10 where it has since remained.

When the 7 black freshmen legislators entered the House of Representatives in 1967, there were, at that time, no House sponsored orientation sessions to acquaint new members with the rules and procedures of that body. Therefore, because the black legislators had no previous legislative experience, and since no concerted efforts were made by their colleagues to acquaint them with the duties of the job of a legislator, they first felt left out and bewildered. One black legislator who entered with this group, remarked about the experience, "No one took it upon himself to point out directions for us, and we were, without a doubt, sometimes out of order because of the newness to us of this kind of experience." Emerging from this initial
experience, a "group consciousness" developed among the black legislators as they felt a need to organize their forces for collective action directed at solving common problems and promoting mutual interests. Thus, during the course of the 1967 General Assembly, the black legislators began to meet informally to discuss legislation pending before the House as it affected the interests of their constituents and other common problems. There was never much fanfare attending their meeting together; however, during the same general assembly, one black legislator voiced sentiments publicly concerning the need to create a "black caucus" among the black Democratic legislators. Some of the black legislators felt this idea conveyed a sanctioning of the practice of "black separatism" in the legislative chambers and they tended to disdain the whole idea. But in spite of the debunking of this notion publicly by some black legislators, members of the group continued to meet informally whenever some pending legislation was conceived valuable for black constituents. Additionally, the practice of the black legislators getting together in the House to discuss common problems can also be attributed to the concurrent emergence of an organization known as "The Black Democratic Elected Officials of Ohio," coming into existence shortly after reapportionment augmented the number of black officeholders in the state. This organization encompassed all the black elected Democrats in the state;
it aimed to assemble all black Democratic officeholders in
the state to discuss common problems and interests, i.e.,
the organization served as a pressure group to protect and
promote black concerns and endeavored to get other black
Democratic candidates elected to public office. The informal
grouping in the House was an offshoot of this larger
undertaking, and later there were issues appearing before
the House after the initial stages of the group's informal
meetings, tending to draw black legislators closer together
for collective action. For example, an anti-riot bill
cleared the House in the 107th General Assembly and during
the 108th General Assembly, a third open housing bill appeared which, when first introduced, lacked significant
power of enforcement. The black legislators staged a
unified effort to oppose the bill until the loopholes were
closed. They did so successfully. The anti-riot bill was
viewed by the black legislators as a disguise for releasing
anti-black sentiments; hence, both of these issues necessi-
tated some kind of collective action on the part of the
black legislators. In the final analysis, the black
legislators' status as an informal group grew out of their
vision of a need to organize for purposes of promoting and
protecting black concerns, in the midst of a group of white
colleagues they considered insensitive and indifferent to
the plight of black citizens in the state.
The preceding analysis was aimed at adding some brief historical perspective to the informal group phenomenon. But the case in point is whether the contemporary black legislators in the 109th General Assembly are an informal group, following the pattern established in the two previous assemblies. In order to determine their existence an interview question so designed asked, "Do the black legislators constitute an informal group?" The nine black Democrats gave a positive response, while the lone black Republican registered a negative response. Therefore, the informal group entity applies to the nine black Democrats only; the black Republican is a deviate from this pattern. He represents a predominantly white constituency and he has to cater to their interests, if he expects to continue to win reelection. His ideological orientation also makes him a deviate; his ideological position was summed up when he stated:

"Look, I represent people... I don't care if they're black, white, yellow, purple, or if they have big feet or little feet. I represent all of them and I always try to do what's best for all of them.

When a man or a woman goes behind that voting booth curtain on election day and makes his mark, the person who counts the votes doesn't know if a black person or a white person made the mark... I represent these marks."

He further favors professionalism, diplomacy and statesmanship in the conduct of legislative affairs; according to him, this strategy is more productive than anything done
by an informal group of black legislators. In practical politics, he claims, numerical strength is most important and without a numerical majority an informal group is ineffective in its efforts to get legislation passed.

In spite of his anti-black group awareness position, most of the nine black Democratic legislators respect him and his right to adhere to his beliefs, but they don't necessarily agree with his philosophy. As a matter of fact, the author attempted indirectly to determine the group's attitude toward the dissenter among the black membership, but no antagonistic sentiments were found to be directed toward the black Republican. There was likewise no attempt to debunk his philosophy. But almost invariably when referring to the black legislators as a group, a black representative refers to "the nine of us"—indicating that only nine are associated with the informal group. This situation, however, is a product of the concurrence of both party and constituency similarities.

Another technique employed to determine the group identity of the black legislators, reinforcing the first method, was simply to ask, "Who are your closest friends in the House?" Sixty per cent named other black legislators as their closest friends—the individuals whom they most often fraternize with after the legislative session, at parties, dinners, informal chats, etc. Only one black legislator mentioned any white legislators in this category of
close friends. Two other black legislators gave priority to political I.O.U.'s over personal friendships, but evidence leads to a conclusion that even these two could be recorded with the other 60 per cent response.  

Meetings among the black legislators usually take place in an informal manner once a week, sometimes once a month; they vary depending upon the necessity for group action promoted by pending legislation. The group has a chairman who presides over the informal meeting—sometimes there is an agenda but it is usually cast aside. It is the job of the executive secretary to handle communications between the black legislators; he sends out announcements concerning these meetings and about any other items coming up the black legislators need to know about as a group. On the other hand, the informal group serves as a means of socializing the black legislators into the larger assembly; within the group the black legislator can hobnob and discuss issues and problems with "likeminded individuals." As a socializing agent entrusted with the responsibility of orientating the newcomer to the House, the group members attempt to apprise him of the nature of legislative politics from a "black perspective," i.e., they spell out the do's and don'ts essential for success in the legislature. In this informal group one can share similar experiences and mutual problems and it reduces the feeling of powerlessness one black legislator might likely experience if he were in
the House alone. Thus, informal group identity engenders status reassurance for the black legislator, and it is also a catharsis because the informal group allows the black legislator to "let off steam" about problems that might infuriate him, among sympathetic colleagues. And the communications function is served primarily by the existence of an executive secretary whose job it is to keep other members informed whenever there is an issue or item meritng their attention. Then too, the black legislators take it upon themselves to keep each other informed of significant legislative developments; for example, if a black legislator misses a key committee meeting (standing committee), or legislative session, he is immediately informed of those transactions by a fellow black legislator. There is a constant flow of communications among the black legislators that is functional to their well-being as legislators. Due to the size of the House of Representatives (99 members), socialization and communication are two key functions which must be provided for in this legislative assembly.

Issues and projects entertained by the black legislators during the current (1971) session are: jobs, black education, law enforcement, cable television, and the controversial firing of the Black Studies Director at The Ohio State University in the Spring of 1971. In addition, they have attempted to find jobs for black citizens in Ohio,
placing them in positions with state government that they never had the opportunity to occupy before. Since the unemployment rate among blacks is always double that of whites,\textsuperscript{19} and since legislators are frequently approached about jobs by their constituents, this item occupies much attention among the black legislators. Regarding black education, most of the concern is with blacks in higher education, e.g., preoccupation is with the skills black students need to succeed in the professions of medicine, law, engineering, dentistry, etc. They look for solutions for improving these skills and thus increasing the number of blacks receiving degrees in these areas where black graduates are vitally needed, in their own committees, and in the nation as a whole. Similarly, they have been concerned with black studies programs at institutions of higher learning in the State of Ohio. In this fashion, they envision a need to increase the number and quality of these programs with a notion of adequately perpetuating the rich heritage and accomplishments of black people, which heretofore have been subtly neglected.

The black legislators enlighten themselves on these and other pending issues by calling in resource persons to appear before them in meetings to share their expertise in these states. For example, on the subject of black education, the black legislators invited professors from the University of Toledo to discuss the strengths and weaknesses
of black students enrolled in institutions of higher learning. The same tactic was employed to learn more about law enforcement. The black legislators had a law officer from the Attorney General's Office of United States, appear before the group to discuss the various implications for the black community, and the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, passed by Congress in 1968.

Resource persons have also been utilized with the group's cable television project. The key purpose of involvement with this project is to examine the potentials for black citizens to benefit economically from this enterprise. According to a pamphlet issued by the staff of the national organization, CATV is one of the most prominent concepts in communications today. It is one of the country's fast growing industries and shows no sign of slowing down. The report also provides prescriptions for understanding the concept of CATV. Accordingly, one technique for organizing the concept in one's mind is to think of "C" as cables, "A" as antenna and "TV" as television sets. This simple analysis provides the main ingredients of the system—an antenna to receive, a cable to carry and a television set to use the signal. The operation of this system was further promulgated by Marie D. Brown when she stated:

Basically, a cable television system works in much the same way as a master antenna system for an apartment building or MATV. Signals are received via antennas placed on towers;
these signals are then amplified by electronic equipment and carried through the cable/either above ground on poles or underground in conduits/in front of the homes to be serviced. From there each resident desiring to subscribe to the service has a "house drop" run to his house—he is then "on the cable." Subscribers pay a monthly fee/from $5-$10/ for this service, plus a one-time installation fee of $15-$20.24

Clearer stronger pictures and a broad range of TV programs are provided by CATV. A typical system distributes up to 24 TV signals; predictions project up to 80 channel capabilities simultaneously.25

Cable television has a direct effect on the black community; it has been estimated that by 1980, according to a report by the Quantum Science Corporation, cable television will be a 4,4 billion dollar industry of which:

- $2.2 billion will be subscribers' fees
- $86 million in communication services and system procurement
- $300 million program material
- $604 million in equipment and cable
- $638 million in installation costs
- $600 million in advertising.26

Black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives and elsewhere are interested in cable television because numerous benefits can be reaped by the black community in terms of increased jobs and possibly some control over channels of communication; more specifically, jobs for
black filmmakers, producers, directors, entertainers, writers, etc., can be created by the industry, as well as jobs associated with installation, manufacturing and repair of cable equipment will readily become available. And the black community through control of its own communication channels will be enabled to contribute significantly to the education of black children and adults. Cable television had its beginning in the mountains of Oregon and Pennsylvania back in the late 1940s and early 1950s. 27

Cable T.V. recently was adopted on a local level in Ohio by the City of Dayton. The Dayton project of Cable TV is valued at $10,000,000 and one of the black legislators from that area is chairman of the executive committee. 28 An estimated 200 new jobs and a monthly payroll of between $150,000 and $200,000 will be created by the institution of the cable television proposed by Cypress Cable T.V. of Dayton. 29 The Dayton project illustrates precisely how this concept can be applied in a local community with a black legislator serving in a supervisory capacity, and how opportunities for blacks in employment is achieved. And here is, likewise, a clear example of black legislators promoting the interests of black citizens in the state, as well as the economic interests of the state as a whole.
The black legislators crystallized their solidarity when they requested and obtained a conference with the President of The Ohio State University to discuss the firing by the administration of the University's Director of Black Studies. He had been arrested and later fired for allegedly failing to obey a police officer when told to leave the premises of a local high school during a racial disturbance in the Spring of the 1970-1971 school year.\textsuperscript{30} The nine black Democratic legislators requested the meeting with the President of Ohio State to resolve what the group described as the "ugly image of institutional racism" raised by the demotion.\textsuperscript{31} The legislators indicated that the request was made on behalf of the 1.2 million black citizens in Ohio they represented, and because no blacks were consulted concerning the director's dismissal.\textsuperscript{32} One member of the group commented:

"Whites are determined to be architects of Black Liberation. Whites have had 400 years to liberate Blacks and have failed to do so. Black students were appointed to hire a Black Studies Director and the students chose him. When he was fired no blacks were consulted. . . ."\textsuperscript{33}

After the nine black legislators' meeting with the President of Ohio State in the Spring of 1971, they claimed the group had not been pleased with the meeting. However, in a prepared statement issued later, the President of Ohio State asserted that "the legislators' objections were not so much about the reassignment as to his being the President, not
having met with the black legislators before making the decision." The meeting did not alter the President's decision to fire the Director of Black Studies, but the symbolic show of consultation and/or confrontation was not without effect. A legislator who is not a member of the House, but who was identified with the group effort expressed the collective sentiments of the black legislators on the issue. He maintained:

The indignities and disrespect placed upon the black legislators who have desired an opportunity to meet with the President indicates a need for better rapport with the University. . . we will take a very close look at all. . . acts and attributes of racism that exist at Ohio State University and other state supported institutions. . . .

The preceding analysis illustrates some of the types of issues and projects that have engaged the attention of the black legislators in the 109th General Assembly. As a group, the black legislators see it as their duty to intervene in situations where issues essential to the well-being of the black population in the state appear jeopardized. Nevertheless, in the aforementioned analysis, no effort was materialized dealing with specific types of legislation the black legislators introduced in the session under investigation. In this direction, our attention is now focused.
The black legislators do not sponsor bills as a group, they do so individually and then solicit the support of their black colleagues in attempting to facilitate the passage of these bills. Usually in the informal meetings, or elsewhere, a black legislator sponsoring a specific bill will let his colleagues know that he is the sponsor of a particular bill. Although these bills are sponsored by individual black legislators, their content, in most cases, reflect the interests of the group as a whole.

In the regular session of the 109th General Assembly, there are a few specific bills, besides the budget, having black legislators as their sponsors or co-sponsors, and they are considered functional to the welfare of black citizens in the state. Included among these bills are H.B. 658; H.B. 336; H.B. 295; H.B. 494; H.B. 216; and H.B. 114.

One of the most noteworthy bills in terms of the interests of black legislators in this assembly is House Bill 658. It aims to begin work on a $2.3 million dollar Museum of Afro-American History and Culture to be located near Central State University. This bill would establish a 15-member commission to start planning for the center supported by an $80,000 allocation included
in Governor Gilligan's capital improvements budget.\footnote{37}

Nowhere in America is there a national museum of Afro-American History and Culture; the establishment of the proposed project in Greene County would attract nationwide attention. The bill passed the Ohio House of Representatives by a vote of 79 to 3,\footnote{38} and is now (December, 1971) before the Education and Health Committee of the Senate. In the final analysis, the bill strives to direct attention to the achievements and contributions of black Americans—an area very much neglected in past years; expectantly, the bill has the support of the black legislators and significantly, four white legislators are listed on the bill as co-sponsors.

The purpose of House Bill 236 is to prohibit members of municipal safety forces from serving as witnesses and challengers at elections. The bill was introduced by a black legislator from Cuyahoga County who was prompted to introduce the bill because of the presence of policemen and firemen in polling places in predominantly black communities in Cleveland during the 1969 election when Mayor Carl B. Stokes was up for reelection.\footnote{39} Policemen, pretending to serve as challengers and witnesses in reference to the proposed amendment to reduce the voting age requirements from 21 to 18 were reportedly stationed in polling places purposely intimidating black voters and seemingly killing Stokes' chances for reelection; however,
Stokes won anyway. In his prepared speech delivered in the House when the bill won on the floor, he commented:

"I introduced this bill because I thought it was necessary to protect the rights and privileges of the majority of citizens of the State of Ohio. No citizen should be deprived of his right to vote or be intimidated in any way by a uniformed officer carrying an arm. . . . There may be many of us here in this 109th General Assembly that feel our uniformed officers can do no wrong. . . . Well, they can do both right and wrong. We should not let the ones who do wrong cast a shadow of doubt on all our peace officers. . . . All adult citizens today are aware that guns and elections have gone together only in places which do not have any resemblance of a free democracy, "... the possibility of creating an atmosphere of fear and intimidation under such circumstances is self-evident. I have no objection to uniform policemen serving in the capacity as authorities feel that their services are necessary, but I do object to a policeman serving an authorized member of the precinct official without forfeiting any of his powers as a police officer. . . ."

The bill had strong bipartisan support and passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 85 to 6. It is currently before the Senate Rules Committee.

House Bill 295 is a relocation bill and has among its co-sponsors two black legislators. It is a bipartisan measure designed to make available to people of Ohio federal relocation funds for those forced to vacate their homes and businesses because of federally aided projects undertaken by state agencies or political subdivisions.

In the words of one of the black co-sponsors, "This bill is designed to give needed aid to those who must sell their property to the government to make room for federal
projects. In addition, the aid includes the following allowances:

... Moving expenses up to $300 with a relocation allowance of $200, compensation for business losses of not less than $2,500 or more than $10,000, up to $15,000 to displaced owner-occupants to apply towards the purchase of a new home, up to $4,000 to displaced tenants to rent, for two years rebates for improvements made to property by the owners.

A bill of this nature is encouraging to blacks and other minority groups because they are the ones who are most burdened by dislocation when federal projects have destroyed large ghetto housing areas. The bill was signed by Governor Gilligan and became law on June 11, 1971.

House Bill 494 aims to separate the Department of Corrections from its current identification with the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. The black Republican legislator worked on this bill for a number of years. The directorship of the new Department of Corrections would be a black gentleman who is now head of the joint departments. Because of this factor, the bill has the support of all the black legislators. The bill is before the House Rules Committee.

Since a large percentage of the prison population is black—it is estimated at 52 per cent—it is to be expected that this factor would arouse the concern of the black legislators on penal matters in general. The death penalty is a specific focus of attention in this area.
A bill sponsored by two black legislators is designed to abolish the death penalty (H.B. 216). In Ohio... 49 persons, including one woman, are awaiting the imposition of the death penalty. The last execution in Ohio was on March 15, 1963. One of the black sponsors of the bill provided the underlying rationale for the sponsorship of the bill when he said, "There is nowhere on record any instance in which a rich person was executed, only the poor man suffers the fate due to his inability to hire competent legal counsel." The bill remains before the House Judiciary Committee.

House Bill 114 supports the rights of residential tenants. It aims to protect tenants against arbitrary and unlawful action on the part of landlords, especially in evicting tenants from dwellings without just cause. One of its black sponsors believes this to be one area in which black citizens are frequently abused due to the existence of inadequate legislation to protect tenants based on the rights they deserve. Therefore, House Bill 114 aims to bridge this gap; this bill is currently before the House Judiciary Committee.

The above listing is a mere sample of the bills sponsored or co-sponsored by the black legislators in the 109th General Assembly, and represents action taken on them as of December, 1971. Additionally, all of the black legislators supported the Governor's Tax Legislation (House
Bills 475, 476 and 477). Support was given to these measures by the black legislators because they were money bills and thereby provided for the allotment of funds to several areas in which these legislators are concerned, e.g., welfare, education, housing, transportation, aid to urban areas, etc. For this reason the "Budget Bills" were regarded by the black legislators as the most important legislation to appear before the 109th General Assembly.

The Black Legislators and Group Norms

All human groups and institutions endeavor to maintain themselves and guarantee their survival through establishing norms of conduct that apply to their members. These norms, folkways or rules of the game govern a variety of situations and practices, both prescribing and proscribing certain rules of behavior. Similarly, a set of norms, folkways, and rules of the game govern the behavior of the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives. The most common of these norms are fairness, cooperation and integrity, i.e., these are the behavior patterns the black legislators expect in their dealings with one another. Some of the individual statements by black legislators illustrate those rules of the game:

A. We act in a democratic way; if we agree on something, we expect all to go along. . . .
A man should always tell the truth; if one fails to live up to his word in the legislature, he has nothing left.
B. I expect fellow black legislators to live up to the propositions that have been put to them.

C. If we agree on a certain course of action, I expect a man to honor this group agreement.

D. We expect the black legislators to vote together when they have decided to in a caucus.

E. In the legislature there is tremendous fellowship. Integrity is important. If you give your word that you will vote for a bill, it is expected that you will vote for it.

Accordingly, these rules of the game among the black legislators are the same as those among all other members of the House, e.g., keeping one's word, integrity, credibility, fairness, and cooperation are characteristic of these relationships.

The black legislators also expect the leadership to render fair and impartial treatment in fulfilling their duties and obligations. There were no indications that any injustices were experienced from the House leadership; the leadership was viewed as fair and impartial. Nonetheless, these expectations are reciprocal. The leadership also expects individual members in the House to attend legislative and committee sessions; to have a knowledge of legislative matters pending before the House and to carry one's full work load. Hence, these expectations, norms and rules of the game are interconnections that maintain stability and continuity in the Ohio House of Representatives.
In essence, this means when one becomes a member of this "select club," he is expected to find out what the rules of the game are, and then abide by them.

Apropos the leadership positions held by the black legislators in the House, a majority of the black legislators contend they do not occupy a proportional share of these positions.\textsuperscript{50} The black legislators account for one committee chairmanship, the minority whip and an advisor to the governor on minority affairs.\textsuperscript{51} The words of one black legislator possibly sums up the group's position on this matter. He maintained, "We have two leadership positions, the minority whip and one committee chairman--it's not proportionate. I think we should be given greater responsibility in matters of state." In addition to these leadership positions there are blacks employed in the House in clerical and other related jobs; one black lady heads the Democratic Stenopool,\textsuperscript{52} two other black secretaries are also included in this pool. The 1967 House of Representatives had one black page, during the 109th General Assembly there are two. These jobs were made possible through the influence exercised by the black legislators. Nevertheless, the black legislators are in the minority party, and this factor accounts, to a great extent for the lack of possession of more leadership positions in the House.
The Perceptions of the White Legislators about the Black Legislators' Status as an Influential Group

In order to ascertain the influence of the black legislators as a group, one of the questions asked the 16 white legislators was, "Do you consider the black legislators influential as a group?" Seventy per cent of these legislators viewed the black legislators as influential while 30 per cent did not; consequently, this perception was established as an index for evaluating the overall influence of the group. Some representative responses by white legislators to this question follow:

A. Yes, through group action they have achieved the minority whip position and the head of the stenopeol position. The black legislators agreed as a group on these appointments.

B. Yes, the problems of the black community would not have come to light without the black legislators, i.e., we would not have known about some of the problems blacks experience.

C. I don't look upon them as a group at all.

D. I don't think you can say they're influential as a group; you're influential on the basis of whether people need you. If you are in the majority party things are different.

E. Yes, if they are together, they are influential.

F. Yes, probably out of proportion to their numbers.

G. Yes, but not so much as a voting bloc, because you rarely have a question that is all black or white; just as any legislator is
expected to represent his constituents, they are likewise. I would expect black legislators to be concerned with a wide range of issues, e.g., schools, banking, etc.

very informative; they have given me information I never knew before. I enjoy the black man, ____ , on my committee.

ascertained the black legislators' status in the Ohio House of Representatives. The ās were also identified in the House. In the House the functions of social legislators into the larger assembly and if communications between them, are likely among the black legislators was also protect the perceived interests of the them they represent, i.e., several receiving the attention of the black pled to affirm this primary preoccupations of the black community. Finally, legislators' own perceptions and those in the House, the black legislators as an informal group in the House of
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CHAPTER V

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BLACK LEGISLATORS AND THE POLITICAL PARTIES

Party affiliation is perhaps the most important cue-giving device affecting legislative voting behavior. The efforts in this chapter are geared toward examining the influence of the black legislators with the parties as an index for measuring their general effectiveness as an informal group.\(^1\) Since party affiliation is the principal variable to weigh in studying legislative behavior (at least as measured by roll call voting), it becomes apparent that any group hoping to exercise influence in the legislature must do so primarily through the channels of the political party with which it is associated. Before probing into the core of this relationship, the general characteristics of party politics in the State of Ohio are discussed.

**Political Parties in Ohio**

Political parties in Ohio have been largely based on a two-party system for the greater portion of the state's history.\(^2\) Accordingly, this point of view was advanced by Beller Zeller using the classification scheme of the American Political Science Association; she labeled Ohio a competitive
two-party state, with moderate party cohesion. At the same
time a trend was shown to be evident in the two-party scheme
giving the Republican party a slight edge in the state’s
legislative politics for a period of over 40 years. This
trend suggests an inclination toward Republican domination
and is confirmed upon examination of the number of contests
won by the Republican party in the state over the years.

Considering party majorities in the lower house of the
Ohio legislature from 1924-1966 as an index, Ohio leans,
again, very heavily toward Republican control. The Demo-
crats controlled the legislative and executive branches
simultaneously on three occasions--once in the mid-1930’s,
in the late 1940’s, and again in the late 1950’s. While
Democratic governors felt fortunate to hold a slim majority
in one house to support their programs, Republican gover-
nors usually have had majorities in both houses. In 1958
the Democrats campaigning on the right-to-work law won
control of both houses and concurrently elected Michael V.
Disalle, former mayor of Toledo and former head of the
United States Office of Price Administration, as governor;
Disalle had previously sought the governorship in 1956,
and in 1962 he lost the gubernatorial race to James A.
Rhodes.

Ohio’s political party system, in addition, shows
organizational disparities between the two parties; for
example, the Republican party organization in Ohio is often
regarded as a virtual organizational model, extending all the way down to the county level, where it seemingly controls access to the state legislature. Recognition of this factor is crucial for assessing the strength of party leadership in the legislative chamber. In his study of politics in the Midwest, John H. Fenton explicated the Republican party's tight organizational position when he pointed out that Ray Bliss, then the Republican party's state chairman, demanded that all county chairmen clear statements with him before making them public and he achieved nearly perfect compliance with these demands. Fenton further attributes the party's tight organization to two key factors: (1) persons identifying with the party are culturally and ideologically homogeneous and acutely aware of the larger number of interests they have in common; and (2) they are aware of the fact they constitute a minority of the voting population and are willing to submit to strong central direction in order to achieve electoral victories.

In contrast to the Republican party organization, the Democratic party is less unified. For example, in his study of party responsibility in the several states, Professor Thomas A. Flinn found the Ohio Democratic party organization "notoriously weak," and badly split. In fact, a similar study likewise alluded to the contention that the Democratic party in Ohio was split into at least three different factions: a loosely knit labor and "New Deal"
faction led by Frank W. King, state senator from Toledo and chairman of the AFL-CIO, the liberal Cleveland based, anti-Lausche group; and the pro-Lausche conservatives. Frank Lausche served as Ohio's popular governor from 1945-1947 and again from 1949-1957; he was a Democrat, but ideologically he pursued the same conservative politics advocated by his Republican opponents; therefore, he carried the backing of the conservatives from both parties.

Fenton further classified the Ohio Democratic party as organizationally resembling the loosely knit parties of the "Deep South" rather than the fairly well organized political machines often characterizing many industrial states. He contended, in effect, no statewide Democratic party exists in Ohio; rather, the Democratic party is only an aggregation of city machines with little or no interest in state-wide elections unless the candidates hail from their home city. Democratic disorganization within the party is attributed by Fenton to several factors, among which are: (1) the large number of medium-sized cities, each with a Democratic organization whose leader views the group as independent from the regular state party; (2) the weakness of the Cuyahoga County organization; (3) the aloofness or impotence of the state's labor organization as related to the state and local politics; and (4) the existence of a conservative rural element within the party.

It is acknowledged regarding Ohio's political party
system that in presidential elections in the past, Ohio has been a "swing state," that is, at times changing from one party to the other in national voting patterns. In the years between 1856 and 1954, Ohio voted for seven Democratic presidential candidates and 21 Republican candidates. Only twice, Dewey in 1944 and Nixon in 1960, has Ohio voted for the losing candidate. In 1960, Ohio awarded the Republican candidate 53.3 per cent of the total vote, but blacks in Ohio followed the national trend with 7 out of 10 voting for John F. Kennedy. Just as the black vote in any close presidential election becomes crucial in six of the most populous states, in Ohio the black vote is similarly crucial in both metropolitan and statewide elections. And this is also an important factor related to this study because the potency of the black vote accounted for the increase in the number of blacks elected to the Ohio House of Representatives.

The Black Legislators and the Parties in the House of Representatives

The first 27 black legislators elected to the Ohio House of Representatives, as noted earlier, emerged from the ranks of the Republican party; this factor is attributable to the relative strength of the party in the state, particularly in terms of finances, jobs, and general resources. Before reapportionment in the 1960's, candidates for the House ran on a county-wide basis, and since the
Republican party provided the primary means by which black candidates could successfully get elected to public office. But at the same time, the national black voting trend favored the Democratic party—an identification dating back to the election of 1936 and President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. However, since reapportionment (1967), black candidates in Ohio have moved to the Democratic party; the creation of single-member districts enabled black Democrats concentrated in the inner city to elect black Democratic representatives to the House; due to this shifting trend, now well established, only one black Republican remains in the House. It is not necessary, therefore, to delineate in great length his relationship with the Republican party; it is merely noteworthy that he has more seniority than anyone of the black Democrats, and he is the only black committee chairman; he is influential and respected by his colleagues.

Influence with the political parties is a phenomenon chiefly associated with the nine black Democrats constituting 20 per cent of their party's membership; they are a force to be reckoned with in the Democratic party. Their influence with the Democratic party can be visualized, in short, through the positions held by black Democrats in the House (listed in the previous chapter). These positions came about as a direct result of the black legislators' influence with their party.
In the Ohio Legislature the political party mechanism serves as a major tool for organizing the body and filtering legislative proposals. Through the party leadership, many of the crucial decisions are made on partisan matters. Consequently, parties play a major role in the Ohio legislative process; the black legislators are cognizant of the importance of party identification and have sought to work within the Democratic party in the House to accomplish their goals and achieve patronage for their constituents. In order to assess the nature of the relationship between the black legislators and the Democratic party, the question was put to the black legislators, "Does a great deal of harmony exist between the black legislators and the Democratic party? In the House? In the state? In your district?" Representative responses follow:

A. In a pseudo sense; i.e., blacks are not in the hierarchy of the Democratic party which can rely on approximately 80 percent of the black vote. The black urban vote can influence national elections, in proportion, we don't get the jobs, recognition, etc, that we deserve.

B. I think there is harmony partywise. It is through political means (politics), you get party members to go along with things they would not otherwise go along with. This is the name of the game. In politics every vote counts--you don't count anyone out.

C. Yes, in my city, the relationship is good; in the state I get along; in the House it is fair because of the existence of different interests.
D. We have a working relationship. We can't be in complete harmony with any white folks; we have to keep plotting and pushing for recognition to get rid of tokenism.

E. Not in my district; there are two factions e.g., pro-Stokes and anti-Stokes.

F. The 21st District Caucus is split between the pro-Stokes and the anti-Stokes forces.

Weighing the substance of these remarks one could conclude that the black legislators do not consider themselves in complete harmony with the Democratic party -- there are minor tensions and conflicts. But there is, nevertheless, a good working relationship existing between the black legislators and the Democratic party. Blacks are traditionally loyal Democrats, and to see whether this tradition held true in the present research, 49 roll calls were sampled from the approximate 498 roll calls taken during the regular session in the Ohio House of Representatives. 17 The 49 sample roll calls represented every 10th roll call taken in the 1971 session. The results of the analysis of party loyalty on these roll calls appear in Table 6 below.
TABLE 6

PARTY LOYALTY SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Democrats</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Democrats</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Democrats</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Party loyalty is the percent of the times each group voted with the majority of the party.

What the above figures reveal is a strong tendency for the black Democrats to support the Democratic party, thereby meaning a sound relationship prevails. Hence, this tendency is a strong cue-giving device relating to the black legislators' behavior in the House.

Exploring this relationship from a broader perspective, the 16 white Democratic legislators were asked the identical question and all give basically positive responses. The following statements are representative samples:

A. I would say there is harmony. I can't remember any particular time when there was any real break with the Democrats on one side and the black legislators on the other. However, if there was a time when the black legislators tried to force an issue and we weren't ready for it, there may be disharmony. There have been only minor situations involving conflicts of position between the Democratic party and the black legislators.
B. I would say harmony exists here more than anywhere else. The Democrats realize blacks have a large percentage of the voting population.

C. Yes, I think for the most part the situation is improving with the party; for example, a black legislator has been minority whip for four years... There have been one or two who have spoken out causing some anger among white legislators, usually on the Republican side of the aisle.

D. Yes, they are part of us. I don't see all this distinction; it would repel me. They are our people; we caucus and then express our agreements and differences.

E. Yes, there is harmony; we work hand-in-hand.

F. The office holds (advisor to the governor on minority affairs) indicates cohesion... The Democratic party has placed black legislators on committees, etc. (I nominated him. We have blacks in cooperation in the writing of the Democratic platform--they get their say.

The optimistic evaluation by these legislators is basically valid. As the roll call analysis illustrated, the black legislators will generally go along with party projects, programs, platforms, etc., except in a small number of cases when the Democratic party takes a position the black legislators conceive to be detrimental to black constituents and/or urban areas. Since the black legislators maintain a 90 per cent loyalty score, these conflicts seem to occur only in a small number of cases. However, the minor discrepancy involved between the two versions of the partisan relationship evolves primarily from the position maintained by some, if not all, of the
black legislators that the Democratic party has not
launched an all-out effort to aid the loyal supporters of
the party in the House and in the state as a whole. More
will be added on this matter later in the chapter.

—The 21st District Caucus was identified by the black
legislators, and the Caucus represents a relevant vari-
able in this analysis. In fact, it is a potent force in
Cuyahoga County and sometimes affects the behavior of
the black legislators in the House from that area, es-
specially when the Caucus adopts a group position before an
issue is voted upon in the legislature. Three of the four
black legislators from Cuyahoga County are members of the
21st District Caucus.\(^\text{18}\) The membership in the Caucus is
predominantly black and this factor per se tends to stir
up the wrath of some white political opponents. Some
critics have given the Caucus a third party label—those
who are members of the Caucus are not considered members
of the regular Democratic party. "There are three politi-
cal parties in Cleveland--the Democrats, the Republicans,
and the 21st Caucus," were the words of one white legis-
lator from Cuyahoga County. More light is shed on the
workings of the Caucus through the following excerpts
taken from a statement of its own program and objectives:

The 21st District Caucus is a nonpartisan
organization of Clevelanders desirous of
eliciting the active participation of more
voters in the political processes of our city,
state and nation.
The Caucus is dedicated to a program of generating greater interest in American politics. We have neglected our political and governmental institutions, and have permitted their virtual take over by racists. We believe the revitalization of the public process is needed to make our political and governmental institutions more responsive to the needs of minorities and low income citizens. This is our prime objective.

Through education, the Caucus will endeavor to stimulate a greater interest in politics and motivate more people to register and vote. The Caucus seeks to stimulate full participation by minorities in the activities of both major political parties.

The Caucus is not a political party. . . . We will work with both political parties to make them more responsive to the people and to all units of government, local, state, and national.

Membership in the Caucus is open to all people who subscribe to its principles, objectives, and programs.19

The basic reason for the consternation generated from the Caucus issue is fear—a fear that from the organization of the Caucus the two traditional parties will be forced to bargain with black citizens in the Cleveland area. In other words, the Caucus is merely an effort toward unifying black voting power and is an appropriate source of fear to any individual or group whose power or status appears jeopardized through solidifying the black vote. Sometimes, therefore, the Caucus becomes a source of friction for the regular county Democratic party. This means, in essence, the Caucus members comprise the pro-Stokes faction,20 while those in the regular county Democratic party compose the anti-Stokes faction. The predicament makes for a weakened Democratic party in the state's largest
county, and the prevalence of these factions sometimes affects the voting of the black legislators from Cleveland, as it did in the contest for the minority leader position at the beginning of the 109th General Assembly. In this case, the black legislators from Cuyahoga County supported the winning candidate, while other black legislators supported the loser, thus splitting the group's votes. But this is about the only instance where any split among the nine black Democrats was so apparent.

In order to acquire a broader view of the positions and leadership roles now held by the black legislators with the Democratic party, it is essential to refer first to earlier years. When the black legislators reached group proportions in the House of Representatives in 1967, as an informal group concurrently developing, they began to pressure and confront the party leadership for group recognition and party patronage—then lacking—and in 1968 the black legislators began to make their presence felt in the Democratic party by pressing for equitable recognition and participation in party affairs.

A bitter floor fight was staged by the black legislators at the Democratic State Convention in September, 1968. On this occasion they were able to meet for two and one-half hours in a closed session with the state party chairman and other party leaders demanding redress for five specific grievances:21
1. Represent blacks adequately in the party's delegation to the National Convention (August, 1968).
2. Appoint nine blacks to the state executive committee.
3. Name two blacks, apparently, the first in Ohio history, to the Democratic Electoral College.
5. Hire a black for the state party headquarters.

All five of these concessions were agreed to by the Democratic party leadership after the confrontation with the black legislators.

Winning concessions in the State Democratic Convention, the battleground was next transferred to the House of Representatives where the same kind of pressure was applied to gain recognition and greater participation in party decision-making within the House chambers. When the House of Representatives convened for the beginning of the 108th General Assembly in 1969, a bitter contest for the minority leader's position appeared imminent. As then former Democratic leader A. G. Lancione (D-Belmont) and John C. McDonald (D-Licking) began rounding up support for the job, the black legislators seized the time to make their demands known, and they pledged to support the candidate who would do the most for them.\(^{22}\) The black legislators wanted a stronger voice in the legislative activity of their party, opportunity for broader experience via committee assignments, and leadership roles.\(^{23}\) As a result of this pressure applied by the black Democratic legislators, one of their
group was appointed by the party caucus to the minority whip position and another black legislator was appointed to the powerful Rules Committee, both for the first time. Consequently, these events involving black legislators confronting the party leadership symbolized their growing numbers and subsequent influence with the Democratic party. And the party positions and recognition they currently possess result from the application of pressures and protests by the black Democrats. The 20 per cent of the Democratic voting strength held by the black legislators makes their influence quite evident within the Democratic ranks in the House of Representatives; i.e., 20 per cent of a party's membership is strength enough to yield effective results.

The Black Legislators as a Voting Bloc

A tendency exists to regard an informal group such as the nine black Democratic legislators as a voting bloc; however, the nine black Democrats do not constitute a solid voting bloc, but rather, they vote together whenever a measure before the House is conceived by them to be detrimental to black interests or urban problems. Relative to this matter, William Chance concluded in his study of the Ohio House of Representatives in 1967, the nine black Democrats did not form such a voting bloc. More importantly, he noted there were two blocs within this group
overlapping among the black legislators. The first consisted of the black legislators from Cincinnati, Dayton, and Columbus, and one member from Cleveland who tied the bloc to the second structure composed entirely of black legislators from Cleveland. Hence, while he confirmed black legislators did not vote together, at least on an intra-party basis, a high percentage of the time (87.7 per cent), they did not form a bloc. The condition has altered somewhat since Chance's study, but still, the black legislators do not form a solid voting bloc; they vote together with a great deal more frequency in 1971 than they did in 1967. Table 7 is indicative of this changed frequency, based on the study of 49 roll calls included in the present investigation.

Table 7 shows a tendency for the black legislators to vote together on a large number of cases, but not enough to constitute a solid bloc.

The white legislators were asked during their interview, "Do the black legislators constitute a voting bloc? Fifty-three per cent answered "no"; one of the white legislators asked noted he didn't follow these things closely enough to give a definite answer. Significantly, the majority of those answering "yes" to the question did so with some reservations; that is, they observed the black legislators voting as a bloc only on certain issues essential to their black constituents. The remarks of one
### Table 7

**Frequency of Dissent Among Black Legislators**  
**N=49**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Votes in Which:</th>
<th>No. of Votes</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Black Legislators Voted Together</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Black Legislator Dissented</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Black Legislators Dissented</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or More Black Legislators Dissented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legislator in this category summarized this position:

It depends on the issue; e.g., if you have something which relates to housing, funding for cities, discrimination in the cemeteries, etc., you would be a fool if you were black to vote against such issues.

On political issues it's different. I remember (a former black Democratic legislator) voting with Governor Rhodes on a couple of administration bills. . . . Blacks will usually support the party.

To test this hypothesis, 10 votes were selected from the 49 roll calls for further interpretation. These results appear in Table 8.

Conclusively, the voting spread on these bills selected for analysis points to the affirmation that the black legislators will vote en bloc when a particular bill under consideration before the House contains racial overtones in
### TABLE 8

AN EVALUATION OF 10 BILLS BEFORE THE OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DURING THE 1971 SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Voting Distribution</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Democrats %</td>
<td>White Democrats %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Party 4Y IN</td>
<td>of Party 4Y IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. H.R. 477</td>
<td>To provide for education and other state and local purposes and to provide property tax reductions and other reforms. Vote on passage of the amended bill.</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.B. 143</td>
<td>To provide for an additional sentence for commission of certain crimes while in the possession of a firearm. Motion to amend.</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. H.B. 172</td>
<td>To revise the licensing of real estate brokers and salesmen; defines real estate brokers, salesmen, etc. Empowers the Ohio Real Estate Commission to prescribe rules for licensing of real estate brokers. Motion to amend.</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap. H.B. 240</td>
<td>To create a division of alcoholism in the Dept. of Health; to provide state assistance for city and county alcohol treatment and care centers, and to increase certain liquor excise tax for that purpose and to authorize courts to commit alcohol defendants to such centers. Motion to Amend.</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL No.</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Voting Distribution</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 56</td>
<td>To authorize a minor to give consent to the diagnosis and treatment of venereal diseases under the public health program. Vote to lay motion to amend on the table.</td>
<td>5 3 63 21 12 64</td>
<td>Basically an urban or &quot;inner city&quot; problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.B. 974</td>
<td>Relative to the regulating and licensing of barbering, barber shops and barber schools. Creates a Board of Barber Examiners consisting of 3 members to be appointed by the governor; each member shall be a graduate of the 12th grade or have an equivalent education as determined by examination conducted under the Department of Education.</td>
<td>4 3 57 13 17 51</td>
<td>The split vote is on a motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. No group position is apparent, thus personal preferences are voted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 770</td>
<td>To define the type of license required for handling unpiced agricultural commodities, to require standards of financial responsibility for agricultural commodity dealers and warehousemen.</td>
<td>9 0 100 28 6 82</td>
<td>Votes on consideration of donate amendments. The bill reflects problems of retail merchants and small businessmen in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.B. 438</td>
<td>To make supplemental appropriations for the period beginning Oct. 1, 1971. Provides moneys for highway construction and other financial obligations of the Highway Dept.; moneys also granted to Wildlife Fund, Dept. of Natural Resources, Dept. of Liquor Control. Further, the act allows the Dept. of Finance to grant extension of the appropriations for a period of three months, if necessary.</td>
<td>3 5 38 19 12 61</td>
<td>The negative majoritv vote on the part of the black legislators reflects their opposition to the revised Republican appropriations bill; and personal preferences are a factor too. The Republican vote was 44-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 980</td>
<td>To require employable recipients of aid to dependent children and poor relief to participate in state work relief projects. The Director of State Personnel is empowered to establish job classifications for state and</td>
<td>0 9 0 25 8 76</td>
<td>Perceived racial overtones; group position is apparent and also dissent with the majority of party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Voting Distribution</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County work relief projects for persons receiving payments in the stated category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To accommodate the state election law to 4 recent developments: the approval by Ohio voters in November, 1971 of a change in the constitutional requirement of state residency for voter eligibility; ratification of the 26th Amendment of 1970; and the declaration of a U.S. District Court in 1970 that several sections of Ohio's election laws are unconstitutional. Passage of the emergency clause as a part of the bill.</td>
<td>0 9 100 5 27 84</td>
<td>Voter registration is traditionally a Democratic party problem; partisan position is reflected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
its contents, affects urban areas, or is an administration bill (party loyalty). Particularly significant in the first instance is the recorded vote on Am. H.B. No. 980 pertaining to Aid to Dependent Children; the nine black Democrats voted en bloc against the majority of the party, which points to the premise that whenever an issue is perceived to contain racial overtones and the party majority favors the pending bill, the black legislators will vote against the party in favor of protecting "black interests." This is especially true when the item involved related to welfare, as the vote on Am. H.B. No. 980 substantiates.

Another situation of this sort occurred in July when by a vote of 51 to 43 the House approved a measure to reinstate the one-year residency requirement as a condition for qualifying for welfare assistance. The Supreme Court of the United States had ruled in 1969 that similar bills in other states were unconstitutional. Such requirements, according to the Court, have a "chilling effect" on one's right to travel freely between states and a state may no more try to fence out these indigents who seek welfare benefits than it may try to fence out indigents generally.

As the chief Republican sponsor of H.B. 977 argued, "the legislation aims to discourage people moving from their home states to Ohio in search of higher welfare benefits." He insisted, in addition, "It will cut down
on the number of persons moving to the state to find work but somehow ending up on welfare."

One of the black legislators taking the floor to speak against the bill voiced the sentiment of the group when he candidly affirmed, "If this bill passes, Ohio will be heading back to the Mayflower, while the rest of the world heads for the moon." However, the bill passed and nine of the black legislators, including the black Republican, registered their opposition to the bill; their opposition was staged based on the indirect effect of the bill on blacks moving into the state from other areas.

The conservative element of the legislature favored the bill's passage because of its anti-welfare views, and the black legislators felt impelled to challenge these sentiments.

Still another suitable means by which one can measure the partisan relationship persisting between the black legislators and the Democratic party is through role perception; i.e., how they see their relationship with the party. Resultingly, 70 per cent of the black legislators look upon themselves as "party men," meaning they vote with the party most of the time, and the other 30 per cent see themselves as party men also but with some slight reservations. Examples of these reservations are:

A. I am first a people's man; i.e., I am an advocate of the rights of the people.
   But realistically, I am a party identifier.
B. I am black number one. Beyond that wherein I can compromise, I go along with the party.

C. I am an independent organizational Democrat. I am organizational on some issues and on others, I am independent as hell.

Likewise, 80 per cent of the black legislators contend they vote with the party in the House 95 per cent of the time, while the other 20 per cent claimed party voting approximately 75 per cent of the time. The former figure is most near the reality of the situation; i.e., party loyalty. To examine the extent of the party loyalty of the black legislators as related to voting in the House, 16 of the 49 roll calls were selected for study and analysis because these were the most partisan of all of the 49 roll calls; they were the votes wherein the split between the parties were almost even—the Republicans lined up against the Democrats and vice versa. These results of the 16 partisan roll calls are illustrated in Table 9. Again, the evidence shows the black Democrats to be the most loyal of all groups on the most partisan issues—a situation wherein party loyalty is indeed crucial. Thus, the evidence strongly supports the contentions previously affirmed in the interview data regarding the black legislators' loyalty to the Democratic party.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Democrats</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Democrats</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Democrats</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Republicans</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The black legislators were asked in the interviews whether they felt blacks supporting the Democratic party in Ohio received a fair share of the political patronage dispensed by the party. One hundred per cent of the nine black Democratic legislators believed black citizens do not receive a fair share of party patronage; some variations of these responses follow:

A. We don't get our fair share of nothing anywhere--state, nation, etc.

B. Based on the proclivity of the black community to vote Democratic, there is no adequate reward; some precincts vote as high as 80 to 90 per cent Democratic.

C. The Democratic party has never been accustomed to doing so. They have not been pressured into complying with black requests and needs.

D. In the past "no"; we are working on it for the future--it's improving.

E. This is because of race; he (the white Democrat) is the same man from the society
at large. I think that it's getting better. The improvement is seen in the number of black scattered out on jobs in the state.

The basic idea conveyed by these remarks is that in proportion to the support given to the Democratic party in the state, the rewards for such loyalty have been somewhat deficient; but they, at the same time, see the condition as improving. And the perceived gap in performance by the Democratic party as viewed by the black legislators is the most apparent flaw in this basically good working relationship.

This chapter examined the relationship of the black legislators with the party as a way of evaluating their influence. The black legislators do, in fact, exert influence on the affairs of the Democratic party. After reaching group proportions in the House in 1967 and subsequently becoming a political force to be reckoned with, they successfully exerted pressure on the party's leaders and thereby won concessions in terms of greater participation in party decision-making activities and increased inclusion on committees within the House of Representatives. The work in this chapter also confirmed the black legislators as the most loyal to the Democratic party based on the analysis of 49 roll calls; this high degree of loyalty to the party is confirmed on both partisan and nonpartisan issues. In addition, the nine black Democrats do not con-
stitute a solid voting bloc, but simply vote together with a relatively high degree of frequency. Therefore, the black legislators can ordinarily be expected to vote along with the party on most issues, but whenever there arises a conflict within the party on any issue pending before the House conceived by the black legislators to contain racial overtones or is detrimental to urban areas, they will tend to vote together in attempting to protect these areas. The ten bill analysis reflected the validity of this premise. In essence, this simply suggests that the black legislators will tend to defend black interests and the interests of urban areas, even at the expense of party loyalty. Consequently, a black voting bloc potential is always existent relating to these issues. Further, the black legislators are continually striving for more jobs for black citizens in the state through the channels of the Democratic party and they view the situation as improving, primarily since the current governor is a liberal Democrat and presumably concerned with the plight of blacks as well as other "have-nots" in the state. This factor in itself augments the influence of the black legislators in the House, and similarly their relationship with interest groups and the state bureaucracy. The next chapter delineates these relationships.
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CHAPTER VI

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BLACK LEGISLATORS
AND INTEREST GROUPS, THE GOVERNOR,
HIS STAFF AND THE BUREAUCRACY

This chapter aims primarily to portray interest groups, the Governor, his staff, and the bureaucracy as prime participants in legislative decision-making in the Ohio House of Representatives. Accordingly, those elements are examined in order to weigh further the overall influence wielded by the black legislators in the House. A supportive relationship between the black legislators and these elements in the House surely enhances the legislators' general influence, especially in terms of their capacity to procure expert information, political patronage and special favors for themselves and the constituents whom they represent.

The Black Legislators and Interest Groups

Interest groups, representing the viewpoints of citizens joined together to maximize their political strength, are full-fledged participants in the legislative process.\(^1\) An assessment of the value of interest groups in the legislative process was advanced by Harman Zeigler when he maintained:
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The role of interest groups is that of articulating demands and placing them within the context of institutional decision-making. They are important not solely because they are occasionally able to achieve their goals at the expense of other and competing values, but also because they provide organizational representation for the opinions of the fluid public which help to form the environment surrounding the legislature.\textsuperscript{2}

Once a belief persisted that interest groups, by virtue of their mere existence, represented a menace to the "public interest," but eventually this view gave way to the current notion that interest groups, as a whole, constitute legitimate participants in the process of formulating public policies in state legislatures. However, on this matter, it is essential to relate that many factors, including circumstance, the subject matter of legislation, and the strength of political parties, help to determine the effect of interest groups on public policy.\textsuperscript{3} On some occasions, because of these factors, the impact of interest groups is decisive, but at other times their input is meager and the legislature controls its own affairs.\textsuperscript{4} Given this arrangement of circumstances, interest groups are enabled to play a functional role in state legislative systems by contributing to the maintenance of these systems through their strategic location in the communication channels that affect the environment of policy-making. Thus, interest groups provide a significant link between constituents and legislators; and communications flow in both directions—from interest groups to legislators and vice versa.\textsuperscript{5}
Just as legislators tend to differ in their role orientation toward their districts and political parties, they also differ in their orientation toward interest groups. A typology for examining such orientations was furnished by John C. Wahlke and colleagues. The general categories are:

- **Facilitators**: Have a friendly attitude toward group activity and relatively much knowledge about it.
- **Resisters**: Have a hostile attitude toward group activity and relatively much knowledge about it.
- **Neutrals**: Have no strong attitude of favor or disfavor with respect to group activity (regardless of their knowledge of it) or have very little knowledge about it (regardless of their friendliness or hostility toward it).

Then the legislator's view of interest groups is a crucial factor determining his own behavior and likewise affecting his influence with these groups. Therefore, the black legislators' views on interest groups were ascertained during the course of the interviews; they are all classified as "Facilitators," because of their cordial attitude toward interest groups—100 per cent of their group conveyed the idea that interest groups played an important role in legislative decision-making.

In addition, the black legislators were asked to rank the interest groups they considered the most powerful in
the Ohio House of Representatives. Table 10 illustrates these rankings by the black legislators.

TABLE 10
INTEREST GROUPS RANKED AS POWERFUL IN THE OHIO HOUSE BY THE BLACK LEGISLATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Groups</th>
<th>Per cent of Black Legislators Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Educational Association</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Unions</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Trucking Association</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Manufacturing Association</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Merchants</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bureau</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These rankings of group interests considered influential in the Ohio legislative process are typical of the kinds of interests commonly visible in state political systems, particularly where interest groups play a key role in legislative decision-making. The black legislators also ranked the interest groups they considered most influential in their own legislative districts. The results of these selections appear in Table 11. The chief revelations emerging from the data in the table is that the same two groups (education and labor) show top rankings as in the previous table. This is significant because labor has for
a long time been an ally of the Democratic party, and since the nine black legislators are Democrats, their influence with this ally is enhanced. Civil rights groups do not show as much strength as would be presumed without examination.

**TABLE 11**

**INTEREST GROUPS RANKED AS POWERFUL IN THE BLACK LEGISLATORS' DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Groups</th>
<th>Per cent of Black Legislators Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Educational Association</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Unions</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights Groups</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Manufacturing Association, Farmers, Bankers, Medical Association, Real Estate, Churches, and League of Women Voters</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influence exhibited by legislators with interest groups and vice versa—it has been suggested up to this point—takes place mainly through the interactions between the two subjects. Harmon Zeigler and Michael Baer have employed interaction theory in studying the role of interest groups in state legislatures. They have maintained:

For interaction to take place it is not necessary that the flow of influence be entirely in one direction. We do not think of lobbying as a one-way street in which the legislator simply responds to the behavior of the lobbyist without
influencing his behavior. Rather, we look on
the legislator-lobbyist interaction as a
reciprocal relationship. Each participant
brings into the exchange certain resources in
exchange for gratifying behavior. The degree
of contingency in the interaction will depend
in part upon the extent to which either party
finds the services (resources) of the other
useful in the achieving of a goal... Consequently, the legislator-lobbyist interaction
will not necessarily be totally contingent.
The behavior of one participant may not be the
total influence on the behavior of the other.
Indeed, it is likely that several sources of
services will compete for the favor of each
participant. 

The techniques frequently employed by interest groups
in the process of interacting with legislators encompass
the following: (1) appeals to the public at large via
the mass media to support a given issue--this tends to
have an impact on the behavior of legislators involved;
(2) staging letter-writing campaigns from the constituents
of a legislator whom they hope to receive favorable sup-
port; (3) providing social entertainment for legislators,
e.g., cocktail parties, dinners "nights on the town," etc.;
(4) contributing to the political campaigns of legisla-
tors and concurrently giving other assistance in campaigns
in terms of manpower, staff help, etc.; (5) securing jobs
for the legislator's constituents; and (6) providing
expert research information for legislators. All of these
techniques do in some way aid the tasks of legislators
and at the same time reap benefits for the interest groups
involved.
Regarding the function of interest groups as suppliers of expert information for legislators, much attention has been given to this situation by political scientists who have systematically studied interest group techniques. One of these political scientists provides insights on this function of interest groups and its importance to legislators as follows:

... Any politician, whether legislator, administrator, or judge; whether elected or appointed, is obliged to make decisions that are guided in part by the relevant knowledge that is available to him. The politician also must rely on somewhat conventionalized assessments of trends, corrected by new information about relevant facts.

The politician is in continuous need of current information because he is at the mercy of the changes as they occur. Like a college president, a politician, especially an elected politician, is expected to have a judgment on all matters ranging from the causes of an outbreak of Bang's disease among the local livestock to the latest strategy of the Kremlin. He must make decisions on many of these questions, decisions on the content of his public statements, on the causes and persons he will champion, on how he will vote on a roll call. ...

The knowledge required by the politician may be divided into two types: technical knowledge that defines the content of a policy issue; and political knowledge of the relative strength of competing claims and of the consequences of alternative decisions on a policy issue. Any (interest) group may be in a position directly or indirectly to supply information of either type.3

The contention that information is one of the valuable resources legislators obtain from interacting with interest groups received additional support from the interview data.
The black legislators provided comments on the advantages they reaped from interest groups in the House.

A. They can provide resource materials. Since we don't have secretaries in the House, we can rely on interest groups. I don't have time to do all the research.

B. The strong point is they provide information. They have resources to come up with answers, and the information they come up with is quite reliable.

C. They help in getting information and in my election campaign, and they also make occasional financial contributions.

D. They provide the research one needs on legislation, i.e., they present the vital statistics.

E. They bring to light things I may not be aware of, i.e., they have the essential expertise and resources.

It is hereby acknowledged that the legislator may influence the lobbyist as much as the other way around. The legislator may influence the lobbyist significantly by refusing to cooperate with him and even more so by virtue of establishing friendly relations with the lobbyist ("the friendship play"). After all, it is the legislator who possesses the vote in the House—this is the prize. Thus, the analysis of the black legislators' relationship with interest groups confirms the former's influence, particularly as this influence relates to the black legislators' capacity to procure expert information, campaign support, and jobs for constituents.
The Black Legislators, The Governor and His Staff

An assessment of the relationship prevailing between the black legislators and the Governor of the State of Ohio must begin first, because of necessity, with an analysis of the typical powers and influences inherent in the office of governor in the American states. The view is generally held that the governor and his staff are forces external to the legislature that significantly influence legislative decision-making. A governor of a state possesses powers that are both constitutional and political. His constitutional powers begin with his delegated responsibility for initiating major legislative programs in a state. Through this power of policy initiation alone, a governor's impact on the legislature is enormous. The governor sets the agenda for public decision-making by largely determining what the business will be in any given session of the legislature. Therefore, few major state undertakings ever get started without being initiated by the governor. By preparing the priorities for the legislators before the session begins, the governor is given a major role in initiating policy proposals for legislative deliberation.

In a similar manner, the governor holds the constitutional responsibility for making periodic reports to the legislature on the affairs of state--his "State of the
State Address." He appraises, in this address, the existing economic goals to strive for by the state and he outlines alternative plans, prescriptions, etc., for achieving these economic goals. Likewise, he may use this occasion to present a program for legislative action; this message usually becomes a political document of major importance in the state's political affairs. If he is a skilled governor and particularly if he has learned the art of capturing public support, his message to the legislature may become the rallying point for the various forces he is able to enlist on his behalf.14 Hence, most of the major legislation introduced in a given legislative session emerges from the governor's office.

Closely related to the governor's power of initiative in legislative matters is the preparation of the budget, which he constructs in cooperation with members of his staff. Generally, the budget consumes the bulk of the time in the first months of a legislative session, thereby dominating much of the initial decision-making in the legislature. And the governor's budget is perhaps the most momentous policy document to appear before a session of a legislature.15 A governor's control over the formulation of a state's budget is basically his most formidable power; his fiscal views are reflected in the budget's contents. In addition to his powers to deliver messages to the legislature and the submission of the executive budget, the
governor of a state is empowered to call special sessions of the legislature to deal with special subjects whenever the need arises. Further, the governors of all the states have the power to veto legislation except in North Carolina; this power may exercise dominant influence in determining the success or failure of a given piece of legislation.

The political bases for a governor's power are visible in his role as party leader, his ability to influence public opinion through the mass media, and his use of the enormous amount of patronage at his disposal. In the first instance, the governor's influence is greater in competitive two-party states where his party has a majority in the state legislature, but even when the opposite situation is prevalent, the governor who is a powerful political leader can bargain with recalcitrant forces from the effective vantage point inherent in his office. In attempting to influence public opinion within a state, the governor has the mass media at his disposal, and the opportunity to call press conferences at will. Within the last few decades the press conference, radio, television, and modern transportation have modified the nature of the governor's political leadership in the legislature. But it is perhaps political patronage that constitutes the chief means by which a governor exercises major influence with legislators, when endeavoring to get his legislative
programs successfully passed through the legislature. In this context, patronage refers to jobs, contracts, road projects and other favors that the governor can offer a legislator, his friends, or his district. The whole gamut of political favors are included under the rubric of patronage; hence, in most stages, the dispensing of jobs offers the governor one of his best opportunities to influence legislators. His appointive power is expansive in that it involves judgeships as well as the numerous positions available with state departments and agencies. There are, however, some limits placed on his appointive powers by state civil service requirements. Nevertheless, whether or not a particular governor actually provides legislative leadership depends, in addition, to the aforementioned constitutional and political powers, on the presence or absence of a tradition of gubernatorial leadership in his state and the concept which he holds of his proper role in government.

From the preceding analysis of the powers of governors in the American states, it becomes readily apparent that the legislative influence of governors varies from state to state and also sometimes even within states; no precise system of measure, to date, has been devised which permits a precise measurement of gubernatorial influence across state lines. In the long run, given the array of alternative uses of the governor's powers in
legislative affairs, his greatest power is probably that of persuasion—his ability to win friends and supporters for his projects.

The governor's staff includes the personnel comprising the executive office of the governor along with his close personal assistants. The staff is significant in assessing the influence any group has with the governor of a state, for they make up his administrative team. They are instrumental in assisting the governor in initiating and implementing his legislative policies and programs. And they similarly help to alleviate some of the pressures of the office that ordinarily weigh heavily on the governor's shoulders. For example, many individuals seeking jobs and special favors from the governor are generally handled by his staff; likewise, citizens requesting conferences with the governor oftentimes are referred to his special assistants. Then it is essential for any individual or group wishing to reap benefits from the governor's office to establish good rapport with his staff. In essence, the governor's staff is the vital intermediary party within the interacting between the governor and legislators.

In Ohio the current governor possesses the array of the previously alluded powers of the office; however, the most crucial restraining force on this exercise of those powers is the fact that the governor's party, the Democrats,
are in the minority in both houses in the Ohio General Assembly. But, in spite of that, those powers enjoyed by the current Democratic governor of Ohio are sufficient for exploring the nature of this political relationship between the governor, his staff, and the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives.

From the outset, the proposition is maintained that the relationship existing between the current governor, his staff, and the black legislators is a cordial and fruitful one; influence is reciprocal between these political entities. This evaluation of the relationship stems from the existence of the following contributing conditions: (1) the governor is a political liberal and has exhibited sincere commitment to providing equal job opportunities for blacks and other minority groups in the state, thus the number of blacks working with state government has increased; (2) the governor appointed a black legislator as his advisor on minority affairs—he is liaison between the governor and the black legislators, and he additionally searches for and screens black job applicants; (3) nine of the ten black legislators and the governor are of the same political party and are likely to be allies on most partisan matters; and (4) the black legislators themselves are convinced that the governor is sincere in his relationship with the group and in his commitment to advancing the well-being of the disadvantaged citizens in the state.
Political observers and commentators on Ohio politics view Governor John Joyce Gilligan as a political liberal; his political philosophy, coupled with his political behavior, support such a labeling. Specifically, the governor is committed to expanding government services to citizens in Ohio as never before through increased government spending—the necessary revenue is to be achieved through taxing individual citizens based on ability to pay. Remarks in the governor's political addresses and his budget reflect this liberal posture.

In an interview with the press shortly before his inauguration, the governor outlined his philosophy of the governor's role when he maintained:

... I can run it at any level they want. I can't determine what level it will be. The people will ultimately decide that through their elected representatives.

It's essentially my job to make the options known to the general public. What are the choices? What are the costs? What are the benefits? Once they make the decision, my job is to try to see that programs are administered as effectively and energetically as I can.23

In addition, the governor made it clear that he was cognizant of his predicament, i.e., having to contend with a Republican-controlled legislature that makes policy decisions; however, he remarked on this point:

... I take the position that I'll have the job for four years whether the legislature votes an additional $1 million, whether they cut $1 million, or whatever they do. I'm
sitting here and I'll run it any way they want it run. 24

When he was inaugurated as the 62nd Governor of the State of Ohio on January 18, 1971, he vowed to fashion a better society for all Ohioans. He pledged:

... To strive to be within the limits of our human talents, within the limits set forth by our Constitution and our laws, the instruments by which (the people of Ohio) will fashion the society in which we and our children shall live.25

In concluding the same address, he called upon Ohioans to:

Command us to undertake the fearful struggle to build a society based upon justice, order and mutual respect, enriched by compassion and hope. If you so command us, we, your servants, will strive with all our strength to give substance to your dream of a better world and a better life, as God is our witness.26

At the beginning of his administration, the governor established a list of priorities for his administration illustrative of his desire to increase the quality and quantity of government services in the state. He cited education, mental health, and corrections at the top of his list, charging that the state is responsible for previous failures in these areas.27 Appearing on the list of priorities also were local government services, which he claims are the responsibility of the state, along with environmental protection, a responsibility he contends is to be shared jointly by the state and Federal governments. His "State of the State" message of March, 1971, gave
additional warnings to failures in these same areas and he voiced again the commitment of his administration to realizing improvements in these areas of government services.

Speaking before the First Annual Banquet of Black Elected Democrats of Ohio, the governor continued to convey his pledge to provide additional services for Ohio's citizens and particularly his avowed aim of enlarging opportunities for minorities in the state. He charged that "no state in the union does less with its resources than Ohio."28 Furthermore, he blamed the Republicans for the financial plight of the state and declared, "there is no excuse for Ohio not having the best of everything from schools to medical treatment."29 On the same occasion, he gave promise to issue an Executive Order prohibiting discrimination by the construction industry in hiring, firing, and laying off procedures and he promulgated plans to appoint a black member to the Ohio Real Estate Commission, which heretofore did not contain any blacks in its membership. The governor carried out this plan shortly afterwards.

The governor's budget represents a "putting into practice" the philosophy of his administration. As it was initially proposed in March, 1971, the governor's budget and tax bill then amounted to a $9.17 billion figure and would have required a $1.6 billion increase in taxes.20
But when the budget tax bill finally passed through the General Assembly in December, 1971, after about nine months of partisan bickering, whittling away of budget items, supporting and opposing the new personal income tax provision, it amounted to a $7.7 billion budget. This final revenue package came only after the deliberations of a fourth Senate-House Conference Committee, having revised many of the proposals offered by the three previous committees.

In the House of Representatives, the vote on passage of the budget was 56 to 46, and the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 17 to 15. As expected, the Democrats in the House solidly supported the administration's budget, with only 2 of the 45 members voting "no"; hence, on the final vote, 43 Democrats joined 13 Republicans in passing the budget tax bill—opposing the bill were 40 Republicans and 2 Democrats. The 9 black legislators voted with the administration, and so did the lone black Republican. A news account appearing shortly thereafter provided an explanation for the black legislators' behavior in supporting the finalized budget tax package. It reported that:

The /Black legislators/ supported the budget after Gilligan aide, , promised that an upcoming gubernatorial executive order on non-discrimination in state hiring would be broadened to include all highway projects and state service operations.
Given the strategic bargaining position of the black legislators in the closely contested partisan struggle over the budget, the news account is not to be easily doubted--for the black legislators were, indeed, in a bargaining position--holding 9 crucial votes.

In addition to providing for a $760 million increase in government spending through June, 1973, a graduated personal income tax of 1.5 to 3.5 per cent is included in the budget and it expects to amass $381.5 million in revenue. Other major items contained in the final budget are:

... A 4 to 8 per cent corporate income tax, with the higher rate applied to earnings above $25,000; a reduced-rate severance tax; a net increase of three cents per pack in cigarette taxes and higher taxes on insurance companies, financial institutions, and dealers in securities.

... An across the board reduction of 5 per cent on 1971 land taxes and a 10 per cent property tax reduction the following year.

... Reductions of $2,000 to $5,000 in property valuations for home owners 65 years of age and older with adjusted gross incomes of $8,000 or less.34

Upon reflecting on the budget's passage, Governor Gilligan expressed gratitude and optimism; he commented:

... The taxes represent the fairest possible base for state financing. I believe this base will enable us to plan sensibly for the financing of state government for decades to come and will remain our equitable way of paying for the services all of us want and need.35
Even though the finalized budget is reduced somewhat from the figures contained in the original tax package, it is still, without a doubt, the most revolutionary tax reform plan in the state's history. Some of the particulars forming the basis for this conclusion appear below:

... The $7.7 billion budget... represents a $1.3 billion increase over former Governor James A. Rhodes' final biennial budget (§6.4). It is less than the $9.1 billion package proposed to the assembly by Gilligan on March 15. 36

The graduated personal income tax provision, the state's first, enabled Ohio to become the 43rd state with a personal income tax. Thus, the governor's budget as approved shows evidence of the efforts of his administration to improve the quality of life in Ohio by expanding and improving government services for the state's citizens. This same point was made when one of the supporters of the governor's budget maintained, "The compromise bill §1is§ the best way way to end the long stalemate. It provides substantial property tax relief and will permit the state to meet its obligations." 37

It was earlier noted that the governor appointed a black legislator as his advisor on minority affairs; this appointment and position further illustrates the governor's commitment to advancing the aims and aspirations of dispossessed minorities in the State of Ohio. The governor's advisor on minority affairs is one of the most influential
black legislator-politicians in the state. Representative C. J. McLin, the black legislator who holds this appointment, previously served as co-chairman along with former astronaut John Glenn of "The Citizens for Gilligan Committee." Gilligan is the first governor in Ohio's history to appoint a black legislator whose duty it is to serve as patronage chief for black and minority political appointments. This factor per se is indicative of the governor's avowed sincerity in effectuating his promise to recruit more blacks for high level jobs in state administration, i.e., the minority affairs position is indeed functional to the realization of recruitment and creation of more jobs for blacks with state government. In addition to his duties as patronage chief, the advisor on minority affairs is the acknowledged liaison between his fellow black legislators and the governor's office. For this reason, this advisor to the governor is enabled to obtain an audience with the governor upon short notice; as a matter of fact, he meets regularly with the governor's cabinet and the governor has an "open door" policy toward him.

Another situation reflective of this influence with the governor is seen in the fact that both the black legislators and the governor are members of the Democratic party; and since the governor and the black legislators share minority party status in the legislature, they are prone to stick together, especially in supporting strictly
partisan matters in the legislature. The roll call analysis in Chapter V demonstrated this tendency, and so did the "budget fight." Significant also is the fact that one of the black legislators served on the governor's "Speaker's Bureau." In the initial stages of the new Democratic administration, and shortly thereafter when the budget was first introduced in the House of Representatives, members of the "Speaker's Bureau" had the responsibility of traveling around to various parts of the state making speeches designed to solicit support for the governor's tax package. Then too, the governor hails from one of the state's urban areas and has a tendency to show sympathy for the problems and concerns of the cities--the governor previously spent 12 years of his career as a city councilman. Since the black legislators themselves represent predominantly urban areas, another common denominator is found for calculating the dimensions of this basically harmonious relationship between the governor and the black legislators.

Aside from these dimensions depicting the relationship between the governor and the black legislators, the interview data further supports a positive assessment. One significant way of viewing this relationship is through consideration of instances wherein black legislators have solicited support, in terms of jobs, information, etc.,
from the governor's office. Ninety per cent of the black legislators indicated they had solicited the support of the governor's office at one time or another during their tenure in office. In most instances, they were pleased with the results of conferring with the governor's office. The interview data explains that these conferences with the governor and/or his staff ranged in time from fifteen minutes to a whole day. Still another factor revealing the relationship between the governor and the black legislators unfolds when considering their response to the interview question, "Do you believe that the governor is concerned about the needs and problems of black citizens in the State of Ohio?" Ninety per cent responded with a "yes"; likewise, 70 per cent regarded the current governor as highly concerned with the plight of black Ohioans. Some of these remarks were stated in the terms that follow:

A. Governor Gilligan is a liberal and sensitive to the needs of blacks.

B. I think he is highly concerned; he is sensitive enough to know that there are certain things in Ohio which need to be served.

C. He is "open" about problems relating to blacks. I've never seen such done by a governor before--this is a bold approach.

D. The only reason that the governor would be concerned is because of the votes that can be delivered. He is a liberal and a politician, and a politician is concerned about votes.
E. The administration is very committed; the present governor is really sincere in what he is doing.

What one finds in these comments are clear perceptive assessments of the governor's avowed sincerity and commitment to advancing the opportunities and economic status of blacks and other minorities in the state. Because the black legislators believe the governor is sincere, a basically harmonious relationship is facilitated; i.e., the nine Democratic black legislators hold the governor in high esteem and even regard the relationship as improving. Therefore, the evidence demonstrates that primarily because of the governor's liberal philosophy and partisan factors, the black legislators have enjoyed good access to gubernatorial patronage; they have sought and obtained jobs for constituents in their districts; sought support for minority students at state universities in Ohio, including Central State; and sought support for aid to education in general. Resultingly, the black legislators have exhibited significant influence with the state's chief executive and have generally reaped lucrative benefits from this basically harmonious relationship.

The Black Legislators and the State Bureaucracy

The state bureaucracy in Ohio represents vital sources of information on government operations within the state; various departments in the bureaucratic complex engage in
research of special interest to their area of specialization and they prepare reports to be utilized as source materials at open committee hearings in the legislature. Most departments follow the progress of legislation affecting their functions closely when the legislature is in session and are usually able and willing to answer questions on what they conceive to be the effects of a given proposal.\textsuperscript{40} Many of the departments, agencies, and the staff of the governor's office provide bill drafting services on proposals of interest to them.\textsuperscript{41} As in most any administrative complex, the bureaucracy plays an integral role in policy formation, primarily because they are information specialists in their particular areas of concern and accordingly they possess experience and expertise in the functioning of the state's administrative machinery.

In Ohio the bureaucracy is contained in 23 departments, 87 agencies, and 161 boards and commissions;\textsuperscript{42} however, it is not the aim of this research to delineate the ramifications and dimensions of the entire bureaucratic complex characteristic of the state's administrative machinery. But rather, the focus on the bureaucracy for purposes of this research stems from the capacity for this administrative machinery to function as a source of jobs for a legislator's constituents, and as a storehouse of knowledge and expertise on government operations. Conse-
quently, the main concerns then are the appointments of black citizens to jobs with the state bureaucracy under the Gilligan administration along with the nature of information and support solicited by the black legislators from the bureaucracy. As discussed earlier in the chapter, there exists a trend toward an increase in the number of blacks appointed under the current administration, and this administration has voiced a commitment toward employing more blacks and minorities with state government.

Of the 23 major departments in Ohio's state government, blacks occupy two directorships, e.g., over the departments of Corrections and Employment Services. The two black directors account for 9 per cent of the directorships of these major departments. Bennett Cooper is a carry over from the previous administration, while William E. Garnes received his appointment from Governor Gilligan. However, it was under the administration of former Governor James A. Rhodes that the first black Ohioan was appointed to the directorship of a state department. The former governor appointed William Q. Walker of Cleveland, editor and publisher of *The Call and Post*, as director of the Department of Industrial Relations.

In an effort to evaluate the functions of the various departments of state government as they relate to the perceived needs of the black legislators' constituents,
the black legislators were requested to rank the departments of state government accordingly. The results appear in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Per cent Cited by Black Legislators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Welfare</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Affairs</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Health, Local Government and Development</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rankings received by these departments are indicative of the perennial needs and problems of black communities as a whole (e.g., welfare, education, unemployment, etc.). It is significant to note here that the two black directors supervise two of the departments receiving high rankings.

As pointed out earlier, the state bureaucracy provides numerous job opportunities for a legislator's constituents, as well as serving as a source for supplying specialized information—a sampling of the black legislators' relationship with the bureaucrats, then, furnishes an additional means of evaluating their influence. To deter-
mine the nature of this relationship, the black legislators were requested to indicate whether they ever had the occasion to request the support of a department chairman or a member of his staff. Eighty per cent had solicited such support, while only 20 per cent had not. All of those who had contacted these bureaucrats were pleased with the responses received from their requests. Typical requests made to bureaucrats by the black legislators fall in the categories that follow: (1) welfare problems, (2) model cities programs, (3) highway construction, (4) the construction of a barber college in a black legislator's district, (5) grants to law enforcement, (6) requests to have a motel constructed in a black legislator's district with the possibility of the franchise being held by blacks, (7) jobs for black constituents, (8) information on special programs involving a given department, and (9) information regarding bills pending before the House. Hence, the interviews suggest that the black legislators have enjoyed success in their dealings with the departments in the state bureaucracy in terms of procuring expert information needed to aid their legislative responsibilities and jobs for the black legislator's constituents.

In addition to the two directorships of state departments held by black individuals, a number of blacks have
been appointed to lower-ranking administrative posts under the Gilligan administration. There are no specific figures showing the number of blacks employed in each department, but most of the notable new appointments to departments, bureaus, and commissions made by the current Democratic administration are listed in Table 13.

Thirty-three per cent of these 57 administrative positions held by blacks are encompassed in the Bureau of Employment Services. This bureau received previous high ranking from the black legislators because of its relative value to the welfare of black constituents. Many of these positions were filled with black individuals and are attributed to the efforts of the black director of the bureau, who sought to get more blacks hired in his department—indeed he has been successful.

In addition to the administrative positions held by blacks listed in Table 13, there are others who received appointment to positions by the governor in 1971. For example, a black Columbus attorney, Napoleon Bell, was named by Governor Gilligan to the State Board of Tax Appeals. Irving J. Franklin, a prominent black Cleveland real estate broker, received appointment to the Ohio Real Estate Commission, becoming the first black to be named to this commission. Some judicial appointments were also carried out by the present governor. John L. Francis,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Black Administrator</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant for Minority Affairs</td>
<td>Samuel T. Britton</td>
<td>Governor's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Administrator</td>
<td>Irving Lowery</td>
<td>Bur. of Employ. Serv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director, Personnel</td>
<td>Henry Evans</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Manager</td>
<td>Walter Diehl</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Manager</td>
<td>Earl B. Stamper</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Defense Manpower</td>
<td>Ralph Beason</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Budget &amp; Time Distribution</td>
<td>David Bretz</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Equal Employment Services</td>
<td>John W. Cooper</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Human Resources</td>
<td>Robert Hart</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Inventory Control</td>
<td>Charles D. Scott</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Cincinnati CEP Office</td>
<td>Allen L. Bivens</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Toledo CEP Office</td>
<td>John L. Cohen</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Cleveland VPC Office</td>
<td>Chester Fossey</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Cincinnati VPC Office</td>
<td>Loraine Hambrick</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Cleveland VPC Office</td>
<td>John Moffett</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Dayton VPC Office</td>
<td>Major Nimock</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Toledo VPC Office</td>
<td>Doris Nurel</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Cleveland CEP Office</td>
<td>Myron Styles</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Cincinnati Claims Office</td>
<td>Ernest Thachter, Jr.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Columbus VPC Office</td>
<td>Leonard Watson</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy State Fire Marshal</td>
<td>Carl R. Jones</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Division of Licensing</td>
<td>Douglas Russell</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director, Housing and Community</td>
<td>Troy Grigsby</td>
<td>Econ. &amp; Commun. Devel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Bur. of Community Economic Improvement</td>
<td>Bill Johnson</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Officer</td>
<td>Glenna Brown</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deputy Director</td>
<td>Alphonso Montgomery</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Black Administrator</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Walter McCready</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity</td>
<td>Marvin Johnson</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director, Planning</td>
<td>William Bunkley</td>
<td>Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to Director for Minority Affairs</td>
<td>Arthur Hill</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Enforcement Division, Bureau of Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>Clarence Lumpkin</td>
<td>Highway Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Enforcement Division, District 1, Columbus</td>
<td>Roger Germany</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Enforcement Division, District 4, Toledo</td>
<td>Anderson Cheeves</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Jimmie Jones, Jr.</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Officer</td>
<td>George Saunders</td>
<td>Liquor Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Permit Inspection</td>
<td>Mac Sharp</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Officer</td>
<td>Sterling Allen</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant for Cincinnati Stores</td>
<td>Elijah Scott</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant for Cleveland Stores</td>
<td>Robert Shefton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant to Chief of Parks</td>
<td>Jack Cornett</td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Fiscal Management</td>
<td>Howard Hurst</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>James Bolden</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Arthur Evans</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Intergovernmental Act Programs</td>
<td>Charles Morton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Temporary Help Programs</td>
<td>Michael Rivers</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deputy, Recruitment</td>
<td>Burton Cooper</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Black Administrator</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Public Employment Training Programs</td>
<td>Ben Adams</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Counselling</td>
<td>Karen Evans</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director, Employment Management Relations Admin.</td>
<td>Alvin Wesley</td>
<td>Public Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant, Special Services</td>
<td>Curtis Lewis</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horace Barnett</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Bureau of Food Admin.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Child Care Resource Development</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Office of Innovations</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Superintendent, State House</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Foreman, Wyandott Bldg.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Youth Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"This information was compiled by the Governor's Office."
another black Columbus attorney was appointed to fill the seat on the Franklin County Municipal Court vacated in October, 1971, by the death of the late Judge Alan Schwarzwalder. But Francis lost out shortly afterwards when he sought to retain his seat in the November election. The other appointment of a black to a judicial seat was effectuated when Lloyd O. Brown, a prominent Cleveland attorney, took a seat as a Justice of the Ohio Supreme Court; he became the second black to serve on the state's highest court. Justice Robert M. Duncan, the first black to serve on the State Supreme Court bench, appointed by former Governor James A. Rhodes, was recently named to the United States Military Court of Appeals by President Richard M. Nixon.

The spirit of these data on blacks serving in administrative and judicial positions in state government is indicative of a trend toward an emphatic increase in the number of blacks employed in state government. And this condition coincides with the expressed commitment of the Gilligan administration to attract more blacks to positions with state government to an extent unequalled by previous governors. Regarding this matter in the interviews, 90 per cent of the black legislators charged, however, that currently blacks do not occupy a proportional share of the positions in the state bureaucracy; 60 per cent acknowledged
the existence of an increasing trend in this direction.

Representative samples follow:

A. The trend is favorable. The governor is very concerned about blacks getting jobs. The black representatives met with the governor on cabinet positions; we wanted 6 of the 23 cabinet posts. We were going to pick the ones affecting welfare, health, etc., but we couldn't find enough qualified blacks to fill the positions.

B. There are not enough, but the trend is increasing.

C. We need a Blue Chip Commission to check the number of blacks on jobs (in state government). We are not looking for token jobs; for example, secretaries, etc. We want department heads and on down the line.

D. There has been a 100 per cent improvement in this administration as opposed to the last.

E. We have two black directors; Cooper in Corrections and Garnes in Employment Services—the trend is toward an increase.

This chapter examined the black legislator's relationships with interest groups, the governor, his staff, and the state bureaucracy as indices for a further appraisal of the influence possessed by these legislators. The evidence confirms the black legislators' influence with these participants in legislative decision-making. The findings emerging from the efforts in the chapter demonstrate that the black legislators were successful in obtaining from these participants in the legislative environment technical information to aid in their work, financial
support for election campaigns, and jobs for their constituents. All of these rewards are symbolic of influence.
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CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

The concept of influence represents an integral part of the legislative process; and any evaluation of legislative inputs and policy outcomes must, of necessity, weigh the influence exercised by various individuals and groups in the legislative environment. This exploratory study focusing on the 1971 session of the Ohio House of Representatives and utilizing an informal group of black legislators as the primary unit of analysis clearly substantiates the influence maintained by the black legislators in the Ohio House. Moreover, the influence exercised by the black legislators was generated both individually and in group proportions.

In the initial stages of this work, a research design was constructed establishing a model of influence which defined it as: A influences B to the extent that he can get B to do something he would not ordinarily have done on his own volition. The model of influence included three dimensions: influence predicated on the individual legislator's personality, influence based on institutional position, and influence generated from an organizational power base.
All of the seven black veteran legislators are influential as individuals because of their cooperativeness, logrolling, and industry. Moreover, the six veteran Democrats are influential due to their roles as subject-matter experts on matters of race relations and problems of the "inner city"; especially in the former case, the black legislators are frequently consulted on matters pertaining to race when issues of that nature appear before the House in the form of legislation. Often the black legislators take it upon themselves to inform their white colleagues in meetings and on the House floor on matters relating to the black experience; consequently, they are acknowledged experts in this area. Additionally, the black legislators derive individual influence from the partisan breakdown in the House. With a 54 to 45 split between Republicans and Democrats, there is only a 9-vote difference; neither party can take too much for granted, since sometimes Republicans will vote with Democrats and vice versa. In a situation of this sort, every vote counts and every possible vote is sought after in that it requires only a simple majority of those present and voting to pass any piece of legislation through the House of Representatives. This partisan distribution places the black legislators in a strategic bargaining position (individually and as a group).
Three of the black legislators hold institutional positions which bestow influence on them. For example, the minority whip's position is one which allows the black legislator who occupies this position to "wheel and deal"; i.e., by finding out who is voting one way or the other, he is in a strategic position to engage in logrolling and he can keep his fellow black legislators informed of the way a given tally on a vote is shaping up. The black Republican legislator, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Cooperation, is enabled to wield influence because of his seniority and the prestige of his position. The advisor to the governor on minority affairs serves as a liaison between the chief executive and the black legislators; his influence is effectuated with the governor himself. In addition, one of the black legislators is influential because he heads one of the most powerful political organizations in any black community in Ohio. The strength of this black legislator's political organization is widely recognized by Democratic candidates seeking national or statewide office--it's always to their advantage to get the backing of his organization. It is chiefly credited to this factor that he co-chaired the "Citizens for Gilligan" campaign committee.

In order to ascertain the black legislators' influence as a group, indices for this purpose were operation-
following: (1) the black legislators' own perception of their influence as a group; (2) the perception of the black legislators' influence as viewed by their white colleagues in the House; (3) the relationship of the black legislators and their political parties; (4) the bloc voting potential of the black legislators; and (5) the black legislators' relationships with interest groups, the governor, his staff, and the bureaucracy. Examination of these five indices in this study confirm the black legislators' influence in the House.

The black legislators, in the first instance, look upon themselves as an influential segment of the Ohio House of Representatives; i.e., they believe themselves to be influential as a group and this perception gives the black legislators a positive view of themselves and likewise a positive approach to their jobs as legislators. Both are functional to the exhibition of influence by a group. But it was not enough merely to study how a group views itself internally; an outside view was essential for weighing the group's total impact. Therefore, the white colleagues' views were canvassed on the subject of the black legislators' influence as a group. Seventy percent of the white legislators look upon the black legislators as an influential group in the House of Representatives. This assessment was predicated on their view of
the black legislators as subject-matter experts, as an ad hoc voting bloc and collectively possessed with group strength.

Regarding the relationship between the black legislators and the Democratic party, the nine black Democrats with 20 per cent of their party's membership in the House are considerably influential. Through negotiation and sometimes protest in the past, the black legislators have won a greater voice in partisan decision-making and also share wider leadership roles and party responsibilities. The positions they now hold result from their influence with the party. Their fellow Democrats also concede their influence with the party. Additionally, the 49 roll calls sampled in the study showed that the black legislators are more loyal to the Democratic party than whites, meaning they have a greater tendency to vote along with the party, especially on strictly partisan issues. While the relationship with the Democratic party is not perfect (there are sometimes tensions and conflicts), a good working relationship flourishes between the black legislators and the Democratic party. In fact, the evidence in this study demonstrates that the black legislators possibly have a greater impact with the Democratic party than on decision-making in the House as a whole.

The examination of the bloc voting potential of the black legislators confirmed the absence of such a bloc and
the conclusion was made that they do vote together with relatively high frequency. For example, out of the 49 roll calls, the black legislators voted together as a bloc on 69 per cent of the times. The main factors which explain why the black legislators voted together as a bloc on occasions are founded upon their behavior related to legislation containing racial overtones and legislation inimical to the welfare of the "inner city." Any time legislation of this nature is pending, the black legislators are likely to vote together as a bloc; they will also split with the Democratic party if the party adopts a stand on a piece of legislation which jeopardizes black interests or urban interests. Aside from these instances, the black legislators will vote personal preferences and no solid voting bloc is cemented.

The findings relative to the black legislators' relationship with interest groups, the governor, his staff, and the bureaucracy confirm their influence with these prime participants in the decision-making process in the Ohio House of Representatives. From interest groups the black legislators have been successful in procuring jobs for their constituents; they have benefitted from the expert information furnished by these groups and they have secured campaign support, particularly from labor unions. Traditionally a supporter of civil rights causes, labor
unions have had a strong impact both in the House and in the legislators' districts. Civil rights groups have also been supportive of the campaigns and work of the black legislators in the House. Hence, interest groups have aided the work of the black legislators in the aforementioned ways.

An exceptionally good relationship prevails between the black legislators and the governor of the state. The following factors contribute to the substance of this relationship: (1) the governor's espousal of political liberalism causing him to exert efforts to advance the condition of blacks and other havenots in the state primarily through increased government spending; (2) his appointment of a black legislator as his advisor on minority affairs who searches for and screens black job applicants; (3) the black legislators and the governor are members of the Democratic party and party loyalty causes them to form alliances on most partisan issues, i.e., their support is frequently sought on partisan issues; and (4) the black legislators themselves believe the governor is very sincere in his relations with them and his commitment to improving the plight of disadvantaged citizens in the State of Ohio. Furthermore, the governor has appointed blacks to jobs they never had the opportunity to hold before, thereby contributing to an increase in the
number of jobs with state government now held by black Ohioans. The black legislators, in addition, have enjoyed success with the governor's staff whenever they have had the occasion to request favors from them and this is functional to the black legislators' exercise of influence.

A complex bureaucracy is functional to providing jobs for a legislator's constituents and supplying the technical information essential to coordinating this work in the legislature. Eighty per cent of the black legislators maintained they had the occasion to solicit the support of the bureaucracy at one time or another and they were pleased with the results received from these requests. Under the current Democratic administration, two blacks are directors of major departments in the state bureaucracy. They are the directors of the Department of Corrections and the Department of Employment Services. A number of other black citizens have been appointed to jobs below the directorship level in the various departments and the influence of the black legislators along with the governor's concern contributed to these appointments. Consequently, the black legislators were found to exercise influence with the bureaucracy as it relates to procurement of jobs and technical information. However, the black legislators contend (100 per cent) that black citizens in Ohio still do not occupy a proportional share of jobs contained in
the bureaucracy, but they likewise believe the trend is moving toward a period of change with blacks receiving jobs with state government in encouraging proportions.

**Summary of Evidence Related to the Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis I**

The nine black Democratic members of the Ohio House of Representatives constitute an informal group; the one black Republican, because of the distinct nature of his constituency, is a deviate from this pattern. Further, esprit de corps exists among the nine black Democrats and their informal organization serves as a means of socializing the members into the larger body. The informal grouping functions as a source for the dissemination of information of mutual interest to members of the group.

The black legislators form only one of several informal groups in the Ohio House of Representatives. Informal groups in the House appear in categories such as occupational groupings (teachers, lawyers, farmers, etc.); ideological groups (liberals and conservatives), county delegations (especially Cuyahoga and Hamilton); committee members (Judiciary, etc.); the leadership strata (committee chairmen and advisors to the Speaker); geographical groups (urban, rural and suburban); and a racial group (the black legislators). Most of these function as
informal groups when there is some legislation before the
House affecting their interests; however, the black legis-
lators meet together as an informal group with a greater
frequency than do the others.

When the research was initiated, it was merely assumed
that the black legislators comprised an informal group;
the author had no evidence. But to affirm the black
legislators' status as an informal group, three sources
were employed. They were: (1) direct observation, (2)
self appraisal by the black legislators themselves, and (3)
the white legislators' perception of the black legislators
as an informal group.

During the two and one-half months of interviewing,
the author observed closely the black legislators'
behavior in the House. There is a high degree of inter-
action between the black legislators when the legislature
is in session; e.g., conversations are frequent among
various black legislators. These legislators also
regularly have meals together and they often attend meet-
ings together outside the legislative chambers in group
proportions. Furthermore, the black legislators them-
selves acknowledge their status as an informal group; 60
per cent of these legislators identified other black
legislators as their closest friends in the House of Repre-
sentatives--this was another means of testing their informal
group.
During the two and one-half months of interviewing, the author observed closely the black legislators' behavior in the House. There is a high degree of interaction between the black legislators when the legislature is in session; e.g., conversations are frequent among various black legislators. These legislators also regularly have meals together and they often attend meetings together outside the legislative chambers in group proportions. Furthermore, the black legislators themselves acknowledge their status as an informal group; 60 per cent of these legislators identified other black legislators as their closest friends in the House of Representatives--this was another means of testing their informal group posture. These are the people with whom the black legislators most often fraternize after the legislative session, at parties, dinners, and in casual chats, etc.

The black legislators initially came together as an informal group during the 107th General Assembly in 1967, and have remained the same since that time. Possessing similar social characteristics and representing predominantly black constituents, the black legislators envisioned a need to assemble as a group to discuss common problems and to protect and oversee black interests--the same rationale still stands. Formed concurrently in 1967,
and comprising all of the black Democratic legislators, was the Black Elected Officials of Ohio. This organization aimed to augment the number of black Democratic officeholders in the state and likewise serve as a forum for the group's concerns. Impetus was generated by this organization which enabled the black legislators in the House to assemble as an offshoot of the larger body of officeholders. As an informal group, the black legislators meet once or twice a month to discuss pending legislation of interest appearing before the House in a given session; a chairman presides and the executive secretary handles all correspondence and communications for the group. No rigid rules govern these sessions; sometimes there is an agenda; but usually it is cast aside, especially when other items pop up demanding prompt attention.

This informal group functions primarily as a means of transmitting communications of interest to black legislators. The executive secretary's job is to keep other black legislators informed of any developments to which it is essential for them to give immediate responses. When this task is not carried out by the executive secretary, any black legislators may inform other black legislators of such developments. In addition to this, the informal group functions among the black legislators to socialize them into the larger body. Significantly, when the seven new black legislators were elected to the House in 1967,
there were no orientation sessions conducted for new members and they felt slighted since they had not yet learned the rules and procedures of the House; currently these sessions are conducted for new members at the beginning of each legislative session. But in spite of these sessions, the new black legislator elected to the House can expect to be apprised of the rules, procedures, norms, etc., of the House of Representatives by his fellow black legislators; and the new black member elected to the House will immediately find friends who will share his problems and interests. Thus, his induction into this representative body is facilitated with a minimum degree of tension and discomfort. In the final analysis, this investigation affirms that the informal group furnishes a useful means of studying legislative influence; as a unit of analysis the informal group reveals the web of human relations operative in a legislative assembly such as the Ohio House of Representatives, with 99 members who show an almost inevitable tendency to congregate in informal groups.

**Hypothesis 2**

Race is a factor affecting the behavior of the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives.

Race as a factor affecting the behavior of the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives is acknowledged on three counts: (1) the black legislators
perceive it as a factor; (2) a significant number of white legislators also see race as a factor; and (3) the state legislature is a microcosm of the larger society where race relations are indeed problematic.

Seventy-five per cent of the black legislators believed their racial identity hampers their effectiveness as legislators; i.e., they contend because some of their white colleagues hold racial prejudices, the black legislators, therefore, cannot accomplish as much as they could if race was not a factor. They contend further that since their white colleagues do hold these views, they (their white colleagues), are insensitive and indifferent to the needs and problems of black citizens in the state. Consequently, it becomes their responsibility to protect the interests of their black constituents from abuse and neglect by those individuals in the legislature who are racially prejudiced. None of the black legislators confirmed any acts of overt racism experienced in the legislature, but they did identify racism as a covert (indirect) variable in their relations in the House.

On the other hand, only 25 per cent of the white legislators interviewed identified race as a factor in the Ohio House. Attempts were materialized by some white legislators to present a "rosy picture" of their relations with the black legislators in the House, as if everything
was perfect--without tensions and conflicts. But the segment of the white legislators who did affirm race as a factor, provided some revealing insights into these relations. In fact, a revelation was made by one white veteran legislator that, in his estimation, a black legislator possessing the essential qualifications and tenure could not, at present, win election to any upper echelon leadership position in the Ohio House of Representatives because of racial prejudices. He asserted specifically, "If there was a high level position open in the House and one white legislator ran against one black legislator, the white legislator would win because there would be those voting against the black legislator solely on the account of his race." Another white legislator adheres to the philosophy that three groups are despised in American society--blacks, Catholics, and Jews. This notion, without a doubt, affects his perception of blacks in the House of Representatives; this same individual cautioned that "black legislators should choose their remarks with care when speaking before the House so as not to inflame the emotions of the white legislators."

Still another white legislator equated the existence of racial prejudice in the House with the same predicament on "Main Street, USA." According to him, prejudiced persons are found in both camps. From these instances,
and closely related ones, it is purported categorically that there is a faction among the white legislators in the House who are racial conservatives; generally they hold the notion claiming blacks are culturally different, and they are, therefore, bent on opposing legislation, directly or indirectly, categorically benefitting black constituents. For example, some of these individuals are anti-welfare, simply because they believe blacks who receive welfare are lazy and irresponsible. As a result of this belief, they tend to oppose welfare legislation, as well as other similar legislation designed to benefit black constituents. How many white legislators in the Ohio House are racially conservative? This we do not know, since racial prejudice is mostly a product of invisible factors and, therefore, is not easily subject to quantitative analysis.

Race relations in the total society are always problematic, and since the legislature is a microcosm of the society at large, the same long-standing racial myths, suspicions and conflicts prevalent in the external environment find their way into the legislative chambers. The individual legislator prejudiced in the larger society will retain these same beliefs if he is elected to the state legislature; i.e., individuals bring into the legislature racial orientations they have acquired through life experiences outside the legislative halls. Neverthe-
less, one who has the problem of racial prejudice must
slightly modify his views on race in the legislative
environment, for the role expectations of a legislator
puts him in a position in which he is expected to behave
toward others in a fair and tolerant manner. Hence, from
the perspective of this study, race is an additional
means by which one can approach the study of legislative
behavior and influence. Political scientists and
observers are now more than ever before beginning to
examine the effect of race on legislative behavior, and
labors of this sort reflect promise for the near future.

**Hypothesis 3**

The increase in the number of blacks in the Ohio
House of Representatives has effectuated an increase in the
volume of legislation categorically beneficial to black
citizens in Ohio.

A direct correlation is noticeable between the number
of blacks in the House and the volume of legislation
beneficial to blacks emanating from the Ohio General
Assembly. Since 1967, when seven blacks were elected to
the House, the volume of legislation categorically bene-
fitting black Ohioans has increased. To investigate this
claim, one needs only to take a scrupulous journey through
the pages of *The Summary of Legislative Enactments* pub-
lished annually by the Legislative Service Commission. The
publications within this time period disclose that the black legislators have their names inscribed on numerous bills relating to the needs and problems of black constituents—the most commonly found categories involve the areas of civil rights, employment, mental health, corrections, education, and appropriations. These areas of legislation generally affect the urban environments wherein most blacks in Ohio reside. In past years, the black legislators sponsored or co-sponsored bills to allocate funds for the creation of day-care centers, have the label of "bastardy" removed from the certificates of babies born out of wedlock, end the practice of racial discrimination in public cemeteries in Ohio, and empower the Civil Rights Commission to enforce the Open Housing Law.

Among the transactions of business taking place in the 1971 session of the Ohio General Assembly, a small number of bills gained the support of the black legislators as a group.² These bills were already discussed in Chapter IV, but to recapitulate, they were (1) H.B. No. 658, designed to provide for the creation of a museum for the study of Afro-American history; (2) H.B. No. 336, which prohibits members of municipal forces from serving as witnesses and challengers at elections; (3) H.B. No. 295, which makes stipulations for aiding persons who have to relocate their residences to make way for the building of
federal projects; (4) H.B. No. 494, which arranges for the separation of the departments of Correction and Mental Hygiene; (5) H.B. No. 216, designed to abolish the death penalty in Ohio; and (6) H.B. No. 114, which protects the rights of residential tenants from arbitrary abuse by landlords. All of these bills relate to problem areas for black Ohioans, and the black legislators labored during the 1971 session of the General Assembly to get these bills through the House of Representatives. In addition, the black legislators vigorously supported the administration's budget bills, H.B. No. 475, H.B. No. 476, and H.B. No. 477--the funding of the various areas of government services are included in these bills.

Hypothesis 4

The black legislators do, in fact, exert influence on the public policies which emerge from the Ohio General Assembly.

Most of what has been explained and analyzed up to this point attests to the validity of this hypothesis. The author realizes quite well, however, the House of Representatives is only one arm of the Ohio General Assembly and whatever action taken in the House has to be approved or rejected by the Ohio Senate, but even so, upon reflection on the public policies formulated in the 1971 regular session of the Ohio General Assembly, one finds numerous
pieces of legislation contributed to by the black legislators, inclusive of those mentioned in the discussion of Hypothesis 3. In this session, 109 House bills were passed and 102 from the Senate succeeded; two acts were vetoed by the governor. The black legislators, through their influence in the Ohio House, individually and as a group possessing potential bloc voting potential, were prime participants in these transactions. The black legislators are cognizant of their own effect on legislative decision-making, and their colleagues in the Democratic party and in the House, too, concede their influence in the legislative process in the Ohio General Assembly.

**Typical Characteristics of the Black Legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives**

Four factors uncovered in this investigation symbolize the typical black legislator in the Ohio House of Representatives. They are: (1) racial identity; (4) predominantly black constituency; (3) urban residence; and (4) party loyalty. These variables decisively affect the behavior of the black legislators in the House.

The black legislator, most of all, possesses identification with the black race; accordingly, he has developed, through life experiences, a distinct set of beliefs on race causing him to strive to protect and oversee the interests of his race by discreetly moving to
defeat any legislation thought to contain racial overtones. He is usually alert for detection of bills hostile to his race, e.g., those which contain detrimental clauses and miscellaneous wordings that can appear as "sleepers" in any routine piece of legislation. Then too, the black legislator tends to view politics as relevant to the black struggle; i.e., he believes the political arrangements and processes are useful for achieving equality (political, economic, and social), and for him politics furnished a means by which the civil rights of his race can be maintained and expanded. Finally, he is generally a racial moderate adhering to working within the political system to achieve racial goals rather than resorting to or advocating violent revolutionary action.

Constituencies elect representatives to the legislature who possess similar social characteristics and social values; the local boy with long residence in the community has the advantage. Economically, his constituency is either a low income poverty area or a middle income community. Consequently, he will tend to mirror the dominant economic segment of his constituency by pursuing the course of action he perceives as beneficial to the people whom he represents. This factor weighs heavily on the behavior of the black legislator--his career depends on his maintaining rapport with those who elected him.
Black residents in Ohio, as in most northern industrial states, are concentrated in urban areas, making the black legislator invariably an urban dweller; he is most concerned with the problems of cities (e.g., unemployment, public assistance, aid to education, urban renewal, etc.). His concern for these problems ranks second only to his interest in protecting his constituents against legislation containing racial overtones. He will, therefore, react negatively to any legislation inimical to urban areas.

Lastly, the black legislator is loyal to the Democratic party, even more loyal than his white colleagues. He can usually be expected to vote along with the party on most occasions—especially when partisan measures are involved. This loyalty to the Democratic party is congruent with the national black voting trend in presidential elections.

All of these four factors are essential for understanding the influence of the black legislators in the Ohio House of Representatives. At times, it becomes very difficult to determine which variable has the greatest impact in any given situation, but their import collectively cannot be easily overlooked. However, race is, without a doubt, the most momentous variable operative on the black legislator—the others are closely related.
Suggestions for Future Research

Like most research projects, this study is not all-inclusive but leaves open other opportunities for future research on blacks in the Ohio Legislature. This is especially true since the work contained here embraces the case study technique dealing with only one session of the Ohio General Assembly (1971). Other sessions should also be carefully studied.

Of particular worth for supplementary research are the means by which black legislators in the House and those in the Senate (2 black legislators out of 33 Senators), coordinate their work in the General Assembly. For example, how do the two senators go about drumming up support for legislation previously sanctioned and supported by their colleagues in the House? Research in this area would clarify the total influence of the black legislators in the Ohio General Assembly.

Another point of interest is the relationship of the black legislators as an informal group to other informal groups in the Ohio House. Such efforts promise to reveal conditions with which the black legislators are likely to be confronted. Occupying 10 per cent of the membership in the House, the black legislators are without a doubt impelled to seek allies in their efforts to get favorable legislation successfully passed through the House. Who
are the allies the black legislators can depend on for support? Who are those who are most likely to be opposed to issues directly or indirectly beneficial to black citizens? Answers to questions of this type could be realized through this kind of suggested research.

Field research by way of random sampling within constituencies represented by the black legislators appears to have value for productive empirical research. Questionnaires and/or interviews may reveal the kinds of perceived needs and the order of priority that black constituents see as essential for their welfare. Accordingly, the researcher would be enabled to evaluate these constituency interests and through follow-up research and study in the House determine how the black legislators go about transmitting constituency interests into policy outcomes; again, possibilities exist in this process for contributing to overall understandings of the impact of the black legislators in legislative decision-making in the Ohio House of Representatives.

Still another area of future concern is the prospect of examining specific types of legislation pertaining to blacks (e.g., civil rights, welfare, unemployment, urban renewal), over several sessions of the General Assembly by taking extensive roll calls and afterwards formulating more inclusive generalizations related to black voting patterns, the extent of split voting among black legislators
against the party and their intensity of party loyalty in
the House as compared to their white colleagues and
Republican opponents.

It was found, too, in the process of this research
that Akron (unlike Columbus, Cleveland, Dayton, Cincinnati,
and Toledo), with a considerable black population, does not
have a black legislator. One could conduct research in
the Akron area aimed at weighing socio-economic conditions,
geographical factors and residential patterns which make
for the absence of a black legislator from that area. Con-
ditions found to prevail there may then be contrasted with
those existing in black constituencies in cities with
black legislators representing them in the legislature.

Finally, it is hoped that the research findings con-
tained here, along with the recommendations for later work
make for a broader understanding of blacks in the legisla-
tive process. Much more remains to be done. Given the
emerging political awareness among black citizens about
the relevance of politics to the black struggle, resulting
in an increased emphasis on the black officeholder as a
political phenomenon, the future appears bright for
scholarly pursuit by political scientists and interested
observers.
Footnotes for Chapter VII

1. The three freshmen black legislators are not counted in this category in that they had to spend the bulk of the 1971 session attempting to adjust to this new political experience.

2. During the 1971 session of The Ohio General Assembly, most of the time was consumed in the budget battle, thus prohibiting the passage of a number of bills which would otherwise have been given more attention. Among the bills generally supported by the black legislators as a group: H.B. No. 295 passed through both houses and became law on June 11, 1971; H.B. No. 658 passed through the General Assembly and became law on September 29, 1971; H.B. No. 336 and H.B. No. 494 both passed the two houses and became law on July 12, 1972; H.B. No. 216 and H.B. No. 114 remained before the House Judiciary Committee at the end of the 1971 session and also did not pass during the 1972 session.


APPENDIX A
### 1971 Voting Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll No.</th>
<th>Call Date</th>
<th>Subject of Vote</th>
<th>Total Vote</th>
<th>All Republicans</th>
<th>% Voting w/Majority of Party</th>
<th>White Democrats</th>
<th>% Voting w/Majority of Party</th>
<th>Black Democrats</th>
<th>% Voting w/Majority of Party</th>
<th>All Republicans</th>
<th>% Voting w/Majority of Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>H.B. No. 8 Relative to employment and compensation of employees of the House personnel and during House organization.</td>
<td>89 0 39 0 100</td>
<td>50 0 100</td>
<td>6 0 100</td>
<td>33 0 100</td>
<td>0 8 100</td>
<td>51 1 98</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>Motion to amend report on Rule 31.</td>
<td>51 43 0 42 100</td>
<td>37 0 100</td>
<td>1 0 100</td>
<td>0 24 100</td>
<td>0 8 100</td>
<td>51 1 98</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>S. Con. R. No. 11. Relative to preparing, printing, and distributing a bulletin.</td>
<td>78 0 37 0 100</td>
<td>32 0 100</td>
<td>5 0 100</td>
<td>0 24 100</td>
<td>0 8 100</td>
<td>51 1 98</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>H.B. No. 109. Relative to charging a minor as a juvenile delinquent of law on granting a new trial.</td>
<td>84 0 34 0 100</td>
<td>28 0 100</td>
<td>6 0 100</td>
<td>0 24 100</td>
<td>0 8 100</td>
<td>51 1 98</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>H.B. No. 9. To require the use of safety clothing materials in hazardous locations in criminal buildings. Motion to amend and the amendment be referred to the Committee on Judiciary.</td>
<td>53 47 26 16 65</td>
<td>28 0 100</td>
<td>6 0 100</td>
<td>0 24 100</td>
<td>0 8 100</td>
<td>51 1 98</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>H.B. No. 151. To allow arrests without a warrant where there is reasonable ground to believe the offense was committed while under the influence of alcohol. Motion to refer to Committee on Judiciary.</td>
<td>69 21 38 2 95</td>
<td>30 2 94</td>
<td>8 0 100</td>
<td>0 24 100</td>
<td>0 8 100</td>
<td>51 1 98</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/15</td>
<td>H.B. No. 121. Regarding criminal offenses and impeachment. Motion to amend.</td>
<td>26 60 11 39 73</td>
<td>10 23 70</td>
<td>1 7 88</td>
<td>9 30 77</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4/22</td>
<td>H.B. No. 212. Relative to fractional sales on reduction of a tax levy. Motion to amend and pass.</td>
<td>38 0 42 0 100</td>
<td>33 0 100</td>
<td>9 0 100</td>
<td>0 24 100</td>
<td>0 8 100</td>
<td>51 1 98</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/29</td>
<td>Sub. H.B. No. 132. To revise the licensing of real estate brokers and salesmen. Motion to amend and pass.</td>
<td>62 27 25 13 63</td>
<td>22 10 69</td>
<td>3 5 38</td>
<td>37 12 76</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td>98 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll No.</th>
<th>Call Date</th>
<th>Subject of Vote</th>
<th>Total Vote</th>
<th>All Democrats</th>
<th>% Voting w/Majority of Party</th>
<th>White Democrats</th>
<th>% Voting w/Majority of Party</th>
<th>Black Democrats</th>
<th>% Voting w/Majority of Party</th>
<th>All Republicans</th>
<th>% Voting w/Majority of Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>H.B. No. 346, Relating to the emergency closing of</td>
<td>32 2</td>
<td>34 3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49 0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banks. (Passed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/18</td>
<td>Sub. H.B. No. 340, To create a division for the</td>
<td>44 47</td>
<td>35 5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26 8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9 39</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>treatment of elevation in the Lena, etc. Health,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motion to amend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>Am. H.B. No. 210, Relative to the absence of</td>
<td>26 65</td>
<td>10 52</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10 23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0 9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16 73</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>banks. Motion to refer to the Committee on Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Appropriations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5/28</td>
<td>Sub. H.B. No. 475, To make appropriations for the</td>
<td>46 51</td>
<td>45 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 53</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motion to refer to the Committee on Finance -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>H.B. No. 344, Relative to abandoned township lands.</td>
<td>88 1</td>
<td>42 1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33 1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46 0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motion to amend and pass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>H.B. No. 518, To provide for the sale of liquor on</td>
<td>61 31</td>
<td>37 7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29 5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9 1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24 24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fairgrounds when not in session. Motion to amend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and pass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>H.B. No. 577, To remove from statutory residency</td>
<td>84 5</td>
<td>37 5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>30 3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47 0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>requirement in public assistance programs the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stipulation that limitations under federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regulations shall not be exceeded. Motion to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>introduce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6/22</td>
<td>Am. H.B. No. 341, Relating to the composition and</td>
<td>29 63</td>
<td>29 13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21 13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>composition of the emergency board. Motion to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>Sub. H.B. No. 581, To provide for the election of</td>
<td>96 0</td>
<td>44 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52 0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>members of the State Board of Education when the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boundaries of the districts they represent are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>changed and to declare an emergency. (Passed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poll No.</td>
<td>Call Date</td>
<td>Subject of Vote</td>
<td>Total Vote</td>
<td>All Democrats %</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority of Party</td>
<td>White Democrats %</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority of Party</td>
<td>Black Democrats %</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority of Party</td>
<td>All Republicans %</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6/29</td>
<td>Am. S.J. No. 55, Authorizes a minor to give consent to the diagnosis and treatment of venereal diseases under the Public Health program and to declare an emergency.</td>
<td>64 25 15 63 21 12 64 5 3 62 39 10 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6/30</td>
<td>Am. S.J. No. 16, Providing for the ratification of the proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens eighteen years of age or older.</td>
<td>9 9 44 1 95 35 1 97 9 0 100 37 8 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Am. S.J. No. 108, To provide pollution abatement and water management and to declare an emergency. Notice to refer to the Committee on Local Government.</td>
<td>37 51 33 9 79 79 7 2 78 4 42 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>R.B. No. 150, To grant credits against the use of tax for sales or use of tax paid in another state.</td>
<td>4 1 34 2 94 94 9 0 100 50 1 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7/14</td>
<td>Sub. R.B. No. 473, To provide revenue for education and other state and local purposes and to provide property tax reductions and other reforms. Substitute will return to House and motion to amend offered,</td>
<td>42 42 18 6 29 6 93 9 0 100 16 36 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7/15</td>
<td>R.B. No. 274, Relative to the regulating and licensing of barbering, barber shops and barber schools. Notice to refer to Committee on Agriculture, Commerce and Labor.</td>
<td>49 42 22 20 82 18 17 51 4 3 57 25 22 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>Sub. R.B. No. 159, To improve retirement benefits for teachers and public employees. Notice to amend the emergency clause.</td>
<td>76 18 39 9 93 31 3 91 8 0 100 35 15 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll No.</td>
<td>Call Date</td>
<td>Subject of Vote</td>
<td>Total Vote</td>
<td>All Democrats</td>
<td>% Voting W/Majority of Party</td>
<td>White Democrats</td>
<td>% Voting W/Majority of Party</td>
<td>Black Democrats</td>
<td>% Voting W/Majority of Party</td>
<td>All Republicans</td>
<td>% Voting W/Majority of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7/22</td>
<td>Am. S.B. No. 115. To increase the assessment of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio against the railroads and public utilities within the state of Ohio, and to declare an emergency. Motion to pass the emergency measure.</td>
<td>54 29</td>
<td>33 5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25 4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8 1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21 24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>S.B. No. 160. To increase the maximum permissible tax levy imposed by the counties within a port district and to declare an emergency. Motion to consider the emergency clause as a part of the bill.</td>
<td>81 8</td>
<td>37 2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29 2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44 6</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>Sub. H.B. No 765. To raise the limit on the construction of county bridges by force account to $40,000. Motion to pass the bill as amended.</td>
<td>67 21</td>
<td>20 18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15 16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47 3</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6/25</td>
<td>Am. H.B. No. 770. To define the type of license required for handling unpurified agricultural commodities; to require standards of financial responsibility for agricultural commodity dealers and warehousemen; to grant an insurance lien in favor of the state of Ohio for the benefit of depositors of agricultural commodities. Motion to consider concurrence on Senate amendments.</td>
<td>76 12</td>
<td>37 6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20 6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39 6</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>8/25</td>
<td>Am. H.B. No. 678. To permit villages to adopt and enforce subdivision regulations within three miles outside their boundaries in counties with no cities.</td>
<td>25 59</td>
<td>1 42</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1 32</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0 9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19 18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll No.</td>
<td>Call Date</td>
<td>Subject of Vote</td>
<td>Total Vote</td>
<td>All Democrats</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority of Party</td>
<td>White Democrats</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority of Party</td>
<td>Black Democrats</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority of Party</td>
<td>All Republicans</td>
<td>% Voting w/Majority of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6/31</td>
<td>Am. H.B. no. 483. Relative to the power and duty of the Director of State Zon- zone to require safety rules. (Passage)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>Am. S.B. 311. To determine the equitable share value of personal property insurance company premiums.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>Am. H.B. No. 16. Relative to setting fires in public abodes by moving and to provide a notice of this law.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>S.B. No. 141. To increase the fire of the State Board of Pharmacy, make changes in the board’s powers and duties, increase registration fees and delete obsolete language.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>Am. H.B. No 94. Relating to offenses involving fraudulent proof of ownership of motor vehicles. (Passage)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>9/28</td>
<td>Am. S.B. no. 410. To make supplemental appropriations for the period beginning October 1, 1971 and ending October 15, 1971 (Funding)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>9/30</td>
<td>Am. H.B. no. 988. To require employment records of aid to dependent children and child relief to participate in state work relief projects. (Passage)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Am. H.B. No. 567. To provide harborage for trustworthy prisoners and the establishment of conditional release centers for such prisoners.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>Call No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Subject of Vote</td>
<td>Total Vote</td>
<td>Total Republican YN</td>
<td>Total Dem. YN</td>
<td>All YN</td>
<td>% Voting w/ Majority of Party</td>
<td>White Dem. YN</td>
<td>White Dem. %</td>
<td>% Voting w/ Majority of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10/19</td>
<td>Am. S.B. 193. To authorize the chief of the Division of Wildlife to issue wildlife stamps. Motion to amend.</td>
<td>22 65 8 32 80 6 24 75 0 8 100 14 33 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>Sub. H.B. No. 685. To require existing municipal corporations to employ township firemen laid off through reductions in force. (Passage)</td>
<td>79 3 34 2 94 29 1 94 7 0 100 43 1 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>12/20</td>
<td>Am. H.B. No. 958. To provide that deer killed by residents drives may be possessed. (Passage)</td>
<td>91 0 43 0 100 24 0 100 9 0 100 43 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>10/28</td>
<td>Am. Sub. S.B. No. 121. To conform Ohio's election laws to the requirements imposed by federal law and the Ohio Constitution. Motion to pass the bill as amended.</td>
<td>90 7 36 7 84 30 6 84 6 3 67 54 0 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>11/2</td>
<td>Sub. H.B. No. 783. To permit a nonresident to apply for appointment of a trustee to avoid garnishment. Motion to pass the bill as amended.</td>
<td>67 10 30 0 109 26 0 100 4 0 100 37 10 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>11/3</td>
<td>Sub. H.B. No. 454. To create a Dept. of Mental Health and a Dept. of Corrections. Motion to amend.</td>
<td>35 50 35 0 109 20 0 100 5 0 100 0 50 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>12/1</td>
<td>Am. S.B. No. 455. To provide supplemental appropriations for the period beginning December 1, 1970 and ending December 31, 1972. Motion to amend.</td>
<td>60 22 33 2 94 24 7 92 9 0 100 27 20 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>12/7</td>
<td>Am. S.B. No. 370. Relative to the prevention and abatement of air pollution. Motion to amend.</td>
<td>41 34 32 3 91 27 1 96 5 2 71 9 31 71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll No.</td>
<td>Call Date</td>
<td>Subject of Vote</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>% Voting</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>% Voting</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>% Voting</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>% Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>12/7</td>
<td>Am. S.R. No. 446, to make appropriations for highway construction and to declare as an emergency. Passage as an emergency measure.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2 37 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31 0 100</td>
<td>6 0 100</td>
<td>38 2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>Sub. H.R. No. 246, To increase retirement benefits being paid to teachers, school employees and public employees who retire prior to July 1, 1960 and to declare as emergency. Motion to accept conference committee's report on the bill.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1 42 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33 0 100</td>
<td>0 0 100</td>
<td>41 1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>S.D. No. 447, Electors signing petitions shall sign such in the presence of a notary public or other authorized official. Motion to consider the emergency clause as a part of the bill.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37 5 36</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5 27 84</td>
<td>0 0 200</td>
<td>44 1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Score: 06

Partisan Voting Score: 34
THE OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN 1971

During the current 109th General Assembly, the House of Representatives is composed of 99 members, while there are 33 in the Senate. Senators are elected for four-year terms and House members serve two-year terms; their election is based on population and they are all elected in even-numbered years from single member districts. The members convene for a regular session on the first Monday in January in odd-numbered years following their election; a second session commences not later than March 15 of the following even-numbered year for a continuation of the regular session. Of the 99 members in the House of Representatives, 54 are Republicans and 45 Democrats.

Each member of the House of Representatives receives an annual salary of $12,750; the Speaker, $16,750; the Speaker Pro Tempore, $14,750; the Minority Leader, $14,750; the Majority Leader, $13,750. Installation of these salaries are payable by the fifth of each month; additionally, each member is paid a travel allowance for one trip to his place of residence once a week as prescribed by law.

In order to get elected to The House of Representative in Ohio, one must have resided in his respective district for
one year preceding the election, unless absent on public business for the United States, or for the State of Ohio (service in the armed forces, etc.). Based on the present reapportionment plan, representation in the General Assembly provides that reapportionment be carried out every ten years immediately following each federal census. The entire population of the state (presently 10,652,017) is divided by 100, and the quotient then becomes the ratio of representation. This process created the current 99 member House, and each member is supposed to represent approximately the same population ratio.

Before the construction of the 1965 reapportionment plan, the size of the House membership varied; for example, it consisted of 137 members in 1963 and again in 1965, and was scheduled to register 140 members in 1967. Under the reapportionment plan put into operation that year, it was provided that the House always contain 99 districts, but the boundaries of each district could be shifted with ensuing changes in the population.

The more populous counties in the 109th General Assembly (1970-1971), Cuyahoga (1,721,301), Hamilton (924,018), and Franklin (833,241), are represented by 17, 9, and 7 House members, respectively. This breakdown is based on the allotments created by the 1967 plan.
APPENDIX C
Map of Ohio showing House of Representatives Districts as apportioned by the Governor, the Auditor of State and the Secretary of State for the remaining years of the current decennium.
APPENDIX D
Interview Questions
(Black Legislators)

I. Personal Background Information

1. What were the occupations of your parents?
   Father ____________________________
   Mother ____________________________

2. How many children were there in your family?
   Brothers ____________________________
   Sisters ____________________________

3. Where did you spend most of your time when you were growing up?
   In a city ___ In the Midwest ___
   In a small town ___ In the South ___
   On a farm ___ In the North ___
   A combination of the above ___
   In the West ___

4. When did you become interested in politics?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
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5. How did you reach your decision to seek a seat in the state legislature?

6. What groups or individuals encouraged you to run?
   Business ______
   Labor Unions ______
   Professional Organizations ______
   Voluntary Associations ______
   Civil Rights ______

7. What groups, if any, opposed your candidacy?

8. What governmental or party positions did you hold before winning your seat in the legislature?

9. How long have you resided in your district?
   All your life ______ 20-29 years ______
   80% of your life or over 30 years ______
   10-19 years ______
   Less than 10 years ______
II. Constituency

1. How many people do you represent? ______

2. What is the socio-economic composition of your constituency?

Working class ___ Middle class ___ Upper ___

Average income ______

Average educational level ______

Percentage: Black _____ White _____

Percentage unemployment ______

Percentage on welfare ______

Extent of school desegregation ______

3. How would you rank some of the major interests of your constituents? Give five.

a) ______
b) ______
c) ______
d) ______
e) ______

4. How much contact do you have with your constituents?

Do you give speeches in your district? Yes _____

No _____

If so, how many per session? ______

Do you receive mail from your constituents?

Yes _____

No _____

How much? ______ How frequently? ______
II. Constituency

4. (continued)

Is your contact with constituents informal?

Yes

No

5. How do you consider your constituency role orientation?

District oriented ___ State-district oriented ___

State oriented ___ Other ________________

6. Under what circumstances is constituency influence the greatest?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

7. How important is a knowledge of your constituents' opinions in determining your vote on an issue?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

III. The Duties and Responsibilities of a State Representative

1. How would you describe your job as a state representative?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
2. Do you consider yourself influential as a member of the House of Representatives? If so, in what ways do you exercise influence?

3. Does "race" hamper your effectiveness as a legislator?

4. What do your duties as a member of the standing committees to which you have been assigned entail?

5. Have you been assigned to any other committees, e.g., joint, special, etc.?

IV. Relationship with other Black Representatives in the House

1. Do the black representatives constitute an informal group? If yes, how often do you meet to discuss mutual problems, issues, etc.?
2. What are the rules of the game for maintaining group cohesion among black members of the House? Among other members?

3. Who are some of your closest personal friends in the House, i.e., the members you see most often outside the chamber at lunch, dinner, parties or other social gatherings? Name five.

V. Relationship with the House leadership and Committee Chairmen

1. What do you expect of the House Leadership, e.g., Speaker, majority and minority leaders, committee chairmen, etc.?

What do they expect of you?
2. What committees are most important for the needs of the black community? Name them. Are black legislators adequately represented on these committees?

3. Do black legislators occupy a proportional share of the leadership positions in the House? If not, why?

4. Approximately how many bills have you sponsored or co-sponsored during your tenure in the legislature? How many succeeded? How many failed? Of these bills, which did you consider to be the most important? List them.

5. What do you consider the most important legislation to pass through the 108th General Assembly?
6. What has been the most important relating to blacks? What will be the chief impact?

7. Have the black legislators agreed on some legislation they would like to see come out of the 109th General Assembly?

8. What were two things considered to be important in the 108th General Assembly, 1969-1970? In the 109th General Assembly? Which succeeded? Which failed?
VI. Relationship with Interest Groups

1. What is the extent of the influence of interest groups in legislative decision-making?

2. What interest groups are the most powerful in the Ohio Legislature?

3. What interest groups are the most powerful in your district?

4. How, if at all, are interest groups advantageous to you in advancing the aims of your constituents?

VII. Relationship with the Democratic Party

1. How would you describe the role played by political parties in the state legislature?
2. Does a great deal of harmony exist between the black legislators and the Democratic party? In the House? In the state? In your district?

3. Do you consider yourself a party man, political maverick or independent?

4. Do you vote in the legislature with the Democratic party most of the time? 95% 75% ___ 50% ___ below 50% ___ Other ___

5. How often do you think the interests of your district and your party are in conflict on legislative issues?

Oftentimes ___ Sometimes ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

When they are in conflict, which do you think should ordinarily carry the most weight?
6. Under what circumstances do you think it is necessary for a member to vote with his party? Not vote with his party? ______ Give instances.

7. What are the advantages of going along with the party leaders when they seek support from you on a bill? Disadvantages?

8. Do you believe that blacks receive a fair share of the political patronage dispensed by the Democratic party in Ohio? Yes _____ No _____ If no, why?

VIII. Relationship with the Governor and Staff

1. Has the Governor or some member of his staff solicited your support at one time or another? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, under which administration and for what kind of projects or measures?
2. Have you had occasion to solicit the support of the Governor's Office during your tenure in the legislature? Yes ______ No ______
If yes, under which administration and for what kind of projects or measures?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

How many times did you confer? For how long?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. Do you believe that the Governor is concerned about the needs and problems of blacks in the State of Ohio? Yes ______ No _____ Highly concerned _____ Slightly concerned _____ Moderately concerned _____
Do you view the prospects as good for the improvement of this relationship in the future?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

IX. Relationship with the State Bureaucracy

1. What departments are the most important regarding the needs of your constituents?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. Have you ever had the occasion to request the support of a department chairman or a member of his staff? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, what was the nature of the request? Were you pleased with the response from the department? Displeased?
3. Do blacks occupy a proportional share of the positions in the state bureaucracy? Yes ___ No ___. Approximately how many jobs are held by blacks? _______. Is the trend toward an increase in the number of job opportunities for blacks with the state government?

X. An Assessment of the Future of Blacks in Politics

1. What is your view on the future of blacks in politics?

____________________________________________________________________________________

In the State of Ohio?

____________________________________________________________________________________

In the nation as a whole?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

2. Which of the following political strategies do you consider to be the most effective for blacks in the future?

   a) Coalition politics __________________________

   b) Independent political parties ________________

   c) Black caucuses within the party system _____

   d) Others: (specify) __________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

3. Is politics relevant to the black struggle in America? If so, in what ways? If not, why?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
XI. Miscellaneous

1. To what extent are you satisfied with the amount of influence exerted by the black legislators on the total output of the legislative process in Ohio?

2. To date, what has been your greatest accomplishments as a legislator?

3. Do you at present plan to seek any higher political office in the future? If so, which? For what reasons?

4. Is there anything else about the work of the black legislators in the Ohio House we ought to pay attention to in our study? What?
APPENDIX F
Interview Questions
(Random Sampling of White Legislators)

1. What has been your relationship with the black legislators in the House of Representatives?

2. Do you consider the black legislators influential as a group? Is race a barrier?

3. Do the black legislators constitute a voting bloc?

4. Have you (in the last three General Assemblies) been a member of a coalition involving black legislators? If so, what was the nature of the coalition?

5. Have you ever been the co-sponsor of bills with black legislators? If so, which ones? Were they successful?
6. Does a great deal of harmony exist between the ________ party and the black legislators?

7. By what means can an individual legislator exercise influence in the House of Representatives?

8. How does an informal group go about exercising influence in the House? What informal groups can you identify?
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