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CHAPTER I

THE FIRST EXTENSIVE EXAMINATION OF BEDO:
A RACIAL PARTISAN STATE LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS

The purpose of this study is to explore the growth and development of a racial partisan state legislative caucus. The caucus is called the Black Elected Democrats of Ohio (BEDO). BEDO formed during the 1967-1968 session of the Ohio General Assembly, and has operated continuously since that time.

Legislative caucuses are informal groups of elected officials operating within state legislatures across America and in the U.S. Congress. Participation in these caucuses represents an extension of the legislators' interests, (e.g., personal, professional, political party and constituency); and participants are therefore lobbyists for these extended interests. Examples of informal groups in the U.S. Congress are the Democratic Study Group (DSG), the Wednesday Group (Republican), the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC, Democrats), and the Senate Rail Caucus (bipartisan); in the Ohio General Assembly, the Southeast Ohio Caucus and BEDO.
For our purposes there is a distinction between legislative caucuses and interest groups, the latter being primarily private organizations established outside of the nation's legislative chambers (See Schlozman and Tierney, 1986 and Pinderhughes, 1988). Private interest groups attempt to effect change in their mutual interests by lobbying legislative bodies, such as, standing committees and House and Senate chambers in addition to the executive and judicial branches, and quasi-governmental bodies.

Legislative caucuses vary along several dimensions: partisanship, racial composition, sex, ethnicity, business-orientation, geographical region, state and local-orientation, et cetera. They consist of voluntary membership: they have a name, membership lists, leadership, fund raising mechanisms and budgets, and staffing arrangements. Some of these groups are formally tied to their legislative chambers but most operate informally (See Hammond et al., (1983), Loomis (1981), and Barnett (1975).

Additionally, legislative caucuses, similar to private interest groups, seek to influence the legislative process, the administrative, the executive and judicial branches of government; this they do to effect change in their particular areas of interests. Hence, we study BEDO to determine its ability to effect change through policy and legislative activity in the Ohio General Assembly.
To summarize, BEDO is an informal, independent political group operating inside the Ohio General Assembly, as well as other environments. Some of its other characteristics are as follows:

- its membership is comprised of black elected state legislators, all of whom are Democrats
- the caucus is formally organized with members in the House and the Senate
- the caucus works to influence legislation and policies, particularly of interest to black people
- the caucus is staffed independently and is headquartered in the capital city of Columbus
- the caucus raises and allocates funds
- the caucus is recognized by other legislative caucuses in the Ohio General Assembly and externally
- the caucus meets regularly and has its own agenda.

Formal groups, on the other hand, are legislative committees, boards and commissions, (e.g., House and Senate Rules Committees, Senate Finance Committee, House Ways and Means Committee, Legislative Service Commission, et cetera). These groups are established by statute and recognized as formal entities within legislative chambers across the nation.

Subsequently, we are interested in exploring how BEDO fits into the general scheme of the legislative environment, particularly caucus activity. Does the group operate
similarly or differently than other caucuses? To what are variations attributed? How does BEDO do what it does? How has it sustained itself over the years? Our specific areas of interest are outlined in the research design discussed later in this chapter. Now, we turn our attention to literature on other works performed on this subject.

**Literature Review on Legislative Caucuses**

Although the Ohio General Assembly has been a part of earlier works, the literature reveals the predominance of legislative research on the congressional level. See Loewenberg, Patterson and Jewell (1985) for a thorough discussion and inventory; and for works on congressional caucuses including the role of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), see Hammond et al., (1983), Loomis (1981), Barnett (1975) and (1977), Henry (1977), Jones (1985), Levy and Stoudinger (1976) and (1978), and Smith (1981).

Researchers have entertained questions on the role of legislators as lobbyists and caucus activity impacting decision making (Hammond et al., 1983); on the accrual of tangible benefits to caucus members, e.g., information, publicity, positions of power and political leverage (Loomis, 1981); on the substantive or symbolic role of caucus activity (Barnett (1977) and Henry (1971); and on the organizational, operational, and substantive characteristics
of caucus activity (Levy and Stoudinger) (1976) and (1978).

Similar topics of interest are inherent in the study before us. For example, is BEDO a well-organized caucus? Does it operate effectively? What are its strategies? How does it impact the legislative agenda of the Ohio General Assembly? Is it primarily symbolic? Also, does BEDO gather and distribute information to its members and colleagues useful for legislative activity? Is the caucus viewed as an obstacle to legislative activity or what? Is it a special interest caucus which happens to operate within the Ohio General Assembly? What types of legislation does the caucus influence and how effective is it in its endeavors? These are some of the questions to be answered as the study unfolds.

Returning to the literature review we look at studies performed on the state level. Here we find works on the role of legislators within the legislature as an institution, (i.e., a political system), and little or no research on special interest or caucus activity, especially racially defined groups. For significant works on state legislators and legislative activity, see Wahlke et al. (1962), Barber (1965), Robinson (1973), and Jewell (1982). Wahlke et al. (1962), for example, developed a method of analyzing the role of state legislators that is considered the informal group approach to the study of legislators.
For literature about racially defined groups within state legislatures, see for example, Colston (1972) on blacks in the Ohio House of Representatives, McGriggs (1977) on blacks in the Illinois legislature, and Bragg (1979) on blacks in the Maryland legislature, all of which adhere to the informal group approach developed by Wahlke et al. Findings show variations, however, in the level of operations and effectiveness of these caucuses, as well as the utility of the informal group approach to the study of racially independent groups.

Specifically, Colston (1972) found that "the nine black Democratic members of the Ohio House, save one, the only black Republican who chose to be a deviant," operated as an informal group. The group functioned as a source of information exchange, and interacted highly, with 60% of the members confirming their black colleagues as their closest friends (pp. 184-185).

McGriggs (1977) found that "the problem for black politics in Illinois is that black legislators practice the same as whites but the black legislators don't secure the same benefits from supporting the machine as white politicians" (p. iii). The author concludes, "black legislators in the Illinois General Assembly serve a symbolic role of representation, primarily because of their uncontested ties to the machine" (p. 194).
Similar to McGriggs, Bragg (1979) found the role of black legislators in the Maryland General Assembly also to be primarily symbolic. For example, it was found that "black legislators served in secondary roles and were unable to satisfy many of their own personal or group goals. None held leadership positions in the party or standing committees, nor could they move legislation effectively" (p. 207).

Findings from previous research on black caucuses coupled with current information on BEDO, will prove most useful for academic discourse on the role of black caucuses in American state legislatures, elite group studies, black politics, and political activity in general.

With that backdrop we turn to specific concerns of the study before us. At this time we present an outline of this investigator's research interests, as well as comparisons to previous research on black caucuses.

Research Interests

It is important to point out that the formation of BEDO, similar to the formation of the black caucuses previously discussed, coincides with other historical developments in the American political arena, (e.g., the Civil Rights Movement and legislative reapportionment, for immediate references). This study will show that certain changes in
apportionment plans and voting rights in the early 1960s impacted directly the increased presence of black elected officials nationwide, particularly Democrats. It will show that the first wave of black elected Democrats in the Ohio General Assembly occurred simultaneous to redistricting in Ohio. Also, this discussion will show that the formation of BEDO came at a time when the Civil Rights Movement was at its peak. This movement is well-documented (See Brown v. Board of Education at Topeka, Kansas, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), Bailey (1967), Bennett (1968), Stone (1968), Franklin (1969), Matthews and Protho (1969), Henderson (1972), Walls (1974), Barker and McCorry (1980), and Oates (1982).

In addition, this research aims to add to the chronicle of black history by examining the part played by a group of black elected Democrats in Ohio politics. We wish to uncover the levels and degrees of variations among black caucuses, and explore the how and why BEDO has effected change in the Ohio General Assembly over a 22-year period. Finally, we wish to explore the challenges that lie ahead for the group.

Of general interest are interrelationships among members of the group. We believe that certain relationships have developed over the 22-year period examined which evidence themselves in friendship ties and support for legislation,
particularly among the charter members, (i.e., Senator William F. Bowen, Representative Troy Lee James, Representative William Mallory, and Representative Clarence Joseph "CJ" McLin). Specifically, it is believed that this 22-year plus association contributes to an automatic bond and this relationship, it is believed, will evidence itself through a relatively cohesive organization and unwritten codes, such as deference to the leadership of the organization.

Additionally, it is believed that levels and degrees of involvement by the members in events, such as, the Civil Rights Movement, coupled with patterns of political careers and recruitment, and types of initial election campaigns will evidence variations within and across the membership of the group. These variations, we believe, will help account for the types of relationships that have formed.

Another research interest is with the techniques and strategies used to influence the legislative process. To have operated successfully for 22 years, obviously the group has developed some politically functional techniques and strategies. Some of these techniques will be evidenced in connections with constituencies, leadership and the use of it, and in coalition building. These connections, we believe, contribute to the overall growth and development of the caucus. How do black legislators— who happen to
represent districts that are disproportionately black and with constituents of low-to-moderate income—secure the necessary votes and political support of the powers-that-be? How do these black Democratic legislators gain consistent and consecutive bids for reelection to their respective seats?

Also, with time comes change in leadership, particularly control of the two houses in the General Assembly; yet, we believe BEDO has demonstrated its ability to adapt to changes in leadership thereby strengthening its role as an effective and viable informal group. Given change in leadership in the Ohio Senate and governor's office, we study how the group manages to pursue its legislative agenda. To help address these questions, this study captures the views of the members of BEDO and the views of some of their white legislative colleagues, political party associates, staff, lobbyists and journalists.

Another research interest is with the role of seniority, chairmanships and the continual recruitment of new members into the caucus. We are interested in exploring how these factors promote the overall effectiveness and apparent success of the caucus.

Committee assignments, chairmanships, and leadership positions, for examples, have direct impact on the effectiveness of the group. Unlike the Illinois and
Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses, BEDO has comparatively greater representation of committee chairmen, standing committee assignments, and leadership posts. Troy Lee James, a charter member, chairs the House Economic Development and Small Business Committee. Seniority has contributed to William L. Mallory's role of Majority Leader in the House. Prior to his death in 1988, C.J. McLin chaired the House State Government Committee, and was a close ally of long-term House Speaker Vern Riffe.

Unlike the situation in the Ohio House, the Senate Democrats are in the minority. At the onset of this study, Michael White was the Assistant Minority Whip. In November 1989 White was elected Mayor to the city of Cleveland and his seat was filled in January 1990 with the appointment of one of his former Cleveland City Council colleagues, Jeff Johnson.

Aside from Johnson, Bill Bowen is the only other black member in the Ohio Senate where he has enjoyed at least three committee chairmanships including Senate Finance Committee and the Commerce and Labor Committee, in addition to serving on the State Controlling Board. Membership on this board is awarded to ranking members of the Finance Committee, by majority and minority party caucuses.

Casey Jones and Ike Thompson, both senior members, entered the legislature during the second and third terms of
the charter members, and by the 1989-1990 sessions Jones chaired the House Local Government Committee and Thompson, the House Transportation and Urban Affairs Committee.

Among the junior members, Helen Rankin, also the first black female in the Ohio House, chairs the Human Resources Committee. Following Rankin are: I. Ray Miller, who chairs the Subcommittee on Human Resources, and Vernon Sykes, Chairman, Interstate Cooperation Committee, both in the House during the 1989-1990 sessions.

The extent of roles played by each of the thirteen members of BEDO will be explored as the study unfolds. At this point it is safe to say the caucus is very well-represented in committees and positions of leadership in the Ohio General Assembly.

We are interested also in caucus size in that we believe it impacts the group's ability to influence legislative activity, particularly in the House where BEDO represents 11 of the 99-member chamber. Therefore, the group is positioned to play a significant role in the House and ultimately in the General Assembly, especially through bloc voting.

Since the Colston study in 1972 BEDO has continued to grow and develop as an informal group. It has increased in size from 10 to 13 members, of which during the 1989-1990 sessions, three were women, (i.e., Helen Rankin, Vermel
Whalen, and Rhine McLin). Also, with the exception of the junior members, as reported earlier, many of BEDO's members chair committees and subcommittees, (i.e., five committee chairs, three committee vice chairs, and two subcommittee chairs), and two hold leadership posts, (1989-1990). During the Colston study black legislators held no committee chairs nor leadership positions; they had minimal seniority.

Another research interest is with the types of relationships developed by the group within the Ohio political power structure and beyond. For example, it will be shown that the group as a whole, and the charter and senior members in particular, have developed effective working relationships with House and Senate caucuses, the various governors and cabinet appointees, the Ohio Democratic Party, and the CBC, among other groups. These ties, it is believed, aid in the effectiveness of group strategy.

Additionally, we are interested in exploring types of policy influenced by the caucus and implications of certain policies acted on by the group and its members. How has it changed over time, if at all and why?

Moreover, it will be shown that the group's legislative agenda has led to significant legislative successes and a few defeats. For instance, quite unlike the Illinois and Maryland black caucuses, BEDO has effected change in
numerous bills including the biennial budget, the comprehensive minority enterprise set-aside bill, the state holiday celebrating the birth of the late Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., fair housing, prison reform, etc. The efforts of Troy Lee James in the area of fair housing, for example, led to an amendment to the Ohio Constitution. These are some of the areas that will be explored while addressing the growth and development of the caucus.

Finally, we are interested in how BEDO compares overall with other black state caucuses, particularly with the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses. It is believed that size, geographical configuration of districts, committee assignments and chairmanships, and overall involvement by the group's members contribute to BEDO's successful status.

There are differences among the three black caucuses in constituencies served: BEDO has a diverse constituency in the state of Ohio including Cleveland, Akron, Toledo, Columbus, Dayton, and Cincinnati, all major metropolitan and highly populated areas in the state. The situation is quite different in the Maryland and Illinois black caucuses.

In 1979, for example, the Maryland Black Caucus consisted of 19 members, of whom five were senators, and 14 delegates. The caucus constituted 10 per cent of the Maryland legislature: 16 of the 19 members represented
Baltimore City, and the others, Prince George's County. Hence, the Maryland Black Caucus was clustered in one area of the state.

In 1977 the Illinois Black Caucus consisted of 19 members, of whom 18 represented districts within the Chicago metropolitan area, and one in East St. Louis, Illinois. Also, 17 of those members were Democrats, and the one Republican member also represented a district located within the city of Chicago. Hence, similar to the Maryland case and unlike BEDO, Illinois' black legislators were overwhelmingly from a single area in that state. As the study develops these data will be updated to include changes in membership and roles played by the three black caucuses up to the 1989-1990 sessions, and in some instances up to the 1991-1992 sessions.

There are other notable variations among the three cases and they will be discussed in the final chapter to this study. For now, however, it is simply important that the reader understands why we need to document the role of BEDO in the Ohio General Assembly, in addition to documenting its comparative role among similarly established black caucuses. In so doing we corroborate the effectiveness of the group, as well as the utility of the informal group approach.
Research Design

The problem before us is an exploration into the growth and development of BEDO, earlier defined as a racial, partisan and independent informal group. In some ways we corroborate previous research by Colston (1972) wherein he explored the role of black members in the Ohio House as an informal group. In other ways however, we explore new territory, (e.g., characteristics of political careers and recruitment, involvement in the Civil Rights Movement, progression in relationships with constituents, relationships with leadership, coalition building, effectiveness of size and strategy, committee assignments and chairmanships, and relationships with House and Senate Caucuses, governors and cabinet members, the Ohio Democratic Party, and the CBC). Therefore, we chose to gather the core of our data through the personal interview process involving most of the 13 members of the organization. This technique is most useful when the population is of the size and nature of the one before us: small and elite level officials.

It is important to mention also that this investigator is acquainted with most of the membership of BEDO from a former position, having served as administrative assistant to Senator Bowen of Cincinnati from summer 1980 through spring 1983 and associating frequently with BEDO, which at that time was an 11-member group. During that time this
investigator associated with BEDO's staff, the leadership throughout the whole of the Ohio General Assembly, journalists and lobbyists. Subsequent to that time this investigator has also met new members in BEDO, attended inaugural ceremonies, and on occasion attends informal receptions sponsored by the group thereby remaining familiar with the organization. My current interest, however, is in studying BEDO from the point of view of a political scientist.

data collection

Several methods of data collection were used including personal interviews with most of the members of BEDO and some of their white colleagues. For example, regardless of partisanship, we were interested in the views of the white legislators that served in the legislature around the time BEDO was formed such as Speaker Pro Tempore Barney Quilter, a Democrat of Toledo, Senator Ted Gray, a Republican of Upper Arlington (in Franklin County), and veteran State Representative Mike Stinziano, a Democrat of Columbus. We believe these individuals have a wealth of information to contribute to this study. Each has either served in leadership or close to it and is reportedly supportive of a considerable part of BEDO's agenda.
A slightly different assumption is made with the informants. With this group we were interested in journalists who covered BEDO activities as part of the Statehouse press corps and who were acquainted with its members, such as Mary Ann Sharkey of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, formerly with the Dayton Journal Herald. Although the Columbus Call and Post, the black weekly newspaper, was not a part of the Statehouse press corps at the time, John Combs, one of its primary political reporters, provided continual coverage of BEDO from its inception. Lobbyists are also considered good 'inside' sources, especially those representing the real estate industry and the building and trades union. These individuals found themselves working closely with BEDO regardless of the caucus' agenda. As the discussion unfolds on the subjects of prison reform and the minority business set asides, for instances, interactions with informants will be shown.

We also collected data from back editions of newspapers and special reports, roll call data from House and Senate journals on certain legislation, such as biennial budgets, the minority set aside, the King holiday, among others. In addition, we were interested in voter registration data and legislative histories filed by the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Legislative Service Commission.
Particularly relevant to comparisons among the Ohio, Illinois, and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses were data generated from surveys to House and Senate Clerks in those legislative bodies. We were interested in leadership positions and committee chairmanships and vice chairmanships held by black members from as far back as the 1967-1968 General Assemblies. In addition, we surveyed clerks of the Houses and Senates nationwide on black membership in the most recent legislative sessions. That was done to place BEDO in a national context. Other data were generated from the Joint Center for Political Studies, also on black elected state officials nationwide; those data were cross-referenced against data generated from our national clerk survey.

Consequently, we were able to secure a variety of data from primary and secondary sources, thereby lending considerable credence to accounts of certain activities and events, as well as to opinions of all concerned.

the personal interview technique

In order to conduct our work, we refer to the works of two scholars on the personal interview process: Lewis Anthony Dexter, probably the foremost recognized authority on "elite and specialized interviewing", and Herb Asher, a recognized authority on the advantages of the personal
interview process in sample surveys. The advice of Asher (1988) on the advantages of the personal interview process in sample surveys is relevant to the initial phase of our research:

"... Personal interviews generally provide the richest and most complete information" (p. 70). [He goes on to state] that respondents are willing to participate in lengthy personal interviews, particularly if the interviewer is skillful in developing rapport with the respondent(s); the response rate tends to be high and representative samples more readily selected and interviewed; the presence of the interviewer allows for as assessment of the survey; the interviewer can directly record not only the verbal responses of the interviewee but also nonverbal behavior such as squirming, sweating, and other signs of unease with the interview situation; and the opportunity to ask follow-up questions (and to know when to probe) is greater in a personal interview ..." (Asher, 1988, p. 70).

In addition and since our population is comprised primarily of public officials, we consult with Dexter for his direction on elite interviewing. Dexter says that an elite interview "is with any interviewee who in terms of the current purposes of the interviewer is given special, nonstandardized treatment. By special, nonstandardized treatment I mean:

1) stressing the interviewee's definition of the situation,

2) encouraging the interviewee to structure the account of the situation,
3) letting the interviewee introduce a considerable extent (an extent which will of course vary from project to project and interviewer to interviewer) their notions of what they regard as relevant, instead of relying upon the investigator's notions of relevance" (Dexter, 1970, p. 5).

Dexter continues by stating, "in the standardized interview, the typical survey, a deviation is ordinarily handled statistically; but in an elite interview, an exception, an unusual interpretation, may suggest a revision, a reinterpretation, an extension, a new approach" (p. 6). Hence, he says, "one cannot assume that persons or categories of persons are equally important." Later we discuss how, after conducting our initial interviews, we added a supplement to the original questionnaire, thereby generating additional information.

In Dexter's discussion on informants, he says they tend to be "well informed" and "well connected" to the situation under study. They help the investigator "acquire a better picture of the norms, attitudes, expectations, and evaluations of a particular group than he could obtain solely from less intensive observations or through conducting a greater number of less intensive interviews, by themselves. Naturally, he says, it will often be preferable to combine the use of informants with other interviewing and with other methods of data collection" (pp. 8-9). The use of informants and other methods of data collection were
discussed earlier.

With respect to the population under study, all of the legislators are accustomed to the interview process. Most are frequent participants in press conferences, the subjects of interviews from other student projects, accustomed to 'confrontations' in floor debates and committee hearings, among other question and answer settings.

During the spring 1988 this investigator met with the executive director of BEDO and formally introduced the nature of this research to him. The executive director in turn contacted the membership and placed the subject of this research on BEDO's agenda. The members were therefore informed ahead of time. Next, we drafted letters to all 13 members, followed up with telephone calls and personal visits. In this way, I was able to meet with some of the staff, become reacquainted with former colleagues, new legislators, new office locations, et cetera. The stage was set to set up appointments for the interviews.

Subsequently, we set out to interview the four active charter members—Bowen, McLin, James, and Mallory. By interviewing the charter members first, we were able to test our survey instrument. This also allowed us to ascertain viewpoints of members believed to possess knowledge about the organization beyond the level of junior and new members. At the start of this research two of the charter members
were experiencing serious health problems. Specifically, in the early part of 1987 McLin was reportedly suffering from cancer. In the interim he relinquished some of his assignments in the legislature and spent less time at the Statehouse. This investigator set out to interview McLin as soon as possible, not only because of his illness but because of his position as chairman of the caucus.

Shortly after news about McLin's illness on February 14, 1988 Delores Bowen died. She was the wife of Senator Bowen. Then shortly after Mrs. Bowen's death, Bill Bowen suffered a serious heart attack. Bowen and McLin were seen less and less at the Statehouse during the spring legislative sessions and the summer 1988.

Noteworthy, however, is the level of support and interest provided by Bowen and McLin. This investigator offered to conduct these two interviews in as informal a manner as possible. For example, arrangements were made to visit McLin at his business office in Dayton, where his family was present and working with him in the McLin Funeral Home. The interview was conducted on the 4th of July 1988. McLin died in December 1988. Shortly after the McLin interview Bowen's interview was set up in Columbus. Both men believed it was crucial to document a scholarly account on the development of the organization.
In the fall 1988 and winter 1989 the same efforts were initiated to contact the senior and junior members. It was decided that Senator White would be most difficult to interview because of his bid for Mayor to the city of Cleveland. He was not interviewed. Also during the interim Ike Thompson suffered a stroke, Casey Jones became ill, and one of the journalists became ill as well, John Combs. Hence, it became extremely important to complete the series of interviews primarily because the age and health of the members of the caucus, including a journalist, were rapidly impacting their accessibility.

It should be mentioned also that efforts were extended to involve new and former members of BEDO. Efforts were made to involve former Senator M. Morris Jackson of Cleveland but he was unavailable. Former Representative and Pastor Phale D. Hale of Columbus, though interested, was not interviewed because of scheduling conflicts. For example, one appointment was postponed due to a funeral. Also, Rhine McLin was interviewed, who at the time of this study was the newest member (appointed to fill her father's seat). Technically, Senator Jeff Johnson of Cleveland was the absolute newest member to the caucus having been appointed in November 1989 and inaugurated in January 1990. It was the decision of this investigator, however, that Johnson was too new to provide any substantive data for this study. In
addition, other members died in office, such as Representative John Thompson of Cleveland, and others have since departed from the legislature. Our interest, however, is with the active delegation in the legislature.

Aside from the extreme situations noted earlier, it is also important to mention that the legislators participating in this research were quite generous with their time and support of my efforts to gather data about the organization. Also, most interviews took place in the legislator's offices at the Statehouse or the Vern Riffe Center for Government and the Arts across from the Statehouse in downtown Columbus.

*the questionnaire and first round of interviews*

The questionnaire consists of seven parts, most of which contain open-ended items. Open-ended items have been shown to allow the respondents freedom to elaborate, and in some instances have yielded additional information unexpectedly. For example, the questionnaire was designed to allow for one-half hour to forty-five minutes of discussion, yet in the cases of McLin and Bowen, charter members, it yielded close to a two-hour interview. It ranged from one-half hour of discussion with the newer members, such as Representatives Thomas Roberts (Dayton) and Vermel Whelan (Cleveland), up to one hour with others, such as
Representative Vernon Sykes (Akron).

The first round of interviews included eight of the legislators:

- Representative C.J. McLin July 4, 1988
- Senator William F. Bowen August 16, 1988
- Representative Thomas Roberts August 25, 1988
- Representative Vernon Sykes September 27, 1988
- Representative Vermel Whalen November 16, 1988
- Representative Casey Jones November 17, 1988
- Representative Troy Lee James November 17, 1988
- Representative I. Ray Miller November 30, 1988

These interviews were all conducted using our initial survey instrument, during which time each legislator was asked if we could conduct a follow-up interview and all said "yes."

Part I in the questionnaire covers political background information. We were interested in obtaining general profiles on the political background of each member, (i.e., prior to tenure in the state legislature). We were also interested in drawing overall profiles on types of characteristics of the membership. Examples of items in this part are:

"At this time I am interested in knowing your recall of circumstances that contributed to your political career. How and when did you become involved in politics?" (probe).
"Did you have any prior political experience before winning your seat (or your first appointment) in the Ohio legislature? Describe please."

Parts II and III were designed to capture information held primarily by charter and senior members. It covers experiences during the Civil Rights Movement. Here, we were trying to capture the legislators' attitudes about the effectiveness of their civil rights involvement, in addition to learning whether there were any ties between events of that period and the legislators' subsequent election campaigning for the Statehouse. Examples of items are as follows:

"At this time I'd like for you to think back to the period in history called the Civil Rights Era. Think particularly during the time between 1954 and 1968. Do you recall any events of the Civil Rights Era? How involved were you? In what ways and in what communities? Please elaborate."

"What do you recall about the social situation in Ohio in the early to middle 1960s? We are especially interested in knowing what it was like for a black person who wanted to run for public office?"

Part III contains certain items designed to capture the legislators' recall of specific events leading up to the formation of BEDO. Examples of items used are:
"Now I'd like to talk to you about the formation of BEDO. How was the organization founded. When and where was the organization founded? Who was present?"

"Do you recall whether or not there was much discussion on the subject of black Republican membership in BEDO?

Did the presence of black Republicans affect your organization and planning of the new black caucus? Explain."

Items in Part IV were designed to capture voting patterns and strategy. The assumption is that voting bloc strength lies primarily with the members in the House. Therefore we asked questions like these:

"Has the size of the caucus aided in affecting voting in the legislative process? Explain."

"Has committee assignment affected any particular strategy of the caucus? Please explain."

"At this time I am interested in knowing what issues BEDO has been most active in and what you consider to be some of the major successes and defeats of the caucus?"

A significant part of the interview centers around the legislators' perceptions of their reception and acceptance into the Ohio political power structure. That information was captured through several items presented in Part V. See sample items below:
"How did white legislators react to the black legislators in the early years? How, if at all, has that treatment changed over the past 22 years?" [If less than 22 years, apply to terms served]

"Let's begin with the formative years. How and when do you recall being invited by the Democratic Party to participate in local, state or national level politics? On the whole, how has the Ohio Democratic Party received the members of BEDO- or other black individuals interested in it- say, over the past 20 years?"

Part VI covers the legislators' views on the role and future of BEDO. Specifically, we asked these members to tell us what they believed the important issues were:

"What kinds of political issues confront BEDO today as compared to 20-odd years ago? How do these issues compare or contrast with others over those years?"

"Has the need for a black Democratic caucus changed any in Ohio since the creation of BEDO? Explain."

"How does BEDO resemble or differ from other black caucuses across the nation?"

The final part in the original questionnaire deals with personal background information. We were interested in knowing where the legislators were born, particularly if they ever resided outside their districts; what other occupations they held; and their educational backgrounds. The original questionnaire is shown in Appendix A.
After reviewing data collected from the initial interviews we decided to revise the questionnaire and return to those members whom we felt could add the type of information needed to answer the remaining concerns of this study, in addition to interviewing those members yet to be interviewed, such as Representatives Ike Thompson of Cleveland and Majority Leader Mallory of Cincinnati, as well as involving the white legislators at this point. Once all the legislators were interviewed, we then interviewed the journalists. These interviews were conducted in the winter 1990.

The updated questionnaire and second round of interviews

During the initial interviews we discovered that some of our questions could be more specifically directed to provide more useful data, such as on the subject of friendship ties within the group. In Part I, for example, we added questions like:

2.0) "More specifically and aside from legislative ties, do you, your spouse and children associate informally with someone in BEDO? In what ways, if any, and how often is this?"

Informal Association w/someone in BEDO

2.1) Personal lunches; bar scene
2.2) Home environment (parties, cookouts, ...)
2.3) Religious/Worship Services
2.4) Business ties (lawyer, accountant, ...)
2.5) College ties
2.6) Other relationships: sports, theater, ...
Categories for frequency of association were included. For review of the item in its entirety, we refer the reader to Appendix B.

Additionally, results of the initial interview indicated the need to take into account age differences among the members. Therefore, items dealing with the formation of the organization and the members' involvement in the Civil Rights Movement would be more appropriately directed to charter and senior members. Moreover, items in Part II were revised to deal more specifically with 'political socialization', that is, the political orientation of the members as they entered the legislature for the first time. See for example Items #5-#7 in the updated questionnaire in Appendix B.

Other items were revised in clerical ways while yet others were revised completely, such as the item dealing with the description of the legislators' initial election campaign (or appointment) to the Ohio House (Senate). See Items #11 and 12 in Appendix B.

Revisions to items in Part III deal with strategies for influencing the legislative process. We were interested specifically in knowing how the organization developed in the areas of floor debates, committee activity, the Ohio Democratic Party, and appointment selections and confirmation process. The assumption is that the
organization has grown in its ability to effect change in areas directly related to the legislators' responsibilities.

For example, we asked:

15.0) Now I'd like to ask you some questions about how the importance of BEDO has changed over time in general and in specific areas. Over time, has the organization become 1) definitely important, 2) somewhat important, 3) slightly important, 4) not at all important, or there has been 5) no particular change?

Area of Interest

15.1) Role in Floor debates
15.2) Role in Committees
15.3) Role in Ohio Democratic Party
15.4) Role in Appointment Selections & Confirmation Process
15.5) Comments: ________________________________

All parts of the questionnaire were revised in some way but we elaborate on only one other item and refer you to Appendix B for a complete description of the updated questionnaire. Some of those and other questions were constructed for legislative colleagues (white members), see Appendix C, and for journalists, see Appendix D. A questionnaire was designed for lobbyists but none were formally interviewed.

During the initial interviews we discovered that at least one item needed to include a list of organizations and areas in which BEDO interacts, in addition to determining BEDO's comparative position with other black caucuses across
the nation. Therefore Part V includes a new item designed to capture responses as illustrated below:

33.0) When compared to other black/state legislative caucuses across the nation, how would you say BEDO compares? Let me list a number of areas and activities and ask you to rate the performance of BEDO on each as either 1) much more effective in its role, 2) somewhat more effective, 3) about as effective as other black caucuses, 4) less effective, or 5) you don't know?

**Area and/or Organization**

33.1) Relationship with Business/Commerce
33.2) Overall Constituency Representation
33.3) Overall Relationship with the CBC
33.4) Overall Role in National Caucus of Black State Legislators
33.5) Role in National Democratic Party
33.6) Relationship with Labor
33.7) Relationship with Education
33.8) Relationship with Legislative Leaders
33.9) Relationship with Governors
33.10) Relationship with Congress
33.11) Relationship with Black Constituents
33.12) Relationship with White Constituents
33.13) Relationship with other House Caucuses
33.14) Relationship with Senate Caucuses
33.15) Relationship with Print Media
33.16) Relationship with Electronic Media
33.17) Comments: ________________________________
33.18) ________________________________

To summarize, although the structure of the original questionnaire allowed the legislators more freedom to elaborate, the updated questionnaire contributed to more specific information. Together, we feel the two questionnaires yielded data most useful for the ensuing analyses. At this time we turn to a description of the remaining chapters in this dissertation.
Chapter II is a description of the development of the organization known as BEDO. It presents an historical analysis of the membership's political backgrounds and socialization: personal data and friendship ties, political careers and recruitment, involvement in the Civil Rights Movement, BEDO's formation as an organization, and the initial election campaigns of its members. This chapter sets the stage for understanding the organizational development of BEDO through the historical event, the Civil Rights Movement, and through the experiences of its membership, respectively.

Chapter III addresses the role of the organization as a legislative entity, particularly as it operated in the Ohio General Assembly during the early years. It was during the early years, (i.e., 1967-1968 to 1981-1982), the organization withstood some of its most formidable challenges. Therefore we examine how the membership views its effectiveness with certain constituencies including leadership and use of it, and coalition building. We expect comparisons of various perceptions of these roles will be enhanced by several factors: level of seniority, age, sex, district, among other factors. We are also interested in accounts provided by informants, House and Senate journals and special reports.
Chapter IV deals with how the organization functions in the Ohio General Assembly. We are interested in knowing about the effects of caucus size on strategy, the effects of committee assignment on strategy, and the effects of committee chairmanship on strategy. We assume that seniority and chairmanship contribute considerably to BEDO's status as the most notable black caucus in the nation, and these subjects will be discussed at length.

BEDO does not wield its influence in a vacuum. Therefore, another aspect of this study is the caucus' relationship with the Ohio political power structure: caucuses in the Ohio House and Senate, various governors and cabinet appointees, the Ohio Democratic Party, and the Congressional Black Caucus. What difference do these relationships make on the overall effectiveness of the caucus? How have these relationships developed over the course of this study? These subjects and more are discussed in Chapter V.

Additionally, in Chapter V we examine the members' perceptions on certain policy. For example, a common assumption is that black and female politicians tend to be concerned primarily with legislation, issues and policy on social and human services. Data generated in this study show that although this was the position of charter and senior members in the early years, the situation has
changed. More recently, for instance, almost all of the members tend to stress the importance of business and commerce. Although BEDO has not abandoned its interests in social and human issues, the caucus has expanded its agenda to include business and economic development in the black community.

In Chapter VI we examine the relative status of groups of black state lawmakers nationwide in the 1989-1990 and 1991-1992 legislative sessions. In that discussion it will be shown that BEDO is one of a very few groups positioned to effect change within its respective legislative body. In addition, we observe notable variations among the groups within and across the nation's legislative bodies.

Later we compare BEDO to the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses along common features, including committee chairmanships, leadership positions, and configuration of districts. This we do over five General Assemblies, from the 1967-1968 up to the 1991-1992 sessions. We explore the overall involvement and direction of these caucuses with an eye towards their future role(s). We are interested also in what differences, if any, size, constituencies, and geographical configuration of districts make? What difference do these variations make?

In addition, Chapter VI includes a summary of BEDO's perceptions about some of the successes and defeats of the
organization. Although BEDO has not achieved all of its agenda, overall, the organization is considered far more successful in accomplishing its agenda as compared to the counterpart caucuses in Maryland and Illinois, respectively.

In the conclusion we present overall findings and observations of this research and look to the future. What has this extensive exploration shown us? What are implications for future research, particularly given the virtual lack of data on black state lawmakers? What difference does it make whether BEDO has evolved into the nation's most viable black state legislative caucus? What are implications for black politics, elite studies, the role of caucuses in American state legislatures, and political activity in general. These are some of the subjects covered in the conclusion to this extensive study.
CHAPTER II

THE FORMATION OF BEDO

The formation of BEDO occurred at an interesting point in history in general and Black American history in particular. We start with an historical overview on certain aspects of these events including the Civil Rights Era, Ohio from statehood to pre-Baker on to the formation of BEDO. Next, we look into political backgrounds of charter and senior members of BEDO beginning with their early political careers and involvement in civil rights activity in their respective communities. We believe it is because of this activity these black men and women found themselves thrust suddenly into a higher level of activity in the Ohio General Assembly.

The Civil Rights Era is referenced as that period between 1954 and 1968. Unfortunately, however, many young people, including some freshmen BEDO members, are not too familiar with some of the prominent characters and events of that era; given this situation a cursory overview is presented. Subsequently, we introduce the reader to all
members in the organization known as BEDO, while simultaneously describing historical developments during the organization's formation.

It will be readily observed that there was very little, if any, organized planning in the political careers of the men and women who make up this group; this is especially true among charter and senior membership. There are, however, similarities in attitudes and launching of political careers, in their purpose for coming together, as well as in their choice of state level politics. This section focuses, therefore, primarily on charter and senior membership. Because of their age and seniority in the organization, it is they who were there in the beginning and who formed the group.

Finally, we turn to the situation involving junior and freshmen membership of the organization. It is within this segment of BEDO that we see patterns of planned political careers. It is during the latter part of the second decade of the organization's history that the junior members were being elected and it was also at that time the organization began to take shape. We turn now to a review of the period known as the Civil Rights Era.
The Civil Rights Era and the Status of Black America

With the exception of the Reconstruction Era (1863-1876), perhaps no other period has been as significant in the history of black America as the Civil Rights Era, (approximately 1954-1968). The latter represents the inclusion of an entire race of people into American society, especially in the areas of education, employment, housing and voting. Specifically, it was a combination of events, enactment and enforcement of federal statutes and court rulings that are attributed to this process. It is also important to point out that, during this era advancements in communications, such as radio, network television, and telecommunications enabled societies worldwide to experience the social situation in America.

The basic problem confronting black Americans was the lack of equal protection under the law. With the assistance of certain groups like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and others the constitutionality of an 1896 ruling in Plessy v. Ferguson was challenged. The Plessy case sanctioned segregation of the white and 'colored' races, as long as "separate but equal" accommodations in public and semi-public facilities (e.g., schools, theaters and railway carriages) were provided. This discussion examines changes in the areas of education, one of the first areas challenged, and later we
examine the role of the American Presidency, the black clergy, and court rulings on reapportionment, all with respect to effecting change related to civil rights of black Americans.

It was as recent as 1954 that the doctrine of "separate but equal" was seriously challenged in America's highest court. In that year the U.S. Supreme Court heard several cases challenging the constitutionality of racial segregation in public schools. The case was Brown v. Board of Education at Topeka. Heretofore the Court held the following criteria as rationale for this doctrine:

"In all cases the facts showed that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other 'tangible factors' (Cushman, 1979, p. 333).

The Court's ruling in Brown overturned Plessy. In its ruling on May 17, 1954 the Court was unanimous and one opinion was written. It found that the Fourteenth Amendment was violated and the school system in question was ordered to desegregate "with all deliberate speed."

Eventually the U.S. Congress and the courts implemented enforcement procedures that dealt specifically with racial
discrimination, hence the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is the most stringent enforcement mechanism to date because it denies federal financial aid to facilities, institutions and companies which do not show programs and related statistics indicating good faith efforts to involve, employ or train black American citizens, among other things.

Other events impacting the socialization of BEDO's charter and senior members relate to the American presidency. We begin with the late Dwight Eisenhower.

*federal elections and the American Presidency*

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a Republican, served from 1953-1960. It was during Eisenhower's Administration that the Supreme Court ordered desegregation in public schools, *(Brown)*. It was also during this administration that the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 were enacted to eliminate racial discrimination in voter registration and elections, primarily in southern states. In 1957, Congress empowered the Attorney General to seek court injunctions when an individual was deprived, or was about to be deprived, of his/her right to vote.

Following the Eisenhower Administration, the 1960 presidential election is significant because it was the first federal election in which many black Americans voted relatively unconstrained. Up to this point in history,
those black people who were registered to vote, many tended to support Republican presidential candidates. Part of the reason was the association of President Abraham Lincoln with the Republican Party. Lincoln is credited with "freeing the slaves" and the famous Emancipation Proclamation. Another reason is that most black Americans resided in the South where southern Democrats practiced a closed party system which denied black political participation. In fact, for those black people desiring to support the Democratic Party, they formed their own Democratic Party (e.g., the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party) but still were denied participation in Democratic party politics.

This scenario is not meant to imply that black Democrats had never voted for Democratic Presidential candidates. Quite the contrary, the elections of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy in particular overwhelmingly refute that.

The point is that black electoral participation has a history of discrimination. The period of 1960-1968, for example, was a time in which the traditionally Democratic South "went Republican." That was particularly true in the 1964 presidential election campaign of Barry Goldwater. At the time the South was still largely segregated and Goldwater was adamantly opposed to the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Goldwater launched a strong platform for the
presidency with a united Southern white Democrat and Republican following. Goldwater was defeated by Johnson in that election. See Matthews and Prothro, 1966 for further details on that period.

Later, in 1968 Nixon launched a successful campaign on 'law and order', capturing a similar following as Goldwater's. The law and order platform came in the middle of urban riots, boycotts, and protest against the Vietnam War.

In the interim black Democrats in the north and south were drawn to support Democratic presidential tickets, such as Johnson and later Robert Kennedy. The period 1968-1976 would prove devastating for Democrats running for president. In fact, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and Jimmy Carter are the only Democrats to have held the Office of President since the early 1950s.

Even so, since the 1960 federal elections black America has tended to overwhelmingly support Democratic Party candidates. This then is another matter of concern to this investigation. Why have all members of BEDO chosen to be Democrats? What other events in history led to the decision on the part of black people to seek public office, as well as to feel they would be successfully elected on the Democratic ticket?
In November 1963, prior to completing his term in office, President Kennedy was assassinated. Although he served a very short term, he was successful in leaving a very positive impression among black Americans; he symbolized a youthful and empathetic leadership. He was portrayed throughout the mass media doing that which no other presidential candidate or executive found necessary: Kennedy talked to and listened to black American people.

Additionally, it was Kennedy and his successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, who used their commander-in-chief rank over the U.S. Armed Forces to enforce federal statutes and court rulings on desegregation in areas such as education, particularly with Old Miss and The University of Alabama during the 1960s. Johnson is also credited with enacting civil rights legislation, (1964, 1965 and 1968) in the areas of education, voting and housing, respectively, which are the basis for much of black America's social and economic progress since the 1960s. In fact, these three Acts are viewed as much broader in scope, especially with respect to their enforcement provisions, as compared to those of 1957 and 1960 (see Barker and McCorry, 1980, p. 182). Finally and prior to leaving office in 1968, Johnson appointed Thurgood Marshall to the U.S. Supreme Court. Marshall is the only black American ever appointed to that body.
At the time America was in the midst of the highly controversial Vietnam War. There was considerable unrest and urban rioting, and Richard M. Nixon, a Republican, was preparing to take office. Nixon served two consecutive terms as President, (1969-1972, 1973-1974), however, the completion of his second term was interrupted because he was forced to resign relative to the Watergate Scandal. Nixon and virtually all his cabinet were characterized as viewing problems associated with the plight of black America with 'benign neglect'. Gerald Ford, then vice president, succeeded Nixon and completed the remainder of Nixon's second term, (1974-1976).

In the general elections of 1976 a soft-spoken Southern Democrat named Jimmy Carter was elected to the Office of President. Carter was seen as favorably disposed to black America, having made several appointments of black people to federal courts and to his cabinet including Patricia Roberts Harris and Andrew Young.

Following Carter was Ronald Reagan, a Republican. Reagan served two consecutive terms, (1981-1984, 1985-1988), and was seen as totally ignorant and insensitive to the plight of black America. Interestingly, however, is the fact that Reagan signed legislation declaring national observance of the birthday of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.
Elected in the general elections of 1988, President George Bush, also a Republican, has yet to be characterized. However, with respect to the types of features observers have come to anticipate, Bush has placed well-respected black Americans in positions of authority in his administration including Colin Powell to head the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Louis Sullivan to head the Department of Health and Human Services. On the other hand, however, Bush vetoed the first Civil Rights bill (1990) that came before him arguing "it would force employers to revert to the quota system."

Another factor believed to impact the socialization of charter and senior members of BEDO was the role of the black clergy, particularly the work of Dr. King.

the black clergy and the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The court ruling in Brown was fresh on the books and most of the nation either ignored the desegregation order or simply had yet to comply with it. Consequently, America was still very much a segregated society.

In the wake of Brown other events were occurring, particularly in southern states, such as Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and the Carolinas. In the fall 1954 a young black minister, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King,
Jr. of Atlanta, Georgia was being considered for his first pastorate at the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama. However, little did he know that in over one year he would be asked to help organize the community for the historical Montgomery Bus Boycott (Oates, 1982).

The setting was Montgomery, Alabama, Thursday, December 1, 1955. Mrs. Rosa L. Parks, a black woman, had just finished work at a local department store when she boarded a Cleveland Avenue bus. Reportedly she took a seat directly behind the section designated 'reserved for whites'. The bus became crowded and the bus driver ordered Mrs. Parks to give up her seat for a white man. Mrs. Parks refused and was arrested.

The next day a meeting was called of local clergy by the Reverend L. Roy Bennett, pastor of the Mt. Zion A.M.E. Zion Church. Bennett was president of the local Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance (IMA). The ministers called for a bus boycott the following Monday, December 5, 1955. Furthermore, writes Walls,

"Reverend Martin Luther King ... accepted the job of seeing that the Negro community of over 50,000 was informed of the boycott. Normally 75 percent of the Montgomery bus riders were Negro. It was agreed to get the Negro taxi companies of the city (18 with about 200 taxis) to transport the people for the same price that they were currently paying on the bus. A committee was appointed to make this contact, with the Reverend W. J. Powell, minister of Old Ship A.M.E. Zion Church, as chairman ... " (Walls, 1974, p. 527).
The *Montgomery Bus Boycott* took place on the same day as Mrs. Parks' trial. She lost the case because she "disobeyed the city segregation ordinance." The case was subsequently appealed. From that incident evolved the Montgomery Improvement Association, for which Dr. King was elected president and the Reverend Bennett, vice president (Oates, 1982; Walls, 1974, p. 527).

In early 1960 Dr. King returned to Atlanta and co-pastored the famous Ebenezer Baptist Church along with his father, Daddy King. It was also at that time that King and then presidential candidate John F. Kennedy forged an alliance. Kennedy needed the Negro vote to win the election and King needed the support of the president for some of his activities. King also served as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Association (SCLC) where he formed ties with the Reverends Walter Lowery and Ralph David Abernathy.

Shortly thereafter Dr. King became involved in organizing the *August 1963 March on Washington* with a multitude of organizations, such as the NAACP, CORE, SNCC and the Urban League and virtually all religious groups. Planning of the march was conducted by activists such as A. Philip Randolph, Baynard Rustin, and Roy Wilkins and, once again King was considered the 'best man' to lead the march (Barker and McCorry, 1980). It was at that time that Dr. King delivered his famous speech entitled "I Have a Dream."
Meanwhile, race relations intensified across the nation, leading to campus unrest, sit-ins, demonstrations at theaters and restaurants, and most dramatically riots in the nation's inner cities. Perhaps most shocking were incidents televised on network news, such as efforts to march nonviolently in Selma, Alabama (1965) depicting police using billy clubs and dogs to 'break-up demonstrations'. Then on April 4, 1968 America and the world were shocked at the assassination of Dr. King. The assassination occurred during his visit to a sanitation workers union rally in Memphis, Tennessee. Although the effects of Dr. King's work and devastating death continue to receive mixed opinions, he is widely recognized as a hero.

At this time we turn our attention to those events occurring within the state of Ohio, particularly those directly related to the political careers of the charter and senior members of BEDO. We begin with a description of the political history of the state as it relates to black citizenship.

Ohio: From Statehood to Pre-Baker

In order to address the subject of Ohio's statehood, we need to briefly look at the state's history prior to the 1960s. Ohio is one of three states that grew out of the Northwest Ordinance in 1787. However, stipulations on how
the territorial governments could become states created a
virtual paradox for black people. On the one hand slavery
and involuntary servitude were prohibited. On the other
hand, although black people residing within the Northwest
Territory were free legally, they enjoyed no political
rights.

Specifically, (Ohio's) territorial government enacted
"Black Laws" in the first decade of 1800. Those laws
restricted the citizenship status of black people. Examples
of restrictions were the requirements to possess a court
issued certificate declaring one's freedom, the prohibition
from attending public schools particularly with white
children, the prohibition from joining the militia, the
prohibition from testifying against a white man, the
prohibition from working without a court issued certificate,
the prohibition from voting, among others. Consequently,
since black Ohioans were not full citizens, they were not a
part of the development of the territorial government into a
state either. Ohio became a state in 1803.

By 1851 the members of the Ohio General Assembly devised
apportionment formula for the election of representatives.
It was based on the adult white male population among the
counties. Following passage of the Civil Rights Amendments
to the U.S. Constitution, the Ohio General Assembly ratified
the 15th Amendment in 1869 thereby permitting all citizens
the right to vote; later in 1876 the Ohio General Assembly repealed the "Black Laws".

Meanwhile the Ohio General Assembly adopted multi-member district formula, that is, the greater the population within a district or county, the greater the number of representatives. Larger counties such as Cuyahoga and Hamilton elected more representatives to the General Assembly than smaller counties such as Allen or Greene. For many black candidates, particularly Democrats, election in at-large districts had proved unsuccessful. Consequently, with the exception of Carl Stokes' election in the early 1960s from Cuyahoga County, which includes Cleveland—a heavily Democratic and black metropolitan area in Ohio—there were no black elected Democrat state legislators in Ohio. That situation remained in place up to the 1962 court ruling in Baker v. Carr.

Ohio redistricts

By 1966, Ohio like many large populated states, had undergone congressional and state level redistricting. Enforcement of Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186 (1962) provided the bases for fair elections practices and reapportionment. The rulings in those cases represented also a first step towards amending the practice of gerrymandering. Gerrymandering is the division into election districts to
give one political party an electoral majority in a large number of districts while concentrating the voting strength of the opposition in as few districts as possible.

Tennessee, the state where Baker filed his lawsuit, had not redistricted since 1901. Other states including Ohio were similarly negligent in updating their apportionment plans. What was clear then and is still the case today is that the political party that controls the state legislature determines the political advantage of the redistricting plan.

Consequently, post-Baker Ohio not only redrew its congressional districts but dispensed with its multi-member regional districts. Prior to those changes it was extremely difficult for black candidates to gain enough votes within Ohio's regional districts to run for the state legislature or county-wide seats, particularly if they were Democrats. Poor race relations coupled with the lack of support from the Democratic Party adversely affected all efforts on the part of black Ohioans running on the Democratic ticket.

Also prior to the 1966 elections in Ohio, of those black people who were elected to the General Assembly, they were Republican and tended to represent the larger counties. Additionally, the Republican Party, unlike the Democratic Party, is credited not only with admitting black people into its ranks but with endorsement of their elections as well.
Noteworthy therefore is that between the period 1880 and 1963 all black elected officials to the Ohio General Assembly were Republican men. During that period a total of 27 black legislators served in the Ohio House. For a thorough discussion on black participation in the Ohio House up to 1971, see Colston (1972). The last three black Republicans to serve in the Ohio General Assembly were David D. Albritton and Fred Bowers, both of Montgomery county, and John W.E. Bowen of Franklin county.

Calvin Johnson of Cincinnati, in Hamilton county, was the first black elected Democrat to serve in the Ohio Senate and served from 1967 up to his resignation in 1970. (Johnson's seat was filled with the appointment of William F. Bowen, also a black Democrat, then serving in the Ohio House; Bill Bowen remains in the Ohio Senate to date). Serving with Johnson was John W.E. Bowen, the last black Republican to serve in the Ohio Senate, (1967-1970).

The situation involving Carl B. Stokes of Cleveland helps to describe some of the problems encountered by black candidates trying to get endorsements from the Ohio Democratic Party, particularly prior to Baker. Stokes' bid for the Ohio Senate in 1958 did not receive endorsement from the Ohio Democratic Party. Although Stokes held the allegiance of the unquestionably large black voting bloc in Cuyahoga county, he could not convince county Democratic
(white) officials to support his campaign. Yet, in 1962, he became the first black Democrat elected to the Ohio House where he served three consecutive terms, 1963-1964, 1965-1966, and 1967-1968. We turn now to a closer examination on the influence of redistricting to the election of black Democrats during the 1966 elections.

the 1966 elections

How then did the court ruling in Baker impact the 1966 elections in Ohio? Those elections represented the first time in the history of Ohio politics that more than three black men were elected to the Ohio General Assembly during the same term. Consider the situation in the 1961-1962 General Assembly up to the 1967-1968 General Assembly as outlined in Table 2.1. Even more phenomenal was the partisan composition of the members in the Class of 1967, two Republicans and 10 Democrats.

Today there are 33 single-member Senate districts and 99 single-member House districts comprising the Ohio General Assembly. Noteworthy, Ohio's black population is located disproportionately within districts encompassing major urban areas, such as Toledo, Dayton, Cincinnati, Columbus, Akron, Youngstown, and Cleveland. Subsequently, the first class of black elected Democrats to the Statehouse represented Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati, and Dayton, with the
largest delegation representing Cleveland. Therefore, it is
safe to assume redistricting directly impacted the election
of black candidates from major metropolitan areas in the
state.

Table 2.1  Black Elected Officials from the 1961-
1962 General Assembly up to the 1967-
1968 Ohio General Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA'</th>
<th>Legislator</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Chamber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961-1962</td>
<td>David Albritton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Ohio House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-1964</td>
<td>David Albritton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Ohio House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl B. Stokes</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Ohio House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1966</td>
<td>David Albritton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl B. Stokes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>David Albritton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John W.E. Bowen</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Ohio Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William F. Bowen</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Ohio House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl B. Stokes</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phale D. Hale</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas E. Hill</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Troy Lee James</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Morris Jackson</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calvin Johnson</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William L. Mallory</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.J. McLin</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry G. Smith</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The two Bowens are not related; and GA' refers to
General Assembly.

With respect to terms of office, Senators serve
four-year terms and Representatives, two-year terms. Of
Ohio's 21 congressional districts, only one is represented
by a black American. Cleveland's Twenty-First Congressional
District has been represented by Louis Stokes since 1968.
He is the brother to former State Representative and Cleveland Mayor Carl Stokes. Hence, redistricting also enabled the election of Stokes to the U.S. Congress.

Later in this dissertation we look at BEDO's relationship to state office-holders such as the governor, attorney general, secretary of state, treasurer and auditor. It will be shown that BEDO maintains relationships with those officials, relationships which in turn, impact the caucus' legislative activity. For now however, we simply wish to present a basic overview of the state government. For example, former Governor James Allen Rhodes served four terms 1963-1966, 1967-1970, 1975-1978, and 1979-1982. Therefore, a considerable part of BEDO's formative years was shaped during a Republican gubernatorial administration. See Table 2.2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA'</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Politics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963-1966</td>
<td>James A. Rhodes</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1970</td>
<td>James A. Rhodes</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1974</td>
<td>John J. Gilligan</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1978</td>
<td>James A. Rhodes</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1982</td>
<td>James A. Rhodes</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1986</td>
<td>Richard F. Celeste</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-1990</td>
<td>Richard F. Celeste</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GA' refers to General Assembly.

Noteworthy, although our interest is centered around the period known as the Civil Rights Era, some of the discussion
goes beyond that period to better explain certain points raised in discussion, such as impact of partisan composition of statewide office-holders on legislative activity. This is done to show that the legislature does not operate in a vacuum, nor does BEDO. Chapter III covers this particular subject in greater detail.

The organization became more viable during the Democratic Administrations of Richard F. Celeste, which, it might be added, happened also to have coincided with the elections of Democrats on all statewide tickets including: Treasurer of State Mary Ellen Withrow, Secretary of State Sherrod Brown, Attorney General Anthony J. Celebrezze, Jr., and Auditor of State Thomas E. Ferguson. See Table 2.3 on Statewide Office-holders other than Governors from 1963 to 1990.

To summarize, from 1967 to 1990 BEDO experienced an equal number of years under Republican and Democratic Gubernatorial Administrations, (i.e., 12 under Rhodes and 12 under Gilligan and Celeste). Of key interest therefore is how and what, if anything, did the organization accomplish during the Rhodes' years? The assumption is that the organization operates more smoothly during Democratic Administrations as compared to Republican Administrations. Chapters III, IV and V all include discussion on this question, particularly Chapter V which deals directly with
Table 2.3 Statewide Office-holders other than Governors from 1963 to 1990

**Treasurers of State of Ohio**

**Attorney Generals of Ohio**
  - Paul W. Brown Republican 1969–1970

**Secretaries of State of Ohio**
  - Anthony J. Celebrezze Democrat 1979–1982

**Auditors of State of Ohio**
- Roger W. Tracy Republican 1963–1964**
- Chester W. Goble Republican 1965–1966

*Saxbe resigned to become a member of the U.S. Senate and was replaced by Brown; **Tracy died in office and was replaced by Goble.
BEDO's relationship with the three governors.

In order to further explain the situation in Ohio during this period, we turn to a discussion on the political backgrounds of some of BEDO's active members. We start with the charter members.

the charter members

As the nation watched network television news coverage of civil rights activity there was equally impressive activity in local electoral politics. Our concern is with electoral politics in Ohio. Unquestionably, each of the charter and senior members of BEDO laud Ohio's reapportionment plan as the key factor attributing to their victory in the 1966 elections. Each member's story, though varied by degree, is consistent with the others': "Prior to Baker, we could not have gone to the Statehouse."

Interestingly, it was the Democratic Party, especially on the county level, that served as an obstacle to these men's quest for city and state level office. Therefore, one cannot assume that Ohio's reapportionment plan was well-received by every Democrat, especially within the lower levels of the party apparatus. Subsequently, getting elected was one challenge, functioning in the Ohio General Assembly was another challenge, and getting reelected
consecutively and continuously were yet additional challenges.

Consequently, this discussion is an examination of the political backgrounds of charter and senior members of BEDO, at least one of whom died shortly after the interview process. Among the charter members active during this research were Representative C.J. McLin, Senator William F. Bowen, Representative Troy Lee James, and House Majority Leader William Mallory. We turn now to each of these men's stories about how they became involved in politics.

Clarence Joseph McLin

Clarence Joseph "CJ" McLin "personally resented politics as a child because it kept my dad away (from the family). ... I wasn't going to be bothered with politics." These are the remarks of a man who first ran for political office around 1949 as ward committeeman. The individual holding the position decided he was not going to run again. McLin recalled "in a conversation with some newspaper officials" that he was urged to run. In the interim the county chairman (Montgomery Democratic Party) contacted McLin and said "he'd already picked somebody to run for that position and I'd have to wait 'til his, ... to my turn. At that particular time (that) made me angry and so that was the beginning of my political (career)."
McLin won the ward committee position and subsequent reelections in spite of the fact that the county chairman ran his preferred candidate against him. In the meantime,

"... when I got in there I found out how disorganized blacks were." He acknowledged also that he conducted his political business from his office, the McLin Funeral Home. People came to his office for everything from notary public services to interpreting correspondence, "and when I'd try to help them, ah ... it was always political and so I said well I just as well get in it if I was to help the people. ... and so that's pretty well how I got started." McLin said.

It was during McLin's tenure as ward committeeman that he reorganized the black Democratic Party in Dayton. For instance, for years the white Democrats owned a building in the black community where they allowed black Democrats to hold meetings. Whenever the white Democrats visited, recalled McLin, they would bring kegs of beer and hot dogs. When McLin was elected president of the black group he decided that practice would cease. He recalled putting forth this philosophy for the black organization: "If you want it, we buy it" and, his argument with the county party, "... we will be coming after jobs and we want some jobs and not just some little throw-away jobs you been handing us."

McLin began his campaign against the unfair treatment of the county Democratic Party on the black members and the county chair threatened "we are not going to make the payments on that building and let you go in there and talk...
about and organize against us." McLin encouraged his people to leave the building and rent their own. Shortly thereafter Paul Tipps, a young white colleague in the Democratic Party, began meeting with McLin and they overthrew the county chairman.

"Eventually," McLin said, "the black Democrats went back to the meeting hall on the deal to buy the building for $9,000, $2,000 in cash and take the difference and fix it up and whatever is left I'll give you and so consequently it wasn't nothing left."

"One day," said McLin humorously, "I made the mistake of being late for a political meeting with the county party and by the time I arrived, my name was placed in nomination to run for state representative in the 1966 elections."

As one journalist puts it, "McLin was not a very articulate politician. He was simply an excellent politician."

William Francis Bowen

Bowen's start was similar to that of many black elected officials across the nation, (i.e., those who began their careers through organizations, such as, the NAACP, as well as "getting caught up in certain activities of the Civil Rights Movement").
"While in high school (middle to late 1940s)," he recalls, "I was very active in my Hi-Y in the Boys Club and at Woodward High School I got into a little difficulty by virtue of being concerned about the plight of black folks. The girls in particular were not permitted to go swimming, i.e., the black girls. Only the white girls could go swimming. The black boys went swimming on Fridays and the white boys went the other four days of the week. White girls went five days a week and the black girls couldn't go at all. So I led an effort at the school, was suspended for my activities, ... but we were able to get swimming for the black girls. Of course to my chagrin and disappointment the black girls didn't want to go swimming after we got the opportunity to (go) because the water would mess up their hair."

In high school and in the early 1950s Bowen says that he was active in the NAACP. He remembers first being appointed to the board of directors as youth advisor, next as chairman of the Commerce and Labor Committee, later winning election to serve as vice president and eventually, president of the Cincinnati Branch. It was during his tenure as NAACP President, Bowen recalls,

"...having led several direct action programs, such as picketing, boycotts, sit-ins, ... economic withdrawals as we called them, rather than boycott because of legal implications there. During that period of time (I) also led voter registration drives and a contingent from Cincinnati to the (1963) March on Washington and established and set-up our own March on Cincinnati."

Continuing his recall of that period, Bowen says,

"As a result of my activities with the NAACP I became involved in formal politics via the
influence of Jack Gilligan who was a member of city council and had taught at Xavier University in the English Department. I was a student there at the time ... I got involved in supporting his candidacy for Congress, got involved in local politics in terms of bringing about a change in the Democratic party leadership and the overthrow and removal of the county chairman."

Therefore, similar to McLin, Bowen also found himself involved in efforts to change the (Hamilton) county party system in order to make it more receptive to black Democrat participation. "1964 was the first year I ran for public office." He remembers losing in his 1964 bid for an Ohio House seat, as well as losing in a 1965 bid for Cincinnati City Council.

Bowen did not work exclusively for his own election campaigns nor for all Democrats. "Prior to that time I participated in councilmatic races assisting Ted Berry in the 1950s when he ran. Berry, a black Republican, was the first black mayor of Cincinnati. (Also worked in the appointment of) Judge William Lovelace, who happened to be a Republican appointed by Governor Rhodes with my assistance and encouragement- as a judge in Hamilton County under the then Cincinnati Municipal Court." Bowen explains,

"After we were able to get Judge Lovelace appointed and subsequently elected, the Republicans then in (control in) the General Assembly changed the electoral process to make the election of judges county-wide instead of city-wide .... This
was done in order to prevent the election of any more black judges. Though they said it was for good government it was outright racism to keep any more blacks from running and winning within the city of Cincinnati."

Bowen was successful in his next bid for the House of Representatives in the 1966 elections.

*William Mallory*

Mallory remembers being interested in politics as follows:

"Since the age of 12. (I) got involved in politics in two ways: started by passing out literature in the old 18th Ward when Ted Berry was running for city council. Second, I got started because of our family physician, Dr. R.P. McClain who attended my mother who (she) suffered from asthma. Whenever he would visit, ... I would then have to walk back with him to his office to get the medication. Well, on the way over we would discuss politics and I imagine he was somewhat impressed with my interest in politics. ... As a result he (Dr. McClain) decided to take me to a political meeting and at that time it was the Lincoln-Douglas Republican Club which met at 6th and Mound, a very prominent spot in Cincinnati."

Mallory remembers also getting involved in ward politics,

"... working with a man named Cheney Alexander in the 18th Ward where I still live. I did all the precinct work, got very active in the Democratic Party, became secretary to the Young Democrats of Hamilton County (the first black to be an officer in that group), and then I became president of my civic association, the West End Community Council."
He says he made the West End Community Council "known throughout the city and respected when 'one-man one-vote' came in 1966 at which time I ran for office. However," says Mallory, "I was opposed in the primary by my Democratic Party and I beat them. I beat their candidate in 1966 so that's the story. That's how I got started."

"Since age 12, at this point I've got 47 years experience."

Here, it is important to mention that only Bowen and Mallory acknowledge, "at one point in my career, when I was young, I considered a party other than the Democratic Party." Each man had brief encounters with the Hamilton County Republican Party through the black organization known as the Lincoln-Douglas Republican Club. Bowen was in college at the time and was interested in government employment, specifically the foreign service. Hamilton County was controlled by Republicans and the U.S. presidency, likewise with Eisenhower. In addition, Bowen recalls that his relatives and prominent blacks involved in politics tended to be Republican and belonged to the Lincoln-Douglas Club. Similar to Mallory, Bowen says he "went to one meeting of the black Republicans and became disillusioned." For example, he remembers that "one of their members was circulating petitions to run for council and the white Republicans sent word to "shut that boy up"
and black members of the club did what they said." He remembers how "sick" he became watching the men whom he had respected for years "just bowing and ... ." The two men, Bowen and Mallory, never again attended meetings of the Lincoln-Douglas Republican Club.

Troy Lee James

Troy Lee James recalls that he "got involved in the old 11th Ward of Cleveland because of concern with city services. City services were at a bad point." James was told to go to city council with complaints about city services and those officials suggested that he consider running for precinct committeeman. Not knowing what the position was, James recalls someone explaining it to him. "That is the first layer of politics in the community." He was told. He ran for office in the late 1950s and won. "The precinct committeeman does everything: bargain, garbage and rubbish, baby contests, ... anything going on in the community, that's what you get involved with," he says.

"Then the next layer of politics, I think was, I got elected ward leader over 25 to 30 committeemen. I worked and learned in that capacity and it served me well because shortly after they started talking about 'one-man one-vote'. Previously in Cuyahoga County we had what was called the Bed Sheet Ballot. That's where, if you have a popular name in Cuyahoga County like Sweeney, Days, ... you could win well for one of those 17 slots for the county. Unless
you had one of those popular names you see a 'James' couldn't get elected to dog catcher."

James continued,

"After 'one-man one vote' you would zero-in on your community and most of my communities were similar; poor, ragged, unkept, ... so we had an open field to work in. We ran for the (state) legislature as a result of all that and won (in the 1966 elections). As I said the experience of working as ward leader and precinct committeeman served me well, prepared me well for the events that were yet to come."

BEDO Organizes

Between the 1966 elections, the January 1967 inaugural ceremonies, and the 1967 Fall session, the newly elected black legislators began meeting informally. Although in the minority party caucus (Democrats in the Ohio House), the black delegation began to learn the legislative process and to develop personal friendship ties among themselves, as well as interrelationships within the General Assembly.

As with congressmen in Washington, D.C., during the time the legislature is in session state legislators must find housing in Columbus. Allegedly, the black legislators would assemble in the Sheraton Hotel suite of one of the members, most often in the suite boarded by roommates Bowen and Mallory. The Sheraton, no longer operating, was located within one block of the Statehouse. At other times they assembled in the Neil House Hotel, formerly in the location
of the recently erected Huntington Center.

During the time in which these men would assemble, very few, if any, written records were maintained, including finance reports that were to be filed with the Secretary of State's office.

Initially the legislators questioned the formation of an organization. They raised concerns about the composition, partisan make-up and other criteria for membership, such as whether to include individuals outside the state legislature. Should there be dues and what should the organization be named? Among the first decisions reached were the name and the racial composition of the organization: it was generally agreed that the group would consist of all black elected officials to the General Assembly and, that the organization would be called the Black Elected Officials of Ohio.

Here, it is important to remind the reader that, in 1967, not all black legislators were Democrats, hence the name, Black Elected Officials of Ohio. Even so, the lone Republican chose not to associate with the black Democrats. For more information on this situation, see Colston (1972). For now however, it is important to note that with the departure of black Republicans from the legislature the organization later underwent a name change.
Although no known records were kept and recollections on this part of the organization's history vary somewhat, most of the membership instructed this interviewer to "ask Bowen and McLin about that part." Consequently a considerable part of this discussion on how and when BEDO organized is attributed to the recall of Bowen and McLin.

Sometime between 1967 and 1971 decisions were made to elect officers, with the chairmanship as one of the most important to fill. Bowen, then a representative, reportedly nominated McLin to the position of chairman. Both Bowen and McLin recalled meeting informally on these concerns. Reportedly, McLin not only wanted the position of chairman but he was the only member financially capable of fulfilling the position. The group had no funding sources; it had yet to develop campaign financing. Therefore, leadership was encumbered with the financial concerns of the group until which time it became self-sustaining. Most of McLin's efforts were conducted through his personal financing up to the early to middle 1980s.

The other concern of naming the group virtually took care of itself. During the second term of the charter members, 1969-1971, the name of the organization was changed. With the departure of black Republicans and the remote possibility of others being elected, the group decided to name itself the Black Elected Democrats of Ohio
(BEDO). By this time all blacks in the Ohio General Assembly were Democrat and men.

We turn our attention now to the political backgrounds of active senior members (i.e., those elected during the 1968 and the 1970 elections), Representatives Casey Jones and Ike Thompson, respectively.

the 1968 and 1970 elections and senior members: Casey Jones and Ike Thompson

Unlike the charter members, Casey Jones and Ike Thompson launched their political careers directly related to labor union activity. Jones of Toledo, says, "I became involved in high school. ... the person who I happened to have become involved with was in the American government class, the teacher that happened to have been running for state representative. And he asked if I'd help and I did; and I did get an 'A' in his class."

Jones says that is when he got started. "I worked in political campaigns for a number of years before I even thought of running for office. In fact I had political jobs: Lucas County Personnel Director with 1,100 employees under my jurisdiction, member of a labor union, union steward of PERS union, secretary in Lucas county Engineering Department, and helped pull off a strike against the county commissioners."
Jones acknowledges that all of his jobs were political jobs and prior to politics his main thrust was athletics. He is a former Harlem Globetrotter. Jones ran for state representative in 1968 with the formidable endorsement of most local labor unions in Lucas County.

Ike Thompson credits his political career to his association with George Forbes and Carl Stokes, both highly regarded personalities in Democratic Party politics in Cleveland. Thompson says there is not much to how he began. He started through a local union in the late 1960s and also held precinct and ward committee positions. "Cleveland has a strong Democratic Party system, of which at least 95% of the blacks that are active tend to be Democrat." Thompson, probably the only black Democrat to do so, was slated and ran successfully against the Democrat incumbent, a charter member of BEDO, Thomas Hill. This was in 1970.

As BEDO organized so did black members in the U.S. Congress. We turn our attention to the beginning of BEDO's relationship with the Congressional Black Caucus.

**BEDO connects with the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC)**

Since its beginning BEDO has maintained ties with its congressional affiliate, Congressman Louis Stokes. BEDO met with newly elected black members of the U.S. Congress from 1969 up to 1971 to aid in the formation of the CBC.
Consequently, by the time the CBC was organized, BEDO had already progressed in its organizational development. BEDO had determined, for instance, it would represent issues of importance to black and poor Ohioans. In this way the Ohio black caucus maintains ties with the constituency that contributed the most to its beginning.

BEDO also decided to serve as an affiliate or satellite for CBC concerns in Ohio. Those initial decisions have proven to be significant in the growth and development of the state caucus: BEDO's ties with the CBC provide unquestionable support for its resources, particularly in the area of minority business development.

For example, former Maryland Congressman and CBC Chairman Parren J. Mitchell visited Ohio on numerous occasions and provided legislative research information on federal measures covering minority business set asides. That aided BEDO tremendously in both drafting and passage of ACT 584 (commonly called the Minority Enterprise Set Aside), enacted in 1980. The Minority Enterprise Set Aside is a statute that provides for percentage set asides of state contracts for goods and services and for construction to be set aside for bidding upon by state-certified minority businesses. Due to the omission of primarily black-owned and operated businesses from the state contracting process up to the 1980s, this legislation was enacted and is in
Returning to the subject of the relationship between the CBC and BEDO, the two black caucuses have worked well together since their beginnings (BEDO's Black Agenda '86: 38, see also The Call and Post, 1988, p. 7B). In Chapter III we show how BEDO's members employed political savvy, resulting in the successful enactment of the Minority Enterprise Set Aside. In addition, BEDO works to ensure the reapportionment process is favorably disposed to the 21st Congressional District which Louis Stokes represents. Without BEDO support in the process, no black Democratic candidate for Congress could hope to win election. Chapter VI examines this process more closely.

The following discussion is about junior and freshmen members of BEDO, all of whom were elected or appointed to the Ohio General Assembly after 1980. Consequently these members joined the organization after it formally organized.

the 1980s and the junior and freshmen members

In this section we look at the beginning of the political careers of five junior and freshmen members, all of whom were either appointed or elected to the state legislature after 1980 and, one of whom was appointed as recent as 1989. Most of the junior members tend to have backgrounds in the political arena, working election
campaigns, holding politically appointed posts, et cetera. The point is junior members, unlike senior and charter members, were interested in political offices and therefore set out to achieve careers in politics.

I. Ray Miller

Miller recalls that it was his family background and environment that caused him to seek elective office. He talks quite openly about his father who was in the Air Force and who was an alcoholic, eventually leaving the family. His mother raised five children and, says Miller, "we experienced all the difficulties of a single woman-headed household. My mother had an eighth grade education. We were on welfare and wore Charity Newsy clothing, ... the whole bit," he recalls.

He also recalls that "early on in school and at every level, I was in decision making positions: high school student government, the Ohio State University student government, graduate student government and, attended political campaign seminars, et cetera."

Miller's public role in politics began when he worked as a volunteer on former State Representative Phale D. Hale's election campaign during the late 1960s. That was in Columbus. Later he acquired a Legislative Internship Fellowship through the Legislative Service Commission (LSC)
available to political science graduate students. It was a full-time position and Miller was assigned to then Majority Whip Dick Celeste and Assistant Majority Floor Leader Bill Mallory. He also served briefly as Celeste's aide.

His career involved a brief period as a research associate for LSC where he was assigned to the House Agriculture Committee. The position was nonpartisan. Miller recalls that he was anxious for a more exciting position, so he went to see House Speaker Vern Riffe. The Speaker instructed him to "write yourself an administrative assistant job description with my office." This was in 1975.

Later Miller learned that he was "really designing a spot to work with McLin." Consequently, he "ended up helping BEDO," as well as serving as McLin's aide.

Around 1976 McLin began encouraging Miller to work with the Ohio Democratic Party's voter registration efforts for the Carter presidential campaign. In so doing he was privileged to work with Arnold Pinkney, a prominent black Democrat in Cleveland; Paul Tipps, who was chairman of the Ohio Democratic Party; and, Hamilton Jordan and Jody Powell, both key Carter advisers.

In the interim Miller was employed with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) as assistant director of legislation and was "quite
content.‖ The Black Elected Democrats, particularly McLin, wanted him to consider a position with the Carter Administration. Miller eventually joined the Carter team as a Deputy Special Assistant to the President.

With the political winds changing drastically for the Democrats, particularly with the American hostages in Iran, the Carter Administration was in serious trouble. Miller prepared to return to Columbus in the latter part of 1979 where he became vice president for Community Development with the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce.

Shortly thereafter Columbus State Representative Les Brown, also a prominent radio personality, announced his resignation. On April 1, 1981 Miller was appointed to fill Brown's seat. It is noteworthy that both Miller and Brown followed the Reverend Phale D. Hale, the first black Democrat State Representative from Franklin County in the history of the Ohio General Assembly.

Vernon Sykes

Although his career track differs from that of Miller's, Sykes' political career began also due to "what appeared to be an interesting and powerful place to get things done." On the other hand and unlike all other members of BEDO, Sykes is the only member who developed a clear course of action, a well-thought-out strategy to obtain his first
publicly held seat and this was without all the endorsements of prominent blacks and Democrats. Impressed from youth "with people working in large buildings and carrying attaché cases," Sykes says that he always "sensed that those people were decision-makers."

He began thinking about public office while working in college: Opportunities Industrial Commission (OIC), Community Action Agency, Summit County Criminal Justice Commission (a planner for the regional unit of an anti-crime program started during the 1960s), Akron Board of Education, ... all somewhat frustrating positions. It was while working for the Summit County Criminal Justice Commission that young Sykes learned that 30 elected officials sat on this funding agency and they determined who and what programs would be funded. He did not realize at the time that 'political' decisions were being made that were completely opposite to all his recommendations for funding to the Commission. His background was business and economics. Then he came to realize that the "real decision-makers were the peoples' choices, i.e., elected officials."

After conferring with his wife, who at the time worked on Akron City Council, Sykes decided to run for city council. Akron City Council had 13 members: three at large and 10 ward seats. He used his planning skills and picked a ward in which to run and analyzed strengths and weaknesses
of opponents. He picked a ward seat where a white member served in a majority black ward, the one where he had grown up. He planned over a two-year period: became active as president of the local anti-poverty program, rented a home in the ward, resigned his job, met with all opponents and convinced them not to run, and ended up with one opponent, the white incumbent on council.

Sykes screened primary Democrats, (i.e., those that vote), and found that there were 12,000 registered. He cross-referenced them with census data and determined conservative white voters who would not vote for him. Next he put together a voter registration campaign focusing on the black vote and worked closely with the NAACP, Urban League, et cetera and pushed a nonpartisan voter registration effort in his ward. He recalls joining as many black organizations as he could and visiting all the churches in the ward, holding breakfasts, et cetera.

"By the time the white incumbent started campaigning, (i.e., three weeks prior to the primary), people in the black community thought he was trying to take my job away," says Sykes. He had become secretary of the 3rd Ward Democratic Club and still he received no black political endorsements. "They did not want to make the white politicians mad. I beat the incumbent 2:1. He didn't have a chance."
Sykes was elected to Akron City Council and shortly thereafter decided to run for state representative, becoming the first black representative from Akron in the history of the Ohio General Assembly, (1983-1984).

Thomas Roberts

It was in 1968 in Dayton that Thomas Roberts got involved in politics and it was in high school. His older brother, Lin Roberts, who at the time of this interview worked for Governor Celeste, inspired him to get involved. Lin got started through C.J. McLin.

In August 1970 Roberts started campaigning for Gilligan. McLin had asked him to run for precinct committeeman in his neighborhood and he did and held the position from 1972 through 1985. He was involved in organizing and planning at least two campaigns per year including Mayor McGee and former Representative Ed Orlett, as well as several city council campaigns.

Ironically, Roberts' House seat was once held by David Albritton, a black Republican, whom McLin and Orlett, a white Democrat, helped to defeat. That was during the 1972 elections. Roberts was appointed to fill the unexpired term of Orlett in January 1986.

Roberts previously served as bailiff for a Common Pleas judge and held that position for eight years. He never
really held an elected political seat prior to this one and says he was primarily a campaign manager in the political arena and under the guidance of McLin.

**Vermel Whalen**

Although a junior level member, Vermel Whalen's career in politics most resembles that of the charter and senior members. It goes back to the 1950s when she did grassroots campaigning: licking, stuffing, and sealing envelopes and door-to-door campaigning for candidates like the Stokes' brothers. It began with civic involvement and interest in her neighborhood association, the Lee Harvard Community Association and the Mt. Pleasant Community Council. She recalls dealing with residential problems and learning how difficult it was to work with some elected officials. She was dismayed with representation on city council, which she says, "didn't seem to have concerns of community-at-heart."

By 1975 Whalen declared her candidacy against the incumbent, a white man, "in his face in my living room." She came within 412 votes of her opponent during her first election campaign. The incumbent had 10 years in office, was indicted, convicted, and sent to the Ohio penitentiary five weeks before the general elections!

In 1977 Whalen secured 53.8 percent of the vote and her opposition was a young Harvard University graduate.
According to Whalen, her victory was announced in all media but a friend from the Board of Elections called and asked if she had given an acceptance speech and she said, "no, but I'm getting ready to and this person said don't because they (the opposition) stole the election." Now, also according to Whalen, she was twice defeated and in peculiar ways.

"After that," she recalls, "let me say, I am a nurse. I am an LPN, ... been nursing all my life. But in 1976, I was offered a position with Kucinich, then Mayor of Cleveland, and I didn't accept that one. Later, he offered me another position, chief monitor of CETA program. I accepted it until he left office. This was a very powerful position: all contracts, Geauga, Parma, and Cuyahoga Counties, involving $60-70 million budget with a staff of 16. Later and due to the change in administration, I became a program analyst in CETA, then a grants writer, and finally assistant administrator to the Commissioner in Parks and Recreation for seven years.

In October 1986 I was elected by the Central Committee and appointed to fulfill the unexpired term of the late Representative John Thompson, who served for 16 years."

Thompson had gone through the primary and died. Whalen was selected to fill his unexpired term and then had to run for the seat, all in the summer and fall 1986. As a courtesy, Thompson's seat was extended to his widow who declined and therefore Whalen accepted it. This situation gives Whalen seniority over members elected in 1986 and inaugurated in 1987 because she was already elected to serve a full two-year term.
Finally, Whalen said, "I represent one of the most prestigious districts in Ohio. It does not lack talent and brains: lawyers, doctors, nurses, teachers, and other professionals and highly skilled black people." Her district is also the highest voting district in Cleveland and Ward 1 pays more taxes than any other ward in the City of Cleveland. She said. These factors make Whalen proud to have finally achieved elected office.

Rhine McLin

After C.J. McLin's death in December 1988 and because his wife had preceded him in death, eldest daughter Rhine was extended the courtesy of completing her father's unexpired term in January 1989. "Otherwise and prior to this appointment," says Rhine, "I didn't consider myself or (my) activities political."

"For example," she says, "I was an Ohio Lottery Commissioner for six years; appointed by President Carter to serve on the National Womens Program to monitor books and other literature ensuring that women were shown in a positive and non-chauvinistic manner; and, ran for Montgomery County School Board in 1982 and lost." None of these positions strikes her as being political but they are. Additionally, she teaches at Central State University and operates the McLin Funeral Home.
McLin says she never imagined the current situation would occur. She says her father acquired immense respect thereby paving the way for her acceptance and indoctrination here (in the legislature).

We now have presented background information on four charter members, two senior members, and five junior and freshmen members of BEDO. Before covering the question about how BEDO was received in the Ohio General Assembly in the early years, we need to cover one other area, the initial election campaigns of the charter members.

**Initial Election Campaigns of the Charter Members**

Although some discussion has already been presented on election campaigning, this section is intended to focus exclusively on how the situation occurred with the charter members. As the discussion progresses it will be evidenced that these men had no prior training or understanding of what lay ahead. For example, none of these men were the sons of elected officials. None of these men were from socioeconomic situations that indicated a political career was 'the appropriate direction' for them.

On the whole, however, and by contemporary measures, election campaigning in the 1960s required substantially less of everything as compared to that which is required today. In addition, the success or defeat of these
candidates represents measures of effectiveness of the newly
drawn legislative districts under Baker. It was the 1966
and 1968 elections across America that produced the
unprecedented election of black Democrats.

Although each of the charter members had achieved some
political experience prior to seeking office in the state
legislature, it was primarily as ward committee and precinct
workers. Each of the four men notes that their initial
election campaigns were the most interesting and rewarding
of all. At this time we review each situation, beginning
with McLin.

McLin had lots of volunteer help and since he was
financially independent, finances were not a concern of his
campaign. Name recognition was his problem.

McLin was one of three candidates seeking the state
legislative seat in his district in 1966: an Independent, a
Republican, and McLin. All three men were black but the
white community was not aware of this. Therefore, McLin
developed a strategy consisting of literature with several
racial and ethnic derogatory terms and language, stipulating
that he and his opponents, "who are also black and who
resent the use of these words." In that way, he
successfully informed the white community that there was no
white candidate on the ballot, and since McLin was the best
known among the three, he was elected.
Unfortunately, however, when McLin recalled "how he felt having won the first time," it was a bitter-sweet memory. He felt he was "now in a position to do something and that I had to do it" and, he thought of how long and hard his father had vied, though unsuccessfully, for local office. In December 1966 McLin was returning to Dayton from a pre-briefing at the Statehouse when he heard the news of his father's death in an automobile accident on his car radio.

A native of East St. Louis, Illinois, McLin resided in his district in Dayton from 1931 until his death in 1988. He was a mortician, developer, and astute businessman. McLin completed two years of college and graduated from the Cincinnati College of Embalming.

Bowen recalls amusingly and somewhat emphatically some of the circumstances surrounding his initial campaign. He says that "one man one vote" is clearly how he won the 69th House District seat in the 1966 elections. He only raised $6,000. He says that he was "highly elated" to have won over nine Democrats and nine Republican contenders, all running for nine positions. Bowen recalls managing a "thoroughly grassroots campaigns with plenty of aggressive literature drops and public appearances," and he boasts of receiving the "endorsement of the Hamilton County Democratic Party." Bowen's eventual success is underscored by the fact
that his campaign organization was already in place due to his bid for the Statehouse in the 1964 elections and that was under the old district plan, county-wide elections.

Consequently, he had already garnered name recognition, much of which was attributed to civil rights activity including his role in the Cincinnati Human Rights Commission, demonstrations, and selective buying campaigns against the cola, brewery, bakery, bottlers, and transit drivers. At the time his district was primarily Catholic, conservative, and predominately white.

Bowen, a native of Cincinnati, has resided in his district virtually all his life, where he completed three years of college at Xavier University. He is an insurance salesman and real estate broker.

Mallory recalls having set up his campaign headquarters "in the heart of my district." He says that he "already had name recognition" and that he had opposition in the primary. He won in his first bid for the Statehouse, House District 23, the old 72nd District seat.

Similar to Bowen, Mallory is a native of Cincinnati and has resided in his district all his life. He is an adjunct professor at the University of Cincinnati and holds a bachelors degree from Central State University, including some graduate training at Xavier and the University of Cincinnati.
James recalls that his initial election campaign was constituent-oriented and that he had a "fast relationship with them". His name recognition was fairly high due to ward and precinct activity, plus he had the Cuyahoga County Democratic Party's endorsement. James' district, unlike that of the others, is plagued with poverty and has a large number of elderly residents. The white people are Polish and Hungarian. Many of the black people are elderly and poor.

Therefore, fund raising for James has always been problematic but he has been creative in dealing with the situation: "Constituents give free service" or volunteer in his campaign and they vote for him, he acknowledges.

Also, James has published a newsletter for years, in which he lists menus of cuisine representing the diversity of his constituency. Otherwise, he shuns press releases and media attention.

James was elected overwhelmingly to his current seat in the 1966 elections and has been reelected consecutively since that time.

A native of Texarkana, Texas, James has resided in his district since 1942. He is a small businessman and has three years of college.

In sum, it is readily discerned that the charter members had an immeasurable amount of will to win as opposed to
resources, therefore their apparent victories. The impact of media, particularly television, is only indirectly related to this discussion. Specifically, Bowen and McLin report later in this discussion on how BEDO has continually been "berated by print and electronic media." According to one journalist, "most of my colleagues simply did not consider covering BEDO," the organization or its individual members. Interestingly, none of these men (i.e., the charter members), mentioned endorsements from the local newspapers or any other media.

To this point the reader has been introduced to the organization known as BEDO, certain historical circumstances surrounding its formation, as well as information about the active membership up to the 1989-1990 sessions. Eleven of 13 members were interviewed for this research. Two other active members, though not involved in this research, were Helen Rankin of Cincinnati and Otto Beatty, Jr. of Columbus, both representatives.

**other members of the organization**

There are other members of the organization, some of whom are active, some are deceased, while yet others have retired or resigned, and only one of whom was defeated. See list of other members shown below:
Earlier it was reported that 27 black men served in the Ohio General Assembly during the period 1880 through 1963, all of whom were Republican. Since Baker a similar number of black
lawmakers has served, all Democrats and inclusive of women. Consequently, the significance of the decision rendered in Baker v. Carr (1962), coupled with Ohio's reapportionment plan most definitely impacted the ability of black Democratic candidates to be elected to the Ohio General Assembly. Later in Chapter VI we see how election of black candidates to state legislatures elsewhere was similarly impacted.

At this time, however, we are interested in knowing what the situation was like for these men in the early years in the legislature; how organizational features of the Ohio General Assembly affected their early activity; how they were received by their white colleagues; and, the general perception on the effectiveness of the organization in the early years. Chapter III addresses these concerns.
CHAPTER III

BEDO AND THE OHIO GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN THE EARLY YEARS:

In this chapter we examine the initiation process of the first group of black elected Democrats serving in the Ohio General Assembly. Although we go back as far as the early 1960s, we are primarily interested in experiences of the group from the 1967-1968 General Assembly up to the 1981-1982 General Assembly because it is this period in which BEDO took shape.

Specifically, we explore the level and degree of preparation of the black legislators, particularly among the charter and senior members, for what lay ahead. Were the black members in the Class of 1967 prepared for their roles as state legislators? In addition, were their white colleagues prepared to receive them? In order to answer these questions, we asked BEDO's charter and senior members about their recall of the early years. We also asked some of the white legislators of both political parties about their recall of this period. Other information is provided by outside observers, such as newspaper journalists.
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Additionally, we examine how and why certain features of the Ohio General Assembly including structure, size, party composition and balance, and professionalism affect legislative activity. The reader will be introduced also to relationships among statewide office-holders, such as, governors, auditors, and secretaries of state, and activity in the General Assembly. For example, in the early 1960s statewide offices in Ohio were held by Democrats and Republicans. Of the six statewide offices, four were held by Democrats including: governor, lieutenant governor, treasurer of state, and attorney general. The offices of secretary of state and auditor of state were held by Republicans, the former by Ted W. Brown from 1951 to 1978. Later, in 1967, when the first class of black elected Democrats was inaugurated, Republicans gained control of all six statewide offices. The obvious question becomes one of what, if anything, this new racial partisan organization was able to accomplish in its infancy and apparent minority-party status.

At the time, the partisan composition of the Ohio House and Senate consisted of a Republican majority. In fact, Republicans controlled the Ohio General Assembly for the entire decade of the 1960s. See Table 3.1 later in this chapter for a profile of state government, including

Another interest in this chapter is with perceptions about how BEDO functioned during the early years. Therefore, we examine opinions surrounding two cases, the budget boycott in the Ohio House in 1975 and activity surrounding enactment of the 1980 Minority Enterprise Set Aside Statute (Act 584). There are other cases or events which illustrate how BEDO functioned during this period. These two cases, however, represent extreme types of strategy, as well as help to explain the growth and development of the organization over time.

To this point it has been implied that race is an important factor in this study. From this point on the reader will see how a factor, such as, race becomes meshed, if not virtually washed-out, in situations involving politics. Having interviewed various legislators on a multitude of issues, one learns a little more about how and why certain legislation passes, fails, gets amended, tabled or simply washed-out. Additionally, it was observed that--although procedures and processes of legislative activity remain fairly consistent over time--it is that which determines a legislator's vote which remains the mystery, particularly to individuals outside the legislative arena.
Finally, we are interested in the social and economic setting of the state. From the time in which BEDO formed, have social and economic conditions remained the same, changed somewhat or drastically? What difference do social and economic conditions make on legislative activity, particularly among the black elected Democrats participating in this research?

This chapter hopefully provides the reader with more than a basic description of the organizational features of the Ohio General Assembly and how BEDO was received in the early years. It is intended also to introduce the reader to the game known as politics, more specifically, Ohio politics.

Organizational Features of the Ohio General Assembly

What were some features of the Ohio General Assembly during the early years? How long did sessions last? How many and what types of committees were in the House and Senate? What kinds of salaries did the lawmakers earn and what difference does this make? What kinds of individuals comprised this "august body" and are those characteristics similar or different today? What difference do variations in these situations make? These are some of the areas that help us understand how the legislature functions and changes over time.
Earlier works by Wahlke et al. (1962) and later by Jewell (1982) provide background for our understanding of state legislative activity. Wahlke et al. (1962), for example, examined legislative behavior in four state legislatures including Ohio, California, New Jersey and Tennessee. They explored "organizational facts" and "situational landmarks" prevalent within these four systems. At the time, the 1957-1958 General Assembly, all four legislatures were controlled by Republicans. More specifically, in the Ohio House of Representatives there were 42 Democrats and 97 Republicans, totaling 139 representatives. In the Ohio Senate there were 12 Democrats and 22 Republicans, totaling 34 senators (p. 42). The Republicans therefore as the majority party in the Ohio General Assembly held leadership roles including all committee chairs, thereby controlling all legislation in the Ohio General Assembly.

In the 1958 Ohio elections, Democrats won control of both houses in the General Assembly, as well as the Governor's Office with Michael V. DiSalle of Toledo. From this point up to the middle of the 1970s, the reader will see that Democratic control in the General Assembly and the Governor's Office will be intermittent at best. See data compiled in Table 3.1.
### Table 3.1 Profile of Ohio Legislative and Statewide Offices: 1961-1962 to the 1981-1982 General Assembly

#### The Early Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. State Offices:</strong></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>Treasurer</td>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>John W.</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. General Assembly</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>Senate</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>Republicans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</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>Republicans</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ted Brown was first elected in 1941. Appointed, vice Roger W. Tracy deceased.*

(continued)
Table 3.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal Clerk</td>
<td>Carl Guess</td>
<td>Carl Guess</td>
<td>Carl Guess</td>
<td>Carl Guess</td>
<td>Carl Guess</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Guess</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Salaries of Legislators</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$12,750</td>
<td>$12,750</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Number of Committees</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>0/9</td>
<td>0/14</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Real Esc't</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>0/12</td>
<td>0/9</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time Legislr</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>4/25</td>
<td>13/37</td>
<td>12/33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sales/Re't</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortician</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2/13</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>0/8</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: *Business category includes merchants, publishers, advertising, wholesale distributors, accountants, and consultants.
**Other category includes engineers and other entrepreneurs.

Source: These data were extracted from the Secretary of State of Ohio Official Rosters on Federal, State, County Offices and Departmental Information for the 1961-1962 up to the 1981-1982 General Assembly. All errors in reporting and compilation of data are responsibility of this investigator.
Also noteworthy is the type of sessions held back then. The legislature met biannually in regular session, convening in February in odd-numbered years, and unlimited sessions. From the time of Wahlke's study to the middle to late 1960s the legislature was comprised of older members with considerable seniority. Although the state was highly industrial and had a relatively large farm district, the legislators were predominantly white, Protestant and representative of business and professional fields, such as, attorneys, insurance agents, journalists, real estate agents, and educators.

Except for the factor of race, the black Democratic members of the Class of '67 fit the profile of their white colleagues (See Table 3.1, Section F. Occupations). All were Protestant (primarily of Baptist denominations), and worked in fields of business and education. Specifically, Larry Smith of Cleveland, William F. Bowen of Cincinnati and David Albritton of Dayton were insurance agents. Albritton was also an educator, as was William L. Mallory of Cincinnati. Thomas Hill and Troy Lee James of Cleveland, and C.J. McLin, Jr. of Dayton were businessmen in fields including sales, retail food distribution, and a mortician business, respectively. Carl Stokes of Cleveland was an attorney and Phale D. Hale of Columbus was a minister. Interestingly, for years the occupation presumed preferable for legislators
was attorney and, among black legislators, the ministry was a common profession (See Jarrett (1968) for a description on characteristics of black Congressmen from Post Reconstruction up to the Twentieth Century; McGriggs (1977, pp. 249-258) and Bragg (1979, pp. 49-60) for background information on black members serving in the Illinois and Maryland General Assemblies, respectively).

In a related study, Jewell (1982) examined representation among House members in nine state legislatures which included Ohio. This study provides background information for the ensuing discussion on the level of professionalism within the Ohio General Assembly. Earlier, for example, it was stated that the Class of '67 entered a legislature comprised of older members and members of relative seniority. According to Jewell (1982), professionalism is determined by long sessions, high salaries and low turnover of members (p. 189). Taking the subject of low turnover first, Jewell states the following:

"In the 1971-1976 period (and generally in the 1960s), California, Massachusetts, and Ohio were low in turnover. ... Massachusetts and Ohio had even lower proportions of freshmen than in the past, and both states had substantially higher proportions of long-term members (more than five years) than did the other states" (p. 25).
More specifically, Jewell (1982) found that "retirement is a more common cause of turnover than is defeat at the polls. The proportion of legislators retiring is lowest in Ohio ..., where low levels of primary defeats are attributed to strong party organizations and informal or formal party endorsements in primaries, which lead to a very low level of primary competitions" (p. 27). Clearly, level of turnover among active charter and senior members of BEDO provides substantial support for Jewell's argument.

For example, of the three active charter members of BEDO, Bowen, James and Mallory have been reelected for consecutive terms from the 1966 elections up to the 1991-1992 General Assembly. In fact, turnover within the group tends to be attributed more to death in office as opposed to retirement, resignation or loss of reelection. For example, James Rankin of Cincinnati, John D. Thompson of Cleveland, and C.J. McLin, Jr. of Dayton all died in office, the latter two having served 18 to 22 years, respectively. Among those having resigned include Calvin Johnson of Cincinnati, Phale D. Hale and Les Brown, both of Columbus, and M. Morris Jackson of Cleveland. Thomas Hill of Cleveland lost in his bid for reelection in 1970, the only caucus member ever to be defeated in a reelection campaign.
A look at salary levels of members in the Ohio General Assembly indicates early on Ohio lawmakers almost had to have a second source of income in order to serve in the state legislature (See Table 3.1, Section D. Salaries). This was particularly true for those members residing outside of Franklin County. When the legislature is in session, members residing outside of Franklin County must travel to and lodge in Columbus. Although reimbursement for mileage has been made available in more recent years, lodging and meals are payable by the members and not state government. Additionally, all district offices are the responsibility of individual legislators because these offices are political, therefore paid for out of legislators' political campaign funds. The point, however, is that state legislative office is relatively expensive.

Accordingly, salary levels have increased since the early years. During the 1961-1962 General Assembly, Ohio legislators received as little as $5,000 per annum, they were paid $8,000 per annum during the time in which the Class of '67 entered, and $12,750 per annum from 1969 to 1972. By this time sessions had become longer. For example, sessions convened on the first Monday in January in the odd-numbered years for the first session and no later than March 15th of the following year for the second session. During the 1973-1974 session legislators received
a base salary of $14,000. By the 1981-1982 sessions state lawmakers were paid $22,500 in salary. Interestingly, during this particular session exactly one-third of the House members, (i.e., 33 of the 99 members), listed their occupation as 'state representative'. Of the 33 members of the Senate, 12 listed their occupation as 'state senator' (See Table 3.1, Section F).

Also by that time sessions had taken on a schedule similar to the public school system, only sessions now extend through June 30th of each year. This is particularly true if an appropriation's bill is under consideration. Information obtained from the Ohio Secretary of State's Official Roster of Federal, State, County Offices and Departmental Information for 1987-1988 shows legislators earning $30,152 per annum (p. 57), with more for leadership positions. Therefore, Ohio legislators are currently earning salaries more commensurate with service of full-time employees.

Another feature of professionalism can be seen in benefits accrued to senior members of the legislature, particularly those in majority-party caucuses. For example, members of relative seniority in majority-party caucuses are often selected to chair committees and tend also to have considerably more voice with respect to which committees they will be assigned. See Table 3.1, Section E for
information on how the number and name of standing committees change with each General Assembly.

Although reapportionment in the 1960s accounts for the decrease in total number of members serving in the General Assembly, (i.e., from 38 to 33 in the Senate and from 139 to 99 in the House); it is not readily discernible why the number of committees has undergone simultaneous, though sporadic growth. Plainly, the Senate, having the lesser number of members, also has the lesser number of committees. Senate Committees range from 10 in the 1961-1962 General Assembly to as few as eight in the 1967-1968 General Assembly, to 13 during the 1981-1982 General Assembly. In the House, there were 20 committees in the 1961-1962 General Assembly, 16 in the 1967-1968 General Assembly, and 25 during the 1981-1982 General Assembly. One advantage given a large number of committees is that freshmen and junior members have a greater probability of being appointed to committees of their preference. A large number of committees also provides alternatives for introduction of bills. Consequently, these features are impressive to members serving in majority-party caucuses in both houses. On the other hand, however, the greater the number of committees, the more work leadership must conduct in order to control its agenda. The effects of size and committee assignments will be explored later in Chapter IV.
As far back as most legislators' interviewed for this research could recall, their "desk served as their office for the session. It was at their desk that the legislators maintained files, read bills, answered mail, and interviewed lobbyists and constituents." One of the few legislative agencies, i.e., the Legislative Reference Bureau, was staffed by students from The Ohio State University (Wahlke et al., 1962, p. 52). Also, according to Wahlke et al. (1962) and some of the active charter members, "everybody used the same pool of stenographers for any correspondence."

Unquestionably, the early years were not as attractive as the current scene at the Statehouse. Today, for instance, most legislators have a secretary and all have use of a pool of pages and interns. In addition to their own secretaries, generally, leadership and committee chairmen have legislative assistants, interns, secretaries, and pages, particularly in the Senate. Top leadership, such as House Speaker and President of the Senate, has numerous staff.

Probably the most attractive feature of recent years is the presence of the new state office tower, the Vern Riffe Center for Government and the Arts, located at 77 South High Street directly across from the Statehouse. Although all Representatives' offices are located in the Vern Riffe
Center, all legislative activity is conducted in the Statehouse.

In addition, all Senate offices remain in the Statehouse, which is undergoing renovation. Senate leadership offices are very spacious, well-furnished and well-staffed. Senate members are closer to the Senate chamber and committee rooms than are representatives. Representatives must travel through underground tunnels connected to the Statehouse. On the whole, however, the setting for legislative activity today is much more conducive than during the early years.

To some extent we have alluded to the structure of the Ohio General Assembly. It is bicameral, consisting of an upper and lower house, (i.e., Senate and House of Representatives), respectively. Consistent with the time of Wahlke's study, the structure of the Ohio General Assembly closely resembles that of the federal level. It also maintains a strong committee and party system. The party apparatus for Republicans and Democrats is similarly strong on the state level and inside the legislature.

Inside the House of Representatives the role of Speaker, for example, continues to be significant today as during the early years, and it most closely resembles that of the federal level, especially the strong speakers in Congress in the late 19th Century. For example, strong speakers tend to
maintain majority-party status for a series of sessions. See Table 3.1, Section C. Leadership. Note particularly terms served by current Democrat House Speaker Vern Riffe which dates back to the 1975-1976 General Assembly.

Although the President of the Senate wields a comparable degree of authority, this leadership position tends to change more frequently in Ohio than the position of House Speaker. To illustrate the point of long service however, note terms served by Republican Lieutenant Governor John W. Brown, who was also Senate President.

Throughout most of this research, the Governor's Office was held by Democrat Richard F. Celeste. It was observed also that Democrat House Speaker Vern Riffe and Republican Senate President Paul Gillmor and later, Stanley Aronoff, tended to work well together, as well as with the Governor. Noteworthy also is the fact that, by the time Celeste became Governor, the Ohio Constitution had been amended to permit candidates for governor and lieutenant governor to run on the same ticket. Therefore, the lieutenant governor is no longer the Senate President. The point of this discussion, however, is that all three entities (i.e., Governor, Senate President and House Speaker), have tended to work well together.

Take, for example, the selection and appointment process of cabinet level officials. Although the selection of
cabinet level officials is primarily an executive privilege (i.e., the governor), it is the Senate that must confirm these appointments. Additionally, it is widely understood, in practice, the Speaker of the House has a voice in this process too. In Chapter V this process will be examined more closely. It will be shown that consideration for executive appointments does not necessarily stem from the executive level to the Senate. For now, however, the point is that the Class of '67 had very little, if any, voice in this process. During the early years these men were in minority-party status. Most were in the House of Representatives therefore not directly associated with the Senate confirmation process. Most notably, black legislators had no seniority and they had yet to learn the rules-of-the-game.

According to data compiled in Table 3.1 simultaneous to changes in party balance and composition were changes in leadership roles and related positions. In the early 1960s, for example, there were far fewer positions of leadership in both the House and Senate as compared to the 1981-1982 General Assembly. Majority leadership positions in the Senate, for example, changed from President, President Pro Tem and Clerk to include Assistant President Pro Tem and Majority Whip. Positions in the minority-party caucus changed from Minority Leader to include an Assistant
Minority Leader and Minority Floor Leader.

In the House of Representatives, leadership positions included Speaker, Speaker Pro Tempore, Majority Floor Leader, Assistant Majority Floor Leader, Majority Whip, Minority Leader, Assistant Minority Leader, and Minority Whip. The clerk's position was divided into journal and administrative roles.

To elaborate, the Senate Clerk, for example, consisted of the following positions: Clerk of the Senate, Assistant Clerk, Journal Clerk, Message Clerk, Engrossing Clerk, Enrolling Clerk, Recording Clerk, Recording Clerk, and Secretary. Also, there was a Sergeant-at-Arms and two assistants. There were similar positions in the House.

To complete the scenario for the 1981-1982 session, Republican Governor James A. Rhodes was in the final term of his historical four terms. Republican Lieutenant Governor George Voinovich had resigned in 1979, leaving the post vacant. Democrats held all other statewide offices including Anthony Celebrezze as Secretary of State, Thomas E. Ferguson serving his second term as Auditor of State, Gertrude Donahey in her third term as Treasurer of State, and William J. Brown, serving in his third term as Attorney General. To some extent, the charter and senior members of BEDO had become accustomed to performing their roles in a varied situation, such as this. The key difference between
the 1967-1968 and the 1981-1982 General Assembly, however, was with the exception of governor, in 1981 Democrats held all other statewide offices and were in majority-party control in the Ohio House.

In the interim, however, black lawmakers acquired certain leadership posts. For instance, in the 1975-1976 General Assembly, M. Morris Jackson was elected by his Senate colleagues to Assistant President Pro Tem and in the 1979-1980 General Assembly, Jackson became President Pro Tem, both positions never before held by a black legislator. On the House side, William L. Mallory became Majority Floor Leader in the 1981-1982 General Assembly and holds that position to date. The point here is black lawmakers became participants in leadership after over a decade in the legislative arena.

Aside from the situation within state government in Ohio, our concern is with the overall social and economic situation in the state. At this time we turn our attention to a brief description of the social and economic setting in Ohio during the early years. To some extent the reader is already familiar with race relations in Ohio during the 1960s and 1970s. That subject was covered in Chapter II. Therefore, the ensuing discussion focuses on other features associated with the state's social and economic situation.
The Social and Economic Setting

In order to understand the larger picture in which the Ohio General Assembly operates, we turn to an examination of the social and economic situation in the state from the early years to the present. At the time of Wahlke et al. (1962), the population in Ohio was 9.1 million. In 1970 the population was at 9.7 million. By 1980, Ohio's population had increased to 10,798,000 million people, decreasing slightly to 10,752,000 million people in 1986. Although the seventh ranked state in the nation in population, Ohio is relatively a low growth state.

Population statistics are important for a multitude of reasons. For example, federal funds are allocated to states based on population statistics. Electoral votes for President of the United States are designated to each state based on population statistics. Within states, intergovernmental funding is allocated based on population. Also, reapportionment of congressional and legislative districts is determined by population. For instance, population statistics for Ohio show Cuyahoga County - the heaviest populated area in Ohio - to be the primary loser in population during the 1980s. Between 1980 and 1986, Cuyahoga County's population decreased by 3.5 percent. On the other hand, Franklin County - the state capital - had a net gain of 4.4 percent. Actual figures for major
metropolitan areas within these two counties will highlight the situation better. In 1986, Cleveland's population was 535,830 compared to 566,030 for Columbus. (Source: *Statistical Abstracts Supplement, County, and City Data Book*, 1988, p. 393 on Ohio counties, and p. 690 on cities, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census).

Implications of these numbers are varied. For instance, compared to Cleveland, Columbus now stands to profit relatively more with respect to federal and state funding. Also, depending on how the new district lines are drawn, Columbus and vicinity are in a more favorable position to receive additional legislative and Congressional representation. Cleveland, on the other hand, faces the possibility of losing legislative and/or Congressional representation.

Additionally, according to 1988 Census data, 10 percent of the state's population is black American. Hispanics are a little over one percent. Other groups total less than one percent including the American Indian (native American), Eskimo, Aleutian, Asian and Pacific Islander. In sum, over 11 percent of Ohio's population is nonwhite. (Noteworthy: Census data are updated in Chapter VI).

The interesting point with these statistics lies within their relative potential. For instance, will the nonwhite group, specifically black American population, capitalize on
its size? More specifically, with respect to black political participation, these numbers indicate the likelihood of participation in elections of candidates and passage of issues by a relatively large and presumably active black electorate. These numbers are equally encouraging for the continued election of black candidates and/or 'favored' white candidates seeking office in areas where large numbers of black citizens reside, (i.e., Columbus, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton, Toledo, Akron, and Youngstown).

On the other hand, however, if the black population increases disproportionately to the rate and level of electoral activity among black people, then the impact of these numbers becomes negligible. Therefore, the question before a concerned and active black citizenry is one of the effective use of its size, (i.e., over 10%), to the state's population.

Of equal concern with population statistics is the level and degree of preparation of the workforce to assume jobs. More specifically, the economy in Ohio has changed considerably over recent years. Whereas, it used to be heavily industrial with steel mills, automobile and rubber manufacturing in the northeast, (i.e., Cleveland, Akron, Youngstown-Warren), the economy tends now to be more high-technological and professional service-oriented. Today
manufacturing involves skills more in the areas of high
technology and considerably less of the virtually obsolete
manually-operated assembly line. Today Ohioans are
primarily employed in wholesale, retail trade, finance, and
real estate (58%). Agriculture, forestry and fishing
constitute a little over one percent of the labor market
(Source: Statistical Abstract Supplement, County and City
Data Book, 1988, pp. 7, 8 and 14).

To elaborate, in Columbus, for example, if one is
relatively educated and possesses certain skills, employment
is attainable in government (i.e., federal, state, county,
and city), educational institutions (e.g., several colleges
and universities including The Ohio State University and
technical and trade schools), research facilities (e.g.,
Ross Laboratories, Battelle), retail (e.g., The Limited,
Lazarus, Jacobson's, Marshall Fields, Lerner, and numerous
fast food chains), insurance (e.g., Nationwide, Mutual of
Omaha, AllState), and real estate.

Consequently, the basic question before us is one of
whether Ohio's current population is prepared to enter into
the 2000s and beyond. If the answer is "marginally" or
"no," the subsequent concern is one of how to deal with the
situation. These then, are some of the concerns facing Ohio
lawmakers today, concerns that are unquestionably more
drastic than during the early years of BEDO.
At this time we turn our attention to various perceptions about the black elected Democrats' initiation into the 1967-1968 Ohio General Assembly, and the years shortly thereafter. To a large extent the reader is already aware of the social context in America and Ohio during this time. Racial tensions were fairly high and rioting and political protest were prevalent. Democrat Lyndon B. Johnson was President and the country was in the midst of an undeclared war in Vietnam.

Most important is the fact that America was still a largely racially segregated society, and this was the case from neighborhood and housing patterns to school districts and legislative bodies, including state legislatures. Ohio was preparing for the inauguration of its largest ever delegation of black state elected officials. What was it like for these men to serve in the Ohio General Assembly? What was it like to effect change in laws affecting their lives and others like themselves? What was it like for their white colleagues? More important, has anything changed and, if so, to what extent?
BEDO's Reception into the Ohio General Assembly: Some Perceptions

Information collected from the organization's charter and senior members indicates 'the early years are reminiscent of minority-party status coupled with racial overtones'; while information gathered from junior and freshmen members rarely, if at all, indicates awareness of minority-party status or racial confrontations. On the other hand, however, information gathered from white legislators suggests they 'did not understand why their black colleagues behaved certain ways to effect change during the early years.' Finally, information gathered from at least one informant suggests that black legislators have yet to receive proper or due respect for their roles as effective legislators.

This discussion therefore provides varied points of view on the reception of black elected Democrats into the Ohio General Assembly. Although we are primarily interested in the early years, we include more recent years for further comparisons. On the whole, findings from data examined show undeniably that the presence and efforts of BEDO's charter and senior members provided for a much more favorable reception for junior and freshmen members of today.

Perhaps a few brief excerpts generated from our interviews with three of the charter members will help lead
into this discussion. Excerpts from interviews with Bowen, McLin, and James on some of their first experiences at the Statehouse are outlined below:

"Well, you know. We were all green. ... Carl was there. Carl Stokes. Carl teaches you and he normally teaches you on the things he wants to teach you" (McLin).

"Was gonna cure all the ills. ... learned that being a freshman and black was insignificant. Looked for obsolete bills and pulled those on horse and buggies. ... being from Cleveland's inner city, ... didn't know anything about the Amish. An 18-year old colleague briefed me better. That was my first lesson" (James).

"It was a new revelation. Being the largest contingent of blacks to ever serve in the Ohio General Assembly, we were berated by editors and press. ... found the legislature most antiquated" (Bowen).

These comments are fairly indicative of what one might expect to have been the case in 1967. Yet, when these same men were probed later in the interview, other and more graphic details were spelled out about their early experiences. We will cover those experiences momentarily.

Data compiled in Table 3.2 show the number of black elected officials varies only marginally from the 1967-1968 up to the 1981-1982 General Assembly and includes data on chamber and occupation. By the 1971-1972 sessions, BEDO consisted of all Democrats and has remained so to date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvin C. Johnson</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phile D. Hale</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl B. Stokes</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William F. Bowen</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David D. Albritton</td>
<td>'R'</td>
<td>Teacher/Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Morris Jackson</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. E. Bowen</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William F. Bowen</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 3.2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>'67-'68</th>
<th>'69-'70</th>
<th>'71-'72</th>
<th>'73-'74</th>
<th>'75-'76</th>
<th>'77-'78</th>
<th>'79-'80</th>
<th>'81-'82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas E. Hill</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Lee James</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. J. McLin</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Mallory</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey C. Jones</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry G. Smith</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate/Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ike Thompson</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thompson</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate/Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 3.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator</th>
<th>'67-'68</th>
<th>'69-'70</th>
<th>'71-'72</th>
<th>'73-'74</th>
<th>'75-'76</th>
<th>'77-'78</th>
<th>'79-'80</th>
<th>'81-'82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas M. Bell</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Rankin</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Brown</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto Beatty, Jr.</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Ray Miller</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen L. Rankin</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: William F. Bowen was appointed to fill the unexpired Senate term of Calvin Johnson, February 1970.

Source: Data were extracted from the *Official Roster of the Ohio Secretary of State* and the *Journals of the House and Senate* for each General Assembly. It is important to note neither of those sources records membership by race or sex, therefore, this investigator cross-referenced names of individuals believed to be black, for example, against data for each year under examination. Confirmation on race and sex of legislator were made during personal interviews. Any errors and omissions are the responsibility of this investigator.
We turn now to the charter and senior members' recall on what it was like in the Ohio General Assembly during the early years. To begin, when asked "how white legislators reacted to black legislators in the early years and whether that treatment has changed," McLin recalled,

"... we were a joke to them. And now, they question BEDO if they (have) an important piece of legislation. ... how will BEDO vote on this? They're going to get, for instance, the leadership of the House, when Vern Riffe leaves, will be determined by BEDO. And so we have come from a token kind of organization to an effective organization that they respect."

Bowen recalled that there were "no black staff and no black media, nor any (black) lobbyists." He said that, "back then, then Representative Vern Riffe involved himself in our elections in Cincinnati. My two years and two months in the House Democratic Caucus were good."

Later in February 1970, Bowen was appointed to fill the vacancy of Senator Calvin Johnson. Early in his Senate tenure Bowen recalls the leadership under Democrat Minority Leader Anthony Calabrese of Cleveland was best described as "benign neglect, ... didn't see me." He says there was a "good old white boy system. Over the years," however, "attitudes changed by the person. Then Oliver Ocasek was in. Ocasek placed me on the State Controlling Board in 1976 and I've served since that time."
On the other hand, Bowen and current Majority Leader Mallory do not recall any 'welcome and introduction to legislative protocol and procedures' back then. Both remember that committee work was "strained." They recall that "freshmen members were virtually on their own."

Troy Lee James recalls that,

"Everybody observes you very closely and makes a determination soon whether you're going to be a hot-shot, ... on the scene making the scenes. Just what are you going to be? A sensible legislator? Are you going to get along with them? ... everybody is treated with suspicion cause they want to know what you are going to be like. It's the same today."

James also recalls that "friendship ties developed slowly." Yet, contrary to the other charter members, James recalls "freshmen classes in orientation and protocol. Also," he says, "I got along well in committees back then."

Overall, except for some of the experiences of James, the charter members share similar memories of this period. It is possible that ones' recall of specific instances over 20 years ago is not as clear as 10 years ago or one year ago, therefore, a partial explanation for which ever situation is more accurate. It is also quite possible that James' personality is remarkably different than the personalities of his colleagues, therefore, the different recall of receptions and early interactions.
Additionally, it is important to mention that prior to the 1966 elections, some of these men were already familiar with each other, while others awaited arrival to the Statehouse to meet their new colleagues. Bowen, Mallory and James Rankin, all of Cincinnati, were particularly close friends. Rankin died in office in 1978 and was replaced by his wife Helen, who has served to this day. Bowen and McLin were also friends prior to the 1966 elections; civil rights activity brought these two men together. The Cleveland representatives were all fairly friendly prior to coming to Columbus and Casey Jones of Toledo got acquainted with the other black legislators upon arrival to the Statehouse. Most important is that all of the black legislators claim a special bond because of BEDO. "It was this bond," argues the charter and senior members, "that carried us through those early years."

In an effort to provide a larger picture of how attitudes on initiation into the Ohio General Assembly have change, we provide brief recollections of some of the senior, junior, and freshmen members of the organization below:
"The first year, nobody paid me any attention at all, new kid on the block. Nobody knew me. Got to go back to right before I was elected though. Black Elected Officials came up to (Toledo) to interview me and helped me to win my election. Gave me an electoral college vote and told me to use it for name recognition in getting elected. But the ironic thing about that was the state of Ohio was Republican so I never got to use that vote" (Representative Casey Jones of Toledo; Inaugurated in the 1969-1970 General Assembly).

"Since I've been in the legislature, most of the guys treated me alright. There are a few however, you find everywhere. I remember 'Welcome and Introductions to Legislative Protocol and Procedures' and I was treated fairly by my white colleagues, as long as it was a bill or resolution where you didn't have to draw a line between black and white" (Representative Ike Thompson of Cleveland; Inaugurated in the 1971-1972 General Assembly).

"Confusing. A lot was going on. There was no training or orientation. You just take your seat and start pushing buttons. Start voting. I had some familiarity because it's very similar to the council process. The mechanics of legislative management were a lot different from Akron's (city council). And to get acclimated with that and not show yourself being stupid or too many missteps, your first impression is your last impression... You have to be very careful, cautious. Successful in buying time to learn the ropes" (Representative Vernon Sykes of Akron; Inaugurated in the 1983-1984 General Assembly).

"A real shock to deal with so many diverse issues, not just those I was interested in but having to learn about a lot of different issues that my background experience really didn't fit. The second point was to deal with leadership issues, ... priorities. After my first year, when I settled down and I think ... right now, I'm comfortable with the job" (Representative Tom Roberts of Dayton; Inaugurated in the 1987-1988 General Assembly).
"Everybody was waiting with open arms. Here again, in that I had been involved in the political process for 25 to 30 years in helping others, ... many of the people that are down here and were here when I got here. I had helped them get here. So, unlike the average legislator that walks in totally new, not knowing anyone, not knowing what to expect, I knew (pause) an example, Patrick Sweeney. He has been my friend a long time. Charlie Butts used to be my Senator, ... so I had friends down here. ... So I came down here knowing I had friends. And Patrick Sweeney was standing at the door waiting on me. He, Ike Thompson and Troy Lee James ... had paved the way" (Representative Vermel Whalen of Cleveland; Inaugurated 1987-1988 General Assembly).

"Received very well. My father had laid ground work of respect. It was mine to hold it, lose it or build on it. Accepted very nicely by my white colleagues. The thing about that is I went to an all-white college. A lot of things when you consider white folks being prejudice, it's really not. It's white folks being white folks, just like black folks being black folks. And with that experience, I was able not to have a chip on my shoulder. Like Representative Vern Sykes is one that if I ask him a question about something that happens on the floor, he'll say, 'go ask them, go ask them so you'll know and get in a habit of doing that.' And when you do they appreciate it. ... I guess the thing about being in public office is I like my privacy and being here is the totally opposite of the way I used to operate. Sometimes I call it a strain on my personality because I'm very good on one-on-one and small groups but I've got to really psych myself up to crowds and large gatherings, such as political receptions. I just can't be talking to people just to talk" [Referenced the January 1990 reception for newly appointed Senator Jeff Johnson who replaced Mike White of Cleveland] (Representative Rhine McLin of Dayton; Appointed to fill vacancy of her father, C.J. McLin and Inaugurated 1989-1990 General Assembly).
Although there were traces of racial overtones and partisanship among the charter and senior members of the organization, by the time junior and freshmen members arrived their experiences were more indicative of all new legislators. Their concerns were less racially or partisan-oriented and more, "Will I fit," "Will I fulfill the responsibilities of this job," or in the case of Rhine McLin, "Will I hold on to the respect my father garnered while occupying this office?"

Other perspectives on the early years are provided by some of the white legislators. We interviewed House Speaker Pro Tempore Barney Quilter and Senate leader Ted Gray. Each of these men has different and interesting memories of the early years.

Barney Quilter

According to Speaker Pro Tempore Quilter, "I'm close to all the members of BEDO through legislation and so forth. But naturally I hold a high esteem and great friendship toward those with whom I came in with. (pauses)... There are very few left. [Quilter was inaugurated with the Class of '67. He's a Democrat from Toledo]. That's the reason I would have been there if I had to walk to "CJ"'s funeral because out of respect that I had for the man. ... "CJ" didn't care for me much in the early years but as the years went by and he became Chairman of House State Government Committee, we became closer."
Quilter says he cannot recall doing anything to offend "CJ" but that "CJ" "just did not care for me much in the beginning."

In addition, Quilter says he is "particularly close to Casey Jones, also of Toledo." For years the two drove back and forth together to the Statehouse "and did a lot of talking on issues, such as prison reform and state contracting, where minority businesses were virtually excluded." Quilter summarizes that private time with Jones gave him more insight and understanding of the concerns often raised by BEDO.

Interestingly, Quilter remembers the lone black Republican in the House, David Albritton, and says, "he did nothing for black people in his position," (i.e., majority-party caucus). He also remembers, "back then, black or white, Democrats couldn't even get a congratulatory resolution passed."

In addition, Quilter recalls "tactics used by House leadership, particularly if they didn't want certain members' names recorded for certain legislation, such as on resolutions and amendments. For example," he says, "(Republican) Speaker Charles Kurfess would call for voice votes. ... Consequently, all of BEDO's early efforts were ineffective because of their position in the minority party." He continues, "this situation could have been
helped by the press who refused to cover Democratic activity inclusive of BEDO's efforts."

Another perspective is provided by Republican Dean of the Ohio Senate, Ted Gray of Upper Arlington.

Ted Gray

Senator Gray has represented six different senate districts since 1951. Today, his district includes parts of Franklin, Morrow and Union Counties. The son of a former state senator, at age 23 Ted Gray was also the youngest person to ever be elected to the Ohio Senate. His record of service includes: Operator of Gray Insurance Agency; Chairman, Senate Republican Policy Committee; President Pro Tem and Majority Leader in the Ohio Senate, 1965-1975; and, Member, National Council of State Legislators Executive Committee.

In 1965, at age 37 Gray was the youngest leader elected in the history of the Ohio Senate, became both President Pro Tem and Majority Leader. At the time partisan composition was 16:16, Rhodes was Governor and Lieutenant Governor John W. Brown, also Republican, presided over the Senate. Therefore, in the event of a tie vote in the Senate, Lieutenant Governor Brown cast the deciding vote, presumably predisposed to his party. Therefore, it is also safe to
assume that Senator Gray's recollection of these years is probably most favorable.

Noteworthy also is the fact that during this time, application of Baker v. Carr (1962) was being challenged in Ohio District Court. Senator Gray and his colleagues in the Ohio General Assembly were under court order to submit a reapportionment plan. Several plans were presented and failed. Later, according to Gray, he and Minority Leader Frank King were instrumental in setting up the current constitutional amendment which was placed on the ballot and passed. In 1967 Gray helped establish the Legislative Reapportionment Committee. As mentioned in Chapter I, the political party which controls state government and the General Assembly determines the reapportionment plan for the subsequent decade. Interestingly, however, although certain predominantly Democratic districts were adversely affected by the reapportionment plan, this same plan provided electoral advantages for black Democratic candidates. This is particularly true of black Democrats seeking office representing large urban areas in the state. This point is substantiated also by BEDO members McLin, Bowen, James, Jones, Thompson, and Mallory.

Returning to Senator Gray's other recollections of the early years, we asked "what the general atmosphere or mood was like with the advent of black members in the
legislature?" Gray says, "once you're a member, you're a member." Elaborating, he recalls that,

"Blacks were swept up with Selma, Alabama and (other) events. Blacks became more vociferous and they had causes within their groups. When they got down to 'one-man one-vote', that was the rhetoric. The feeling was there, ...but frankly, there was probably more conviviality then than there has been lately. For example, they isolate themselves on the issues, such as housing issues we've got now. Well, that's difficult to say because society has changed in terms of issues. But in the beginning stages, because they were responding to their constituencies, ... it became not as much 'you're part of the team'. C.J. (McLin) early on understood you had to have 'positions' but he also understood that working with leadership was important on other issues in the House. In the Senate, you didn't form those cliques. For example, Bowen and Jackson, you never saw them get together on something. They really philosophically had different views. So and it's too small a group (in the Senate) to form (cliques). In the House C.J. was a master at merchandising those views."

In addition, Gray recalls when he first entered the General Assembly that,

" ... the dichotomy was religion, Catholic and Protestant. The Catholic Church was struggling with educational programs, competing with public schools, having problems getting people to become priests and nuns, ... competing for dollars. There was a schism so to speak. The Catholics were a minority like the blacks in certain areas. Now that wasn't in every area but in some. Then when John Kennedy came in (U.S. President), he met the issue head-on and now that's not an issue. Mayor Dinkins and Governor Wilder ... also with women. Women are more discerning. They don't just rally around a woman because she's a woman. It's kind of different with the Catholics and blacks. They tend to be groups," said Gray.
Yet, the perspective rendered by a journalist offers another angle to BEDO's reception into the General Assembly.

Mary Ann Sharkey

In 1978 an energetic white female reporter, formerly with the Dayton Journal Herald, was assigned to cover the Statehouse. Mary Ann Sharkey is probably best known for her graphic and insightful stories on Statehouse activity, particularly her stories on racism in the state Correction's System.

Sharkey remembers being acquainted with all members of BEDO back then, (i.e., Statehouse). "For years," she says, "McLin was BEDO. He was politically astute, a back room politician." Sharkey says she sought McLin whenever she really wanted to know something.

On the subject of press coverage of BEDO, Sharkey does not recall BEDO having many press conferences. When conferences were held, spokesmen were usually Bowen and McLin.

More important, however, Sharkey remembers that BEDO got very little press coverage. She attributes this to what she calls "an attitude period." She contends the thinking then was "we've gotten past the Civil Rights Era and people forgot. This is old hat, boring and who cares."
Sharkey remembers it was interesting "being the only white person at BEDO's conventions," but (she) wanted the information and contacts, so I kept going"; adding, "I gained a lot of information, (e.g., BEDO's legislative agenda, which campaigns they'd support, ...) and good contacts."

To illustrate what the situation was like at the end of this period, Sharkey elaborates on the case of former Corrections Director George Denton. She recalls interviewing Denton on a situation that occurred at the Lucasville Prison. Lucasville is located near Cincinnati. At the time the prison had 60 percent black population and less than one percent black staff. She remembers, emphatically referring to the prison as "the last plantation," including documentation of guards wearing white sheets and black staff having their car tires slashed (by the white guards). Upon confronting Denton about these matters, Sharkey says the director remarked, "I don't have black employees because they don't have the habit of coming to work on time."

At the time BEDO was heavily involved investigating working conditions at Lucasville. McLin was chairman of the Legislative Oversight Committee on Corrections. BEDO issued a statement "demanding Denton's resignation." According to Sharkey, this all occurred during Rhodes lame-duck session
(1978-1980) and nothing was done.

Later on, however, according to Sharkey, Denton went to California to interview for a similar position. McLin followed the situation closely and then went to California. At Denton's confirmation hearing, McLin testified opposing his appointment as Director to the California Corrections Agency. Denton did not receive the appointment.

Clearly Sharkey was impressed with BEDO, particularly McLin. For a journalist, however, it aided her career tremendously to be one of the few, if not only, to devote so much attention to the organization. For the organization, on the other hand, this type of coverage aided its recognition considerably as an effective and formidable political group.

In 1983 Sharkey joined the Cleveland Plain Dealer as Columbus Bureau Chief. By 1988 she was promoted to Editorial Page Director working out of the paper's headquarters in Cleveland. In her current position Sharkey continues to cover BEDO, primarily the Cleveland members.

In sum, the charter members of the organization were relatively active during the early years, and this was in spite of relatively unfavorable conditions. As some of the previous discussion shows, although their white colleagues disagreed with some of their tactics, they grew to respect the black legislators.
In the final section of this chapter, we examine two different strategies employed by BEDO to effect change in the legislature during the early years. One strategy deals with attempts to wield influence during deliberations on the Appropriations Bill in 1975. The other strategy deals with deliberations on the Minority Enterprise Set Aside (Act 584) in 1980. Both cases show BEDO forming alliances.

Coalition Building in the Early Years

In this part of our discussion we examine two cases which demonstrate different strategies employed by BEDO to effect change during the early years. In so doing we review opinions of some of the legislators and an informant, and we review documents, such as House and Senate Journals, newspapers, et cetera, all of which help enlighten the reader on the way in which the members of BEDO learned how to participate in the legislative process during the early years.

We label description of the first case, confrontational politics primarily because of the decision on the part of BEDO to engage in what might best be called protest politics. We label description of the the second case, coalition politics because BEDO demonstrated effective coalescing tactics within the rules-of-the-game of the Ohio General Assembly.
The 1975 Appropriations Bill, a case in confrontational politics

In the latter part of 1975, Democrat John J. Gilligan was Governor, Republican Lieutenant Governor John Brown was President of the Senate, and Democrat A.G. Lancione was Speaker of the House. Democrats were in the majority in the Ohio House. Refer back to Table 3.1 on statewide office-holders and partisan composition of the Ohio General Assembly. To provide more details about this situation, we refer to comments by current Speaker Pro Tempore Quilter. According to Quilter,

"The House Democratic Caucus was stunned because the budget bill had gone the course and was ready for floor vote ... (we) headed to the floor and lost the floor vote and BEDO was still absent. [Democrats had a 59:40 ratio over Republicans. There were nine black members in the House. So, apparently all Democrats were either not present nor supportive of the bill]. Former Speaker Chuck Kurfess approached Speaker Lancione for reconsideration of the bill but the caucus didn't want it. Waited until next day and reconsideration of the bill occurred with BEDO present and it (the bill) passed."

In addition, Quilter argues, "that was wrong. They (BEDO) should never have done that. They should have come to the caucus and aired it. White Democrats resented that but as a result of that we became a very close-knit caucus. ["This was the second half of the Gilligan Administration, around 1975."] At this point it is noteworthy that the
incident occurred so long ago that key legislators interviewed in this research were seemingly confused about the exact session in which the walk-out occurred. We checked the journals for legislative hearings and voting on House Bill 155 and found no evidence to substantiate any of the comments presented herein. On the other hand, however, given the way in which leadership coups occur inside the legislature, it is highly likely that all were correct in their recall of the incident. If so, this means that the apparent leadership coup of Riffe over Lancione took place during the disputed time period. It is also quite plausible that this is one of those incidents in which the rules-of-the-game imply that 'there is no public recording about the reason for the the coup.' Whenever it happened, then Speaker Pro Tempore Vern Riffe rallied enough votes within the House Democrat Caucus to oust Speaker Lancione. In fact, all other data collected in this research indicate that there is no recollection or disclosure on the part of any of the legislators, Republican or Democrat, black or white about the coup.

Either way, it is also noteworthy that the backgrounds of the black members of the House definitely influenced their chosen strategy. Almost all the charter and senior members were experienced in protest politics from their respective neighborhoods. Boycotts, sit-ins, walk-outs, et
cetera were common tactics employed by civil rights activists at the time. Obviously these men utilized strategies that were known to work for them, therefore the boycott during the House vote on HB155.

McLin's recollection of this case is as follows:

"I guess our strongest thing was when we had the budget and we weren't satisfied. ... and they put the budget on the floor and we would not come out and vote. So they couldn't vote on the budget and we stayed in our caucus and never came out so they had to adjourn the meeting. They needed so many votes cause we made the difference of the Democratic votes to get the budget passed! So they couldn't act on the budget at that time. They sent messages to us and I guess the most beautiful part of it was that we (BEDO) made a pact that nobody is to say why we did it. We have 'no comment' on it. Consequently, we had them to tell us more things they were doing to us than we ever dreamed. We got more information and we never, never told them why we did it, to the newspaper, not to anybody."

Presumably BEDO boycotted the budget bill to demonstrate its strength as a caucus and to 'voice' concern on certain items in the budget to House leadership. Prevalent issues of concern to the organization were allocations to Central State University and general relief subsidies to welfare recipients. Remarks by Troy Lee James indicate the overall posture of the organization, "a bill that passes with no money is only good advice." He added, "because of our experiences, backgrounds, that is, ... we couldn't abandon our original ideas. This helps us to negotiate."
It was also at this time that McLin and current House Speaker Vern Riffe became fairly close. Speaker Lancione served one term, later overthrown by a coalition in support of Riffe. BEDO was a significant faction in the Riffe coalition. The Riffe coalition, however, is also a subject that none of the legislators will divulge. Clearly BEDO was at the right time and place to assert its influence, thereby becoming a viable force within the Ohio House to date.

Other observations about BEDO and the walk-out are provided by Representative Mike Stinziano of Columbus.

Mike Stinziano

Eighteen-year veteran legislator Mike Stinziano prefaxes his remarks about BEDO in the following way,

"Black Elected Democrats of Ohio is a statewide organization of all black elected Democrats as far as I know. You're just dealing with the so-called black caucus. ... they told you that we only have two caucuses here in the House, the Democratic Caucus and the Republican Caucus, ... so you're talking about my colleagues who are members of BEDO. ... So if you talk to our Speaker I'm sure you'd know that there are only two caucuses. And, we'll get on to that. I'm sure you've heard about the famous BEDO walk-out on the budget. That's really my first recollection of BEDO, as an organization or as a black caucus. At that time we told "CJ" that we only have two caucuses, the Democratic Caucus and the Republican Caucus. And ah, you know what happened. "CJ" took the troops and ... took a walk and it didn't work so." [Talk about that
please]. "I don't really remember that much about it.

It was a long time ago number one. Number two, it's really my first recollection of BEDO as an organization. I don't remember. ... I wasn't on the (House) Finance Committee at the time. I remember and I think it was that year that Jimmy Rankin cried in caucus. I think it was that year. He was so upset. He was upset because ... he had worked very hard. He was Chairman of the Human Resources (Welfare) section of the Finance Committee, to establish a level of funding for human services significantly higher than what we were in a position to fund. It may have been a different time. I don't know but it's connected in my mind as the same time. Frankly I've read more about it since it happened than I remember it happening at the time."

Stinziano notes that, "CJ" had a close relationship with Riffe. "CJ" supported the Speaker with the exception of the walk-out and the Speaker supported "CJ".

The other case demonstrating coalition building by members of BEDO deals with passage of the Minority Enterprise Set Aside (Act 584).

The Minority Enterprise Set Aside (Act 584), a case in coalition politics

There are a couple interesting features about this case, one deals with the bill's sponsor, a white Democrat House member from Dayton; former Representative Edward Orlett sponsored Act 584. Orlett's initial election campaign was supported by BEDO, McLin in particular, to run against black Republican David Albritton in the 1972 elections, the
results of which effectively ended 12 years of tenure in the Ohio House for Albritton. Also noteworthy is that as early as 1972, black legislators were not so close-minded as to overlook effective use and possible alliances with their white colleagues. Orlett proved to be more than just amicable to BEDO. He was a constant supporter.

The scenario for adopting strategy for passage of the Set Aside involved Orlett drafting legislation and introducing House Bill 584 on the House side. This was the second session of the 1979-1980 General Assembly. His bill called for a comprehensive loan and bond package for minority contractors. Minority contractors were found to have a history of difficulty obtaining financing and bonding in order to qualify for bidding on state government construction projects.

At the time minority contractors were found to be virtually excluded from the state contracting process. The legislative history on House Bill 618 (1977) outlines these data.

Orlett worked to move HB584 through the appropriate committees in the House and eventually got it placed on the calendar for a floor vote. House Bill 584 passed the Ohio House, June 25, 1980.
Meanwhile on the Senate side, Bowen, then Chairman of the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee, drafted legislation for the 'set aside' in Senate Bill 131. A set aside is the process of setting aside certain contracts or portions of contracts to be bid on by minority enterprises (MBEs) only. Given the history of the state contracting process, there was not much disagreement with the set aside, rather the amount of the set aside, (i.e., 15% of all goods and services contracts and 7-10% of all construction contracts).

A 1978 Task Force Report by then Attorney General William J. Brown revealed statistics on minority business involvement in state contracting, covering the period 1957-1979. Briefly, it was found that MBEs received less than two percent of $2.11 billion dollars in contract awards by the state of Ohio. Additionally, of $130 million dollars in state expenditures in the 1977-1979 biennium, identifiable MBEs received less than $1 million dollars in contracts.

The point in this section is to show the overall strategy. With Democrats in the majority in the Senate (18:15 ratio over Republicans), M. Morris Jackson on the Rules Committee and Bowen chairing Commerce and Labor Committee, Bowen took advantage of the situation to move Senate Bill 131 through the Senate.
In the Spring 1980, Senate Bill 131 was introduced and received by Senate Commerce and Labor Committee. The first hearing was held on April 15, 1980, with subsequent hearings in September. Throughout the summer and fall of 1980, BEDO, along with Orlett, held receptions and informal hearings among black entrepreneurs, black business and professional associations (e.g., lawyers, accountants, doctors, nurses, architects, engineers, construction contractors, ...); solicited updated analyses on contracts awarded from the Ohio Department of Administrative Services and fiscal impact statements from the Legislative Budget Office; solicited groups, (e.g., NAACP, Urban Leagues, Ohio Council of Churches, labor unions, federal administrators, et cetera), to serve as proponents before committee hearings; engineered a letter-writing and telephone-calling campaign; secured opinions from Democrat Attorney General Brown, et cetera; eventually winning enough recognition and public sentiment to lead to legislative activity on the bills.

In the interim a problem arose when Bowen did not have all 18 Senate Democratic votes. (At the time of this particular case, this investigator was legislative aide to Senator Bowen and recalls some of the scenes at the Statehouse quite vividly. For example, there were some legislators supportive of the bills but because their constituencies were considered conservative and
predominantly Republican, they could not vote for the bill(s) without adverse effects to their upcoming 1980 reelection campaigns). Therefore, Bowen, Orlett, and BEDO caucused and decided that "whichever bill passed over to the other house first would be the one to be amended with full substitution of the other bill." Orlett's bill (House Bill 584) moved first. On September 9, 1980 the substitute version of the bill (i.e., Amended Substitute House Bill 584) was passed out of Senate Commerce and Labor Committee.

Shortly thereafter in the November 1980 elections, Senate Democrats lost the majority. The bill was referred to Senate Rules Committee on November 19 and referred for floor vote on November 20, 1980.

The interesting point in this case is that no one really knew where the supporting votes would come from, and all were caught off-guard at some of the legislators who eventually supported the bill. Democrats and Republicans who earlier opposed the bill but who had grown upset over losing their reelection campaigns decided to support the bill. In addition, Governor Rhodes had previously committed to signing the bill, "if it passed the legislature."

On the day of the Senate floor vote the Statehouse was filled to capacity with black business people and supporters of the bill, as well as opponents. On November 24, 1980 Amended Substitute House Bill 584 passed the Ohio Senate
25:7 and won House concurrence on the next day, November 25, 1980 by a 68:24 majority vote. On December 17, 1980 Governor Rhodes signed Amended Substitute House Bill 584. Since the bill contained an emergency funding clause, the Governor's signature made it effective immediately.

BEDO maintains strong ties with lobbyists representing various groups supportive of Act 584. BEDO has acquired considerable respect from the Ohio Contractors Association, a predominantly white contractors' organization that opposed the bill then and which continues to challenge all set-aside legislation throughout the state. However, there are many legislative measures requiring the support of BEDO, such as the capital improvements bill. Consequently, when necessary, the Ohio Contractors tend to resolve most of their differences with BEDO in a way that is politically expedient.

In addition, BEDO proved that, as an informal racial political caucus, it could rally around a cause believed crucial to the betterment of black people, (i.e., equal protection and access to state contracting), and within the legislative process. By this time BEDO had members and allies strategically placed throughout the administrative system, (e.g., Burton Cooper, then with the Ohio Department of Administrative Services and later with the Department of Transportation, who helped research contract awards to
minority businesses). Also, Bowen chaired Senate Commerce and Labor Committee, as well as served on Senate Finance Committee and the Controlling Board which awards state contracts. Majority Leader Mallory in the House and Senate President Pro Tem M. Morris Jackson were instrumental in getting both versions of the bill referred for appropriate committee action. In statewide offices, Attorney General Brown and of course, Governor Rhodes were both predisposed to BEDO's agenda at the time. It should be mentioned, however, that Attorney General Brown was a candidate for Governor and was seeking the endorsement of BEDO.

Subsequently, these two cases were meant to show different strategies utilized by BEDO to effect change during the early years. The organization's actions with respect to the 1975 Appropriations Bill, though scorned by white colleagues, were effective. Later, with more experience, political savvy and allies, the organization showed it had "learned to play within the established rules-of-the-game through its actions on the set-aside legislation."

In Chapter IV we turn our attention even more specifically to show how the organization functions inside the Ohio General Assembly. That discussion will bring us up to the present. We examine the effects of caucus size on
strategy, committee assignments on strategy, committee chairmanships on strategy, and other features related to strategy.
CHAPTER IV


In this chapter we examine the impact of three major variables on legislative activity, more specifically, on strategies effecting change in the Ohio General Assembly. The three variables are caucus size, committee assignment and committee chairmanship. These three variables are referenced by the legislators interviewed in this research and are the subject of previous works, (e.g., Hammond et al. (1983), Bragg (1979), McGriggs (1977), Levy and Stoudinger (1976), and Colston (1972). For example, in their discussion about the effects of caucus success, Hammond et al. (1983) note three factors -- membership, leadership and flexibility. Most notably they report, "a major resource of an informal group is the size and cohesiveness of its membership. To be a viable political force, the involved membership must extend beyond the leadership" (p. 283). Although the authors are describing informal group activity in the U.S. Congress, their argument on the influence of group activity is relevant for our purposes. It is this
investigator's position that BEDO has the numbers, (i.e., caucus size), a relatively strong leadership, and is arguably flexible on issues relative to its agenda.

Therefore, in this chapter we examine more closely the influence of caucus size, committee assignment and committee chairmanship on legislative activity. Has the size of BEDO impacted legislative activity over the years? How and when? Does size alone effect change? We are also interested in the effects of committee assignment on strategy. What difference does committee assignment make? Does the size of a caucus have any relationship to committee assignment of its members? Either way, what difference have committee assignments made for BEDO?

In addition, we are interested in the effects of committee chairmanship on strategy. Has committee chairmanship impacted any particular interests of BEDO? How and to what extent? Is there any relationship between BEDO's size, members' committee assignments and/or members serving as committee chairs? What difference, if any, does any of this make with respect to effecting change in the Ohio General Assembly?

Finally, there are other factors presumably related to effecting change in the legislature, such as seniority and leadership. Here too, what difference do these factors make in determining legislative activity?
To some extent the reader is familiar with partial answers to some of these questions? On the other hand, however, we need to explore these interests in more detail. In this way it will be shown that there are very few simple responses or scenarios in determining the effects of any of these variables on caucus strategy. The primary reason for this, we contend, is called 'politics'.

There is, however, one instance in which numerical strength (i.e., caucus size), was found to be a strong indicator of legislative activity. This case took place on the federal level. It is found in Loomis (1981) wherein he examined the New Members Caucus (NMC) in the 94th Congress. The caucus consisted on 75 freshmen Democrats, all elected in the 1974 elections. According to Loomis, the Class of '75 entering the 94th Congress,

"... faced an institution that was more open to influence by freshmen than at any time in this century. The new members had one great asset - numbers (75) - and one substantial need - information" (Loomis, 1981, p. 213).

The obvious difference between the freshmen term of the 94th NMC and BEDO's freshmen term back in 1967 was not solely caucus size. It was also majority-party control in the respective chambers. In the 107th Ohio General Assembly, for instance, Democrats did not control the Ohio House; whereas, in the 94th U.S. Congress Democrats were in
control in the House of Representatives. Therefore, 75 new members in the Democrat-controlled federal House amounted to comparatively more influence than 10 black Democrats (of whom nine were freshmen) in an overwhelmingly Republican-controlled Ohio House.

Elaborating on this point, we refer to another excerpt from Loomis highlighting the case of the 94th NMC:

"When we acted together it's made a difference. Take the chairmanship thing. We first sent a letter to each chairman asking that they come to one of our meetings and talk a little bit about their committee. To a person, we got back polite notes saying no—so, we then sent a second letter saying we were going to vote en masse against any chairman who didn't come. They all came. Even Hebert (from Louisiana), who showed up the day before the Super Bowl in New Orleans" (Loomis, 1981, pp. 213-214).

The point is size made an obvious difference for the behavior of the NMC at the start of its freshman term. Generally speaking, however, it is not often the case that an affiliate caucus, (i.e., the NMC), threatens the respective parent-party caucus, (e.g., the House Democratic Caucus or Wednesday Study Group). On the other hand, however, in the early years the NMC, similar to BEDO in the 1975 Appropriations Bill case, resorted to extreme strategy to obtain "responsiveness" from its parent political body inside the U.S. Congress.
Interestingly, however, unlike the NMC, over time BEDO acquired relatively more influence as an informal group in the Ohio General Assembly. According to Loomis, as the new members in the NMC began "acquiring benefits including subcommittee chairs and exclusive committee assignments, the caucus lost much of its importance to individual members" (p. 213). For BEDO, the opposite has occurred. The more benefits the membership obtains, the more connected members have remained to the caucus.

Consequently, in order to address the interests raised in this chapter, we examine data on Ohio House and Senate membership as related to BEDO's ability to function in the legislature from the 1967-1968 to the 1989-1990 Ohio General Assembly. To explore overall effectiveness of the black caucus as a 'bloc vote', we examine roll call data on legislation considered important to the caucus' legislative agenda, such as appropriations bills, the Martin Luther King Holiday bill, and South African divestiture bills. The reasoning here is this: if a caucus does not vote as a bloc on issues believed to be of interest to its own agenda, it is most probably not supportive as a 'bloc' on other issues.

With respect to the impact of committee assignment on strategy, we examine data on the black legislators' roles in certain committees, such as the House Finance and Appropriations Committee, the House Transportation Committee
and the House Human Resources Committee. Although not considered a standing committee, the State Controlling Board is also being considered in this discussion. Earlier it was mentioned that the Controlling Board has membership from both chambers and that this board has become one of the most significant in the Ohio General Assembly. This is primarily because of its authority to award or deny state funds and contracts authorized in appropriations and capital improvements bills. Clearly one can safely assume the position of the black caucus can be strengthened through membership on this board.

Additionally, in order to determine effectiveness of the black legislators' roles as committee chairs, we examine data generated from interviews, as well as certain legislation acted on in their respective committees.

Other factors believed to be related to the caucus' overall effectiveness include seniority and leadership. In this part of the discussion we examine data generated from interviews about the roles of certain members, particularly charter and senior members. In this way, we see how, if at all, seniority and leadership impact caucus effectiveness.

In sum, information presented in this chapter clearly shows the overall effectiveness of BEDO's legislative activity in the Ohio General Assembly. Later in Chapter VI comparisons are made among BEDO, the Illinois, and the
Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses, respectively. For now, however, our concern is exclusively with determining the effectiveness of BEDO in the Ohio General Assembly. We turn now to an examination of data on the influence of caucus size on strategies pursued by BEDO.

**Effects of Caucus Size on Strategy**

In order to investigate our interest on the influence of caucus size on strategy in the Ohio General Assembly, we compiled data from the Ohio Secretary of State's *Official Roster on Federal, State, County Offices and Departmental Information for the 1967-1968 General Assembly up to the 1989-1990 General Assembly*. See Table 4.1 on Black Elected Officials in the Ohio General Assembly for this period. Overall, data compiled and analyzed show the number of black elected officials has increased. Although the rate of the increase is minimal, (i.e., from 10 to 13), the presence and number of black Democrats in the Ohio House is the significant point in this discussion.

For example, when the Class of '67 began its freshman term black legislators totaled 12. There were nine newly elected black Democrats out of 99 members in the House; Carl Stokes was beginning his third term and brought the number to 10. David Albritton, a black Republican member in the House, was in his fourth term.
Table 4.1  A Comparison of Black Elected Officials in the House and Senate, and in the Republican & Democratic Caucuses, 1967-1968 to the 1989-1990 General Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Assembly</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Black % of Total House</th>
<th>Black % House Dem. Cauc.</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>#/% Black</th>
<th>Total GA</th>
<th>Total # BEDO</th>
<th>% Total BEDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1967-1968)</td>
<td>62R:37D</td>
<td>1R; 8D= 9 (9%)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23R:10D</td>
<td>1R; 2D=3 (3%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1969-1970)</td>
<td>64R:35D</td>
<td>1R; 8D= 9 (9%)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21R:12D</td>
<td>1R; 2D=3 (3%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1971-1972)</td>
<td>54R:45D</td>
<td>1R; 9D=10 (10%)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20R:13D</td>
<td>1R; 2D=3 (3%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1973-1974)</td>
<td>58D:41R</td>
<td>9D (9%)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17R:16D</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1975-1976)</td>
<td>59D:40R</td>
<td>9D (9%)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21D:12R</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1977-1978)</td>
<td>62D:37R</td>
<td>10D (10%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21D:12R</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1979-1980)</td>
<td>62D:37R</td>
<td>10D (10%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18D:15R</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1981-1982)</td>
<td>56D:43R</td>
<td>10D (10%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18R:15D</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1983-1984)</td>
<td>62D:37R</td>
<td>10D (10%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17D:16R</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1985-1986)</td>
<td>59D:40R</td>
<td>10D (10%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18R:15D</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1987-1988)</td>
<td>60D:39R</td>
<td>11D (11%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18R:15D</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1989-1990)</td>
<td>59D:40R</td>
<td>11D (11%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19R:14D</td>
<td>2D = (6%)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 'GA' refers to General Assembly, 'R' means Republican, and 'D' means Democrat.

Source: These data were extracted from the Ohio Secretary of State Official Rosters for the period covering the 1967-1968 up to the 1989-1990 General Assembly. Data on race were obtained from personal interviews and compiled by this investigator.
Additionally, there were three black members in the Senate, of whom one, John W.E. Bowen, was a Republican. Two others were Democrats M. Morris Jackson and Calvin Johnson. In all there were 12 black members in the Ohio General Assembly, of whom 10 were Democrats. Consequently, in 1967 black elected Democrats constituted seven percent of the General Assembly.

It is therefore readily observed that the majority of black members serve in the House, where the numbers range from eight in the 1967-1968 General Assembly to 11 in the 1989-1990 Ohio General Assembly.

It is also apparent that, since the 1973-1974 General Assembly all black members serving in the legislature have been Democrats. It was during the 1973-1974 General Assembly that Democrats gained control of the House with a 58:41 ratio to Republicans. Of that number nine were black members, then comprising nine percent of House membership and over 15 percent of the House Democratic Caucus.

Interesting data are seen in the freshman terms of BEDO's charter and senior members. It was during these terms, (i.e., 1967-1968, 1969-1970, and 1970-1971), that black Democrats comprised between 20 and 26 percent of the House Democratic Caucus. Ironically, however, those also were among the most devastating years of Democrat-minority status in the Ohio House of Representatives (at least for
the period under examination). Consequently, black Democrats in the House had considerable size and minimal seniority, but no committee chairs and no other notable leverage.

On the other hand, however, the organization's relative status in the House began at nine percent in the 1967-1968 General Assembly and increased marginally to over 11 percent in the 1989-1990 General Assembly. Given the size of the House Democratic Caucus, as well as the House on the whole, (i.e., 99 members), it is safe to argue that BEDO's size is indeed a recognizable factor with which to contend. By the 1989-1990 General Assembly, the relative status of black elected Democrat legislators was over 18 percent of the House Democratic Caucus. Consequently, size is both absolute and relative to his discussion.

Up to this point it has been assumed that black Democrats constitute a cohesive group, particularly in the House. One way to substantiate this assumption is through an examination of data extracted from common measures of legislative activity, such as patterns of voting. More specifically, we analyze the extent to which these members act on legislation believed to be of interest to black constituents. In the discussion before us we analyze data on patterns of voting among black Democratic members on at least three bills including: 1) the 1975 Appropriations
Bill, 2) the Martin Luther King Holiday Bill, and 3) several South African Divestiture bills. These types of legislation were chosen also because of their presence on BEDO's agenda and because they vary with respect to overall legislative support. Our interest therefore is with the degree to which BEDO supports its legislative agenda over time.

the 1975 appropriations bill (HB155)

Introduced in the 111th Ohio General Assembly in January 1975, this bill authorized general appropriations of $11 billion for the biennium (1976-1977) and was enacted on June 29, 1975. It is customary for the Chairman of the House Finance and Appropriations Committee, then Myrl Shoemaker, to sponsor this bill.

We are already familiar with the situation involving the walk-out by the black members. At this time, we are interested in their voting record. Were there enough Democrats voting in the affirmative to pass the bill without BEDO, (i.e., an absolute majority of 50/99)? The partisan composition was 59:40 favoring Democrats. Of the Democrats, 48, not counting BEDO, voted in the affirmative. With BEDO, the vote was 57. One Republican, Claire Ball, voted with the majority bringing the final vote to 58 in the affirmative; all other Republicans, 39, voted in the negative. Consequently, without BEDO the bill would have
failed to receive the required absolute majority.

Given that, was there an effort on the part of leadership to show unanimity in Democratic support for the bill? Consider also the possibility that the budget vote was a political ploy by BEDO to demonstrate its strength. Either way, the voting record during the third consideration of the bill shows the bill would not have passed without BEDO.

In an effort to uncover details about this case it was discovered that none of the legislators interviewed for this research would provide much more that the obvious details. Yet, we were able to determine that the walk-out occurred during deliberations on HB155, as is referenced somewhat in certain accounts by print media. In fact, the incident occurred on Tuesday, May 13, 1975 and it involved all the black House members. For example, the Columbus Citizen Journal's May 14, 1975 edition carried an article covering the House floor vote from which the following excerpts were mentioned:

"Democrats fought bitterly in a long caucus over adding more money to the welfare budget to hike grants, but closed ranks after deciding in private the state could not afford to spend any more in that area. Emotions over welfare funding reached such a pitch in the Democratic caucus, according to a leading Democrat, that tears were shed in frustration" (cover page, by William Merriman).
Another publication, the *Dayton Journal Herald*, stated,

"House Democrats, having beaten back a last-minute welfare revolt by their black membership - and ignoring in windy laments by Republicans - last night approved a $10.6 billion, two-year state budget. The vote was 58 to 39, virtually along party lines" (p. 8, by Hugh McDiarmid).

Interestingly, there was no mention of dissatisfaction among the black membership in the Columbus *Dispatch*. Most notable, however, there was very little evidence on the part of journalists to cover the incident.

Additionally, the newspaper morgue at the Ohio Historical Society only contained two editions of the *Columbus Call and Post*, the black newspaper, and they were for May 10 and May 31, 1975, neither of which referenced Statehouse news. It is also important to mention that the *Call and Post* Newspaper is not affiliated with the Statehouse press corps and the publication tends to rely on news releases forwarded from legislative staff.

In sum, there is an apparent rule-of-the-game pervasive throughout the legislature called 'deference for internal caucus differences', which supersedes all else, including leaks to media. What is most surprising about the incident is the length of time for which secrecy has been maintained. Yet, everybody seems to remember that the 'incident' indeed occurred.
the Martin Luther King holiday bill (SB18)

This bill also was introduced in the 111th Ohio General Assembly in January 1975. Senator Bowen was the sponsor. Senate Bill 18 makes the third Monday in January a legal holiday, to be known as Martin Luther King Day, and makes Martin Luther King Day a paid holiday for certain public employees. The bill was enacted August 1, 1975.

In 1975 Democrats controlled the Senate by a 21:12 ratio to Republicans. On January 9 Bowen introduced SB18 in the Senate. The bill was co-sponsored by 21 other senators, of whom four were Republican including: Oakley Collins, Max Dennis, Donald Lukens, and Michael Maloney. On February 19, SB18 received a floor vote and passed 24 to 5. There was bipartisan support for the bill in the Senate. On February 20th SB18 was received in the Ohio House, and on April 24 the bill passed with a 57:33 vote.

Interestingly, of 11 black elected Democrats in the Ohio General Assembly, all but one, Thomas M. Bell of Cleveland, added their names to the bill's title. Representative Bell did vote, however, in the affirmative for passage of the bill. In sum, the black members voted unanimously for SB18 and received some bipartisan support in both houses for eventual passage of the bill.
South African divestiture bills

Numerous bills have been drafted and introduced in both the Ohio House and Senate "prohibiting the investment of certain state funds in companies and corporations present or having a subsidiary present in the Republic of South Africa." For example, in 1985 four bills were introduced: SB57, HB22, HB103, and HB331. Of those bills, HB22-McLin passed the House by a 50:40 vote and was referred to the Senate where it died in committee.

In 1987 there were at least two bills on South African divestiture. All eleven black members in the House were co-sponsors. HB122-McLin passed the House, 55:44 and died in Senate committee. In the Senate, SB14-Bowen, died in committee.

The point in this discussion is that BEDO is aware that the Senate is its greatest obstacle for enactment of a divestiture bill. In the interim BEDO has made the determination that it will introduce bills on divestiture in both the House and Senate each session until passage occurs. This particular issue was mentioned as a major item in BEDO's agenda by members including Bowen and McLin, two key sponsors of the various bills.

This case therefore clearly shows where size of caucus makes a difference. BEDO is too small numerically to impact legislative activity on this type of bill. Until BEDO can
either recruit and elect additional members to the legislature, especially to the Ohio Senate, it must contend with the reality of its size on this particular agenda item.

In sum, the case involving the Appropriations Bill shows the size of the black caucus in the Ohio House to directly influence passage of that bill. Most important, however, and to answer the question about the influence of caucus size on strategy, plainly the case involving HB155 best illustrates the significance of bloc voting by BEDO. If only one of its members had broken rank and voted with the House Democratic Caucus, thereby giving it the required absolute majority, the bill would have passed. Yet, the organization proved its voting strength through the walk-out. On the other hand, however, size of caucus was not as significant in the case involving passage of the King Holiday bill. Contemporary circumstances were perhaps more directly related to passage of that bill, such as social activism. Additionally, circumstances surrounding passage of any bill on South African divestiture are more complicated than BEDO's size. Finally and most important, all three of these cases demonstrate the organization as a cohesive voting bloc within the Ohio General Assembly.

At this time it is important to mention that it is no minor coincidence when legislators of different parties either co-sponsor and/or support certain legislation. In
fact it is quite safe to assume in the case of Republican
members co-sponsoring the King Holiday bill, for instance,
there were some informal agreements extended by the bill's
sponsor (Bowen), who at the time chaired Senate
Transportation and Local Government Committee and served on
Senate Finance. Presumably, similar agreements were
extended by BEDO members on the House side, particularly
among those either chairing or sitting on influential
committees. To this end we see some overlap in this
discussion and the next one on effects of committee
assignments and chairmanships on strategy.

Effects of Committee Assignments and Chairmanships on
Strategy

Because the subjects of assignments and chairmanships
are so closely related, we have combined these two
discussions. In order to address the relationship of these
variables on strategy, we limit this discussion to a few
committees. One committee which almost all legislators
desire membership is House Finance and Appropriations, in
the Senate, it is called Senate Finance Committee. These
committees receive all legislation with appropriation
language, such as the biennial budget and capital
improvements bills. Anything that is state-owned and/or
-operated and state-appointed and regulated, is found in the
budget bill including: schools, colleges and universities, parks and lodges, funeral homes, aid to families with dependent children, arts and humanities, industrial commission, rehabilitation commission, lottery commission, personal income taxes, corporation taxes, pay raises for legislators, agency officials, judges, et cetera. Therefore, most legislators want a seat on their respective house finance committee in order to deal directly with constituency-related finance and appropriations interests.

In the early years leadership allegedly assumed "all black legislators wanted to be assigned to their respective house Health and Welfare Committees." The thinking was, 'activity on this committee would give the black members direct access and experience in preparing and following legislation believed to be of interest to black and poor Ohioans.' Information generated through interviews with black members in the Ohio General Assembly substantiates this line of reasoning. However, with time comes change and the interests of the caucus have grown to include other areas.

Today black members are found on most committees in the Ohio House. It is, however, their presence on Finance, Human Resources, Education and Retirement, State Government and Transportation Committees that tends to relate to most of the discussion in this dissertation. Additionally,
perceptions of their colleagues about their roles in committee are also relevant. Put another way, an organization can have members strategically placed on a multitude of committees but without the support of leadership and ones' colleagues in committees, committee assignments can become inconsequential.

Earlier in this dissertation it was reported from 1967 up to 1973 Republicans controlled the House and from 1967 up to 1975, they controlled the Senate; therefore, during that period no Democrats held committee chairs. The lone black Republican in the House, David Albritton, chaired the Interstate Cooperation Committee from 1969 to 1973. (See Rosters of the Ohio House and Senate Committees for the 1967-1968 up to the 1989-1990 General Assemblies).

In the Senate, John W.E. Bowen (Republican) and Calvin Johnson (Democrat) have been the only black attorneys to serve on Senate Judiciary Committee and that was in the 1967-1968 and 1969-1970 sessions. From the 1969-1970 up to the 1989-1990 sessions, there were no other black attorneys in the Ohio Senate. Yet, it is interesting to mention that two other black members serving in the Senate have also served on this committee and they were not attorneys, M. Morris Jackson (1971-1972) and Mike White (1987-1988 and 1989-1990).
Earlier we learned in the 1967-1968 sessions there were twice as many committees in the House, (i.e., 16) as compared to Senate committees. Quite expectedly, there was a single case in which at least four black members served on one committee and that committee was House Health and Welfare with Bill Bowen, Phale Hale, Troy Lee James, and Casey Jones in the 1969-1970 sessions. Typically, however, one would find at most three black members assigned to various House committees. For instance, Hale, Mallory and Stokes were assigned to Local Government and Urban Affairs Committee, and Albritton, Bowen, and Hill served on Taxation Committee.

In the Senate, M. Morris Jackson and Calvin Johnson were assigned to the Education, Health and Welfare Committee. Not surprisingly, in the 1967-1968 sessions none of the black members, Republican or Democrat, were assigned to Finance and Appropriations Committees in either the House or Senate. Then, during the 1969-1970 session Bill Bowen was appointed to the Welfare section of House Finance Committee.

Subsequently, by the 1973-1974 sessions, of BEDO's members arriving with the Class of '67, they then had six years of tenure. Two members were appointed committee chairmen and one received a section chair to Finance Appropriations. Specifically, James was chairman of House Environment and Natural Resources Committee, Hale was
chairman of House Health and Welfare Committee, James Rankin was chairman of the Welfare Section of House Finance and Appropriations Committee (and in the 1975-1976 session), and in addition to Rankin, Mallory was the only other black member assigned to Finance. Vice-chairs were awarded to Ike Thompson on Agriculture, John Thompson on Insurance, Utilities and Financial Institutions Committee, and Casey Jones on Reference Committee. Unquestionably, all those assignments were a 'first' for black members in the Ohio legislature. The Speaker at the time was A.G. Lancione and current Speaker Vern Riffe was Speaker Pro Tempore.

Clearly, BEDO had initiated coalition building with leadership early in formation of its organization, from which the benefits accrued are apparent to date.

The year 1975 was an interesting one. For example, by the 1975-1976 sessions Democrats had gained control in the Senate. With both houses then under Democratic control, black members presumably were even more positioned to vie for additional benefits. In the Senate, Jackson was appointed chairman of Senate Education and Welfare Committee and Bowen, Transportation and Local Government Committee. Both Bowen and Jackson experienced their first terms as members on Senate Finance Committee. Jackson also was vice-chair of Senate Rules, part of the Celeste-Ocasek leadership team.
Also as alluded to in Chapter III, sometime following the 1974 elections and early in 1975 the Riffe Coalition led a successful coup against the Lancione team, also Democrats. One-term Speaker Lancione was out and Riffe has held the Speaker's position since that time. Barney Quilter was chosen Speaker Pro Tempore and, like Riffe, has held that position to date.

Meanwhile black members received three committee chairs: Hale on Human Resources, Jones on Interstate Cooperation, and Ike Thompson on Transportation and Urban Affairs. Rankin retained his chair on the Human Resources Section of Finance and John Thompson, his vice chair on Insurance, Utilities and Financial Institutions. James chaired the Aging subcommittee on Economic Affairs and Federal Relations.

Most notably was the presence of McLin and Mallory on Rules Committee. Interestingly, Lancione maintained chairmanship on Rules with Riffe as vice-chair; however, the presence of McLin and Mallory on Rules, as well as with James and Rankin on Reference, adds support to the presumption that BEDO was indeed part of the Riffe coalition. Membership on these two committees is indicative of privileged benefits in either house; these two committees determine legislative agenda. More specifically, Rules Committee, for example, determines under what conditions and
Reference Committee determines whether or not the bills will even be considered, as well as in which committees and sessions.

By 1977 four black members acquired chairmanships in the House and one vice chair, along with both Jackson and Bowen holding chairs in the Senate. Jackson maintained chairmanship on Senate Education and Welfare, and Bowen acquired Senate Commerce and Labor which he held until 1980. By 1979, Jackson had acquired chairman of Senate Reference Committee. Noteworthy, both of those positions were directly related to strategy on Act 584— Minority Enterprise Set Aside.

For black members in the House, 1979 represented the beginning of at least seven members consistently holding chairs or vice chairs up to the 1989-1990 sessions, (not including subcommittees). For example, from 1975 to 1980 James chaired the Aging and Housing subcommittee of Economic Affairs and Federal Relations, and during the 1981-1982 session when Aging and Housing was elevated to a full committee he received its chairmanship, which he maintained through 1987. At that time, James was appointed chairman of the Economic Development and Small Business Committee and holds that position to date.
John Thompson's chairmanship on Health and Retirement enabled BEDO direct access to information about the state's pension funds. More specifically, this committee assignment was important in the organization's research on state funds invested in corporations and companies with subsidiaries doing business with the Republic of South Africa. However, it is important to explain that, although the late Representative John Thompson chaired the Health and Retirement Committee, he was not the primary conduit for sponsorship of South African divestiture legislation. Thompson's committee was responsible for working with agencies and organizations authorized to invest state funds, such as State Teachers Retirement funds. This committee works closely with a variety of investment fund companies and must attempt to obtain the most feasible investment of state employee retirement funds. Additionally, investment fund officials find it most disconcerting to have their activities "mandated by legislation," particularly if the legislation is restrictive.

That precarious situation did not restrict Thompson's role, however, in providing information to his colleagues in BEDO. For example, over the past two decades BEDO has been instrumental in lobbying to influence corporations to establish divestiture plans. More specifically, major pharmaceutical companies, oil and gas companies, alcohol and
beverage companies, tobacco and candy companies, and many others all tend to be affected by certain legislation under consideration in the Ohio General Assembly. These types of companies dispatch lobbyists to the various state legislatures across the nation. Their lobbyists support annual conferences and fund-raising activities of BEDO, the National Black Caucus of State Legislators, the Congressional Black Caucus, et cetera. The point here is access to information is made much easier when someone favorably disposed to an organization, such as BEDO, chairs a committee, (e.g., House Health and Retirement), responsible for legislation of interest to it, such as investments in companies doing business with the Republic of South Africa.

Equally important to this discussion is the size of the black caucus. Earlier it was reported that from 1977 to 1987 black House members constituted 10 percent of the House and 16 to 18 percent of the House Democratic Caucus. Consequently, 10 years after the Class of '67 was inaugurated senior members were in a position to act in a relatively more effective way. By 1987 these members had acquired seniority, experience, and a variety of resources including access to information, thereby aiding their efforts at effecting change in the legislature.
Also in the interim black members in the Senate shared in the benefits of a Democrat-controlled chamber for four General Assemblies, (1975-1976, 1977-1978, 1979-1980, and 1983-1984). Most notable of those serving in leadership roles was former Cleveland Senator M. Morris Jackson. Jackson teamed-up with former Akron Senator and Senate President Oliver Ocasek. Upon Ocasek's ascension to the Presidency Jackson became Assistant President Pro Tem in 1975 and served as President Pro Tem from 1977 to 1980. During that period, Jackson was vice chairman of Senate Rules Committee, a member of Senate Finance, and chairman of the Senate Education and Health Committee. He also chaired Senate Reference Committee in the 1979-1980 sessions. Jackson's leadership, committee assignments and chairmanships all were significantly related to legislative activity of BEDO, especially enactment of the King Holiday Bill and Act 584.

Then, during the 1981-1982 General Assembly, Republicans regained control in the Senate and Democrats lost all the privileges of leadership including committee chairs. From 1983-1984, however, Democrats regained control in the Senate with a 17:16 ratio and this time, similar to the 1975 House Democratic Caucus coup, there was a coup within the ranks of the Senate Democratic Caucus. Youngstown Senator Harry Meshel formed a coalition and was successful in overthrowing
the Ocasek coalition, then in the minority in the Senate. Following the 1982 elections Democrats were back in the majority in the Senate and Meshel became Senate President. Bowen, a supporter of Meshel, was appointed Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, a key committee in the legislative process.

Meanwhile, between the November 1982 elections and the January 1983 inaugurations, Senator Jackson (a Democrat) joined ranks with the Senate Republican Caucus, thereby giving Senate Republicans a one-vote margin over Democrats; the ratio flipped to 17:16, Republican. In contrast to the Riffe-Lancione coup in 1975 and the Meshel-Ocasek coup in 1980, the coup between Jackson and the Senate Republican Caucus received tremendous media coverage which spanned the November elections up to shortly after the 1983 Senate inaugurations. Also unlike the Riffe-Lancione and the Meshel-Ocasek coups, this coup involved a bipartisan coalition vis à vis the traditional intra-caucus coalition.

However, by January 1983 differences were resolved and Democrats were back in control in the Senate. Bowen retained the enviable position of chairing Senate Finance, as well as serving as ranking Senate Democrat on the State Controlling Board.

Interestingly, it was Ocasek who appointed Bowen to Controlling Board back in 1976 and he has served on the
Board to date. Bowen chaired Finance at the time Ohio experienced one of its worst deficits and, at which time Governor Celeste raised taxes. In the end Bowen was part of the budgetary process credited with successfully balancing the state's budget. In Chapter V we elaborate on BEDO's relationship with the executive office. The point here is that a member of BEDO now had the opportunity to not only serve on Finance Committee, but to chair this committee.

From the 1985-1986 to the 1989-1990 sessions, however, Republicans were back in control in the Senate, and black members in the Senate since then have only served on committees and not chaired them. On the other hand, in the House black members continued to enjoy the privileges of belonging to the majority-party caucus. They acquired six committee chairs and one vice chair. Due to the death of McLin, one House chair, (i.e., Local Government), was lost and an additional vice chair was gained with Mallory on the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee.

One concern that continually arises throughout this discussion is succession to certain positions, such as committee chairs, due to death or illness in BEDO's membership. Has the caucus developed a plan to deal with recruitment and training? A partial answer to this question is readily available. For example, senior members tend to already hold the types of committee chairs in which they are
trained and experienced and are therefore not interested or suitable for transfer into other or vacant chairs. Also, freshmen and junior members generally do not hold enough seniority or committee experience to fill the vacant chairs. Consequently, in the conclusion to this dissertation, the question of recruitment, ascension to chairmanships and leadership positions will be addressed as a future concern of BEDO.

Another concern inherent in this discussion deals with the relationship between the junior members and factions in the House and Senate Democratic Caucuses. Are the black junior House members, such as Miller and Sykes, predisposed to Speaker Riffe or some other enterprising and potential leader? Are members, such as Miller and Sykes, considering the possibility of seeking the Speaker's position themselves? Whatever the scenario, the situation in the Ohio House in the 1989-1990 General Assembly is quite different when compared to the situation back in the 1967-1968 General Assembly. Additionally, given the situation with the older and senior black caucus members, are the younger and junior members capable of engineering the types of political favors for committee assignments and chairs as received during the McLin era. Will there be a black member chairing House Appropriations Committee? Will there be a black Speaker of the House? What difference will
any of this make, particularly with respect to the legislative agenda of the caucus?

Consequently, from 1967 up to 1990 BEDO, the organization, unquestionably grew and developed in size, and within the committee structure and process of the Ohio General Assembly. The immediate concern before us is whether that growth and development will be sustained in the coming years? How will BEDO fare in the 1990s and the early decades of the 2000s? On which committees will its members be assigned and how will they use their positions to fulfill the caucus' agenda? Chapter VI and our conclusion examine these areas more closely.

Other Factors Affecting Strategy and BEDO's Relative Status in the Ohio General Assembly

Earlier it was mentioned that there are other factors related to effective legislative activity including seniority and 'leadership'. Interestingly, although black members in the Senate have served more years in the minority as compared to the majority, at least two members have acquired seniority that aided BEDO's agenda, (i.e., Jackson and Bowen). Jackson served 18 years in the Ohio Senate and held leadership positions with the Celeste and Ocasek leadership teams. Jackson's successor, Mike White, a short-term legislator, managed to wield his way into the
leadership position of Assistant Minority Whip during the 1987-1988 and 1989-1990 General Assemblies. Clearly Senator White was an aggressive and ambitious legislator because he managed to accomplish so much in such short tenure. In less than three terms he not only acquired a leadership position in the Ohio Senate but he also launched a successful bid for Mayor to the city of Cleveland. Consequently, this is an example where longevity in office was not necessarily a prerequisite for acquiring privileged benefits of leadership.

Similar to McLin in the House, Senator Bowen argues, "I couldn't hold a leadership position and have time to serve my constituents and cater to all my other legislative interests successfully." Interestingly, however, Bowen is recorded as the first black Democrat to hold a leadership position in the Ohio House of Representatives and that was in the 108th General Assembly, 1969-1970. During his second term in the Ohio House Bowen was selected to serve as Minority Whip under the leadership of then Minority Leader John C. McDonald. After McDonald's leadership, Lancione followed, and was succeeded by Riffe.

Bowen has by far come to be recognized as a senior statesman in his own right. He is dean of the Ohio Senate Democrats, and along with Representatives William Mallory
and Troy Lee James, remain BEDO's only active charter members.

In addition, although McLin never held a leadership position and only chaired one committee, House State Government, he is considered the 'father of BEDO'. During his tenure he was in undisputed 'leadership' not only in BEDO but in the Ohio House too. His relationship with Speaker Riffe was considered most favorable, as well as key to all committee assignments and legislative activity of BEDO. In fact, during this investigator's interview with McLin, he spoke of the Speaker in similarly favorable terms that Bowen spoke of Ocasek and Meshel. These men were closely allied with their leaders. They were friends and legislative colleagues.

Another concern inherent throughout this research is how the other members of the organization fare, as well as how they will operate in the absence of McLin and, subsequently Bowen. Will any of the other members develop the type of rapport with leadership that allows them to be absorbed into the 'fold'? In addition, will the emerging black leadership in the House maintain favorable and working relationships with their black and white colleagues in the Senate, in the Ohio Democratic Party, et cetera? Moreover, former BEDO Chairman McLin possessed personal finances which enabled him to serve as leader of the organization, often at the expense
of fundraising activities for his own reelection campaigns. Today, the sole member with similar financial independence is Columbus Representative Otto Beatty, Jr., however, there is no evidence to indicate his desire for leadership.

With that we turn our attention to an examination of data showing the relative status of the organization inside the Ohio General Assembly. We review data collected and compiled on the 1967-1968 up to the 1989-1990 General Assembly (see Table 4.2 for details). These data are interesting for a number of reasons, the primary reason is that a picture of sustained growth is portrayed.

First, we listed the various General Assemblies from the 107th up to the 118th, which can total as many as 12 two-year terms for charter members who are representatives, and as many as six four-year terms for charter members who serve in the Senate. We also collected data on House and Senate leadership positions acquired by BEDO's members.

Other data represent select committees within the two houses. Specifically, we are interested in the relative status of black members serving on Rules, Reference, and Finance Committees, as well as the relative status of members holding chairmanships and vice chairmanships on full and subcommittees.

Data on number of members serving in the 12 General Assemblies are fairly self-explanatory. There is a nominal
Table 4.2  BEDO's Relative Status by Seniority, Leadership, Committee Chairmanships and Vice Chairs, and Key Committee Assignments from the 1967-1968 up to the 1989-1990 Ohio General Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Assembly</th>
<th>#BEDO Members</th>
<th>Seniority (Terms)</th>
<th>#BEDO in Leadership</th>
<th>#/% BEDO w/Chairs &amp; V. Chairs*</th>
<th>#BEDO on Rules</th>
<th>#BEDO on Reference</th>
<th>#/%BEDO on Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107th (1967-1968)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108th (1969-1970)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109th (1971-1972)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110th (1973-1974)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(8) 73%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111th (1975-1976)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2 (9) 82%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4) 36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th (1977-1978)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2 (10) 83%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(5) 33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113th (1979-1980)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2 (10) 83%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(5) 42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114th (1981-1982)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1 (7) 58%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(5) 42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115th (1983-1984)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1 (10) 83%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6) 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116th (1985-1986)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1 (9) 75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7) 58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117th (1987-1988)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2 (9) 69%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6) 46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118th (1989-1990)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2 (9) 69%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(5) 38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes subcommittees

Source: Data were extracted from Journals and Rosters of the House and Senate from the 1967-1968 up to the 1989-1990 Ohio General Assemblies. Mean scores on seniority, and numbers and percent-members in leadership, holding chairs/vice chairs, and key committee assignments were calculated to show relative status of the organization for each General Assembly. Discrepancies in compilation and computation are responsibility of the investigator.
increase from 10 members in the 1967-1968 General Assembly to 12 in the 1977-1978 General Assembly, to 13 members in the 1987-1988 General Assembly, averaging over 11 members for the 22 years under investigation. At no point has the organization decreased in size.

Additionally, the data reveal some variations when we look at means for seniority. For example, we see a steady increase in the means starting at 1.2 terms during the 1967-1968 General Assembly in which nine new members were greeted by three-term Representative Carl Stokes, to a mean of 5.2 terms in the 1977-1978 General Assembly. By that time six charter members remained active and four new members were in the group. The mean continued to increase to as high as 7.1 terms in the 1987-1988 General Assembly. By that point only four charter members and two senior members remained active; then following the death of McLin in December 1988 and the resignation of White in November 1989, the mean decreased to 6.5 terms. On the whole, however, BEDO tends to exemplify the type of low turnover described by Jewell (1982, pp. 25-27). Put another way, for an organization operating within the legislature for at least two decades, to retain three of its charter members and to accumulate a mean of over six terms for 13 members, is fairly notable.
Data on BEDO's positions in House and Senate leadership are fairly small and sporadic. BEDO has had at least one but not more than two members in leadership over the course of the 22-year period examined.

With respect to committee chairs and vice chairs, the data reveal zero positions during the first three terms, with a notable increase to eight positions or 73 percent during the 1973-1974 sessions, and another increase to 10 chairs and vice chairs (83%) during the 1977-1978 sessions. Meanwhile the group lost three of its chairs and vice chairs and the numbers decreased to seven (58%) in the 1981-1982 sessions. By the 1989-1990 sessions nine members held chairs and vice chairs, (69%) respectively. On the whole, however, these are fairly high numbers for a group of this tenure and size. Here, the question is 'which committees do the members chair?' It is widely known that key committees to chair are Rules, Reference, and Finance. This does not mean that the other committees are not important, rather key committees have greater breadth and scope which tend to carry over into activities of other committees. In the Senate where there are fewer members and an average of two black members per session, black members have chaired the Reference (Jackson) and Finance (Bowen) Committees. In the House, which has the larger number of members and committees, BEDO has yet to obtain chairmanships of key
committees. Perhaps the picture will change in the latter part of the 1990s.

With respect to BEDO's assignments to key committees, the group has accumulated a respectable amount of experience. On the Rules' Committees, the group began at zero in the early sessions, increased to five members in the 1979-1980 sessions, and ended up at four by the 1989-1990 sessions, respectively. Assignments to Reference Committees, though less impressive, peaked at two during the early 1970s and decreased to one member towards the latter part of the 1980s. Yet, the data evidence a consistent presence of BEDO on each of these key committees.

Interestingly, at one point in the group's history, 1985-1986, there were seven members on the two Finance Committees, (58% of BEDO's membership), the highest percentage to date. By the 1989-1990 sessions, however, representation on those committees dropped to five members, (38%), respectively.

Regardless, the data indicate BEDO is very much involved in key committee activity and tends to be represented consistently over the course of this study. One way to ensure representation on the numerous House committees is to launch an ambitious recruitment campaign. If the current committee system holds throughout the 1990s and the early 2000s-- and from all indications it will-- then BEDO will
need to recruit additional members. In this way the organization will be better positioned to vie for assignments on the 25 to 27 House committees, as well as to vie for key committee chairs.

Finally, although the State Controlling Board is not considered a legislative committee, it has become one of the most desired boards on which to be assigned. Generally, the respective Finance Committee chairs, ranking minority members on Finance Committee, and one-to-two additional members from the majority-party of each house are appointed to this board, whereas, the governor appoints the presiding officer (a non-legislative official) to the board.

With respect to BEDO, this board is also important because it awards state contracts, many of which involve set-aside contracts mandated by Act 584. Since enactment of the law, many observers, particularly minority entrepreneurs, have assumed that Bowen would be 'their man' on the board and this assumption has held in spite of the fact that he has served in minority-party status for most of his tenure in the Senate. Bowen has been privileged to serve on this board since 1976, thereby acquiring a leadership posture for which BEDO can claim. Yet, if he retires or loses his appointment to the board, then BEDO must be prepared to vie for a seat. Again, the question here is who, if anyone, will be recommended by BEDO?
In sum, there is a lot to consider when discussing the effects of caucus size, committee assignments and chairmanships, leadership, and seniority on strategy. What has been implied throughout this discussion is that Bowen and McLin have served BEDO's 'leadership' in title and/or legislative capacity. Representative Sykes and Miller, for examples, must convince other members of BEDO, as well as inside the legislature, that they are not only interested but that they are capable of garnering the kind of overall respect, rapport, and resources necessary to successfully implement BEDO's agenda. In the Spring 1990 Miller relinquished the chairmanship of BEDO to Mallory. Mallory holds leadership within the House but is not widely known or recognized as a strong leader outside of the legislature. The question here is who will take over the reigns of leadership subsequent to Mallory.

Before writing the final chapter on the viability of the organization, there are two other areas addressed in this dissertation: BEDO's role in the Ohio political power structure, and its relationship with other black state legislative caucuses. At this point we turn our attention to BEDO's relationship with the Ohio political power structure from Rhodes to Celeste. The discussion continues to focus on the charter and senior members demonstrating over two decades of building a viable organization.
CHAPTER V

BEDO'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE OHIO POLITICAL POWER STRUCTURE: FROM RHODES TO CELESTE

In this chapter we attempt to discern patterns of relationships that presumably developed since the formation of BEDO. It is believed, for example, that the group as a whole, charter and senior members in particular, have developed working relationships with various entities in the Ohio political arena. More specifically, we are interested in examining relationships that presumably existed with the three most recent governors, (i.e., James A. Rhodes, John J. Gilligan, and Richard F. Celeste) and their respective cabinets; with the House and Senate leadership, caucuses and colleagues; the Ohio Democratic Party (ODP); and the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). It is also believed that it is the nature of these relationships that aids in the overall effectiveness of group strategy, hence the group's effective role in the Ohio political arena.

Additionally, we examine the members' perceptions about certain policy. Earlier, for example, it was mentioned that
a common assumption by many observers is that 'black and female politicians tend to be concerned primarily with legislation, issues and policy on social and human services.' Although data reveal that was a common concern among charter and senior members during the early years, the situation has changed. In fact, information uncovered by this research clearly indicates a change. Recent concerns tend to include business and economic development, and housing, in addition to continuing work on social and human service concerns. Discussions in this chapter, therefore introduce the reader to the expansive nature of BEDO's agenda, particularly as compared to the early years.

In order to address those areas of interest, we examine data generated from personal interviews with BEDO and a journalist. Also, we continue our examination of data compiled by the Ohio Secretary of State in the Official Roster of Federal, State, County Offices and Departmental Information for the 1961-1962 up to the 1989-1990 Ohio General Assemblies.

Earlier in Chapter III we learned that the decade of the 1960s was characteristically a Republican era in Ohio politics. With the exception of Governor Michael V. DiSalle completing his one-term administration in the 1961-1962 biennium, Lieutenant Governor John Donahey, Treasurer Joseph Ferguson, and Attorney General Mark McElroy were the
only other Democrats to hold statewide offices during that
decade. Interestingly, Republican James Allen Rhodes was
Auditor of State during DiSalle's administration. Following
that Rhodes served the first two consecutive terms,
(1963-1966 to 1967-1970) of his historic four terms as
governor.

The decade of the 1970s brought a gradual shift in
partisan control, if not a mixture of political control in
Ohio state government. For example, Democrat Governor John
J. Gilligan served one term from 1971-1974, along with three
other Democrat state office-holders including Auditor Joseph
Ferguson, Treasurer Gertrude Donahey, and Attorney General
William J. Brown. Rhodes was reelected Governor in 1974 and
again in 1978. Quite the opposite to the partisan
composition of statewide offices during his role as Auditor
of State, however, Rhodes served his fourth Gubernatorial
term with all other statewide offices held by Democrats.

Similar to Republican control of state government in
the 1960s, Democrats controlled state government in the
1980s. As Rhodes was completing his fourth and final term
in 1982, Democrat Richard F. Celeste ran a successful
gubernatorial campaign that same year and again in 1986; and
all statewide offices continued to be held by Democrats
during the decade of the 1980s.
With that backdrop one would assume that a Democrat and black state legislative caucus would have fared relatively well during the times in which Democrats controlled state government, most especially during the administrations of Governor Celeste. It also would be quite understandable for one to assume that Democrats, black or white, fared less well, comparatively speaking, during the Rhodes' eras; whereas, examination of data generated from our research yields mixed results. For example, in some cases the data show BEDO with very favorable ties with Republican Governor Rhodes and at the same time very poor ties with at least one of his cabinet members, namely Corrections Director George Denton. (The situation involving Denton and the Lucasville prison was discussed earlier in this dissertation by McLin and Journalist Sharkey). In other cases the data show that BEDO had a relatively good though disruptive relationship with Democrat Governor Celeste and that the benefits of that relationship are somewhat questionable.

In any case, certain implications of our data may be deeper than our analyses permit. This means that more research is probably necessary in order to generate the type of data more useful for higher level generalizations. For example, some of the members of BEDO referred to former Governor Rhodes as "fair" and "a personal politician." It is the belief of the researcher that certain attitudes
developed about Rhodes, particularly among the legislators under study, that are primarily derived from Rhodes' longevity in Ohio politics. Rhodes truly came up through the ranks in Ohio's political apparatus, more specifically, the Republican Party apparatus. Specifically, he served as Auditor of the city of Columbus from 1939 to 1942; Mayor to the city of Columbus from 1942 to 1953; Auditor of State from 1953 to 1962; and, Governor of the state of Ohio from 1963-1966, 1967-1970, 1975-1978, and 1979-1982. Throughout his political career Rhodes amassed numerous allies and considerable experience. Most important and for our purposes, he was reportedly "very good and fair to his friends," and this was regardless of race and politics.

Even so, none of these observations is meant to imply Rhodes was not a partisan politician. During his tenure, for example, Rhodes was quite often called upon by all three Republican Presidents of the United States including Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, and Ronald Reagan, as well as by other governors, such as New York's Nelson Rockefeller. The point is that Jim Rhodes was clearly a respected politician and that includes garnering the respect of BEDO, particularly from among the charter and senior members of the organization.

In sum it is easy to attempt to draw larger generalizations than our data allow but in order to do so,
we reiterate, additional research is warranted. We are primarily interested in BEDO's relationship with the three governors during whose tenure they have served in the Ohio General Assembly up to the 1989-1990 sessions. In the following discussion therefore, we examine the members' perceptions of their relationships with former Governors' Rhodes, Gilligan, and Celeste, respectively.

BEDO's Relationships with Ohio Governors and Cabinet Members

This part of the discussion is based primarily on data generated from personal interviews with charter and senior members of the organization. It was interesting to observe these men when asking about their relationships with the various governors. Some of them, for instance, either talked at length about particular governors or they were very brief in their remarks. Also, whether recall was pleasant or unpleasant, either they spoke in very emphatic terms or they were noticeably indifferent.

It is conceivable that the legislators were being very careful with their remarks and for obvious reasons. First, it is only reasonable to speak cautiously of another colleague, (i.e., legislator, governor, cabinet member, or other official). Second, all three governors in question are alive and residing in Ohio. Celeste is young enough to consider another term as governor, to run for the U.S.
Senate, the U.S. Presidency, or to take some other political position. Also, although in private practice as an entrepreneur, Jim Rhodes is still very active in Republican Party politics. Gilligan is a university professor. This then brings us to our third point. If BEDO indeed fared better or worse under one governor vis à vis another, these legislators might not want to reveal just 'how well' or 'how poor' those relationships were.

Beginning with the late C.J. McLin, we observed him to be quite direct in his remarks. Accordingly, he said,

"I think that we've done pretty good for all the governors." [Emphatically he said], "We did alright under Rhodes as a group."

"I think we did better under Gilligan than we did [paused] even though Celeste appointed more cabinet members. We had more people in second command around who (were) able to implement things under Gilligan than we have now (under) Celeste."

A little background is necessary before discussing some of McLin's other remarks. Although McLin, Bowen, and other black Democrats worked on Gilligan's 1970 gubernatorial campaign, their prominence on the state level was more prevalent by the time Celeste ran for governor in 1982. By that time McLin, unlike Bowen and some other Democrats, black and white alike, made early endorsement of Celeste's candidacy. It is also noteworthy that, then popular Attorney General William J. Brown was also a candidate for
governor and many Democrats chose to wait until after the May Primary before joining any gubernatorial camp. In the interim McLin was serving as Minority Coordinator for the Celeste campaign. Celeste won the Democratic Primary and eventually defeated the Republican candidate in the November elections. In January 1983 he was inaugurated Governor.

It is also important to note that it is generally understood that individuals or supporters endorsing candidates and working on campaigns, especially early supporters, receive certain favors or privileges, (e.g., key jobs, voice in appointments, et cetera). This then brings us to our next point.

Early in Celeste's first term, several controversial appointments and policies plagued his administration, including certain cabinet appointments, tax increases, deinstitutionalization of mental retardation and developmentally disabled group homes, et cetera. More specifically, although Celeste was initially lauded by BEDO for appointing more blacks to cabinet posts than any other governor in Ohio's history, he was simultaneously criticized. For example, his appointments of Warren Tyler (a black man), a banker, to head the Environmental Protection Agency, later appointed to head the Department of Commerce, was routinely under attack, not so much by BEDO but by the media. To some extent, Tyler was in a no-win
situation with the Commerce Department because of problems plaguing savings and loan institutions. That was a particularly problematic situation because another of Celeste's long-term supporters and friends, Marvin Warner, headed Home State Savings and Loan in Cincinnati. News accounts were on network television with Dan Rather reporting on CBS, for immediate example.

Celeste's appointments of James Rogers (a black man) of Cleveland to head the Department of Youth Services and, Minnie Fells Johnson (a black woman) to head the Department of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities (MR/DD) were equally damaging to his initial administration. Rogers was accused of employing individuals of questionable qualifications and criminal records to certain jobs and of awarding contracts to individuals and companies "not performing any work." Rogers eventually fled the state to Florida. Authorities captured him in Florida and he was returned to Ohio where he was convicted and sentenced to prison.

It was Minnie Fells Johnson whom McLin had "hand-picked" and whom he felt was mistreated most badly by the Celeste Administration. Johnson was responsible for deinstitutionalizing MR/DD facilities around the state and turning them over to private care-providers, or to private group homes. At the time, it was front-page news about how
"nobody wanted those group homes in their neighborhoods" and about how "inept and unqualified providers were mistreating those helpless patients." Probably the most serious offense against Johnson related to her professional and academic credentials. The most common question was, "Does Johnson have a bona fide doctorate degree?" The results of various media investigations indicated a resounding "No."

Subsequently Celeste was persuaded by his colleagues to "let Johnson go." That decision disappointed McLin greatly. Consequently, when asked about which cabinet officials he recalled most notably, McLin made the following remarks:

"Well, I have to say that I feel that Minnie Johnson was treated more wrong than I've seen any individual. She got lambasted for doing 'exactly' what the governor (Celeste) asked her. That girl really caught hell. I just think it was so unfair. But you see, the same thing they did to Minnie is the reason they catching so much hell. They did not handle government even-handed."

"Power,' McLin said, 'is supposed to be handled without you putting the words 'I'm powerful' before you speak. ... That should not be and that's what the Celeste Administration (does) and consequently they were personal people. They did more of the issues on personal, personality. If you did something to them, well, ... 'so-in-so did something to me and I'm gonna get him.' You can't get him without getting the governor. That didn't come in their minds. And consequently the Governor got in a lot of embarrassing situations because some of his people just want to get John Doe because of the way John Doe not speak to them right."
During our interview, (July 4, 1988), McLin was clearly disappointed with the Celeste Administration. Comments by other members of BEDO substantiate similar points of view raised by McLin, as well as about the situation involving Celeste's appointment of the aforementioned black cabinet members.

According to Bowen,

"BEDO has been received very well by the various governors. James Allen (Rhodes), Jack Gilligan and Richard Celeste all have received us, uh, very well."

With respect to cabinet appointees, Bowen mentioned former Director of Administrative Services Richard Jackson (a white Republican) in the Rhodes Administration. "He (Jackson) stood very good. He testified in our (BEDO's) behalf in the set-aside suit. Bill Sykes has shown substantial leadership in trying to see to it that blacks got a fair shake. The current Director (David) Baker, ... I would say he's the best director in my perspective who we've ever had in the Development Department with the sensitivity (to black people)." Bowen said.

Celeste's appointment of William Sykes (a black man) of the state of Maryland to head the Department of Administrative Services eventually was considered one of his best appointments to date. Sykes came in with Celeste in

Troy Lee James recalled,

"We're talking about Jim Rhodes ... Jim Rhodes was a personal and professional politician."

Reflecting on certain encounters, James elaborated,

"'You want something? Come in and see me',' he said Rhodes would say. "He was a personal politician. I have to admire him. Jim would say," James said, "'Where have you been. How come you haven't been in to see me?'" Additionally, James recalled Rhodes to say,

"Now that don't mean you gonna get what you want but come in to see me. The door is open."

On Gilligan, James said, "Ah Gilligan, we were uh, ... He came looking for us."

"Celeste started off beautifully. ... We're raising some questions now. We watch him. ... I hate to term it like this but you'll understand. Before, they'd (Celeste Administration) replace him (i.e., a cabinet member), with a black. Now, it's so much that they replace him with a white. That's something we're going to have a little discussion on." [Here, James is referring to the practice of replacing a black person with another black person, which BEDO was discussing at the time of this interview].

"On cabinet officials," James said, "under the Rhodes Administration, ... some of those names escape me now. His Finance guy who is now at the University of Cincinnati. ... Good. The foreign guy under Rhodes" [Kwegyir Aggrey. Aggrey was the son of a former U.S. Ambassador to Ghana and the first black cabinet appointee in Ohio history,
having come up through the ranks in the Ohio Department of Public Welfare. Rhodes appointed him Director during his final term. "Under Gilligan," James recalled his top aide, Freedman. "Very, very good." Under Celeste, he restated, "Celeste started out well. ... It needs to be talked over."

Mallory recalled a situation involving establishing a day care center at Cincinnati Technical College. The day care centers enabled parents, particularly mothers, to bring their children to school while they attended classes. "Well," said Mallory, "that appealed to me because those mothers would be minority mothers at that particular school. Well, the majority of them would be. So I went to see Jim Rhodes," and the scenario went as follows:

"I need $750,000 to do a day care center. And he (Rhodes) looked at me and he said, 'Mallory, don't you know you can't build a day care center with $750,000. You need a-million-two ($1.2 million dollars).' And he (Rhodes) said, 'Furthermore, it's such a damned good idea, I want one of those put at every major school in Ohio'."

"Obviously," said Mallory, "we had documented our need in Cincinnati but the rest of the schools didn't survive. So that's an example of Jim Rhodes." Clearly Mallory wanted something that was consistent with what Rhodes wanted and Rhodes eventually supported the day care centers. That was in spite of the fact that no justification or documentation was available on technical colleges in other parts of the
Consequently, according to Mallory, none of the other day care programs succeeded.

On cabinet officials, Mallory recalled "McKenna (Rayford F.) in the Department of Public Welfare," and said,

"Oh yeah, yeah. He (McKenna) was hurtful. Ray McKenna. I think that was his name. Hey. The fact that they're (cabinet officials) hostile don't stop (us)... If they're hostile, we just devise a strategy to get what we want in spite of their hostility."

Ike Thompson, a senior member of BEDO, recalled,

"I think we were received very well by Jim Rhodes. I don't think Gilligan was ah, ... not to good. On Celeste, ... somewhat."

"Rhodes was alright. I tell ya, Republican or not, he was alright."

"Minnie Fells Johnson ... She was very helpful to us. Bill Sykes to BEDO as a whole not as an individual to me. These are the black guys I'm talking about, so ah ..."

"There was one guy we filed a suit against him. I'm trying to remember him right now."

The other senior member, Casey Jones, recalled,

"Now we have learned a very long time ago to put pressure on the governor so that we can get some appointments to put black folks in all departments, boards and commissions in state government, so that when and if we need something we have somebody we can go to to get that information. We've been very, very successful in doing that with most of the governors, even with Governor Rhodes. But with Rhodes we knew it was going to cost us something. But politics is give and take anyway."
The following is an example, according to Jones, of how politics worked under Rhodes:

"See Rhodes would come in (to see) some of the (guys) out there, some of his white counterparts and he'd say, 'if you're against some legislation I want to go through the House, ... I don't like what you're doing to my legislation and you're not voting yes for me.' Then he'd say, 'but I understood that you needed a bridge in your town, ... you got that bridge. You got that bridge if you'd just vote for my bill." Jones said.

Consequently and similar to comments made by Mallory and James, Jones' recall of Rhodes involved the 'quid pro quo' condition. Whether the condition involved a bridge, a nursery in a technical college, or the quiet assurance of something else, Rhodes was considered a "fair politician."

Two of the junior members of BEDO who are unfamiliar with the Rhodes' or Gilligan administrations, commented on their relationships with Celeste. Vernon Sykes stated,

"Well, Governor Celeste is a very strong and powerful ally. Celeste has appointed with our (BEDO's) encouragement more blacks on cabinet positions than any other governor in the state of Ohio, than any other governor in the union period." Sykes said.

On the question about his relationship with various cabinet members, Sykes remarked,

"Yeah. Like I said, more blacks than any other state and it has been extremely influential in helping us (BEDO) accomplish our goals and
objectives. With them being at the top of those agencies when we deal with jobs and contracts, we can talk directly to the person in charge."

_Thomas Roberts and I. Ray Miller_ also felt BEDO has been received well by the various governors. In fact, these junior members seemed most impressed with the amount of resources and networking that exist between their offices and cabinet officials in the Celeste administration. Clearly they view Celeste in different terms as compared to the charter and senior members, who, along those lines, have grown to be comparatively unimpressed with the number or relative significance of black appointments in Celeste's two terms as governor.

In sum, it is readily apparent from the recall of the charter and senior members that they have clear though varied opinions about BEDO's relationships with the three governors, as well as with their respective cabinet members. All charter and senior members interviewed found Rhodes a fair and respectable governor, without qualifying that point of view. It is also noteworthy to mention that two of the most controversial bills believed to be of interest to black people in Ohio were enacted not during Democratic administrations, but during a Republican administration. The Martin Luther King Holiday legislation, SB18 was enacted
under Rhodes in 1975, as well as the Minority Enterprise Set Aside, Act 584 in 1980.

Although junior members tend to have favorable recall of their relationships with Celeste, it is fairly obvious that the jury-is-still-out on the overall effectiveness of BEDO's relationship with Celeste whose second term ended during the 1989-1990 General Assembly. In addition, it is conceivable that Gilligan's short tenure is what most likely attributes to the brief, though generally favorable comments made by some of the members. At this time we turn our attention to another area of interest, BEDO's relationship with House and Senate leadership, caucuses, and colleagues.

**BEDO's Relationships with House and Senate Leadership, Caucuses, and Colleagues**

Since most of the data stem from interviews with members of the Ohio House of Representatives, it was not too surprising to learn that most of the members have an unyielding deference for 'leadership'. The interesting observation, however, is not that the deference exists, rather the extent to which it exists. For example, virtually all questions dealing with leadership and caucuses received responses such as, "The leader," "The Speaker," "Speaker Riffe." Additionally, very little if any mention was made of other members of the House leadership teams,
(i.e., Democrat or Republican Caucus). Therefore, it is easily discerned that the term 'leadership' is virtually synonymous with the current position of House Speaker, more specifically, Speaker Vern Riffe.

What about some of the relationships that exist among the members and leadership? How do the members of BEDO view their relationships with leadership, Democrat or Republican, House or Senate? At this time we review data on the members' relationships with the House and Senate Democratic Caucuses, on 'leadership' and the development of relationships, and on relationships with House and Senate Republican Caucuses. Due to the overlap that occurred in some of the members' responses, this discussion starts with excerpts from recall of charter and senior members and concludes with excerpts from recall of junior members. We begin with the late C.J. McLin.

"Well, There's a great difference between the House and Senate on everything. Entirely two different animals. They want entirely different things. The Senate (Democrat) caucus over everything. The House (Democrat) caucus very seldom and if it is, it's over very important measures and it's a short caucus. So ah. The House Caucus is nothing that we have to worry about trying to get input. We got into the Speaker. That takes care of it."
On the subject of leadership and developing relationships, McLin provides an interesting analogy about 'teaspoons of sugar in coffee' which is outlined below:

"I think that we have a very good relationship with the leadership. For us to have five members on the Finance Committee (1988) demonstrates that. I don't know of a particular thing that we have (gone) after that was really fair that we didn't get. Now there may have been some things that we have (gone) after that ah, ... was a little uh. In other words we had our sugar, two teaspoons of sugar in the coffee and we went after two more. We didn't get that. But ah, I don't know of a time when we went after our regular two teaspoons of sugar in the coffee we didn't get." McLin said.

With respect to BEDO's relationship with the Senate, McLin said, "We ... we leave it mostly to Bill (Bowen) to handle but we keep a relation with the leadership."

On BEDO's relationship with the Republican House and Senate Caucuses, McLin said,

"Well we've knocked on their door(s) but ah, generally we've not been that successful. But we've always been rejected politely. The Republican Party has not really went after us (to ask our opinion or support)," McLin said.

Another interesting description on the concept of leadership is provided by Bill Bowen. Bowen takes us from his position in the House to his position in the Senate. He recalls,
"It depends. There's leadership and there's leadership. There's leadership in terms of the party and there's leadership in terms of the formal structure of leadership. The relationship has been courteous regardless. But you have real relationships when your party is in power, ... meaningful relationships when your party is in power."

"Leadership back in 1967-1970 when I was in the House was ill and ill-formed. It was Republican, dominant, historical, traditional, and ah, ... 'We got the majority. You got a seat (elected) over there boy and that's it' and they might look out the corner of their eye at you but hardly ever recognized you and made it quite clear and plain, with no sophistication and blinking. 'Okay?' ... You see the Republicans had control and they had a majority." (Kurfess was House Speaker at the time). Bowen said.

When asked about his relationships with leadership since that time, Bowen said,

"Based on personalities over the years, Vern Riffe, I couldn't ask for a better relationship. Though we were in different houses, we had the personal on-going relationship that has grown over the years. Ah, that's true in terms of our legislative relationship."

"In the Senate, the Senate amongst Democrats, that type of leadership with Ocasek and Meshel, it has been a very close cooperative working relationship. And ah, Harry and I (paused), relationship, ... we're like brothers, beyond our legislative relationship." [Then he mentioned Stan Aronoff's name and smiled, no comment followed. Aronoff is a Republican senator who represents part of the Hamilton County district adjacent to Bowen's].
Troy Lee James was less conversant on these questions and said the following:

"I give BEDO a big credit there. Experiences with the leadership in the House and Senate are fine, beautiful."

"On the Senate side, I've noticed over the past few years we've reached a stalemate" [no elaboration].

Another charter member, Bill Mallory who happens to be part of the leadership team in the House, spoke generally favorable about his relationships with leadership.

"I generally had a good relationship. Except, well, back in the 1960s they had a group of guys in here. Guys in here that I thought were a bunch of Nazis. They were on the Republican side. Reminded me of fascists, you know what I mean? ... they all sat in the same row, on the back row. We used to call them the House Bill 996 Boys. ... pass all that anti-riot legislation. Oh yeah. They're the one's that came up with that 'stop and frisk kind of stuff'."

About the Republican Caucus today, Mallory said, "Well I think that's more of an individual basis. I don't think there's any kind of mass-like coalition. There is no formal negotiation. It's by individual legislation."

Ike Thompson, a senior member, shares similar recall to Bowen's in that both have relatively unpleasant viewpoints about their relationships during Republican control of the House in the early years. Says Thompson,
"With leadership, I think my relationship is very good with leadership in both houses. Yes. It improved over time."

On the subject of relationships with Republican caucuses and leadership, "Some of the R's (Republicans), I get along with very well, others I don't know." [Is this like, say 'issue-oriented'?] "I think some of them, the ones I don't get along with are just prejudiced." [It has nothing to do with the job, they're just prejudiced?] "Right. Sometime as the committee chairman (Transportation), well, they have to work with me. Well, they don't have to but if they want to get something through (committee) ...," recalled Thompson.

A somewhat academic or tertiary perception of leadership is seen when these questions were put before the junior members. For example, Vernon Sykes and Thomas Roberts both spoke of their leaders with an almost absolute deference. An excerpt from Roberts' interview most exemplifies the younger members' definition of the word 'leader'. According to Roberts,

(On his relationship with the House and Senate Caucuses and leadership) "Excellent. I think one thing you'll find out about the Speaker is he's fair. You do what you're supposed to do. He believes you're the one to take care of your constituents. And if you do that, you work hard up here, he's fair. And, I've not had a whole lot of contact with Harry Meshel (Senate Democratic Caucus) but I'm almost certain he's fair; I'm sure that's what he does." Roberts recalled.

His colleague, Sykes said, more emphatically and more specifically,
"Strong leaders. Occasionally when a caucus is called, you're on party-line loyalties, very strong influential and you make [couldn't decipher word] at those meetings. Decide whether or not you're going to go along with them and keep in good graces of the party or if you going to go against them and you'll fall out of grace, you're going to lose your status. They're very influential."

"My relationship with House and Senate leadership is very good. I'm chairman of a committee (Interstate Cooperation), ... and an Agency Rule and Review Committee. ... The leadership has accepted me into the fold, so-to-speak."

"My relationship with Republican members is cordial and friendly. As a committee chairman all their bills that come to my committee, I get to decide what's going to happen to them, whether they're going to hear them at all. Because the Senate is controlled by Republicans, then you have to kind of be nice to them to the standpoint that when your bill(s) go over there, they won't dog you." Sykes said.

Consequently, there appears to be some difference of opinion or perception on the members' relationships with leadership, the definition of leadership, as well as on their relationships with the the Republicans. The differences appear to be most visible among the junior members, i.e., those who are more apt to be seeking positions other than their current committee chairs or House seats. It is also possible that the senior and charter members have become relatively inculcated or familiar with the legislative process and do not see the need to describe their colleagues by party or other characteristics as
compared to the younger members of the organization. In any case, differences in perceptions on leadership and relationships with legislative colleagues are evident in the data. It is the significance of those differences which are not yet discernible.

Also noteworthy was the fact that with the exception of Majority Leader Mallory, none of BEDO's membership considers themselves key players in leadership. It was most interesting to observe that none of BEDO referenced its own membership in positions of leadership, that is, the type to which deference is given. They seemed to equate leadership exclusively with the title and role of Speaker Riffe. One would think that some reference would have been made to Majority Leader Mallory, who has held his leadership position since shortly after Riffe became Speaker. Additionally, no mention was made of the late C.J. McLin nor of Bill Bowen as BEDO's key leaders. There was no reference.

Interestingly, however, in an article by Sharkey, McLin was referenced as a leader, not only inside the Ohio General Assembly but in state and national politics as well. Excerpts from that article are presented below:
"... McLin established himself as the black leader at the Statehouse and he stayed at the top. He made good use of his power. ... helped rebuild Central State University after it was blown apart by a tornado. He was the driving force behind the establishment of an Afro-American museum in Wilberforce. He investigated prison conditions in Ohio and pushed through needed reforms. ..."

"... At the convention (1987 Democratic National Committee), he was proud that he was given the opportunity to vote for a black man for president. Yet, Jesse Jackson would not have made it that far if it had not been for C.J. McLin, Louis Stokes, George Forbes and other courageous strong black leaders sitting in the convention hall who built strong party organizations that supported Jackson's candidacy. ..." (Mary Ann Sharkey, "C.J. McLin," January 4, 1989, Cleveland Plain Dealer).

It is this investigator's observation that although none of the members referenced their membership as part of leadership they indeed respected the role of leadership played by McLin and realize that it is a difficult role to fill. Sentiments to this end were specifically mentioned by Ray Miller when asked about his role while serving as chairman of the organization.

In conclusion, this discussion points to several patterns of relationships that have developed between BEDO and several governors and legislative leaders in the Ohio political arena since the latter part of the 1960s. First, it is the charter and senior members who have paved the way for the less difficult 'access' afforded the junior and freshmen members of BEDO. Relationships developed by
charter and senior members have enabled junior members
relative ease and favorable access into party politics, as
well as the legislative arena. It took the combined efforts
of the charter and senior members' early political activity
to ensure contemporary party endorsements for the junior and
freshmen members' legislative races and subsequent
legislative elections. It took the sophistication and
political savvy of the charter and senior members' along
with their roles in their respective state and county
political party organizations to obtain the positions of
chairs, vice chairs and other privileges accrued the
membership of the organization.

Yet the junior members do not address the hardships of
access and acceptance as previously described by the charter
and senior members. The junior members do not address
concerns about race and party politics to any notable degree
consistent with that of the charter and senior members. The
junior members seem to view their access into the Ohio
political power arena and subsequent relationships with an
elementary deference for leadership and very little
acknowledgment of how access was generated.

On the other hand, however, each of the members
interviewed in this study seems poised for dealing with
changes in leadership, whether legislative or gubernatorial.
The charter and senior members have experience in minority-
party status in the House and Senate, as well as in relationships with statewide office-holders of both political parties. Their recall of the 22-years under examination evidences that adaptability quite well. Much to the contrary, the junior and freshmen members only know majority-party control; they have yet to experience anything else. Consequently, the question arises to one of 'how will they manage to wield BEDO's agenda in the coming decade, one in which Democrats will not have total control of the General Assembly, governor's office or other statewide offices'? How will the junior members fare in a less-controlled environment? Will their perceptions of 'leadership' become more like their elders, remain the same or deviate to some extent from present perceptions which tend to exude uncontested tolerance and unyielding deference for 'leadership', however defined?

The final discussion in this chapter deals with BEDO's agenda. To that end it is noteworthy that regardless of ones' perceptions of his/her relationships with governors and cabinet members, leadership, and colleagues, it is the relative success of those relationships that really matters. More specifically, it is the successful enactment of certain legislation and/or activity on certain policy and issues that determines the true definition of an organization's effectiveness in the legislature. Therefore, we turn our
attention to the members' perceptions of their agenda and how, if at all, it has changed over the years, as well as the degree to which the caucus has successfully met its agenda.

Perceptions on Agenda: From Social Concerns to Human Services to Business and Economic Development

In this discussion we look at agenda items that are considered significant by BEDO. We examine patterns of change in agenda over time, (i.e., from social concerns to human services to business and economic development). Then, in Chapter VI, we look at certain items in more detail and discuss the members' perceptions of the caucus' success or defeat on those items. At this time, we begin with a glance back at BEDO's initial agenda, as we progress to more current concerns of the caucus.

Almost all legislators interviewed for this study tend to recall that the first delegation of black-elected Democrats tended to push for general acceptance among their white colleagues. That was back in the early years. None of the charter and senior members had predecessors to the Ohio General Assembly to orientate them to the rules-of-the-game. Consequently, the initial agenda consisted of the acquisition of general acceptance by their peers.
Another early agenda-item confronting the black-elected officials was to organize, which they did from 1967 up to 1971, at which time it was generally agreed that the organization would always 'fight for the betterment of socioeconomic conditions of black and poor people', (i.e., those constituents who enabled their initial elections).

Excerpts from a few interviews confirm this position. For example, when specifically asked, "What about your stated purpose? What is it and has it altered any over the past 20-odd years," most would agree with the following:

"Well, we wrote it down but I don't know where we put it (laughter). Ah we,... our purpose was to initiate economic changes for the betterment of black folks within the legislature, within the Democratic Party, and with the public in general" (C.J. McLin).

In a related question, "Are there political issues that confront the organization today that differ considerably from those that confronted you 20-odd years ago," McLin responded,

"Oh yes. Oh yes. Twenty-odd years ago white people would come to us to champion social action. Now we say we will support social action but we won't take the leadership in it; we're going for economic development. We lost a lot of our so-called 'liberal' friends because they figured that we should be fighting for a little more dollars in ADC or something like that. We thought that it would be better to fight for John Doe to be
able to get him a business and he could hire him somebody and there wouldn't be anymore ADC. That's the kinds of things that happened" (McLin).

Similar to McLin, his protégé, I. Ray Miller, said that although BEDO was concerned initially with human services (welfare), its focus changed when "a wave of liberal white legislators came to the Statehouse back in 1978. They were men such as Sherrod Brown, ... Zehner, Ed Hughes, and John Begala. At the time," Miller said, "BEDO had shifted its focus to economic development" and when he entered the legislature in 1981 he chose to champion human services.

Interestingly, however, are the opinions of junior and freshmen members on the subject of BEDO's agenda. They too agree that the general concern of the caucus is to look out for the well-being of black and poor people. From Miller, Sykes, Roberts, and Whalen to Rhine McLin, there is unanimous agreement on that aspect of the agenda. The difference today, they say, tends to be more efforts towards business and economic development legislation, whether it is with programs at Central State University or the state contracting process. There is considerably more concern today with business and economic development than in the early years. Consequently, although BEDO continues to be concerned with socioeconomic conditions of black and poor people, the members' paramount concern today is "the
prioritization of appropriations" (Bowen).

How has BEDO's agenda been realized? To what extent has the organization experienced success in promoting its agenda? In Chapter VI we describe certain agenda items that place BEDO in the national forefront, including fair housing, the Martin Luther King holiday bill, efforts towards South African divestiture, efforts to enhance the status of Central State University, and the Minority Enterprise Act.

In addition in Chapter VI we engage in comparative analyses on how BEDO fares with other groups of black state lawmakers nationwide, especially with those in Illinois and Maryland. In so doing we look at the relative status of groups throughout the nation's Legislatures; after which we engage in an exercise to help determine the degree to which other groups of black lawmakers are positioned to effect change within and across their respective Legislatures. We revisit arguments raised earlier in Chapter I and concentrate on comparisons among BEDO and the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses. We examine data on constituencies, size, geographical configuration of districts, committee chairs, and leadership positions. We review data on how BEDO perceives its relative status with other black caucuses over a similar period in time. In this way it is believed the reader will acquire a greater
understanding and appreciation for the level of effectiveness of BEDO, as well as for its overall role in effecting change in the Ohio General Assembly.
CHAPTER VI

A COMPARISON OF BEDO TO GROUPS OF BLACK STATE LAWMAKERS NATIONWIDE:
FOCUS ON COMPARISONS TO
THE MARYLAND AND ILLINOIS LEGISLATIVE BLACK CAUCUSES

Up to this point we have presented a lot of information about the growth and development of BEDO, including: the evolution of the organization from the perspective of the Civil Rights Movement, the influence of certain events, such as, the court ruling in Baker v. Carr (1962), the 1966 election of an unprecedented number of black legislators (Democrats) in Ohio and their subsequent re-elections, as well as, the election of additional black Democrats in Ohio General Assemblies since that time. We examined patterns of partisan composition and control of Ohio state government and the General Assembly from as far back as the 1961-1962 sessions up to the 1981-1982 sessions, the early years. Later, we examined data on BEDO's size and its relative status with respect to committee assignments and chairmanships, seniority, and leadership positions. Subsequently, we addressed BEDO's agenda items, strategy,
and relationships with Ohio's political power structure. On the whole it has been shown that BEDO has developed into an effective informal group, (i.e., state legislative caucus).

At this point, however, we are interested in knowing how BEDO compares with other groups of black legislators nationwide and, more specifically, with the Maryland and Illinois Legislative Black Caucuses. Therefore, we start by examining the presence of black state legislators nationwide in the 1989-1990 and the 1991-1992 Legislatures. Later we look back over five General Assemblies comparing the three black caucuses by other features, thereby providing a more comprehensive profile on their development.

To address those interests, this chapter consists of four major parts. The first part compares BEDO with groups of black legislators nationwide. To aid in that discussion two primary sources of data were examined. One data set was compiled by the National Black Caucus of State Legislators; the second source of data was obtained from the Joint Center for Political Studies. Those data allow for comparisons primarily by size and sex composition within and across each group. Overall the data reveal many variations and implications, most of which can only be addressed through further research.

Subsequently, in the first part of this chapter we examine the relative status of group size within and across
each of the nation's Legislatures, after which we examine more closely influence of groups of notable size. Finally, we examine group size as it relates to party control. In doing so, we put forth two conditions to test the degree to which group size influences passage of legislation within and across certain Legislatures. This exercise, we believe, further substantiates our earlier argument that size is not a singular determinant of effective group activity.

With respect to implications in the data, one observation points to the increasing presence of black women state legislators. Another observation is the extreme diversity in size of groups of black state lawmakers nationwide. Yet another observation is seen in the extreme differences in number of black state senators as compared to black state representatives, the former being the lesser of the two.

Perhaps the most significant observation was within the sources of data. When this investigator set out to conduct this research she assumed a report or database on black state legislators existed. Up to this point, however, it has been discovered that 'lists' exist but no single source of the type compiled in the ensuing pages, at least not to this investigator's knowledge. Therefore, this research addresses the regularity of monitoring and updating a database inclusive of data generated and referenced herein.
Once the national profile on black men and women state legislators is presented, that profile, it is believed, provides us a base for further analysis of the three black caucuses under consideration. Therefore, in the second and third parts in this chapter we examine data on other features including constituencies, configuration of districts, legislatures, leadership, and committee chairmanship positions. In that way we update certain features common among the three caucuses, thereby providing additional measures on their development to date.

Back in Chapter I we mentioned notable variations exist among the Maryland, Illinois, and Ohio Legislative Black Caucuses. We resume that discussion in the second part in this chapter. Specifically, we are interested in patterns of constituencies represented and configuration of districts. It is believed that the greater the diversity in constituencies represented by the caucus, the greater its influence. If, for example, a caucus is overwhelmingly representative of one or two quadrants or regions in a state, then its political influence is relatively constrained. On the other hand, however, if a caucus is representative of several or all major quadrants or regions in a state, then its political influence is presumably more expansive, more inclusive, therefore more influential as compared to caucuses with less or limited representation.
The third part in this chapter deals with the relative status of each of the black caucuses within its respective legislature. We review data on caucus size within each chamber, sex composition, and partisan composition within and across several General Assemblies. Once those examinations are completed, we analyze trends in committee assignments and chairmanships, and legislative leadership positions among the three caucuses. In Chapter IV we examined BEDO's relative status inside the Ohio General Assembly. Now we wish to examine some of those same features within and across the Maryland and Illinois Legislative Black Caucuses. The reasoning here is the more members of a caucus holding key committee assignments and chairmanships coupled with caucus level of seniority and leadership positions, the more influence the caucus can wield within its respective legislative body, as well as within its state's political arena. It is along those lines that we wish to know how the three caucuses compare.

More specifically, we examine data on the three caucuses within and across the 1967-1968, 1977-1978, 1987-1988, 1989-1990, and 1991-1992 General Assemblies, respectively. Those sessions were chosen to demonstrate certain intervals of change, if any, and to include periods examined throughout this dissertation. Also, it is believed the data will generate interesting comparisons among the three
caucuses by placing each within a more uniform context. For instance, the impact of Baker v. Carr (1962) was national, not just in Ohio, therefore the election of black state legislators in larger numbers than ever should presumably have begun during the early to middle 1960s, continuing through subsequent election periods nationwide.

In the fourth and final part in this chapter we examine BEDO's perceptions of its successes and defeats, particularly on its legislative agenda. This discussion takes place last because it is believed that the members' attitudes on the successes and defeats of the organization's legislative agenda, including their opinions about the organization's future, will be more appreciated. Additionally, by that point in the discussion we will be interested in how the membership feels about its relative status to similar black caucuses across America.

In sum, this chapter is designed to complete the study and with enough information that will hopefully generate further study by others. This chapter is designed to show how and why the relative status of BEDO accounts for its acclaim as the nation's most viable racial partisan state legislative caucus. We turn now to the first part of our discussion on the relative status of black state legislators across the nation, focusing on the most recent Legislatures.

This discussion is intended to place BEDO in the national context by showing how all states compare with respect to black men and women legislators but in order to properly address the relative status of black state legislators nationwide, we need to clarify some terms and describe certain features common among legislative bodies nationwide. In addition, we brief the reader on our sources of data, as well as discrepancies found within the data.

**terminology**

Not all legislative bodies are called General Assembly. In fact, most are called 'Legislature', followed by 'General Assembly', and 'Legislative Assembly'. Because our focus is the Ohio General Assembly, we habitually, though unintentionally, have referenced all other legislative bodies in the same way. Also, since legislative bodies in the states of Illinois and Maryland are also called 'General Assembly', that mishap was further reinforced. Therefore, from this point on when speaking in general terms of legislative bodies we will use the term Legislature. Otherwise, when speaking of particular legislative bodies, we will call them by their proper names.
Other terms need to be clarified. For example, all upper houses are called Senate; however, the Nebraska Legislature is unicameral and all of its members are called Senators. Also, all lower houses are not called House of Representatives. Examples are found in the California Assembly, the Maryland House of Delegates, the Nevada Assembly, the New Jersey General Assembly, the New York Assembly, the Virginia House of Delegates, the West Virginia House of Delegates, and the Wisconsin Assembly, respectively. For further information about legislative bodies, consult The Book of the States.

about the data

Earlier we mentioned two primary sources of data were examined for this discussion. First, in January 1991 this investigator collected data on the number of black men and women serving in the 1989-1990 and the 1991-1992 Legislatures nationwide. That research was commissioned by the National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL) for its newsletter, News from the NBCSL (March 1991). A survey consisting of one item was administered to the Clerks of the House and Senate in all state legislatures for the two Legislatures in question. The survey was conducted through the mail with a self-addressed return envelope and on the stationery of the editor of the newsletter,
Representative Vernon Sykes of Akron (see Appendix E). With the exception of seven clerks, all others responded. Also, in instances where "zero (0) black members" were reported, we collapsed categories for those states' House and Senate reports showing '0' black members for both terms. Those states include: Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Utah, respectively.

The second source of data was obtained from the Joint Center for Political Studies (JCPS), which consisted of a list of 429 black state legislators. (Noteworthy: This is a more current list, not data extracted from the JCPS' National Roster of Black Elected Officials (1990). When cross-referenced against the NBCSL data, however, some discrepancies surfaced. For example, the NBCSL survey produced a total of 392 black state legislators for the 1989-1990 Legislatures nationwide, and 399 black state legislators serving in the 1991-1992 Legislatures, respectively. After cross-referencing the two data sets, our totals increased considerably to 433 for the first period and to 447 for the 1991-1992 period. Consequently, the NBCSL data set was notably larger when compared to the JCPS data set.

At first we attributed the differences to the lack of data supplied to the NBCSL by the seven clerks, later extracted from the JCPS data. Specific JCPS data added to
the NBCSL database were as follows: the Connecticut House (7), the Georgia Senate (8), the Kansas House (3), the Pennsylvania House (15), the Rhode Island House (7), the South Carolina Senate (6), the Utah House and Senate (0), and the Washington House (2), respectively. Those data — missing from the NBCSL data set — total 48 additional black state legislators. See data compiled in Table 6.1.

Perhaps the variations lie within the actual numbers reported to the NBCSL by the various clerks. This investigator, for example, discovered at least one error as reported by the Clerk of the Ohio House of Representatives. The report showed nine black men and three black women for 1989-1990; and eight black men and four black women for the 1991-1992 General Assembly, respectively. In fact, however, there was one less black man in the House for both periods. That same discrepancy was confirmed by BEDO's executive staff in the Columbus office. This point, however, is not to imply there were errors in all clerk reports submitted.

On the other hand, it is highly likely there were discrepancies in data supplied to this investigator by the JCPS. Those additional data were provided in a supplemental list in February 1991, faxed, and not compiled into official report format. Interestingly, however, JCPS monitors and updates its roster periodically, therefore its data include changes with respect to appointments and/or departures from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama (House)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Missouri (House)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama (Senate)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Missouri (Senate)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska (House)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Montana (House/Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nebraska (Unicameral)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona (House)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nevada (Assembly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nevada (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas (House)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Hampshire (House)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Hampshire (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (Assembly)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Jersey (Gen. Assemb)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Jersey (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado (House)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Mexico (House/Sen.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York (Assembly)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut (House)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>New York (Senate)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3/56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut (Senate)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Carolina (House)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware (House)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Carolina (Senate)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Dakota (House/Sen)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida (House)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ohio (House)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ohio (Senate)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (House)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oklahoma (House)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (Senate)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oklahoma (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii (House/Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Oregon (House)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho (House/Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Oregon (Senate)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois (House)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pennsylvania (House)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois (Senate)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pennsylvania (Senate)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana (House)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rhode Island (House)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Rhode Island (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa (House)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>South Carolina (House)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Carolina (Senate)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas (House)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Dakota (House/Sen.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tennessee (House)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky (House)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tennessee (Senate)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Texas (House)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana (House)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Texas (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana (Senate)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Utah (House/Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine (House/Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Vermont (House)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland (Delegate)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vermont (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland (Senate)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Washington (Delegate)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts (House)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Washington (Senate)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wyoming (House)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (House)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wyoming (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (Senate)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wisconsin (Assembly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota (House)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Virginia (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>West Virginia (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi (House)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wisconsin (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi (Senate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wyoming (Senate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data were requested from the Clerks of the House and Senate in each state on black men and women legislators for the 1989-1990 and the 1991-1992 Legislatures. Also, we merged missing data on certain states from the JCPS report submitted to this investigator February 1991. Data on size of chamber and Legislature were extracted from The Book of the States 1990-91 Edition (1991, p. 123). See Appendix E for survey instrument. Errors in compilation are the responsibility of this investigator.
office. The center has compiled data on all black elected officials since 1971 and is well-recognized in this area of research. Finally, the JCPS database (as referenced in the official National Roster) includes lists of federal, state, judicial, county, school board, and municipal office-holders. In February we, however, only requested and therefore only examined lists on black state legislators. With that, we turn our attention to a summary of patterns discerned within the merged data.

Patterns in sex composition, state, group size, size of chamber, and partisanship of chamber

Table 6.1 contains the merged data which show during the 1989-1990 Legislatures there were 433 black men and women state legislators in America. Of that number there were 329 men and 104 women. Following the 1990 elections, the total number increased to 447, with 322 men and 125 women. Those numbers reflect a net gain of 21 seats for women and a loss of seven seats for men. Black women now comprise 28 percent of the total number of black state legislators. Although overall group size has increased, the question before us is whether or not those numbers indicate black women merely 1) gaining seats or 2) gaining seats at the loss of seats to black men. Let us examine the data more closely.
That the data show an increase in the number of black women state legislators is not surprising. As far back as the JCPS has compiled statistics on black women elected officials (1975) the numbers have increased, particularly on the municipal level. Yet, black women state legislators only comprise a little over one percent of all seats and 8.3 percent of all female state legislators (National Roster of Black Elected Officials, 1975, p. 2). The interesting point is found within our merged data, which upon closer scrutiny reveal many of the newly elected black women are replacing seats formerly held by black men (see Table 6.1). Alaska, Georgia, Maryland, and Ohio illustrate this point.

More specifically in Ohio, for instance, it was reported earlier that the first black female legislator, Helen Rankin, was extended the courtesy of completing her husband's term (James Rankin) after his death in 1978. In cases not involving spouses, other family members (such as Rhine McLin, daughter to the late C.J. McLin), or close political associates (such as Vermel Whalen for John Thompson), all initially were appointed to complete their predecessors' unexpired terms in office; subsequently, however, those women launched successful election campaigns. This is not to imply all or even most black women initially acquire state legislative seats through the appointment process, yet, it is noteworthy in the case of Ohio.
Exceptions to the aforementioned cases are found in Arkansas where six new members were elected during the 1990 elections, of whom four were women, all obtaining seats not previously held by other black legislators; included within that group was a black female Republican, Christene Brownlee. Also, of three newly elected black members to the Connecticut General Assembly were two black women, one of whom, Jannette Parke, won a seat not previously held by other blacks. There are of course other exceptions but our general concern is substantiated: although the overall number of black state legislators increased in the two periods, the increase was due largely to the election of black women.

In addition, data in Table 6.1 show, with the exceptions of New York and New Jersey, the groups most notable in size represent state legislatures located within southern, southwestern, and midwestern regions of the nation. In order to make further comparisons we categorized the groups by sizes ranging from one to nine members, 10 to 19 members, 20 to 29 members, and over 30 members. Not counting the eight states reporting '0' black members, there are 23 groups of black state legislators ranging in sizes of one to nine members, the largest category. There are 11 groups of black state legislators ranging in sizes of 10 to 19 members. Seven groups range in sizes of 20 to 29 members,
and only two have membership of over 30, respectively.

Examples of states with relatively large black membership in the 1991-1992 sessions include: Alabama (24), Arkansas (12), Georgia (33), Illinois (29), Louisiana (20), Maryland (31), Michigan (14), Mississippi (22), Missouri (16), New Jersey (10), New York (22), North Carolina (21), Ohio (13), Pennsylvania (18), South Carolina (21), Texas (15), Tennessee (13), and Virginia (10). Therefore, it is safe to say from the national perspective the Ohio group falls within the lower stratum on groups of notable size; and Georgia, Maryland and Illinois, the uppermost stratum, respectively.

Up to this point we have analyzed group size in absolute terms. Now we examine the data more closely. First, it is important to note that size of legislative body including respective chambers vary nationwide. In fact, legislative bodies vary in size from as few as 49 seats in Nebraska's (nonpartisan) unicameral, to as many as 424 seats in the New Hampshire General Court; and, black membership in both these bodies is relatively small. In the Nebraska unicameral, for example, there is one black member (2 percent), and two black members (less than one percent) in the New Hampshire House, respectively.

In addition, with respect to percent black membership to each chamber, other observations stand out in the data (see
Table 6.1). Most notably, there are only four groups comprising close to 20 percent of their respective chambers and none of the groups constitutes 20 percent or more of their respective chambers. Although the subject of configuration of districts represented by black lawmakers will be covered in the second part of this chapter, it is relevant to the discussion before us. Do these numbers reflect representation of diverse constituency or single clusters of constituency, such as in one metropolitan area or region in the respective states? The data do not address this question.

On the other hand, the data allow for comparisons of group status within each chamber. For example, black membership in the Alabama House is 18 percent of 105 seats; in the Illinois House, it is 19 percent of 118 seats; in the Maryland House, 17 percent of 141 seats; and black membership is 16 percent of the Mississippi House's 122 seats, respectively. Moreover, when we examine the relative status of black membership in the Georgia General Assembly, the legislative body with the largest black membership, we see that group comprises only 14 percent of the 56-member Senate, and 14 percent of the 180-member House. These data suggest that in order to be relatively effective within their respective chambers, these groups must be aligned with the party in control or the ruling coalitions, respectively.
Therefore, in order to further explore the significance of group size, we take into account party control of each chamber. In so doing, the reader needs to keep at least two points in mind. One point deals with the virtual fact that black state lawmakers affiliate with the Democratic Party. With the exceptions of Minority Whip Carson Ross in the Missouri House and newly-elected Representative Brownlee in Arkansas, this investigator is unaware of other black state lawmakers currently affiliated with the Republican Party.

The second point is referenced by Jones (1991), who addresses the tendency for Legislatures to be dominated by Democrats. Accordingly, Jones states,

"... Democrats continued to dominate state legislatures throughout the 1980s and during the 1989-90 biennium. As of November 1989, there were 4,449 Democrat legislators, 2,940 Republican legislators, 49 nonpartisan members in the Nebraska unicameral, six independents and 17 vacancies. Democrats control 29 legislatures, Republicans control eight, and (there are) 12 legislatures where each party controls one chamber" (Rich Jones, The Book of the States 1990-91 Edition (1991, p. 114).

Therefore, we computed percent black membership to Democrat-controlled chambers in the 1989-1990 Legislatures and compiled the results in Table 6.2. Finally, since we remain interested in the significance of groups of notable size, we only examine those particular cases.
Table 6.2 The Relative Status of Groups of Notable Size in the 1989-1990 Legislatures by State, Size of Legislature, Chamber, Group Size, and Party Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and Size of Legislature</th>
<th>% Black Upper House</th>
<th>% Black Lower House</th>
<th>% Black Total Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama (140)</td>
<td>5/35 (14%)</td>
<td>19/105 (18%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D28(18%):R6</td>
<td>D85(22%):R17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas (135)</td>
<td>1/35 (03%)</td>
<td>5/100 (05%)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D31(03%):R4</td>
<td>D88(6%):R11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (236)</td>
<td>7/56 (13%)</td>
<td>25/180 (14%)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D45(16%):R11</td>
<td>D144(17%):R36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois (177)</td>
<td>7/59 (12%)</td>
<td>22/118 (19%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D31(23%):R28</td>
<td>D67(33%):R51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana (144)</td>
<td>5/39 (13%)</td>
<td>15/105 (14%)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D34(15%):R5</td>
<td>D86(17%):R17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland (188)</td>
<td>6/47 (13%)</td>
<td>22/141 (16%)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D40(15%):R7</td>
<td>D125(18%):R16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (148)</td>
<td>4/38 (11%)</td>
<td>13/110 (09%)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R20:D18(22%)</td>
<td>D61(21%):R49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi (174)</td>
<td>2/52 (04%)</td>
<td>20/122 (16%)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D44(05%):R8</td>
<td>D112(18%):R9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri (197)</td>
<td>3/34 (09%)</td>
<td>13/163 (08%)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D22(14%):R12</td>
<td>D104(13%):R58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey (120)</td>
<td>2/40 (05%)</td>
<td>8/80 (10%)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D22(09%):R17</td>
<td>D44(18%):R36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (211)</td>
<td>5/61 (08%)</td>
<td>16/150 (11%)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R34:D27(19%)</td>
<td>D92(17%):R58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina (170)</td>
<td>5/50 (10%)</td>
<td>15/120 (13%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D37(14%):R13</td>
<td>D74(20%):R46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio (132)</td>
<td>2/33 (06%)</td>
<td>11/99 (11%)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R19:D14(14%)</td>
<td>D59(19%):R40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Table 6.2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and Size of Legislature</th>
<th>% Black Upper House</th>
<th>% Black Lower House</th>
<th>% Black Total Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA (253)</td>
<td>3/50 (06%)</td>
<td>15/203 (07%)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D23(13%):R27</td>
<td>D104(14%):R99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina (170)</td>
<td>5/46 (11%)</td>
<td>16/124 (13%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D35(14%):R11</td>
<td>D92(17%):R32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee (132)</td>
<td>3/33 (09%)</td>
<td>10/99 (10%)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D22(14%):R11</td>
<td>D59(17%):R40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas (181)</td>
<td>2/31 (06%)</td>
<td>13/150 (09%)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D23(09%):R8</td>
<td>D93(14%):R57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia (140)</td>
<td>3/40 (08%)</td>
<td>7/100 (07%)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D30(10%):R10</td>
<td>D59(12%):R39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** Total membership in each Legislature is shown in parentheses next to the name of the state. The number of black members is shown over the total membership in each chamber, followed by percent black membership. The total percent black membership per Legislature is shown in the '% Black Total Legislature' column. 'D' means Democrat and 'R' means Republican. Data shown on the second line of each listing references party in control within each chamber; and, where 'D' is shown it is followed by percent black membership.

**Source:** Data on party control were extracted from *The Book of the States 1990-91 Edition*, p. 123. Data reflect composition of Legislatures as of January 1989. Percent black membership was computed by this investigator and all errors are therefore this investigator's responsibility.

Earlier in Chapter IV we argued that BEDO's size was significant with respect to legislative activity. In fact, we showed how group size influenced passage of the 1975 Appropriations Bill. Also in that discussion we dealt with the need for BEDO to vote as a bloc, if its actions were to
be effective. In addition, we pointed out that passage of appropriations bills in the Ohio House requires an absolute majority. Subsequently, in order to conduct a comparable test on the significance of group size, particularly among groups of notable size, we put forth similar conditions referenced in determining the effectiveness of BEDO during deliberations on HB155. They are as follows:

1) Let us assume that we have a 'dummy bill' which is ready for floor votes in each of the respective chambers (where there are groups of notable size);

2) Let us assume that all parent-party caucuses, (i.e., House Democrats, House Republicans, Senate Democrats, and Senate Republicans), invoke party-rule voting; and,

3) Let us assume that all chambers require an absolute majority for passage of our dummy bill.

Subsequently, we believe, we will produce a more realistic interpretation of the data, particularly as related to groups of notable size within and across the nation's Legislatures.

Overall the data reveal very few cases where groups of notable size are positioned to effect change within their respective chambers and/or Legislatures. As we read down Table 6.2, it is readily observed that the first three cases do not meet our conditions. Most notably, black lawmakers in the Georgia Senate are shown to be unable to influence passage of our dummy bill because that group is only seven
(13%) of the overwhelmingly Democrat-controlled Senate. The same situation is seen in the Georgia House, where, for example, Democrats control 144 seats in that 180-seat chamber. Therefore, for instance, if 91 votes are required for the Georgia House to pass the dummy bill, then quite unlike the case involving passage of the 1975 Appropriations Bill in the Ohio House, the Georgia House Democratic Caucus can act successfully without the black membership.

Now, let us review those cases which meet our conditions. Black membership in the Illinois Senate and House is significant for passage of our dummy bill. In the Senate, Democrats control the majority, 31 to 28 Republicans; black membership is seven (23 percent of the Senate Democratic Caucus) and 12 percent of the Senate. In fact, this case illustrates an instance where the Senate Democratic Caucus requires full support of its black membership in order to pass any legislation requiring party-line voting. In the Illinois House, the relative significance of black membership is likewise noteworthy. There, black membership is 22 of the 67 seats held by the Democrat-controlled majority (33 percent of the Democratic Caucus) and 19 percent of the House. Consequently, Democrat caucuses in both chambers require black membership's support to pass any party-line legislation.
In the Michigan House we see similarities to the case involving black membership in the Ohio House. The Michigan House Democratic Caucus controls 61 of the 110 seats in the Michigan House; black membership is 21 percent of the Democratic Caucus and nine percent of the House. The next five cases do not meet our conditions. In addition, back in Chapter IV we explained in considerable detail the significance of group size for BEDO membership in the Ohio House and that case fits our conditions in this exercise too.

Another case which illustrates our point is seen in the Pennsylvania House. Similar to Democrats in the Illinois Senate, Pennsylvania House Democrats have narrow control of 104 seats in that 203-member chamber; and black membership is 15 seats or 14 percent of the House Democratic Caucus. Black membership is seven percent in the House. In fact, given our conditions, the Pennsylvania House Democratic Caucus needs virtually all its membership to pass any party-line legislation.

Our point has been made: when one takes into account variables operating within most Legislatures, such as party control, size of black membership was found to be significant in only five cases among groups of notable size. Put another way, size alone is not a determinant of effective group legislative activity.
Before concluding this discussion we need to address a couple of other concerns. First, although we concentrated on groups of notable size, this is not to imply that all other groups have no relative significance within their respective chambers and Legislatures. For example, when we alter the conditions raised earlier, such as 'relaxing party-line voting', then cases involving the Tennessee House, the Missouri Senate, the New Jersey House, and the Virginia House— which show extremely close party control— also exemplify the degree to which group size can effect change. In addition, this exercise was not meant to imply that groups of relatively small sizes have no influence; that is simply not true.

This then brings us to our next point. According to Jones (1991), there is a trend toward cross-party coalitions. During 1989, reports Jones, "cross-party coalitions formed in several states, resulting in the removal of long-tenured legislative leaders." He cites the Florida Senate, the Tennessee Senate, the North Carolina House (where, in 1991 Daniel Blue, Jr., a black man, was elected House Speaker), the Rhode Island Senate, and the Connecticut House (pp. 114-115). The point here is that group size coupled with other factors can lead to relative significance within and across Legislatures. This investigator contends, however, that association to party
control is still most probably one of the strongest factors to consider when determining group influence.

At this time we return to other observations in the data on black membership in the 1989-1990 and the 1991-1992 Legislatures. Since we have already dealt with differences in legislative bodies, chambers, group size, sex, and partisan composition, we will review other features.

Other features

Other features, such as 'minority' configurations are not included in the data. For example, unlike the Ohio General Assembly, Legislatures in New York, California, New Mexico, and Florida all have membership representing ethnic and/or language-minority people, such as Spanish-speaking and Asian people. New York has a sizable Puerto Rican population; Florida has a large Cuban population, et cetera.

Those cases are noteworthy also because several names listed in the JCPS data set, at least in the one faxed to this investigator, were of Spanish and/or other group derivation. Consider for example surnames of Castro and Fernandez. Perhaps those observations help account for some of the variations in the two sources of data.

At this point a question for future research is with the impact of 'other groups' on legislative activity among the black groups. In the study before us we are primarily
interested in the influence of race, size, and partisanship on BEDO's legislative activity. Yet, when viewed in this light, the issue becomes relatively more complex.

Subsequently, at issue with the nation's black state legislative groups is the relative merit of coalescing with other groups, particularly those identified as 'other minority', as well as the issue of coalescing with white women -- another group of growing interest in the study of state legislative activity. Couched within these two issues is one of whether the perceived need for larger group size outweighs the loss of each group's own relative influence. This is quite puzzling for groups lauding 'all black' status.

An article in the Atlanta Journal • Atlanta Constitution seemingly takes these very issues a step further. See the following excerpt:

"The (Georgia) General Assembly has 32 female lawmakers (13 black), not one of whom can set a committee agenda, force a bill to the floor, or kill it all together" (Jeanne Cummings, Atlanta Journal • Atlanta Constitution, January 20, 1991).

Consequently, other implications lie within 1) the relative status of black state legislative groups' leadership and committee chairmanship roles, and 2) each group's relative voting strength, such as a black caucus within the House and/or Senate, as well as within each respective Legislature
(which we covered earlier). Consider also the relative voting strength of groups within each group (i.e., black women among black men) and within coalitions (e.g., white women, Hispanics, and Asians, among other factors).

Other interesting observations are found in the data where, for example, in some cases black women legislators outnumber or nearly equal the number of black men. See, for instance, data in Table 6.1 on the Arkansas House, the California Assembly, the Georgia House, the Illinois Senate, and the New York Assembly. Upon closer scrutiny of the situation in the Georgia House, for example, in the 1989-1990 General Assembly, there were 16 men to nine women, by 1991-1992 the ratios in size and sex changed to 12 men to 13 women legislators, respectively.

Additionally, the data reveal yet other interesting patterns among the groups, particularly among states which are least populated, as well as least populated with black Americans. Typically, there is zero to a couple of black men in those legislative bodies, yet the data reveal where black legislators exist, they tend to be women; Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Oregon are cases in point. More specifically, Arizona and Colorado have one black man and two black women in the House, with one black woman and one black man in their respective Senates. Oklahoma has two black women in the Senate and one in the House, along with
two men. Alaska has one black woman in the House; Oregon has one black woman in its House and two black men in the Senate. Wyoming has only one black member in its 1991-1992 Legislature, Senator Harriet Byrd. With few exceptions those data mirror the situation for the 1989-1990 Legislatures too.

Michigan appears to be the only state which lost black membership, one man and two women in its House of Representatives. Neither of the two sources of data deals with questions on defeat, resignation, or retirement, therefore we cannot explain why those losses occurred.

Several questions for future research stem from within the data. Are most of the senate districts represented by black members comprised primarily of house districts represented by black members? This is significant in aiding ones assessment of the breadth and scope of constituents represented by black state senators. For example, Georgia has eight black state senators; Illinois and Maryland each has seven black state senators; South Carolina has six; Alabama, Louisiana, and New York all have five, respectively. Otherwise, the numbers average one to four black state senators, and in many states there are no black state senators. Additionally, given extremely small numbers on black state senators, how, if at all, are the groups
preparing for recruitment into their respective upper chambers?

Therefore, the data signal lots of questions, most of which require higher level analysis, as well as additional data. What about levels of seniority? What is the relative status of seniority among these groups? Are the groups more or less effective as cohesive voting blocs within their respective legislatures? Are all groups of black state legislators organized as legislative caucuses, such as BEDO? How effectively are they organized? Do the groups network on the national level? Are they active in the NBCSL, NCSL, and/or other legislative organizations and, if so, how effectively do they operate? Moreover, although this study does not attempt to analyze the relative status of each black group within its respective legislature, it does focus on three of the more notable groups, i.e., Ohio, Maryland, and Illinois. In the following discussions we explore the relative status of the three groups in more detail.

Finally, the data on the 1991-1992 Legislatures show the overwhelming majority of the nation's legislative bodies have zero to nine black members, with black representatives far outnumbering black senators. In addition, with the exceptions of black membership in the Illinois General Assembly, the Ohio House, the Michigan House, and the Pennsylvania House, size of group is basically
insignificant, particularly among groups of notable size. With respect to the five cases cited, however, group size was found to be significantly associated with size of Legislature, chamber, and Democrat party-control.

Yet, the data reveal little else on relative status within and across legislative bodies. Therefore, we move to another level of analysis and look exclusively at the three groups under consideration from the 1966 elections up to the 1990 elections.

Comparisons of Constituencies, Configuration of Districts, and Legislative Features among the Illinois, Maryland, and Ohio Legislative Black Caucuses

At this point we refer to the three groups of black state legislators as caucuses. This is because their existence as organized legislative groups has already been documented: Colston on black elected officials in the Ohio House of Representatives (1972), McGriggs on black state legislators in Illinois (1977), Bragg on black state legislators in Maryland (1979), and the study before us on BEDO, respectively.

Among earlier findings, for example, it was reported that the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses were not cohesive groups, at least not at the time they were studied. It was also reported that black state lawmakers in the Maryland and Illinois General Assemblies tend to
represent predominantly black constituencies, and those constituencies were clustered in one or two metropolitan areas of each state. Most significantly, however, were earlier findings that neither of the two black caucuses operated effectively within its respective General Assembly.

Subsequently, in this discussion we start with those findings and go a step further comparing the three caucuses along additional features up to recent General Assemblies. First, we examine the population of each state and show how and where the black population fits within the total population. Following that examination we show where black populations of notable size or clusters reside within the three states, which are virtually the same areas as over a decade and a half ago. Second, we examine data on voting age and voter registration among the black populations within the three states. Those data, it is believed, provide an interesting profile about constituencies currently represented by legislators in the three black caucuses. In addition, the third part of this discussion focuses on comparisons of features within and across the three legislatures. Overall, with respect to constituencies and configuration of districts the data show variations within and across the three states, with Maryland and Illinois most similar, and Ohio, the most distinct. With respect to characteristics of the three legislatures, the
legislature in Ohio also stands out as the most distinct. We turn now to the first part of our examination which deals with constituencies and configuration of districts.

constituencies and configuration of districts

Data referenced in this discussion were extracted from the National Roster of Black Elected Officials (1990, pp. 153-155, 217-220, and 343-345), and the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Data User Service's Division, February 1991 (P.L. Law 94-171 Redistricting Data).

Beginning with Maryland, the smallest of the three states has approximately 4.8 million people, with black population at 25 percent of the total, the largest proportion among the three states. More specifically, the city of Baltimore has over 736,000 people, of which 435,768 (59%) are black; the city of Annapolis, the capital, is 33 percent black; and, Prince George's County is 51 percent black. All three cities are located in the same region of the state, and state legislative districts located within each area are represented overwhelmingly by members of the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus.

Illinois is the largest of the three states with a population of over 11.4 million people, of which 15 percent is black. Similar to Maryland, Illinois' black population is largely concentrated in one metropolitan area, Chicago.
The Bureau of the Census records 2,783,726 people residing in the city of Chicago, of which the black population is over one million, (39%); and, certain areas of the city have considerably higher proportions of black population, such as the South Side and Lake Calumet. The Chicago area is represented by an overwhelming majority of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus.

Quite unlike the states of Maryland and Illinois, however, Ohio, with 10.8 million people, has the smallest black population at approximately 11 percent of the total. Also, quite unlike Maryland and Illinois, the black population in Ohio is widely dispersed geographically, though located primarily within the seven major metropolitan areas as follows:

- City of Akron 54,656/223,019 25%
- City of Cincinnati 138,132/364,040 38%
- City of Cleveland 235,405/505,616 47%
- City of Columbus 142,748/632,910 23%
- City of Dayton 73,595/182,044 40%
- City of Toledo 65,598/332,943 20%
- City of Youngstown 36,487/95,732 38%

Each of the seven metropolitan areas is represented by at least one black state legislator; Columbus is represented by two; and, the Cleveland and Cincinnati areas represented by at least three black lawmakers, respectively.
Differences among the three states were also observed within voting age population statistics, with Illinois and Maryland being most similar. Maryland has the largest proportion of black voting age population at 24 percent to the state's total voting age population. Black registered voters in Maryland comprise 18 percent of the total number of registered voters.

Illinois follows Maryland with a black voting age population at 16 percent to the total voting age population for the state; and, its black voting age population is 77 percent of the total black population. Also similar to the case of Maryland, the relationship of black voter registration to the total for the state is 19 percent.

In Ohio, the black voting age population is nine percent of the total voting age population, least among the three states. Black registered voters in Ohio comprise nine percent of the total number of registered voters in that state.

Back when Colston (1972), McGriggs (1977), and Bragg (1979) conducted their studies, virtually all black state legislators were elected from districts with large concentrations of black populations and, that factor has not altered significantly to date. This point is significant on yet another level. For example, although congressional representation is not the focus of this study,
it is related because most of the nation's black congressman tend to be elected from districts with large concentrations of black state legislators, who in turn are elected from districts with sizable black constituencies, such as Cleveland, OH., Baltimore, MD. and Chicago, IL. Therefore, there are several implications in the data related to the future election of black congressmen, especially for those representing areas which face losing seats due to decreases in population over the past decade.

From the late 1960s up to the 1990 elections the state of Maryland had eight congressional districts with one represented by a black person from Baltimore; Ohio had 21 congressional districts with one represented by a black person from Cleveland; and Illinois had 22 congressional districts with three represented by black persons, all from the Chicago area, respectively. Today, Ohio and Maryland face the greater probably of losing congressional representation due to population losses, and recent accounts indicate Ohio will lose one of its districts, most probably in the Cleveland area. Early speculation on districts targeted include 25-year veteran Congressman Clarence Miller, (R-Lancaster), and more recently, Democrat Edward F. Feighan of suburban Cleveland. Although Congressman Stokes represents the district with the greatest population loss, the law forbids reducing black representation in Congress.
What about state legislative districts? The Cleveland area, long recognized for its large delegation of black state lawmakers, also will most probably lose a seat or two in the redistricting process. For now, however, redistricting plans have yet to be presented and we can only speculate. Therefore, we turn our attention to the final discussion in this part, which deals with features of each legislature and constituency sizes.

**variations within and across the three General Assemblies**

Each of the three General Assemblies also varies. Taking Ohio first, the smallest body, it is already known that there are 132 seats in the Ohio General Assembly: 99 house seats and 33 senate seats, all held by members elected from single-member districts. Each representative's district is comprised of at least 101,000 constituents, and each senate district, approximately 300,000 constituents, respectively. Therefore, there are three house districts to each senate district. Senators serve four-year terms, representatives serve two-year terms.

Illinois has the second largest General Assembly with a total of 177 seats. Its 59 senators are elected from single-member districts of nearly 195,000 constituents. A constituency size of over 97,000 is represented by each of the 118 representatives. In this case, the ratio is two
representatives' districts to each senate district. Senators serve staggered terms of two or four years, and representatives serve two-year terms. More specifically, Illinois Senate districts are divided into three groups. One group of senators serves terms of 4-years, 4-years, and two-years; the second group serves terms of 4-years, 2-years, and 4-years; and, the third group serves terms of 2-years, 4-years, and 4-years. In addition, the entire Senate is up for election every 10 years, beginning in 1972, which means the next major election year for all Illinois senators is in 1992. For further information, consult The Book of the States (1990-91 Edition, p. 123). Consequently, state lawmakers in the Illinois Senate have a relatively complex election system as compared to their counterparts in the Maryland and Ohio Senate.

The Maryland General Assembly follows Illinois' as the largest with a total of 188 seats: 141 delegate seats and 47 senate seats. Theoretically, there are four delegate seats to each senate seat in Maryland. Unlike both Ohio and Illinois, however, all state legislators in Maryland serve four-year terms. Senators are elected from single-member districts, and delegates, from within the 47 senate districts, which points to yet other variations. First, because of the relatively small population in the state and the relatively large number of seats in the
legislature, the number of constituents per legislative district is quite small. Each senate district includes approximately 93,600 constituents and since delegates are elected from within senate districts, it is almost amusing to compare constituency size in Maryland to Ohio and Illinois. On the other hand, however, size is a relative factor.

In sum, there are several differences among general features of the three state legislatures, constituencies, and district configurations. Overall, however, black state lawmakers in Ohio have substantially larger constituencies as compared to their counterparts in Maryland and Illinois. Black lawmakers in Ohio tend also to represent more racially diverse and geographically dispersed districts as compared to black lawmakers in Maryland and Illinois, who, on the other hand, tend to represent districts with heavy concentrations and/or single clusters of black populations. One needs also to keep in mind that all state lawmakers in Maryland serve four-year terms. Also, Illinois senators are elected from within a complex system in which each term varies from 2-years to 4-years. Therefore, determinations on levels of effectiveness need to keep these differences in mind.

To illustrate our point further we turn to comparisons on other features common among the three black caucuses. We
examine how each caucus fits inside its respective legislature by comparing size of caucus, partisan composition of caucus to chamber and legislature, and sex composition, respectively. We also are interested in how the three caucuses compare with respect to committee chairmanships and leadership positions. To that end we examine various data across several General Assemblies to help create a more comprehensive profile on the relative status of the three black caucuses.

The Relative Status of the Illinois, Maryland and Ohio Legislative Black Caucuses within and across Five General Assemblies

This discussion is based on information generated from surveys administered through the mail to four clerks of the House and Senate in the Maryland and Illinois General Assemblies, respectively. The survey instrument consisted of a cover letter and three-part questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire asked the clerks for the number, sex, and partisanship of black members including the partisan composition of each chamber for five General Assemblies, 1967-1968, 1977-1978, 1987-1988, 1989-1990, and 1991-1992. The second part of the questionnaire dealt with black members serving in leadership positions during the same General Assemblies. The third part asked for names and titles of committee chairs and vice chairs held by black
members over the General Assemblies under consideration. See cover letter and questionnaire in Appendix F.

The survey was administered in February 1991 through the mail. With the exception of the Clerk of the Illinois House of Representatives, the other three clerks responded. Later on, however, the Legislative Research Unit of the Illinois General Assembly faxed a 10-page report of historical data on black lawmakers in Illinois, (1876-1991). McGriggs (1977) provides certain data on the size, partisanship, committee assignments, and leadership positions held by black members serving in the Illinois General Assembly up to 1977.

Another, though relatively minor problem was in the response to one of the items in the first part of the questionnaire from the Clerk of the Maryland Senate. The clerk provided information on partisan composition of black membership only and not on partisan composition of the Senate, we were able to reference Bragg (1979) for certain information, and The Book of the States on the partisan composition of the three General Assemblies.

In sum, we had hoped to reference a single source, that is, all clerks, thereby aiding the level and degree of reliability of the data. On the whole, however, the data generated, including previously collected data on Ohio General Assemblies and 1991-1992 rosters on committee
assignments in the Ohio legislature, were most useful for the ensuing analyses. With that we turn our attention to the first part of the data analysis. It deals with comparisons of the three black caucuses by size, partisan composition, sex, size of chamber, and size of legislature, respectively. See Table 6.3 for compilation of the data.

patterns in sex composition, state, group size, size of chamber, and partisanship of chamber across five General Assemblies

On the whole the data reveal each of the three black caucuses increased in size from the 1967-1968 General Assembly up to the middle to late 1980s. Simultaneous to increases in size was the virtual elimination of (black) Republicans coupled with remarkable increases in number of (black) women. Additionally, the data show the Maryland and Illinois black caucuses, unlike BEDO, have grown substantially in size over the five General Assemblies.

At the start of the 1967-1968 General Assemblies reapportionment had already taken effect in Ohio and there were 99 seats in the Ohio House and 33 seats in the Ohio Senate. That was not the case in the Maryland General Assembly where changes in size of legislative body appear in the data in the 1977-1978 period, and after 1983 for Illinois. Meanwhile, the Maryland House decreased from 142 to 141 seats; the Illinois Senate increased from 58 to 59
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illinois GA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Seats</td>
<td>980:770 (175)</td>
<td>940:830 (177)</td>
<td>670:510 (118)</td>
<td>670:510 (118)</td>
<td>720:460 (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Seats</td>
<td>370:190 (56)</td>
<td>340:250 (59)</td>
<td>310:280 (59)</td>
<td>310:280 (59)</td>
<td>310:280 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GA</td>
<td>1,350:960 (235)</td>
<td>1,280:1,080 (236)</td>
<td>1,170:790 (177)</td>
<td>1,170:790 (177)</td>
<td>1,170:790 (177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 vacancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maryland GA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Seats</td>
<td>1170:250 (142)</td>
<td>1250:150 (141)</td>
<td>1240:170 (141)</td>
<td>1250:160 (141)</td>
<td>1160:250 (141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Seats</td>
<td>350:80 (43)</td>
<td>390:80 (47)</td>
<td>400:80 (47)</td>
<td>400:80 (47)</td>
<td>380:90 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GA</td>
<td>1,520:330 (189)</td>
<td>1,640:230 (188)</td>
<td>1,640:230 (188)</td>
<td>1,640:230 (188)</td>
<td>1,540:340 (188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio GA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Seats</td>
<td>620:370 (99)</td>
<td>620:370 (99)</td>
<td>600:390 (99)</td>
<td>590:400 (99)</td>
<td>610:390 (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Seats</td>
<td>230:100 (33)</td>
<td>210:120 (33)</td>
<td>180:150 (99)</td>
<td>180:140 (99)</td>
<td>210:120 (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GA</td>
<td>850:470 (132)</td>
<td>830:490 (132)</td>
<td>780:540 (132)</td>
<td>770:540 (132)</td>
<td>720:510 (132)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Legend:** 'GA' means General Assembly; 'Sen.' means Senate; 'Dem.' means Democrat; 'Rep.' means Republican; 'Bl.' means black; 'Wm.' means women.

**Source:** These data were collected from surveys administered to clerks of the respective Houses and Senates referenced herein, and the Book of the States for partisan composition of each legislative body. Discrepancies in compilation and reporting are responsibility of this investigator.
seats; and, the number of seats in the Illinois House decreased from 177 to 118, respectively. At the time, there were four black members in the Illinois Senate, all men and Democrats, approximately seven percent of the Senate. There were nine black members in the Maryland House, of whom seven were men with one Republican among them, and two were women. That group constituted five percent of the Maryland House. There were two black members in the Maryland Senate, one man and one woman, both Democrats. Earlier we described the composition in the Ohio General Assembly but will review it for this discussion. Of the 12 black members at the Statehouse, all were men and two were Republican. Ten of the black members served in the House and two served in the Senate. Black members comprised nine percent of the House and nine percent of the Senate. See Table 6.3.

Black membership in the Illinois and Maryland Senates increased during the 1977-1978 General Assemblies. There were six black members in the Illinois Senate, all Democrats and one woman. There were five black members in the Maryland Senate, all Democrats and one woman. Over the five General Assemblies, no more than two black members have served in the Ohio Senate, and since the 1971-1972 General Assembly they have been Democrats and men, therefore, their proportion has not surpassed six percent of the Ohio Senate. In Illinois and Maryland, black membership constituted 10
and 11 percent of the upper chambers, respectively. See Table 6.3.

According to McGriggs (1977) there were 19 black members in the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus, and since the Senate Clerk reported six black members in the upper chamber, the balance of 13 members were in the House. In the 1977-1978 sessions there were 177 seats in the Illinois House, by January 1983 the number of seats was reduced to 118. Interestingly, the number of black members was not adversely affected. In fact, the number of black members has either remained consistent or increased throughout those changes.

Additionally, we know there were 10 black members in the Ohio House, all Democrats and all men. Of 14 black members in the Maryland House, one was a woman and all were Democrats. Consequently, black members were approximately 10 percent of the Maryland House, 10 percent of the Ohio House, and seven percent of the Illinois House, respectively.

By the 1987-1988 General Assemblies black membership appears to have stabilized, especially in the three upper chambers. That was also the period in which the presence of black women became notable, at least as compared to the previous 20 years. Of seven black members in the Illinois Senate, all were Democrats and three were women. In the
Maryland Senate there were six black members, all men and Democrats. Black members constituted 12 percent of the Illinois Senate and 13 percent of the Maryland Senate.

Also during the 1987-1988 period, black membership remained highest in the Maryland House, with 20 delegates (14 percent), respectively. In Ohio, black membership was at 11 in the Ohio House (11 percent), its highest. In addition, during the 1989-1990 period, there were significant increases in number of women in the three General Assemblies. In Illinois, there were eight women in the House and three in the Senate. In the Maryland General Assembly there were seven women delegates; and, in Ohio, an additional woman in the House, respectively.

By the 1991-1992 General Assemblies, the only black caucus to experience increases in membership was Maryland's. The Maryland Legislative Black Caucus increased from 28 to 31 members: two new members in the House of Delegates and one new member in the Senate.

By now the reader is aware that black state legislators serving in the Illinois, Maryland, and Ohio General Assemblies since compliance to Baker v. Carr (1962) have been and are Democrats and men, though black women are gaining in number. The question before us is with the effectiveness of their membership within their respective House and Senate Democratic Caucuses, and within their
General Assemblies on the whole. In an earlier exercise we looked at the relationship between group size and party control during the most recent Legislatures nationwide. Each of the three legislative bodies currently under review was included in that exercise. The results of that exercise showed black membership in the Illinois Senate and House, and the Ohio House positioned to effect change. Now, we wish to include the early years to see if other patterns emerge in the data.

Specifically, in the 1967-1968 sessions Republicans dominated the Illinois and Ohio General Assemblies; whereas, freshmen black elected officials in Maryland were inaugurated into an overwhelmingly Democrat-controlled environment. In fact, the data show that Democrats have enjoyed uninterrupted control in the Maryland General Assembly and with decisive margins to date and therein, however, lies a serious impediment to the relative status of black membership. Maryland's black membership has been consistently disproportionate to an overwhelmingly Democrat-controlled General Assembly for the entire 24-years under consideration. Stated another way, the Maryland House and Senate Democrat Caucuses can function effectively with or without support of its black membership, at least, numerically speaking.
Returning to the cases of Illinois and Ohio, we see by the 1977-1978 sessions, black lawmakers in these two legislative bodies had begun to experience majority-party control. We already know that BEDO's size in relationship to Democrat-control in the Ohio House is significant and has remained so from the middle 1970s to date. In addition, since about the same session in Illinois, black membership has achieved similar status as BEDO. Specifically, of 94 seats held by Democrats in the Illinois House, 13 (14%) were held by black members. Of 34 seats held by Democrats in the Illinois Senate, six were held by black members. Therefore, during the 1977-1978 sessions, size of black membership across these two black caucuses was significantly related to legislative activity of parent-party caucuses.

Data in Table 6.3 also show increases in significance of group size in the Illinois Senate during the 1987-1988 sessions. At the time black membership was a substantial portion (23%) of the Senate Democrat Caucus, and in the House, group size was even more significant, at 33 percent of the House Democrat Caucus.

In sum, the question remains with respect to overall effectiveness of the three black caucuses within and across the three General Assemblies. Another indicator of level of effectiveness -- given their relative status within their respective chambers -- is with number and type of committee
chairmanships and vice chairmanships, as well as with leadership positions. Does black membership evidence the acquisition of key committee chairmanships and vice chairmanships, and leadership positions over the course of the 24-years under review? Let us examine those data.

patterns in acquisition of leadership positions

Although the data show black state legislators gradually becoming part of leadership, to date no black members among the three black caucuses examined have acquired the top leadership positions in the House, (i.e., Speaker) nor in the Senate, (i.e., President). Also, as discussed in Chapters IV and V, in order to effect change within the legislative process, several factors need to exist. To this point we have concentrated on size, sex and partisanship of each caucus, yet, in order for size to become relatively operative, other factors need to be considered including leadership, seniority, committee assignments, and chairmanships. Further, as reflected in the data, it takes time to accumulate seniority, leadership, and certain committee assignments and chairmanships. This discussion focuses on leadership positions. Finally, given our earlier findings, we would expect to find, few, if any, members of the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus in leadership, as compared to the more likely acquisition of leadership
positions among members in the Illinois and Ohio Legislative Black Caucuses, respectively.

Starting with the 1967-1968 period, it was not surprising to find no black members in leadership positions. See Appendix F. That was the freshmen year for BEDO and most other black state legislators across the nation. Consequently, regardless of partisanship, freshmen black legislators did not have adequate seniority and experience to acquire leadership positions.

By the 1977-1978 General Assemblies, there were a couple of black legislators holding leadership positions in the Illinois and Ohio General Assemblies. Specifically, Senator Kenneth Hall was Assistant Majority Leader in the Illinois Senate. In Ohio, Representative William Mallory was Majority Floor Leader in the House, along with Senator M. Morris Jackson as Assistant President Pro Tem in the Senate. Additionally, and similar to Bragg (1979), there were no black members in leadership in the Maryland General Assembly at that time.

By the 1987-1988 General Assemblies the situation changed slightly. In Maryland, Senator Clarence W. Blount was Majority Leader in the Senate, along with Representative Nathaniel Exum as Deputy Majority Whip in the House. In Illinois, Senator Richard Newhouse was Assistant Majority Leader where black members comprised 23 percent of the
Senate Democratic Caucus. In Ohio Mallory retained the position of Majority Leader, along with Senator Mike White as Assistant Minority Whip in the Senate. At the time BEDO was 18 percent of the House Democratic Caucus and 13 percent of the Senate Democratic Caucus (and Democrats were the minority-party caucus in the Ohio Senate).

Apparently group size has not aided acquisition of leadership positions among members of the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus, as indicated by our earlier exercise on relationship to party control. In Ohio, black members in the House did not participate in majority-party control until the middle to late 1970s, nor have they enjoyed as decisive margins of control as compared to their counterparts in the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus. Perhaps black lawmakers in the Ohio House play a more pivotal role in party control as compared to black membership in the Maryland General Assembly.

An interesting scenario is observed in the data on the situation in the Illinois Senate, where, for example, with the exception of the Republican majority during the 1967-1968 General Assembly, there has been consistent but close ratios in party control, favoring Democrats. Presumably the power struggle for leadership has been comparatively most competitive in the Illinois Senate and that is in spite of the fact that black membership is 23

Noteworthy also is the above discussions presuppose the Illinois Senate Democratic Caucus and the Maryland House Democratic Caucus are fairly cohesive groups. The discussions also presuppose black membership is relatively cohesive and allied with the respective ruling coalitions within each respective chamber. Take, for example, the concept of machine politics as discussed by McGriggs (1977). Thus far, the data indicate black members in the Illinois Senate have not fared very well with respect to leadership positions over the period examined. The same observations hold for black members in the Maryland General Assembly, who did not acquire leadership until after the 1977-1978 General Assembly.

Overall the data do not show much change in leadership positions for black members in the three General Assemblies for the 1991-1992 sessions either. In Illinois, for instance, Senator Earlean Collins, a woman, became Assistant Majority Leader, thereby filling the only leadership position held by black members in the Illinois Senate to date. In Maryland, Senator Blount retained the position of Majority Leader in the Senate, along with three other black members in House leadership positions, Representatives' Nathaniel Exum, Frank Boston, and Ulysses Currie, all of whom serve in the Deputy Majority Whip position. It is
interesting that there are three legislators serving in the same type of leadership position which leads one to assume there are a lot of factions in the Maryland House Democratic Caucus. Finally, Mallory retained the position of Majority Leader in the Ohio House. Yet, with White's election to Mayor to the city of Cleveland, no other black member succeeded him in filling the position of Assistant Minority Leader in the Ohio Senate.

In sum, one would assume--over the 24-year period reviewed--black members would hold more and higher levels of leadership within and across the three General Assemblies as compared to that reported herein. One would also assume that black members in the Illinois General Assembly had achieved substantially more and higher level leadership positions as compared to their counterparts in Ohio but the data do not show that. In contrast to black membership in the Illinois General Assembly and in spite of limited majority party-control, black membership in the Ohio Senate has acquired comparatively higher levels in leadership and with relatively more consistency. Now we make comparisons among the three caucuses in committee chairmanships and vice chairmanships where differences among the three black caucuses become even more apparent.
patterns in committee chairmanships and vice chairs

Several interesting observations were found in the data. See Appendix F where we report information submitted by the clerks on committee chairmanships and vice chairmanships for the General Assemblies under examination. First, common within and across each of the three General Assemblies was the absence of black legislators chairing or vice chairing any committees during the 1967-1968 sessions. Also interesting in the 1967-1968 sessions was the presence of what were called 'minority spokesmen', Democrats, who, at the time, functioned in the Republican-controlled Illinois Senate. Interestingly, of four black legislators serving as 'minority spokesmen', none represented key committees.

Additionally, the data reveal when chairs and vice chairs were acquired they were similar among Illinois and Ohio black lawmakers. Specifically, from the 1977-1978 sessions up to the current sessions, the data show black membership in the Ohio House and Senate, and in the Illinois Senate acquiring a variety and larger number of chairs and vice chairs as compared to black membership in the other chambers. Yet, as we examine the data more closely, black membership in the Ohio General Assembly stands out most notably among all three black caucuses with respect to the type and number of committee chairmanships and vice chairmanships acquired over the course of this study. This
point will be elaborated on as the discussion progresses.

Also notable in the data was the apparent void in chairs and vice chairs among members of the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus and that void remained up to the 1987-1988 period. These observations in the data further substantiate earlier arguments about the relative status of the three black caucuses. Let us examine each period more closely.

Probably the most notable observation in the data on chairmanships among the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus was seen during the 1977-1978 Maryland General Assembly. At the time Representative John W. Douglass chaired the Joint Budget and Audit Committee. Serving with Douglass was Senator Blount, vice chairman of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee (since 1975). These observations are noteworthy because whenever the House and Senate Budget Committees fail to reach concurrence, joint committees are established. Chairmanships and vice chairmanships on joint budget committees are generally awarded by leadership to high ranking committee members and to members with considerable respect on the budget committees among their peers. Consequently, at the time, both Douglass and Blount were in positions to effect considerable change within the Maryland General Assembly. For that period the data reveal no comparable positions among black lawmakers in the Ohio or Illinois General Assemblies.
Meanwhile, with respect to other committee chairs held by black lawmakers during the 1977-1978 sessions, the data reveal similarities in the Ohio General Assembly and the Illinois Senate. Interestingly, however, was the common finding that one of the first committee chairs awarded any black lawmaker was 'Welfare'. For instance, of eight chairs and vice chairs held by black lawmakers in the Illinois Senate, there were only two chairmen: Senator Fred Smith chaired the Senate Public Health, Welfare and Corrections Committee, and Senator Charles Chew chaired the Senate Transportation Committee. In Ohio, beginning with the 1973-1974 sessions, Representative Phale D. Hale chaired the House Health and Welfare Committee, along with Representative James Rankin who chaired the Welfare Section of the House Finance Committee. In the Ohio Senate, Senator Jackson chaired the Senate Education and Welfare Committee from the 1975-1976 sessions up to the 1979-1980 sessions. Most notable during this period, however, was the acquisition of a key vice chairmanship by Representative Casey Jones on the House Reference Committee (which he held until the end of the 1970s). At the time, however, the data reveal no other black members holding a comparable (key) committee position.

Also interesting was the observation where black lawmakers in Ohio chaired committees, their counterparts in
Illinois were vice chairs of similar committees. For instance, from the 1977-1978 up to the 1979-1980 sessions, Senator Bowen chaired the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee; in Illinois, Senator Earlean Collins was vice chair of the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee. Otherwise, where Ohio lawmakers held vice chairs, so did their counterparts in the Illinois Senate and on similar or comparable committees, such as the Elections and Financial Institutions Committees, and Transportation Committees, respectively.

Earlier in this dissertation we explored what was believed to have been a coup within the Ohio House Democratic Caucus back in the middle 1970s, one in which current Speaker Vern Riffe was the victor. We also speculated, quite accurately we believe, black members in the Ohio House supported Riffe. According to Bragg (1979) a similar power struggle took place within the Maryland Senate following the 1978 elections. At the time Senator Clarence W. Blount, a rapidly rising black member in the Senate, "reportedly supported the wrong candidate for President of the Senate"; therefore, when key committee chairmanships were handed out (p.91) he was passed over for another legislator (who happened to be white). Senator Blount was in line to become chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.
Meanwhile, between the 1977-1978 and the 1987-1988 sessions black lawmakers in Ohio were making history, at least with respect to committee chairmanships. Senator Jackson became chairman of the Senate Rules Committee during the 1977-1978 sessions and he chaired the Senate Reference Committee in the 1979-1980 sessions. Later in the 1983-1984 sessions, Senator Bowen chaired the Senate Finance Committee. Up to those points in time, none of BEDO's counterparts in Maryland and Illinois held comparable chairmanships, all of which are key committee positions in any Legislature. Consequently, it is most apparent in the data that BEDO, unlike its counterpart caucuses, was well-established in the committee structure to effect change in the Ohio General Assembly.

These observations are significant for another reason. Over the course of this investigation Senate Democrats in Ohio have enjoyed limited majority-party status and during periods of Democratic-control both black members have tended to benefit most favorably. Additionally, from the 1985-1986 sessions up to the 1991-1992 sessions, however, Republicans have controlled the Ohio Senate, therefore, there were no other chairmanships awarded to black members in the Senate. These observations also are significant because actual size of black membership in the Ohio Senate is smallest among the three groups of black senators under examination. Finally,
BEDO appears to be in a more pivotal position to effect change as compared to its counterpart caucuses in the Illinois and Maryland General Assemblies as evidenced by the variety, number, and consistency of committee chairmanships and vice chairmanships acquired over the course of this study.

Between the 1987-1988 sessions and the 1991-1992 sessions the data show some change in number and types of chairmanship positions acquired by black membership in the Maryland and Illinois General Assemblies. Specifically, in Illinois the Senate Appropriations II Committee (a section of the Senate Appropriations Committee) was chaired by Senator Kenneth Hall during both General Assemblies. In Maryland Representative Howard P. Rowlings was vice chair of the House Appropriations Committee, and Representative Hattie N. Harrison chaired House Rules and Executive Nominations Committee, both in the Maryland House of Delegates.

Other interesting observations deal with the presence of black women chairing a variety of committees within and across the General Assemblies, as well as with black lawmakers chairing the Elections and Reapportionment Committees, and the Executive Nominations Committees. Refer to Appendix F for details.
At this point in time, chairmanships of Elections and Reapportionment Committees are an integral part in the reapportionment process. In the Illinois Senate, for example, black lawmakers have either chaired or served as vice chairmen of these committees from as far back as the 1977-1978 sessions, and in the 1991-1992 sessions, a woman, Senator Ethel Skyles Alexander, serves as chairperson. In Ohio, Representative Rhine McLin acquired the vice chair of the House Elections and Townships Committee. The significance of black members chairing these committees is directly related to their ability to effect change with respect to redrawing state and congressional district lines. If their parties control the General Assembly, they have a far greater chance of designing districts compatible with their preferences. However, in order to assess the effective role of these committee chairmanships one must follow the activity of each committee, a procedure beyond the scope of this investigation.

That BEDO chairs fewer committees in recent sessions as compared to the 1970s through the 1987-1988 sessions is attributed largely to deaths and retirements among charter and senior membership, (i.e., James Rankin, John Thompson, M. Morris Jackson, Mike White, and C.J. McLin). Even so, the organization continued to acquire significant roles on committees during the 1991-1992 sessions. In the Ohio
House, BEDO acquired chairmanship of a subcommittee on the House Appropriations Committee (Miller on Human Resources) and a vice chairmanship of a subcommittee on Appropriations, (Mallory on Education), respectively. (See Ohio House committee roster in Exhibit F). Otherwise, refer to data examined in Chapter IV on committee assignments and chairmanships where the variety, number, and types of chairmanships acquired by BEDO are evidenced. In any case, up to this point in time, the data consistently support our contention that BEDO is better positioned overall to effect change as compared to the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses.

Before ending this discussion we will address briefly the subject of seniority. Although we did not collect data on seniority of members in the Maryland and Illinois Legislative Black Caucuses, certain data were available allowing us to make some useful observations. McGriggs' (1977) study included black state legislators elected to the Illinois General Assembly from as far back as the 1942 elections. Particular reference is with Illinois State Senator Fred Smith, initially elected to the House of Representatives in 1942, later running for the Senate where he served from 1954 to 1978. Serving with Smith was Corneal A. Davis, also elected to the House in 1942, according to data extracted from the Illinois Legislative Research Unit.
Report. In fact, according to that report Smith and Davis each amassed 36-years tenure in the Illinois General
Assembly. Noteworthy also are Senators Newhouse, Hall, and Chew who have seniority comparable to the charter and senior
members of BEDO, (see McGriggs, 1977, pp. 249-258); former
Senator Chew, first elected in the 1966 elections, died in
1986.

In addition, Maryland's black caucus is most similar to
Illinois' with respect to size and number of women. On the
other hand, however, the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus
had more women elected during an earlier period than did the
other two caucuses. For example, Truly Hatchett was the
first black female elected to the Maryland House of
Delegates (1954-1958), followed by Verda Welcome
(1959-1963), later becoming the first black woman elected to
the Maryland Senate from 1963 to the present, and Irma
George Dixon (1959-1963), all Democrats (Bragg, 1979, pp.
13-14).

At this time we wish to place some of our major findings
in perspective. In this way the reader will hopefully
better understand how we arrive at the conclusion that BEDO
is most viable among the three black caucuses examined, and
most probably among all groups of black state lawmakers
nationwide.
Overall Findings:

1) In the beginning of our data analysis we examined the relative status of groups of black lawmakers nationwide in the 1989-1990 and the 1991-1992 Legislatures. We argued that size was not a singular determinant of relative status within or across Legislatures and set forth conditions to test our argument. It was revealed that—when party control is taken into account—group size was significant in only five cases. Those cases included the Illinois Senate, Illinois House, Michigan House, Ohio House, and the Pennsylvania House, respectively. The significance of BEDO’s size and relationship to party control were argued earlier in this dissertation and the organization was found to be in a pivotal position to effect change, for example, with respect to passage of the Appropriations Bill in the Ohio House in 1975, and the organization’s status has not altered to date.

In addition, the data showed the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus to be disproportionate to an overwhelmingly Democrat-controlled environment for the entire 24-years under examination. Consequently, although the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus is largest in size among the three black caucuses, it does not possess relative status within the Maryland General Assembly to effect change.
2) We argued that the greater the diversity in constituencies represented by the caucus, the greater its influence, and the data revealed that black membership in the Ohio General Assembly has considerably larger constituencies, more racially diverse, and geographically dispersed districts as compared to its counterparts in the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses. It was determined that black lawmakers in the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses continue to represent the types of districts represented during the time of McGriggs (1977) and Bragg (1979), respectively. Those districts continue to be clustered in single areas of each state and have considerably larger concentrations of black citizens as compared to districts represented by BEDO.

3) We argued that the more members of a caucus holding key committee assignments and chairmanships coupled with the caucus' level of seniority and leadership positions, the more influence the caucus can wield within its respective legislative body, as well as within its state's political arena. Most of this argument was substantiated in the discussion preceding this report on major findings, and it was found that from the early 1970s up to the 1987-1988 period, BEDO held a wider variety and greater number of key committees and other committee chairmanships, and vice
chairmanships as compared to its counterparts in the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses. In addition, it was revealed that BEDO's members have chaired and served as vice chair on key committees including House and Senate Reference and Rules Committees, and Senate Finance Committee, and recent voids in those positions are due largely to deaths and retirement among charter and senior members. Moreover, our extensive analysis on types and number of committee chairmanships and vice chairmanships acquired by BEDO revealed the organization holding as many as 10 chairs and vice chairs (83%) in the 1977-1978 and 1979-1980 sessions, nine chairs and vice chairs (69%) in the 1987-1988 sessions, and in the 1989-1990 sessions, nine chairs and vice chairs (69% of its membership, respectively). Although the data indicate a change occurring in number and types of committee chairmanships acquired by black membership in the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses during recent sessions, overall, however, those data do not appear comparable to the variety and type of committees already acquired by BEDO.

Additionally, it was found that BEDO demonstrated comparatively more longevity in leadership as compared to its counterparts in the other two caucuses. In fact, this investigation revealed a minority leadership position (Minority Whip) held by Bowen as far back as the 1969-1970
sessions. At the time, Democrats were in the minority in the House of Representatives, and Bowen was the only member of the then Black Elected Officials of Ohio to hold a leadership position. At the time black membership was 22 percent of the House Democratic Caucus. That point is significant because none of the other black caucuses report leadership positions during that period.

It was also revealed that BEDO acquired higher level leadership in the Ohio Senate earlier in its development and retained those positions with more consistency as compared to its counterparts in the Illinois and Maryland Senates. Specifically, M. Morris Jackson was Assistant President Pro Tem, later President Pro Tem, and Mike White was Assistant Minority Whip. Otherwise, none of the black membership in the three caucuses has acquired notable leadership positions, such as President of the Senate or Speaker of the House. Additionally, in the Ohio House, Bill Mallory has probably served in the Majority Leader position longer than any of his counterparts have served in any comparable position.

With respect to seniority we are unable to draw too many conclusions. Black membership in the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses appear to be more extensive with respect to the number and freshmen terms of certain members as compared to BEDO. For example, Fred Smith and Corneal
Davis' freshmen terms were in the 1943-1944 Illinois General Assembly, lasting 36 years, followed by Newhouse, Hall, and the late Senator Chew, all of whom have seniority comparable to BEDO's charter members. It also was observed that black women were present in the Illinois and Maryland General Assemblies for at least two decades before Helen Rankin arrived at the Statehouse in Columbus. Even so, our discussion in Chapter IV substantiates that BEDO has respectable seniority in the Ohio General Assembly. The data revealed a mean score of 5.2 terms, as of the 1977-1978 sessions, a mean score of 7.1 terms by 1987, and 6.5 terms as of the 1989-1990 sessions, respectively. This means there is low turnover in the organization, (i.e., relatively high seniority), as referenced by Jewell (1982). In fact, it was discovered that turnover in BEDO was due largely to death and retirement, and that only one member has lost a reelection campaign, Thomas Hill, back in 1970, (and that seat was filled by another BEDO-supported candidate, Ike Thompson). Yet, the data on seniority reveal little else. Refer to the conclusion to this dissertation for other findings and overall observations.

With that we turn to the final discussion in this chapter. In the following discussion we review BEDO's perceptions about how the organization compares with other black caucuses across America. We also examine BEDO's
perceptions of its' successes and defeats, and its outlook on the future.

**BEDO's Perceptions of other Black Caucuses, Its' Successes and Defeats, and the Future of the Organization**

In Part V of the original survey administered to BEDO we asked the following question:

31.0) "At this time we are interested in knowing what you think are the issues and policies BEDO has been most active in pursuing and what you consider some of the major successes and defeats of the caucus to be?"

Several responses were given and those mentioned most frequently were as follows: 1) fair housing, 2) the Martin Luther King holiday, 3) South African divestiture, 4) Central State University, and 5) the Minority Business Set Aside in state contracting. All five items received BEDO support, and although we will not go into full discussion on all of them, we provide an overview on some perceptions of their relative success.

Beginning with the subject of fair housing, it is noteworthy that probably the most outspoken proponent of fair housing legislation in the Ohio General Assembly has been Representative Troy Lee James. Ironically, however, it is equally noteworthy that James is also the least recognized legislator for his efforts in this area. At the
time of legislative activity on the bill, (HB1), Richard F. Celeste was serving the first part of his first term (1983-1984) as governor, and was highly lauded throughout the state and nation on the relatively innovative nature of the bill. Yet, the point is the fair housing bill was sponsored by James who was overshadowed by attention afforded the Governor. Let us review the impetus for the legislation, as told from the perspective of its sponsor.

James tells a story about "Tokyo Rose, a radio announcer during World War II who attempted to thwart the morale of the Axis soldiers." Most Ironically, however, following the war Tokyo Rose was allowed to come to America and reside in a Cleveland neighborhood, one in which black people were not even allowed to visit, James says. At the time, he says, the late W.O. Walker, publisher and owner of the Call and Post newspaper and political ally of former Governor James Rhodes, was encountering "restrictions on his efforts to purchase housing in the neighborhood in which Tokyo Rose happened to reside." Later, similar to Walker's experiences, Carl Stokes and David Albritton, "both encountered restrictions when attempting to secure hotel lodging in the capital city during their tenure in the legislature" (early to middle 1960s).

James says former Representatives Stokes and George Voinovich (Republican), now Governor Voinovich, sponsored
legislation dealing with the elimination of restrictions, thereby enabling fair housing for all citizens in Ohio. He recalls also that enforcement measures were a constant problem with early legislation.

It was in the early 1980s when James was successful in drafting and getting enacted one of the most effective and comprehensive fair housing bills in Ohio or any other state in the nation. The bill created a Housing Financing Commission, established criteria for first time home-owner mortgages, as well as financial incentives for socially-disadvantaged residents (e.g., persons residing in low-income predominantly black communities). Certain Cleveland communities, including the Huff area, which experienced blight particularly following the riots in the 1970s are notable.

Through this bill James became the first and only black state lawmaker in Ohio history to successfully amend the Ohio Constitution, while at the same time effecting change in an area most significant to black citizens and others seeking residence "unrestrictedly," and to citizens in need of financial assistance to purchase their first homes. In the state of Illinois, for example, it was 1989 before a comparable measure was enacted (The Affordable Housing Act of 1989).
With respect to the Martin Luther King holiday statute, one would assume that since the first step, (that is, successfully passing a law recognizing the birthday of the slain civil rights leader) has occurred, all is well. Not so. To BEDO, the success of a legislative measure involves more than its legislative success. To BEDO, success involves enactment, plus some measure of implementation and enforcement. For example, was there substantive and clear language, (i.e., in contrast to vague and permissive). Yes. Does the state honor paid-leave-of-absence on the designated day, and the answer is "yes." Do banks and schools, et cetera, recognize the holiday? Yes. In the state of Ohio, the Martin Luther King holiday is recognized with activities and events statewide. Noteworthy also is that until the Reagan Administration acted on the King holiday on the federal level, several other states in the nation did not recognize the holiday. Black lawmakers in Ohio, therefore, have been most influential in pioneering efforts to effect federal legislation honoring Dr. King.

With respect to minority business set asides, Ohio is recognized as the front-runner with its loan, bonding and financing components in the statute, coupled with percentage set asides for goods and services contracting and construction contracting. Ironically, however, in the state of Maryland, home to nationally-recognized 'father of
minority business' Parren Mitchell, there is no comparable measure. In fact, reports Bragg (1979), the language in the Maryland statute, enacted in 1977, is so "vague" and permissive that state agencies hardly acknowledge the law (p. 104).

While serving on the U.S. House Small Business Committee, former Maryland Congressman Parren Mitchell successfully led congressional activity on the inclusion of set asides in federal public works laws, and establishment of the Minority Business Development Agency, which is tied to the Small Business Administration. Most of that activity occurred during the middle to late 1970s. See also Jaynes and Williams (1989, pp. 255-257). The State of Illinois also has a minority business statute but it, similar to Maryland's, is far less comprehensive as compared to the Ohio law.

Additionally, although the Ohio Minority Enterprise statute has been challenged, it remains an effective measure in that numerous minority-owned and operated businesses are now actively engaged in contracting with the state of Ohio, something which was not the case prior to the early 1980s. Most important, however, is the fact that the law is relatively aggressively implemented by agency administrators, and since Rhodes, each governor has declared his support for the statute.
Black lawmakers in Ohio have unquestionable support for the continual growth and development of curriculum and capital improvements of Central State University, the only historic black state institution of higher learning in Ohio. It is through the budget and capital improvements bills that BEDO and other legislators tend to make significant contributions to the university. This is noteworthy given the closings and/or mergers among various historic black state institutions of higher learning and other state colleges and universities during the decade of the 1970s. BEDO remains successful in maintaining the predominant black character of Central State, as well as in keeping it relatively autonomous.

When the state implemented certain high technology programs in the various universities during the middle 1980s, Central State University received a research grant for a water treatment facility and a grant for a horticulture center. Noteworthy also is the fact that minority contractors are recipients of many of the contracts awarded for construction of the university's physical plant.

Although BEDO tends to stand together in efforts to support the university, Representative William Mallory, an alumnus, tends to be most outspoken. Also, in the coming years, one can expect Representative Rhine McLin to become a recognized spokesperson for the institution as well.
is because of notable efforts her father expended in support of the university and vicinity (e.g., establishment of the Afro-American Museum in Wilberforce), as well as because of McLin's position as an instructor at the university.

As stated earlier in this dissertation, BEDO's efforts in the area of South African divestiture have been perceived primarily as defeats. Quite unlike the previously discussed legislation and issues, all legislation introduced to date on South African divestiture has failed. Yet, BEDO pledges to continue introducing bills until one is passed.

On the whole, it is the opinion of this investigator that BEDO has been most successful in effecting change in the Ohio General Assembly. The caucus has experienced considerable success with its agenda, as well as with implementation and enforcement efforts on BEDO-supported bills. Additionally, because of drastic differences in legislation enacted on similar bills in the Maryland and Illinois General Assemblies, this investigator has chosen not to go into full discussion herein. Similar legislation either sponsored or co-sponsored by black lawmakers in the Illinois and Maryland legislatures simply does not contain comparable provisions nor does any of that legislation produce comparable results.

In fact, as of this writing, the situations described in the Maryland General Assembly by Bragg (1979) and in the
Illinois General Assembly by McGriggs (1977) have not altered notably. Recent evidence, however, on individual lawmakers positioned to effect change, particularly on individuals chairing committees and acquiring leadership positions, suggest perhaps earlier commentaries will change. We believe, however, that circumstances in those two General Assemblies must undergo dramatic changes in order for black membership to begin to impact the legislative process as an informal group, especially as compared to the level and degree to which BEDO has already demonstrated. Moreover, black membership in those two legislative bodies must begin to exert their role, even if they face defeat (similar to BEDO on the South African divestiture bills), as a group effort and with consistency. Perhaps those two caucuses will also begin to consider coalition-building with other factions inside and outside of their respective chambers. Finally, it is understood that implementation of these suggestions takes time and adaptation to a political posture which, in the beginning, might not be readily accepted by the entire group(s). Otherwise, as the data show, size of group will remain inconsequential.

To conclude this chapter, we present a few excerpts from BEDO on how some of its members feel the organization resembles or differs from other black caucuses. Starting
with comments made by the late Representative C.J. McLin, it was stated:

"I've been all over this country and, ... I cited examples like in Oklahoma where they had three legislators who were black and none of them speak to each other. In Kansas they fight against each other. The unity is not there among the others. Now, I ah, to be a leader of the caucus is a difficult job. It's just like this. I led the fund-raising activities but when I lead the fund-raising activities for BEDO, I slack on the fund-raising activities for me personally. So consequently, you see, I have never had a fund-raiser in Columbus. I think we are one of the few caucuses that finance our own economic development trips, and that contributes to members' (campaigns)."

[What about in New York, Illinois, and California?] "They are not as strong" (McLin).

"(BEDO) is one of the most effective in the country" (Mallory).

"Others are more politicized" (James).

"(BEDO has) similar philosophy as Congressional Black Caucus" (Whalen).

"Overall, BEDO is much more cohesive and progressive" (as compared to other legislative black caucuses) (Bowen).

On the whole, this investigator observed when the members of BEDO were asked the aforementioned question, they were either immediately direct in noting their relative lack of knowledge about other black caucuses, such as with many of the freshmen and junior members, or they were careful
not to speak in unpopular terms about their counterparts in other Legislatures, most notably the case with the senior and charter members. In fact, the general consensus was that most historic legislative black caucuses are not as organized as BEDO nor are many organized at all, and among those which we tend to hear about, those caucuses are led by individuals who share their notoriety as a caucus effort.

In the conclusion to this study we review our methods for collecting and analyzing the data and outline several of our observations and overall findings. In addition, we address what we believe lies ahead for BEDO, as well as for the study of historic legislative black caucuses.
CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the growth and development of a racial partisan state legislative caucus called BEDO; and it is the opinion of this investigator that we have completed a most thorough exploration on the subject. In Chapter I, we outlined several research interests, all of which were examined throughout this dissertation. We identified the personal interview process as our primary research method whereby we generated data on and about members of the Black Elected Democrats of Ohio (BEDO). That method proved to be most advantageous; a substantial amount of useful data was generated and analyzed herein. In addition, as the study progressed we found ourselves generating more data, not only from personal interviews but from brief, well-directed surveys to legislative officials such as clerks in Houses of Representatives and Senates nationwide. At this time we review some of the major findings and observations of the study, beginning with Chapter II.
In Chapter II we set the stage for what turned out to be an extensive examination of BEDO in particular and what we now call historic legislative black caucuses in general. In addressing the formation of BEDO we chronicled the political history of a group of individuals (black elected Democrats) in the Ohio General Assembly, while simultaneously reviewing corresponding events of the Civil Rights Era (1954-1968). The discussion focused on the charter members, of whom, as of this writing, only three are active, (i.e., Representatives Troy Lee James and William Mallory, and Senator William F. Bowen). The recall of charter members produced the type of insight generally revealed in diaries and memoirs; their recall, often in the form of anecdotes, was very informative. The reader was hopefully able to imagine what certain situations were like from the time the charter members launched their initial election campaigns to the Statehouse up to the present.

Also in Chapter II the recall of the charter members, particularly Senator Bowen and the late Representative C.J. McLin, helped to define the purpose and formation of the organization, something which all the members stated was most warranted. Until this undertaking, there was no recognized written account on the organization’s history.
Additionally, it was in Chapter II where we introduced the senior, junior, and freshmen members of the organization, and described their political careers. Later, we introduced all other members including former and active members of the organization, thereby compiling an exhaustive description on BEDO's membership.

In Chapter III we focused on a period described as the early years, (1967-1968 up to the 1981-1982 Ohio General Assemblies). It was shown that BEDO took shape during that period. We examined organizational features of the Ohio General Assemblies including professionalism, leadership, and partisan composition of the legislature, revealing that in spite of BEDO's minority-party status and certain racial mishaps, the charter and senior members learned how to play the game known as politics.

Accordingly, for example, BEDO allied itself with the Riffe coalition thereby acquiring a long-term and formidable relationship with House Democratic leadership. To explore coalition building further, we examined BEDO's role in passage of the 1975 Appropriations bill. In that example, we described how size of the black caucus was directly influential in eventual passage of the bill through the infamous walk-out by BEDO. We outlined the strategy employed on successful passage of Amended Substitute House Bill 584 (the Minority Enterprise Act) by showing how BEDO
operated within and across chambers. In sum, in Chapter III the reader could envision how the members in the organization grew and acquired the necessary political savvy to maneuver their legislative agenda; hence, becoming a recognized informal group inside the Ohio General Assembly.

Chapter IV was an examination on how BEDO fits within the organizational structure of the Ohio General Assembly. There, we detailed the effects of caucus size on strategy by examining at least three bills: the 1975 Appropriations bill, the Martin Luther King Holiday bill, and several bills on South African divestiture. Because it takes an absolute majority to pass a budget bill and because BEDO's size made a clear difference in House passage of the bill, size of caucus was shown to be directly related to the bill's passage. In fact, the case illustrated the significance of the caucus voting as a solid 'bloc'. On the other hand, however, size of caucus was not as significant in the case of the King Holiday bill. It was determined that contemporary circumstances, (e.g., social activism during the middle to late 1970s) were perhaps more directly related to passage of that bill. Additionally, it was also determined that circumstances surrounding passage of any bill on South African divestiture were more complicated than size of caucus. Specifically, although bills on South
African divestiture tend to pass the House, they almost always die in Senate committees.

Also in Chapter IV we looked at the effects of committee chairmanships on strategy and showed how instrumental BEDO chairmen, (e.g., Bowen on Senate Commerce and Labor, and Jackson on Senate Reference) were in maneuvering Amended Substitute House Bill 584 through the Senate, the more difficult chamber for successful activity on the bill. Simultaneous to that discussion was a continuation on the subject of coalition building wherein it was shown that good working relationships with one's white colleagues, most notably former Representative Ed Orlett, sponsor of HB584, could prove most beneficial.

Finally in Chapter IV we examined other factors related to strategy, such as leadership, seniority, and assignment to the State Controlling Board. It was found that BEDO tends to exemplify the type of low turnover described by Jewell (1982). That means BEDO's members tend to have high levels of seniority. More specifically, however, was the finding that reasons for departure from office are most attributed to retirement and death in office than defeat at the polls or forced resignations.

The organization, on the other hand, was found to have relatively modest representation in leadership, having never attained the top positions of Speaker of the House or
President of the Senate. Jackson was President Pro Temp during the Ocasek Presidency in the Senate and Mallory has been Majority Leader in the House since the late 1970s. Otherwise, there are no notable leadership positions held by BEDO. It is, of course, expected that one of the junior members will be afforded a key leadership position in the current decade.

With respect to the State Controlling Board, it was observed that the only black member ever to serve on that board has been Senator Bowen (since 1976), and that has been regardless of whether Democrats were in majority-party control in the Senate. Consequently, unlike situations in the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses, one can safely assume -- the consistent appointment of Bowen to the board indicates he definitely exudes a certain political stature. This is significant given the varied changes in Ohio Senate leadership over the General Assemblies covered, most of which reveal Democrats in the minority party. The question which follows therefore, is with Bowen's successor. Generally, individuals are considered who possess considerable seniority on the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees. The data show, black members in the House have yet to chair the budget committee but they have begun to acquire seniority (on the committee). Surely BEDO desires to maintain representation on the State
Controlling Board, and it is this investigator's opinion that the organization will vie for representation in the event of Bowen's departure.

With respect to committee chairmanships, it was observed that although black members in the Senate have chaired key committees, (e.g., Jackson on Senate Reference Committee during the 1979-1980 sessions and Bowen on Senate Finance Committee during the 1983-1984 sessions), black membership in the House has yet to acquire comparable chairmanships. Another concern inherent within the discussion was with the lack of stability of black members in the Senate to maintain those key chairmanships, and perhaps that is directly attributed to simultaneous losses in majority-party control.

In Chapter V we addressed BEDO's relationship with the Ohio political power structure from Rhodes to Celeste. First, it is noteworthy that the charter and senior members managed to establish working relationships with all three governors. It was also revealed that there were certain mishaps with some of the cabinet members and to some extent, not all of BEDO felt the same about the manner in which they were treated by the three governors. All charter and senior members, for example, found Rhodes a fair and respectable governor. Also, it was found that although junior and freshmen members had generally favorable attitudes on their relationships with Celeste, the "jury-is-still-out on the
overall effectiveness of BEDO's relationship with Celeste, whose term ended during the 1989-1990 General Assembly. In addition, we attributed the brief, though favorable, comments about Gilligan to the fact that his tenure was comparatively short.

Virtually all of BEDO acknowledged most favorable working relationships with leadership. The most interesting observation in that discussion, however, was not that deference exists, rather the extent to which it exists. Specifically, when asked about leadership, virtually all members responded, "The Leader," "The Speaker," and "Speaker Riffe." Therefore, we concluded that the term 'leadership' is synonymous with the current position of House Speaker, more specifically, Speaker Vern Riffe.

In sum, it was most apparent that Bowen and McLin shared a high level and degree of respect among their black and white colleagues. In addition, both men expressed high levels and degrees of respect towards one another, and both shared similar views on leadership, (e.g., McLin on Speaker Riffe and Bowen on Speaker Riffe, and former Presidents Ocasek and Meshel), respectively.

Finally in Chapter V we looked at BEDO's agenda. It was revealed that although the initial purpose of the organization remains intact, the agenda has expanded. Initially members concentrated efforts on social and human
services. Today, however, the agenda involves economic development. Along those lines, it was most interesting to learn that the attitudes of the junior and freshmen members are in sync with those of the charter and senior members: BEDO must always consider the plight of black and poor people in Ohio. That point is perhaps the most major explanation for how and why BEDO remains a cohesive black caucus today.

As we turn to findings and observations on the relative status of groups of black state lawmakers nationwide, we must remind the reader that not all states have organized black legislative caucuses. Therefore in the first part of Chapter VI we spoke of 'groups' of black state lawmakers, not caucuses. Essentially, Chapter VI, a relatively lengthy discussion, placed BEDO in a national context wherein it was revealed that BEDO falls within the lower stratum on groups of notable size. There were three groups of black state lawmakers in the upper stratum, including Georgia (33), Maryland (31), and Illinois (29) members, respectively. In fact, it was revealed that most states have groups ranging in sizes of zero to nine black members. Also, the growing presence of black women in state legislatures tended to predominate discussion wherein it was learned that, quite unlike their virtual absence during the early years, black
women now comprise over one-fourth of all black state lawmakers in America.

Subsequently, we were interested in knowing the relative status of groups of notable size with respect to party control. In so doing, we set forth two conditions: 1) All parent-party caucuses invoke party-rule voting; and, 2) All chambers require an absolute majority for passage of our dummy bill. Only five groups of black lawmakers met those conditions. They were found in the following chambers: the Illinois Senate, the Illinois House, the Michigan House, the Ohio House, and the Pennsylvania House, respectively. In each of those cases, size of black membership was significantly related to passage of our dummy bill. This means, in order for the respective Democratic Caucuses to pass the bill, it required full support of black membership. Data were referenced from the 1989-1990 sessions. Those findings, we argued, added credence to our argument that size is not a singular determinant of effective group legislative activity.

The next step involved going back as far as the 1967-1968 sessions and conducting a similar exercise, only this time, among the Ohio, Illinois, and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses. It was found that, with the exception of the periods of Republican majority-control, size of black membership in the Illinois House and Senate,
and in the Ohio House (and Senate, though limited) was significantly associated with party control, (i.e., Democrat Caucuses) for the sessions covered. To the contrary, however, from the 1967-1968 sessions up to the current sessions, size of black membership in the Maryland General Assembly was found to be inconsequential to legislative activity. It was revealed that -- although Democrats have enjoyed uninterrupted control in the Maryland General Assembly and with decisive margins to date -- the association between group size and party control was negligible over the entire 24-year period examined. Stated another way, Maryland's black membership finds itself disproportionate to an overwhelmingly Democrat-controlled General Assembly.

Later, we examined general features among the three state legislatures, constituencies, and configuration of districts, where variations were observed in the data. Black state lawmakers in Ohio have relatively larger constituencies as compared to their counterparts in Maryland and Illinois. Black state lawmakers in Ohio tend also to represent more racially diverse and geographically dispersed districts as compared to their counterparts in Maryland and Illinois, who, it was confirmed, tend to represent districts with heavy concentrations and/or single clusters of black populations. The Illinois and Ohio General Assemblies were
found to be most similar with respect to terms of office but the Maryland and Illinois General Assemblies resemble mostly in size, the former being the largest of the three legislatures.

Moreover, with respect to size of black caucus, it was learned that each caucus has grown in size over the course of the five General Assemblies examined, with membership in the Senates stabilizing the most, particularly in the Ohio Senate.

Another major finding in Chapter VI dealt with black members acquisition of committee chairmanships and leadership positions. It was revealed that BEDO's membership has chaired and served as vice chair on key committees including House and Senate Reference and Rules Committees, and Senate Finance Committee, and recent voids in those positions are due largely to retirements/or resignations among charter and senior members of the organizations, as well as intermittent losses in Democrat-majority control in the Senate. No comparable positions were reported among the other caucuses for the periods covered.

With respect to leadership, it was found that BEDO demonstrated comparatively more longevity and consistency in leadership roles as compared to its counterparts in the other two caucuses. BEDO acquired higher level leadership
in the Ohio Senate earlier in its development and retained those positions with more consistency as compared to its counterparts in the Illinois and Maryland Senates. Otherwise, none of the caucuses has acquired the top leadership positions in the House, (i.e., Speaker) nor in the Senate, (i.e., President).

It was also interesting to observe black women beginning to hold committee chairmanships, as well as leadership positions, and that was notable because, on the whole the women have relatively less seniority as compared to the men. Inherent within discussion in Chapter VI was the general subject of politics wherein we learned that at least one black member in the Illinois Senate lost the opportunity to acquire chairmanship of the Senate Appropriations Committee because "he reportedly supported the wrong person for President of the Senate." Consequently, black lawmakers in general must cope with the politics of their respective environments, especially ramifications of chamber-caucus politics.

Finally, it was determined that BEDO was most effective as a legislative black caucus as compared to the Maryland and Illinois Legislative Black Caucuses up to the 1991-1992 sessions. That tends to have been the case across the board, and among the perceptions of BEDO.
At this point, it would be easy to make the assumption that most of the nation's historic legislative black caucuses evolved similar to the manner of BEDO but what most probably is a more accurate assertion is there were peculiar circumstances surrounding the development of each caucus. Additionally, it was probably most apparent in Chapter VI that the intention of this study was not to diminish the overall effectiveness of the Maryland and Illinois Legislative Black Caucuses, rather to place them in a common context along with BEDO. This type of research enhances academic discourse by establishing common and reliable measures of effectiveness on historic legislative black caucuses.

The Need for Recruitment and Training Programs

Most important, however, throughout this undertaking was the observation on the need for all historic legislative black caucuses to develop recruitment and training programs for future black lawmakers. It is probably quite safe to assume that BEDO and all other historic legislative black caucuses have no formal recruitment program, and as indicated throughout this study, one is needed. What happens to an organization when its primary leadership disappears, retires, or simply no longer functions within the organization? How are new members recruited and trained
to seek state legislative office, subsequently leadership in the black caucus and in the legislature? In the case of BEDO, C.J. McLin, long lauded as 'the father of BEDO', died and he was succeeded by his junior protégé, I. Ray Miller. Although very well-respected in the central Ohio area, Miller had little visibility elsewhere and after approximately one year as chairman of the caucus, he stepped down.

Consider the following comments, for instance, from an outside observer on the transition in BEDO's leadership:

"It's hard to say because "CJ" had a real talent for pulling all the factions together. It's going to be very difficult in the transition for BEDO. He had entrée, ... to Rhodes and Riffe. I think it's going to be a little bit of a struggle for Ray. It's going to take years for him to gain that stature. ... I don't know an answer here. "CJ" was a gut politician. He knew how to close the door and cut a deal. Ray has good stage presence and appeal" (Journalist Mary Ann Sharkey).

Whether one agrees with everything Sharkey says is beside the point, rather the fact that an outside observer perceives the serious need for attention to the succession process is the significant point.

It seems almost unthinkable for an organization as developed as BEDO to suffer from a succession crisis but the organization is experiencing that as the final pages to this dissertation are written. Mallory, Bowen, and James, the remaining charter members, are preparing for retirement and
therefore are not easily excited about opportunities afforded additional political recognition. Although Mallory is doing a good job of maintaining the chairmanship, the position unquestionably requires a more energetic and ambitious individual, as well as someone who can devote the time and other resources necessary to retain the acclaim for which BEDO has come to hold.

Perhaps the NBCSL can establish a seminar series geared exclusively towards recruitment and training of interested individuals in state legislative offices. Although this might seem somewhat far reaching, this investigator believes the idea warrants serious consideration. Specifically, for instance, the NBCSL, similar to the CBC, has a corporate roundtable. The corporate roundtable is comprised of officials representing some of the largest conglomerates in the world. Their interests in the current and future of the NBCSL would seemingly support their willingness to help underwrite a seminar series of the type recommended herein.

In addition, perhaps the leadership and/or representatives from each legislative black caucus and group could coordinate the establishment of the program and work with the corporate roundtable. In that way, representation from key states and regions might be included.

Candidates and/or interested individuals of all political parties must be permitted equal access to
participate in the seminars. A committee comprised of legislators and academicians could be established to determine criteria on curricula, workshop presenters, certificates awarded, et cetera.

Additionally, perhaps the caucuses that are most viable, such as BEDO, will provide a matching fund to support the seminars. Either way, it is no longer an issue of whether a recruitment and training program is necessary, rather how and when it will be established.

Finally, it is essential that the establishment of the program be done in a not-for-profit and nonpartisan corporate structure, which, incidentally, meets with the current structure of the NBCSL.

Additional Research

Inherent within the aforestated are numerous other concerns and calls for further research, some of which are outlined below:

- Given the fact that most charter and senior members of the nation's historic legislative black caucuses were initially elected as a result of state level court and legislative interpretations, and implementation of Baker v. Carr (1962) and of those members still active today, how, if at all are they indoctrinating and preparing the junior and freshmen members to influence the reapportionment process? Are veteran black state lawmakers imparting their skills, knowledge, and experiences to better prepare the junior and freshmen members to successfully negotiate in the reapportionment processes -- which are currently underway nationwide?
Another concern inherent in this study is with the relationship between black state lawmakers and statewide office-holders, and this is regardless of race and partisanship. Charter and senior members in BEDO were found to have most favorable relationships with the various governors and most cabinet officials, and have tended to cope well with the executive (i.e., gubernatorial) transition processes, at least over the course of this study. Are junior and freshmen members of BEDO, the Illinois and Maryland Legislative Black Caucuses, and other historic legislative black caucuses similarly prepared? If not, how will that relative lack of preparation impact current and future relationships in those same areas?

The above concern leads to a question about how junior and freshmen caucus members will fare in less-controlled environments, (i.e., environments in which Democrats do not control the whole of the General Assembly and/or state government).

Another concern of this investigator is with the direction of organizations, such as BEDO. For example, although most members of BEDO interviewed for this research tended to make most admirable remarks about how well "the organization has branched out into local communities and the need to continue educating local communities ...," there is still the question of the organization's agenda. Will economic development overshadow the continued need for monitoring legislation on human services? Are interests of caucus members varied enough to encompass the multiplicity of issues confronting state lawmakers today?

In yet other areas one needs to give attention to the question on whether the informal group approach is applicable to all historic legislative black caucuses. Is it possible that in some states the individual approach is more applicable to effecting legislative activity among black lawmakers as compared to the informal group approach.
This question is particularly useful when considering cases involving state legislatures where there are relatively few black members, such as in those states least populated, and least populated with black Americans. Consider, for example, states such as Arizona, Colorado, Oklahoma, Alaska, and Oregon. Regardless, however, it is this investigator's opinion that no matter what the size of the group, similar efforts as raised above should be made to prepare new recruits to participate in the state legislative arena.

the need for data on black state lawmakers

Additionally, there were several concerns inherent in the data and/or relative lack of data, some of which were addressed in Chapter VI. For example, it is fairly clear there is need for a central source of data on all black state legislators and that data, at a minimum, should be maintained by:

- legislator's name
- initial seating, (i.e., appointment or election)
- term
- partisanship
- sex
- race

This investigator's examination was limited in part due to the lack of basic data as outlined above when discussing the
subject of seniority. In order to make reliable comparisons among the three black caucuses under review in this study, for example, one would have had to generate and analyze terms of office on all black state legislators serving in the Maryland and Illinois Legislative Black Caucuses from the 1967-1968 up to the 1989-1990 sessions. Although a tedious process, it could have been done if the data were readily available; they were not.

For higher level analyses, however, similar data needs to be compiled and maintained with respect to the kinds of subjects covered in Chapters IV, V, and VI. Specifically, in order to draw more conclusive interpretations, one needs to reference data within and across state legislatures on the following:

- comparable committee assignments
- comparable committees (standing, ad hoc, joint, and subcommittees)
- comparable leadership positions
- organizational data (e.g., officers, meeting schedules, dues, annual events, et cetera) on historic legislative black caucuses and/or other minority-oriented caucuses

Subsequently, this study demonstrates the need for lots of information that will help enhance the study of historic
legislative black caucuses and other minority groups nationwide.

**Significance of Study**

It is hoped that readers of this study, especially black state lawmakers, will focus on how and why this study was conducted and the overall findings, then attempt to determine the level of effectiveness of their own caucuses. It is also hoped that BEDO will not become complacent with its relatively successful stature--particularly as noted in our discussion on its relationship to the Ohio political power structure--but continue to build on those areas most in need of development, such as recruitment and training.

In addition, information is provided herein which many students and faculty in political science merely assume takes place inside the old, and some newly renovated Gothic structures called Statehouses. Some of the legislators participating in this study, black and white, addressed the need for more understanding by outside observers and citizens about the inner workings of state government and the legislative process. They therefore spoke openly and candidly about events and personalities addressed herein, adding substantial credibility to this work.

It is also believed that information contained in this dissertation supports the call for more elite level studies
and case studies. Both types of studies provide a level and degree of insight that, we believe, was captured through this particular study. Now that the study is completed one cannot imagine having conducted it differently.

Finally, it is believed that this study can be easily replicated and if the recommended data are compiled in the near future, perhaps further study and higher level analyses also will be pursued. In any case, it is recommended that any replication of this and/or comparable level studies be done at a reasonable period following each census, particularly following reapportionment proceedings. In that way most legislatures will have undergone internal and required structural changes and therefore will be reflected in the data.

With respect to interests of political campaign consultants, particularly those interested in the 'probability of electing black candidates,' this study provides a solid foundation from which to gauge black state lawmakers, especially contenders for higher level office. This study also provides a look at how to approach black state lawmakers from a multitude of angles and on an ongoing basis.

It is important to point out, however, personalities, e.g., Jesse Jackson, are the exception and not the rule on how and why black politicians ascend the political apparatus
in America. Governor Douglas Wilder of Virginia and New York's Mayor David Dinkins are similarly exceptional, not in their ascension to higher office but in their respective cases. There is, for example, no comparable constituency to New York City nor is there a comparable constituency to the state of Virginia. That makes those two cases exceptional. On the other hand, however, studies, such as the one before us, offer a common context in which to study the political careers and ascension to higher office by state lawmakers who happen to be black American, as well as by those who are winning elected offices at the city and the federal legislative levels. Congressman William Gray of Pennsylvania comes to mind. Gray, chaired the U.S. House Appropriations Committee and, now heads the House Democratic Caucus in Congress. Consider also State Representative Daniel Blue, recently elected Speaker to the North Carolina House of Representatives. The latter two black elected officials are ascending the political apparatus in a way commonly referenced in textbooks and studies such as this one; the most interesting feature in the stories, however, is the main characters happen to be black American.

It is through studies, such as the one before us, this investigator believes, campaign strategists will rely most for understanding certain common, though crucial components in political activity among black American state lawmakers.
Black Americans have fought for equal access and due process in the electoral arena and are certain to be around to have their chance at all levels of politics and well into the Year 2000 and beyond.

This investigator has thoroughly enjoyed this study and hopes to continue many of the research needs outlined herein. It was, for example, most coincidental to have been afforded the opportunity first, to serve as a legislative intern while in graduate school at The Ohio State University during the middle 1970s. Second, it was another coincidence to acquire employment as an administrative assistant to the able and distinguished Senator William F. Bowen in the early 1980s. Third, it was hardly imaginable that this research topic would so invigorate this investigator, particularly as the study unfolded. Fourth, it was no small coincidence, when, during the Summer 1990 this investigator was drawn once again into the state legislative arena by being asked to serve as managing editor of the News from the NBCSL newsletter. It was through that assignment that additional insight and interests influenced me to delve yet further into the 'how' and 'why' historic legislative black caucuses function.

Finally, it was certainly no small coincidence that this investigator had one of the most conscientious advisers and supportive committees ever assembled, a group of individuals
who worked with me when I was hardly excited about doing this project, especially since I had established a career somewhat removed from the field of political science, (i.e., public relations and marketing). My dissertation committee chairman, Professor Herb Asher, insisted "there's something in the story about BEDO. Why don't you consider coming back (to graduate school) and finishing." Professor Asher was right. There is a lot in the story about BEDO and, as I later learned, there is something about other historic legislative black caucuses too. Those stories deserve to be unveiled before students and professors of history, political science, and organizational behavior everywhere.
APPENDIX A

Original Questionnaire
Interview Questions
Members of BEDO

Part I. Political Background Information

1. At this time I am interested in knowing your recall of circumstances that contributed to your political career. How and when did you become involved in politics? (Probe).

2. Did you have any prior political experience before winning your seat in the Ohio legislature?
   a. 01)_____ Yes, describe 02)_____ No
   b. 01)
   02)
   03)

3. Was there ever a time when you thought of yourself as a Republican, an Independent or something other than a Democrat? (Probe).
   a. 01)_____ Yes 02)_____ No
   b. 01)
   02)
   03)

4. Describe your initial election campaign (or appointment) to the Ohio House (Senate). Compare and contrast it to this last one?

   01)________________________________________
   02)
   03)
   04)
   05)
5. Do your recall how you felt when you won the first time? the second time? subsequent times?

01) ____________________________________________
02) ____________________________________________
03) ____________________________________________
04) ____________________________________________
05) ____________________________________________

6. As best you can recall, please describe the situation you experienced during your first year in the legislature. [Then ask about any improvement over the subsequent years]

01) ____________________________________________
02) ____________________________________________
03) ____________________________________________
04) ____________________________________________
05) ____________________________________________

Part II. Experiences during the Civil Rights Era

1. At this time I'd like for you to think back to the period in history called the Civil Rights Era. Think particularly during the time between 1954 and 1968. Do you recall any events of the Civil Rights Era? How involved were you? In what ways and in what communities? Please elaborate.

01) ____________________________________________
02) ____________________________________________
03) ____________________________________________
04) ____________________________________________
05) ____________________________________________

2. What do you recall about the social situation in Ohio in the early to middle 1960s? We are especially interested in knowing what it was like for a black person who wanted to run for public office?

01) ____________________________________________
02) ____________________________________________
03) ____________________________________________
04) ____________________________________________
05) ____________________________________________
3. Now tell me about circumstances leading up to the formation of BEDO. Do you recall any of your BEDO colleagues at that time and yourself participating in civil rights activity? Explain.

01) 
02) 
03) 
04) 
05) 

4. Did you know any of the other newly elected black legislators prior to inauguration in 1967? [If elected after 1967, then apply that year].

a. 01)____ Yes, Describe 01)____ No
b. 01) 
02) 
03) 
04) 
05) 

Part III. Formation of BEDO

1. Now I'd like to talk to you about the formation of BEDO. How was the organization founded? When and where was the organization founded? Who was present?

01) 
02) 
03) 
04) 
05) 

2. Has the caucus always been named BEDO? Explain.

01) 
02) 
03) 
04) 
05)
3. Where did you meet and how often?

01) __________________________________________

02) __________________________________________

4. Do you feel that the founding members demonstrate a bond that differs from the kind of relationship among the junior members, particularly those coming in after the late 1970s?

01) __________________________________________

02) __________________________________________

03) __________________________________________

04) __________________________________________

5. Do you recall your attitude to the black Republicans when you first came to the legislature? Describe. [For those legislators arriving during the 1970s or later, how do you relate to black Republicans in general?]

01) __________________________________________

02) __________________________________________

03) __________________________________________

04) __________________________________________

6. Do you recall whether or not there was much discussion on the subject of black Republican membership in BEDO? Did the presence of black Republicans affect your organization and planning of the new black caucus? Explain.

01) __________________________________________

02) __________________________________________

03) __________________________________________

04) __________________________________________

05) __________________________________________

7. What were the membership requirements when BEDO was first organized? Have they altered any over the past 20 years? Describe.

01) __________________________________________

02) __________________________________________

03) __________________________________________

04) __________________________________________

05) __________________________________________
8. What about your stated purpose? What is it and has it altered any over the past 20-odd years?

01)
02)
03)
04)

9. What were the caucus' resources then? Now?

a) Number of Staff: 01) 1967 02) 1977 03) 1987

b) Do you recall the positions of these staff?

01)
02)
03)

c) Budget: 01) 1967 02) 1977 03) 1987

d) Office space and location in 1967: 01) 02) in 1977: 01) 02) in 1987: 01) 02)

e) During BEDO's formative years, what type(s) of relationships did the caucus have with the Democratic Party with respect to sharing resources?

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)

10. Do you foresee the admission of black Republicans to BEDO- should any be elected? Explain.

01)
02)
03)
04)
Part IV. Strategy of Voting Patterns

1. Has the size of the caucus aided in affecting voting in the legislative process? [For example, it would seem more likely that BEDO could affect voting on certain bills and resolutions that have close voting patterns in the House where there is a total of 99 members]. Explain.

2. Are there occasions when caucus members feel that their votes can affect the passage or defeat of certain legislation? Explain.

3. Has committee assignment affected any particular strategy of the caucus? Please explain.

4. Do you view your greatest influence through BEDO or singularly? Explain.

5. Has BEDO served as a useful resource medium? Do individual members provide their own legislative research and/or political clout prior to securing BEDO support (endorsement)? Has that avenue affected membership's ability to act in any significant manner? Explain.
6. Have there been instances in which you have had to oppose BEDO's position? On what issues or types of legislation and why?

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)

7. How does BEDO determine what policies, legislation or appointments it considers? Has there been any notable change in this process since 1967? Explain.

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)

8. Aside from factors such as staff, budget and membership size, how has BEDO changed since 1967—particularly with respect to issues served and physical territory? Why is this?

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)

9. At this time I am interested in knowing what issues BEDO has been most active in and what you consider some of the major successes and defeats of the caucus, as well?

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)
Part V.
Reception of BEDO by Ohio Political Power Structure

1. How did white legislators react to the black legislators in the early years? How, if at all, has that treatment changed over the past 20 years? [Apply to terms served if less than 20].

   01)_______________________________________________________
   02)_______________________________________________________
   03)_______________________________________________________
   04)_______________________________________________________
   05)_______________________________________________________

2. Let us begin with the formative years. How and when do you recall being invited to participate in local, state or national level politics by the Democratic Party? On the whole, how has the Ohio Democratic Party received the members of BEDO- or other black individuals interested in it- over the past 20 years?

   01)_______________________________________________________
   02)_______________________________________________________
   03)_______________________________________________________
   04)_______________________________________________________
   05)_______________________________________________________

3. What have been your experiences with the House and Senate Democratic Party Caucuses in the Ohio General Assembly?

   01)_______________________________________________________
   02)_______________________________________________________
   03)_______________________________________________________
   04)_______________________________________________________
   05)_______________________________________________________

4. Along those same lines, tell me about your relationship with the leadership in the House and Senate. How have those relationships developed over the years?

   01)_______________________________________________________
   02)_______________________________________________________
   03)_______________________________________________________
   04)_______________________________________________________
   05)_______________________________________________________
5. On the whole, how would you say BEDO has been received by the various governors since 1967?

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)

6. Have there been any cabinet officials that are particularly notable? Describe?

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)

7. Now, tell me about your relationship with the Republican members of the legislature, particularly the House and Senate Republican Caucuses. Do you have any occasion to coordinate and/or negotiate your strategy with these members?

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)

8. This next question is about certain bills that you feel are beneficial to the interests of black and/or poor people in this state. Can you list at least five bills that you feel BEDO has affected over the past 20 years. In so doing, please describe the political strategy employed for the bills' successful passage or failure.

01)
02)
03)
04)
05)
Part VI. The Role and Future of BEDO

1. What kinds of political issues confront BEDO today as compared to 20 years ago? How do these issues compare or contrast with others over these years?

01) __________________________________________
02) __________________________________________
03) __________________________________________
04) __________________________________________
05) __________________________________________

2. What do you see as BEDO's greatest asset? What about its weakness? Explain.

01) __________________________________________
02) __________________________________________
03) __________________________________________
04) __________________________________________
05) __________________________________________

3. If you could turn back the hands of time to 1967, what would you do similarly, differently and why?

01) __________________________________________
02) __________________________________________
03) __________________________________________
04) __________________________________________
05) __________________________________________
06) __________________________________________

4. Has the need for a black Democratic caucus changed any in Ohio since the creation of BEDO? Explain.

01) __________________________________________
02) __________________________________________
03) __________________________________________
04) __________________________________________
05) __________________________________________

5. Are black and poor people in Ohio any better off today as compared to 20 years ago? Explain.

01) __________________________________________
02) __________________________________________
03) __________________________________________
04) __________________________________________
05) __________________________________________
6. How does BEDO resemble or differ from other black caucuses across the nation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. What do you see as the future of BEDO? What needs to be done in order for BEDO to maintain its influence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Part VII. Personal Background Information

The final part of this questionnaire deals with some personal data about you.

1. Where were you born? 01)

2. How long have you resided in your district? 01)

3. Sex: 01) Male 02) Female

4. a. In addition to your legislative duties, what other occupation have you? 01)

   02)

   b. Self-employed? 01) Yes 02) No

5. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

   01) high school graduate

   02) some training since high school

   03) some college

   04) college graduate

   05) attended graduate school

   06) graduate school degree (e.g., Masters of Arts)

   07) attended professional school

   08) professional school degree (e.g., Law)

*********************
APPENDIX B

Updated Questionnaire
I. Personal Friendship Ties

1.0) With which members of BEDO, if any, are you or have you become particularly close? How did the relationship(s) begin? What is the nature of the relationship(s) today? Feel free to elaborate.

1.1a) Member: ____________________________________________
1.1b) Occasion of Introduction: ________________________________________
1.1c) Status of Relationship: ________________________________________

1.2a) Member: ____________________________________________
1.2b) Occasion of Introduction: ________________________________________
1.2c) Status of Relationship: ________________________________________

1.3a) Member: ____________________________________________
1.3b) Occasion of Introduction: ________________________________________
1.3c) Status of Relationship: ________________________________________

2.0) More specifically and aside from legislative ties, do you, your spouse and children associate informally with someone in BEDO? In what ways, if any, and how often is that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal Association w/someone in BEDO</th>
<th>Frequency of Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1) Personal lunches; bar scene</td>
<td>______ ______ ______ ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2) Home Environment (parties, cookouts...)</td>
<td>______ ______ ______ ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3) Religious/Worship Services</td>
<td>______ ______ ______ ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4) Business Ties (lawyer, accountant,...)</td>
<td>______ ______ ______ ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5) College Ties</td>
<td>______ ______ ______ ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6) Other Relationships: sports, theatre,...</td>
<td>______ ______ ______ ______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Categories of Frequency: 1) often; 2) on occasion; 3) rarely; 4) not at all; or 5) Refused).

3.0) Did you know any of the other black elected legislators prior to your inauguration? [If elected after 1967, apply year of inauguration]

3.1) _____ Yes. Please describe
3.2) Description: ____________________________________________
3.3) Description: ____________________________________________

3.4) Heard of or Seen________ but never really knew them.

3.5) _____ No.
3.6) Other: ____________________________________________
4.0) How would you describe the relationship among the senior members of BEDO? How about among the junior members? Do you see any differences? Please elaborate.

4.1) ____ Yes, there are. 
4.2) Describe: ________________________________________________

4.3) ____ No, there are no differences in relationships among the senior & junior members. 
4.4) Explain: ________________________________________________

4.5) ____ Not sure.

II. A. Political Socialization

5.0) At this time I'd like for you to think back to the period in history called the Civil Rights Era. Think particularly during the time between 1954 and 1968. Do you recall any events of the Civil Rights Era? How involved were you? In what ways and in what communities? Please elaborate.

5.1) Do you recall any events of the Civil Rights Era? 5.1a) ____ Yes 
5.1b) ____ No 5.1c) ____ Too young 
5.1d) ____ Other: ________________________________

5.2) If involved, how involved were you? 5.2a) ____ Extremely 
5.2b) ____ Somewhat 5.2c) ____ Slightly 5.2d) ____ Not at all 
5.2e) ____ Does not apply

5.3) In what ways? ___________________________________________

5.4) __________________________________________

5.5) In what communities? ___________________________________

* Items #6 and #7 for Senior Members only.

6.0) What do you recall about the social situation in Ohio during the middle 1960s? We are especially interested in knowing what it was like for a black person who wanted to run for public office?

6.1) __________________________________________

6.2) __________________________________________

6.3) __________________________________________
7.0) Now tell me about circumstances leading up to the formation of BEDO. Do you recall any of your BEDO colleagues at that time and yourself participating in civil rights activity? If so, how did that participation relate to the formation of BEDO, if at all?

7.1) Civil rights activity was related to formation of BEDO.

7.1a) __ Yes 7.1b) __ No 7.1c) __ Other: ______________

7.2) ______________________________________________________________________________________

* Return to all members with Item #8.

8.0) At this time I am interested in knowing your recall of circumstances that contributed to your political career. How and when did you become involved in politics? (probe)

8.1) Circumstances: ____________________________________________

8.2) ______________________________________________________________________________________

8.3) When: _____________________________________________________

8.4) ______________________________________________________________________________________

9.0) Did you have any prior political experience before winning your seat in the Ohio legislature?

9.1) __ Yes; specify 9.2) ______________________________________________________________________

9.3) __ No

9.4) ______________________________________________________________________________________

10.0) Was there ever a time when you thought of yourself as 10.1) __ Republican, 10.2) __ Independent or 10.3) __ something other than Democrat?

10.4) Explain: ____________________________________________________________________________

11.0) Describe your initial election campaign (or appointment) to the Ohio House (Senate). Say, for example, how were efforts towards ...

11.1) Grassroots campaigning: __________________________________________________________________

11.2) Garnering Name Recognition: __________________________________________________________________

11.3) Political Party Endorsement: __________________________________________________________________

11.4) Fundraising: ____________________________________________________________________________

11.5) Media Relations: __________________________________________________________________________

11.6) Other: ________________________________________________________________________________
12.0) Compare the initial election campaign with your most recent campaign? Let's begin with

12.1) Grassroots campaigning: _________________________________

12.2) Garnering Name Recognition: _________________________________

12.3) Political Party Endorsement: _________________________________

12.4) Fundraising: _________________________________

12.5) Media Relations: _________________________________

12.6) Other: _________________________________

13.0) Since your initial election campaign, how would you describe the role of BEDO over time? If that occurred after the organization was formed, what do you remember or have you heard about the organization? Please elaborate.

13.1) During the formative years, 1967-1976: _________________________________

13.2) 1977-1986: _________________________________

13.3) 1987-present: _________________________________

14.0) As best you can recall, how were you received during your first year in the legislature? (Then ask about improvements or changes over subsequent terms). That is, how were you treated by your colleagues?

14.1) For example, did anyone in particular introduce you to various members in the House (Senate), the various offices, ...? 14.1) _____ Yes

14.2) No _____________________

14.3) Did anyone explain the procedure for introducing bills, resolutions, and the method for introducing them on the floor and/or in committee? _________________________________

14.4) _________________________________

14.5) _________________________________

III. Interest Areas: Strategies for Influencing the Legislative Process
15.0) Now I’d like to ask you some questions about how the importance of BEDO has changed over time in general and in specific areas. Over time, has the organization become 1) definitely imp., 2) somewhat imp., 3) slightly imp., 4) not at all imp., or there has been 5) no particular change?

15.1) Role in Floor debates

15.2) Role in Committees

15.3) Role in Ohio Democratic Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deftn</th>
<th>Smwnt</th>
<th>Slig</th>
<th>Nort</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Chge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impt</td>
<td>Impt</td>
<td>Impt</td>
<td>Impt</td>
<td>Impt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.0) This next question is about certain bills that you feel are beneficial to the interests of black and/or poor people in this state. Can you list at least five bills that you feel BEDO has influenced during your tenure? In so doing, please describe the political strategy employed for the bill’s successful passage or defeat. (probe)

16.1) Name or Description of Bill: ________________________________

16.1a) Strategy for Passage or Defeat: ________________________________

16.2) Name or Description of Bill: ________________________________

16.2a) Strategy for Passage or Defeat: ________________________________

16.3) Name or Description of Bill: ________________________________

16.3a) Strategy for Passage or Defeat: ________________________________

16.4) Name or Description of Bill: ________________________________

16.4a) Strategy for Passage or Defeat: ________________________________

16.5) Name or Description of Bill: ________________________________

16.5a) Strategy for Passage or Defeat: ________________________________

IV. Interest Area: Influence in the Ohio Political Power Structure

*Items #17, 18 and 19 for Senior Members Only.

17.0) In the early years, how would you say your white colleagues treated you? Say for example

17.1) In Friendship circles: ________________________________

17.2) In Overall Welcome and Introductions to Legislative Protocol and Procedures: ________________________________

17.3) Support in resolutions and bills: ________________________________

17.4) Committee work: ________________________________

17.5) House (Senate) Caucuses: ________________________________

17.6) Other: ________________________________
18.0) How, if at all, has that treatment changed over the years?
18.1) Improved Considerably: _____
18.1a) ______________________________________________________
18.2) Improved Somewhat: _____
18.2a) ______________________________________________________
18.3) Improved: _____
18.3a) ______________________________________________________
18.4) Improved Slightly: _____
18.4a) ______________________________________________________
18.5) Has not improved: _____
18.5a) ______________________________________________________

19.0) With specific reference to the Ohio Democratic Party, how and when do you recall personally being invited to participate in local, state or national level politics by the party? Please elaborate on the circumstances you feel led to that contact.

19.1) Circumstances: __________________________________________

19.2) When: __________________________________________

19.3) Personalities: __________________________________________

19.4) Other: ______________________________________________

**Return to including other members:**

20.0) On the whole, how has the Ohio Democratic Party received the members of BEDO- or other black individuals interested in it- over the past 22-odd years? For instance, when do you recall receiving your first meeting notices; occasion to speak, run for office, or work on committees, such as, platform committee; etc.?

20.1) When do you recall first receiving meeting notices? And, did you attend the meetings? ________________________________ 20.1a) Yes 20.1b) No

20.2) First permitted to speak: ________________________________

20.3) Ever run for office: _____ 20.3a) Yes 20.3b) No
20.4) Ever appointed to office: ____ 20.4a) Yes 20.4b) No

20.5) ________________________________

20.6) Ever work on committees: (specify) ________________________________

20.7) Would you say you are actively involved in the Ohio Democratic Party today: 20.7a) Yes 20.7b) No 20.7c)
Other: ________________________________

21.0) Let's return to the role of BEDO as an organization in the Ohio General Assembly. More specifically, we are interested in your experiences in the House (Senate) Democratic Party Caucuses. For example, do you or any of your colleagues in BEDO hold leadership positions in the Caucus, and if so, how do you see this helping your work as a legislator? Please elaborate.
21.1) Caucus Leadership Role(s):

21.2) Work as Legislator:

21.3) 

22.0) More specifically, tell us about your particular relationship with the leadership in the House and in the Senate? How have those relationships developed over time?

22.1) Relationship with House Leadership:

22.2) Development over time:

22.3) Relationship with Senate Leadership:

22.4) Development over time:

23.0) On the whole, how would you say BEDO has been received by the various governors (since your tenure)? For example,

23.1) During the Rhodes Administration:

23.1a) Not here then:

23.2) During the Gilligan Administration:

23.2a) Not here then:

23.3) During the Celeste Administration:

23.3a) 

24.0) Have there been any cabinet officials that are particularly notable, be they helpful or hostile to BEDO? Please describe.

24.1) Cabinet official:

24.2) Circumstances:

24.3) Cabinet official:

24.4) Circumstances:

24.5) Cabinet official:

24.6) Circumstances:

25.0) Now tell us about your relationship(s) with the Republican members of the legislature, particularly in the House and Senate Republican Caucuses.

25.1) 

25.2) 

25.3) 

25.4) 

25.5) 

25.6)
26.0) Do you have any occasion(s) to coordinate or negotiate your strategy with Republican members, and, if so, please describe.
   26.1) ___ Yes  26.2) ___ No  26.3) ___ Other: (specify)

V. Area of Interest: Role of Seniority, Size, Chairmanships & Recruitment of Members

27.0) Would you say that the size of the caucus has aided in influencing the legislative process? If so, how's that? Please provide examples of circumstances in which caucus size has impacted the process.
   27.1) ___ Yes  27.1a) Circumstances: _________________________________
   27.2) ___ No  27.2a) Circumstances: _________________________________
   27.3) Other: _________________________________

28.0) Would you say that committee assignments of certain BEDO members has impacted on certain types of strategies employed by the organization? If so, please give examples.
   28.1) ___ Yes. Example: 28.2)
   28.3) _________________________________
   28.4) ___ No. Example: 28.5) _________________________________
   28.6) _________________________________

29.0) Do you view your greatest influence in the legislative process through BEDO, the organization, your individual seat, or your party caucus? Please elaborate.
   29.1) Greatest influence through BEDO: ___ Yes
   29.1a) ___ No  29.1b) ___ Other: (specify) _________________________________
   29.2) Individual Seat: ___ Yes
   29.2a) ___ No  29.2b) ___ Other: (specify) _________________________________
   29.3) Party Caucus: ___ Yes
   29.3a) ___ No  29.3b) ___ Other: (specify) _________________________________

30.0) Does BEDO provide useful resources to its members? If so, what are some of the specific resources provided to your office?
   30.1) ___ Yes.
   30.2) Specify: ____________________________________________________
   30.3) ___ No.
   30.4) ___ Other: __________________________________________________
V. Area of Interest: Types of Policy & Implications

31.0) At this time we are interested in knowing what you think are the issues and policies BEDO has been most active in pursuing and what you consider some of the major successes and defeats of the caucus to be?

31.1) Issue or Policy: __________________________________________

31.2) Issue or Policy: __________________________________________

31.3) Issue or Policy: __________________________________________

31.4) Successes: ______________________________________________

31.5) Successes: ______________________________________________

31.6) Defeats: _________________________________________________

31.7) Defeats: _________________________________________________

32.0) Thinking back to your initial term(s) in office, what kinds of political issues confront BEDO today as compared to your beginning term? How do these issues compare or contrast with others over the years? Please elaborate.

32.1) Issues of 1967-1976: _______________________________________

32.2) _________________________________________________________

32.3) Comparison: _____________________________________________

32.4) _________________________________________________________

32.5) Issues of 1977-1986: _______________________________________

32.6) _________________________________________________________

32.7) Comparison: _____________________________________________

32.8) Issues of 1987-present: ____________________________________

32.9) _________________________________________________________

32.10) Comparison: ____________________________________________

32.11) _________________________________________________________
33.0) When compared to other black/state legislative caucuses across the nation, how would you say BEDO compares? Let me list a number of areas and activities and ask you to rate the performance of BEDO on each as either 1) much more effective in its role, 2) somewhat more effective, 3) about as effective as other black caucuses, 4) less effective, or 5) you don't know?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Much more effective</th>
<th>Somewhat more effective</th>
<th>About as effective</th>
<th>Less effective</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.1) Relationship with Business/Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.2) Overall Constituency Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.3) Overall Relationship with the CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.4) Overall Role in National Caucus of Black State Legislators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.5) Role in National Democratic Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.6) Relationship with Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.7) Relationship with Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.8) Relationship with Legislative Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.9) Relationship with Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.10) Relationship with Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.11) Relationship with Black Constituents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.12) Relationship with White Constituents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.13) Relationship with other House Caucuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.14) Relationship with Senate Caucuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.15) Relationship with Print Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.16) Relationship with Electronic Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.17) Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33.18) 

33.19) 

34.0) What do you see as the future role of an organization like BEDO. Please explain. For example, do you see BEDO becoming more or less important in the future?

34.1) More Important: 

34.2) Less Important: 

34.3) Other: 

35.0) Given the latest transition in BEDO's leadership, how would you compare and contrast the leadership styles of C.J. McLin with the performance of I. Ray Miller? Please elaborate.

35.1) 

35.2) 

35.3) 
(Hold this item and statement until the very end).
Thank you very much for your support and cooperation in this research on BEDO.

36.0) Additional Remarks, if any: __________________________________________
36.1) ________________________________________________________________
36.2) ________________________________________________________________
36.3) ________________________________________________________________
36.4) ________________________:____________________________________

Part VII. **Personal Background Information**

1.0) Where were you born? 01) ________________________________

2.0) How long have you resided in your district? 01) ________________________________

3.0) Sex: 01) ___ Male 02) ___ Female

4.0) Employment:
   4.1) In addition to your legislative duties, what other occupation have you?
        01) ________________________________________________________________
        02) ________________________________________________________________

        4.2) Self-employed: 01) ___ Yes 02) ___ No

5.0) What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
    01) ___ High school graduate
    02) ___ Some training since high school
    03) ___ Some college
    04) ___ College graduate
    05) ___ Attended graduate school
    06) ___ Graduate school degree (e.g., Master of Arts)
    07) ___ Attended professional school
    08) ___ Professional school degree (e.g., J.D., M.D.)

***************************************************************************************************************

*Return to top of page.*
APPENDIX C

Questionnaire for

Legislative Colleagues
Questionnaire for Legislative Colleagues:

1.0) Let us begin by identifying BEDO as an organization. It consists of 13 Democrats, of whom all are black, and it operates in the Ohio General Assembly. Since BEDO began in the middle 1960s, how would you describe its role over time? What do you know or remember about the development of BEDO as a legislative caucus? (probe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1) 1967-1976:</th>
<th>____________________________________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2) 1977-1986:</td>
<td>____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3) 1987-present:</td>
<td>____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4) Comments:</td>
<td>____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.0) Do you recall how you and your white colleagues reacted to the black legislators in the early years, and, if so, please describe that for us? Today, how, if at all, has that changed?

2.1) ____ Yes 2.2) ____ No 2.3) ____ Don't Recall Exactly

2.4) Comments: ____________________________________________________________________________

3.0) Now I'd like to ask you some questions about how the importance of BEDO has changed over time in general and in specific areas. Over time, has the organization become 1) definitely important 2) somewhat important, 3) slightly important, 4) not at all important, or there has been 5) no change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1) In its Role in Floor Debates</th>
<th>Defin'ly Somew't Slig'ly Not at All Chge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2) Role in Committees</td>
<td>Defin'ly Somew't Slig'ly Not at All Chge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3) Role in Ohio Democratic Party</td>
<td>Defin'ly Somew't Slig'ly Not at All Chge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4) Role in Appointment Selections &amp; Confirmation Process</td>
<td>Defin'ly Somew't Slig'ly Not at All Chge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5) Comments: ____________________________________________________________________________

3.6) ____________________________________________________________________________

4.0) With which members of BEDO, if any, are you or have you become particularly close? How did the relationship(s) begin? What is the nature of the relationship(s) today? Feel free to elaborate?

4.1) Member: ____________________________________________________________________________
4.2) Occasion of Introduction: ______________________________________
4.3) Status of Relationship: _______________________________________
4.4) Member: ___________________________________________________
4.5) Occasion of Introduction: ______________________________________
4.6) Status of Relationship: _______________________________________
4.7) Member: ___________________________________________________
4.8) Occasion of Introduction: ______________________________________
4.9) Status of Relationship: _______________________________________

5.0) Let's return to the subject of BEDO as an organization in the Ohio General Assembly. It is generally believed that there are certain types of issues and legislation in which BEDO is particularly active. What do you see those issues to be? And, over time, have those issues changed? Please elaborate.

5.1) Issues of 1967-1976: _________________________________________
5.2) Comments: _________________________________________________
5.3) Issues of 1977-1986: _________________________________________
5.4) Comments: _________________________________________________
5.5) Issues of 1987-present: _______________________________________
5.6) Comments: _________________________________________________

5.7) Overall, would you say the focus of BEDO's legislative agenda has changed?  
Yes 5.8) No 5.9) Remains the same 5.10 Not Sure
5.8) Comments: _________________________________________________

6.0) What do you see as the future role of an organization like BEDO? For example, do you see it becoming more or less important in its future, and why?

6.1) _____________________________________________________________
6.2) _____________________________________________________________
6.3) _____________________________________________________________

7.0) Do you have any comments or recollections about BEDO that you wish to share with this research? For example, is there a particular event that comes to mind that you'd like to comment on?

7.1) _____________________________________________________________
7.2) _____________________________________________________________

*Thank you very much for your support and cooperation in this research on BEDO.*
APPENDIX D

Questionnaire for Journalists
Questionnaire for Journalists:

1.0) Let us begin by identifying BEDO as an organization. It consists of 13 Democrats, of whom all are black, and it operates in the Ohio General Assembly. Since BEDO began in the middle 1960s, how would you describe its role over the time that you have covered the Statehouse? What do you remember and/or have been told about the organization, say during ...? (probe)

1.1) 1967-1976: __________________________________________________

1.2) 1977-1986: __________________________________________________

1.3) 1987-present: ________________________________________________

1.4) Comments: __________________________________________________

2.0) Do you recall your initial reactions when you first learned about the organization? And, how, if at all, has that changed?

2.1) ____ Yes  2.2) ____ No  2.3) ____ Don't Recall Exactly  2.4) Comments: ________________________________________________

3.0) Now I'd like to ask you some questions about how the importance of BEDO has changed over time in general and in specific areas. Over time, has the organization become 1) definitely important, 2) somewhat important, 3) slightly important, 4) not at all important, or there has been 5) no change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imp't</td>
<td>Imp't</td>
<td>Imp't</td>
<td>Imp't</td>
<td>Chng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1) In its Role in Floor Debates __ __ __ __ __

3.2) Role in Committees __ __ __ __ __

3.3) Role in Ohio Democratic Party __ __ __ __ __

3.4) Role in Appointment Selections & Confirmation Process __ __ __ __ __

3.5) Comments: __________________________________________________

4.0) With which members of BEDO, if any, are you or have you become particularly close? How did the relationship(s) begin? What is the nature of the relationship(s) today? Feel free to elaborate.

4.1) Member: __________________________________________________

4.2) Occasion of Introduction: ____________________________________

4.3) Status of Relationship: ______________________________________

4.4) Member: __________________________________________________

4.5) Occasion of Introduction: ____________________________________

4.6) Status of Relationship: ______________________________________
5.0) Let's return to your beginning years at the Statehouse. Do you recall your particular attitude toward BEDO, an all black group, mostly men? Has your attitude changed over time and, if so, how and why?

5.1) Change in Attitude: ___ Yes 5.2) ___ No 5.3) Remains the Same
5.4) Comments: _________________________________________________

6.0) When BEDO held press conferences, do you recall what they were like, the conferences? Who spoke? What types of subjects were covered? How were those conferences covered by the press?

6.1) Overall impression: ____________________________________________
6.2) Who spoke: ____________________________________________________
6.3) Subjects Covered: ______________________________________________
6.4) Press and Electronic Media Coverage: ______________________________
6.5) And today, how is coverage now: _________________________________

7.0) Do you have any comments or recollections about BEDO that you wish to share with this research? For example, was there any particular event that happened and it was or was not covered a certain way, by some or most media ... probe. Please feel free to elaborate.

7.1) __________________________________________________________________
7.2) __________________________________________________________________
7.3) __________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your support and cooperation in this research on BEDO.

Additional Remarks, if any: _____________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E

Questionnaire for

NBCSL Survey of House and Senate Clerks
MEMORANDUM

To: The Clerk of the Senate

From: Ohio Representative Vernon Sykes &
Editor, News from the NBCSL

Date: January 9, 1991

RE: Current Data on Number of Black Elected Officials

The purpose of this correspondence is to request information about the number of black elected officials in the Senate for the following legislative periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, if possible, please provide the names of the most recent black elected officials on the back of this sheet and return it in the self-addressed enclosed envelope to:

Managing Editor
News from the NBCSL
c/o M.J. Simms and Associates, Inc.
Post Office Box 06297
Columbus, OH 43206-0297
Fax # (614) 258-2266

In order to meet our February edition deadline, we would appreciate your response by January 23, 1991.

Thank you for your cooperation.

VS/MJSM
MEMORANDUM

To: The Clerk of the House

From: Ohio Representative Vernon Sykes & Editor, News from the NBCL

Date: January 9, 1991

RE: Current Data on Number of Black Elected Officials

The purpose of this correspondence is to request information about the number of black elected officials in the House for the following legislative periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, if possible, please provide the names of the most recent black elected officials on the back of this sheet and return it in the self-addressed enclosed envelope to:

Managing Editor
News from the NBCL
c/o M.J. Simms and Associates, Inc.
Post Office Box 06297
Columbus, OH 43206-0297
Fax #(614) 258-2266

In order to meet our February edition deadline, we would appreciate your response by January 23, 1991.

Thank you for your cooperation.

VS/MJSM
APPENDIX F

Questionnaire(s) for
Survey of House and Senate Clerks
in the States of Illinois and Maryland

(Data shown are as reported to this investigator by clerks).
February 20, 1991

Margaret J.S. Maddox

Columbus, OH 43206

Clerk of the Senate
Maryland Senate
StateHouse
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: Dissertation Research

To the Clerk of the Senate:

The purpose of this correspondence is to request your assistance in compiling data on the role of black legislators in the nation's General Assemblies since the 1967-1968 sessions. In order to aid in your compilation of these data please refer to the attached forms. Please note that they are short and may be answered in a very short period of time.

I need this information returned to me at the above address or you may fax it to me at work, FAX (614)258-2266. My deadline is March 5, 1991. In the interim if you have any questions I can be reached at home after 5:00pm EST (614) . Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret J.S. Maddox
Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science
The Ohio State University

Attachments: 1-3
## ATTACHMENT 1

### Black Members in the Maryland Senate, 1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Maryland Senate: R/2 D

### Black Members in the Maryland Senate, 1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Maryland Senate: R/5 D

### Black Members in the Maryland Senate, 1987-1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Maryland Senate: R/6 D

### Black Members in the Maryland Senate, 1991-1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Maryland Senate: R/7 D

Please continue to Attachment 2.
ATTACHMENT 2

1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Members in Leadership Positions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Legislator, Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Legislator, Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Members in Leadership Positions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Legislator, Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Legislator, Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1987-1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Legislator, Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarence W. Blount, Majority Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Legislator, Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Legislator, Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1991-1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Legislator, Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarence W. Blount, Majority Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Legislator, Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue to Attachment 3.
## ATTACHMENT 3

### Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs Held by Black Members

#### 1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1977-1978

Claude W. Blount, Vice Chairman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Taxation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From 1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>Nathan C. Terry</td>
<td>Vice Chairman (from 1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 20, 1991

Margaret J.S. Maddox

Columbus, OH 43206

Clerk of the House
Maryland House of Delegates
StateHouse
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: Dissertation Research

To the Clerk of the House:

The purpose of this correspondence is to request your assistance in compiling data on the role of black legislators in the nation's General Assemblies since the 1967-1968 sessions. In order to aid in your compilation of these data please refer to the attached forms. Please note that they are short and may be answered in a very short period of time.

I need this information returned to me at the above address or you may fax it to me at work, FAX (614)258+2266. My deadline is March 5, 1991. In the interim if you have any questions I can be reached at home after 5:00pm EST (614) . Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret J.S. Maddox
Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science
The Ohio State University

Attachments: 1-3
Maryland House members serve 4 yr. terms.

ATTACHMENT 1

Black Members in the Maryland House, 1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Men</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Maryland House: **25 R/117 D**

Black Members in the Maryland House, 1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Men</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Maryland House: **15 R/124 D**

Black Members in the Maryland House, 1987-1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Men</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Maryland House: **17 R/124 D**

Black Members in the Maryland House, 1991-1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Men</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Maryland House: **16 R/116 D**

Please continue to Attachment 2.

In Feb, one black male member resigned replaced by female.

(See black)
ATTACHMENT 2

1967-1968
Number of Black Members in Leadership Positions: 0
Name of Legislator, Title
Name of Legislator, Title

1977-1978
Number of Black Members in Leadership Positions: 0
Name of Legislator, Title
Name of Legislator, Title

1987-1988
Nathaniel Exum Deputy Majority Whip
Name of Legislator, Title
Name of Legislator, Title

1991-1992
Nathaniel Exum Deputy Majority Whip
Name of Legislator, Title
Frank Boston
Name of Legislator, Title

Please continue to Attachment 3.
### ATTACHMENT 3

**Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs Held by Black Members**

**1967-1968**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**1977-1978**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John W. Douglas</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Attachment 3 (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>Howard P. Rawlings</td>
<td>Vice Ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elijah E. Cummings</td>
<td>Vice Ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional &amp; Administrative Law</td>
<td>Horrie M. Harrison</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Executive Nominations</td>
<td>Larry Young</td>
<td>House Ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarence Davis</td>
<td>House Ch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please copy forms if additional space is required. Thank you.
Margaret J.S. Maddox,  
Columbus, OH 43206
1991 cont.  Statutory Committee - Joint Committee

House Chm:
  Budget & Audit - Richard N. Dixon
  Legislative Ethics - Kenneth C. Montague, Jr.
  Workers' Compensation Benefit Percentage Oversight
  Elizabeth C. Cummings

Speaker of House has not appointed House members to
  Gt. Statutory Committee, 3-4-91
February 20, 1991

Margaret J.S. Maddox

Columbus, OH 43206

Clerk of the Senate
Illinois Senate
StateHouse
Springfield, ILL 62706

RE: Dissertation Research

To the Clerk of the Senate:

The purpose of this correspondence is to request your assistance in compiling data on the role of black legislators in the nation's General Assemblies since the 1967-1968 sessions. In order to aid in your compilation of these data please refer to the attached forms. Please note that they are short and may be answered in a very short period of time.

I need this information returned to me at the above address or you may fax it to me at work, FAX (614)258-2266. My deadline is March 5, 1991. In the interim if you have any questions I can be reached at home after 5:00pm EST (614) . Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret J.S. Maddox
Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science
The Ohio State University

Attachments: 1-3
### ATTACHMENT 1

#### Black Members in the Illinois Senate, 1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Men</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Illinois Senate: 38 R / 20 D

#### Black Members in the Illinois Senate, 1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Men</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Illinois Senate: 25 R / 34 D


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Men</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Illinois Senate: 28 R / 31 D


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Black Men</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan Composition of Illinois Senate: 28 R / 31 D

Please continue to Attachment 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Black Members in Leadership Positions</th>
<th>Name of Legislator, Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1978</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sen. Kanneth Hall - Assistant Majority Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue to Attachment 3.
ATTACHMENT 3

Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs Held by Black Members

1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator Financial Institutions</th>
<th>Committee-Chairman</th>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Senate Banking and Finance Divisions</td>
<td>Cecil G. Parker</td>
<td>Minority Spokesman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sen. Fred J. Smith | Minority Spokesman |
Sen. Financial Institutions Comm. - Credit Regulation Division | Name of Committee |

1967-1968 Continued on Attachment 3-C

1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator Financial Institutions</th>
<th>Committee-Chairman</th>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Fred Smith</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator's Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sen. Richard Newhouse | Vice Chairman |
Senator's Name | Title |
Name of Committee |

Sen. Harold Washington | Vice Chairman |
Senator's Name | Title |
Name of Committee |

Sen. Earline Collins | Vice Chairman |
Senator's Name | Title |
Name of Committee |

Sen. Fred Smith | Chairman |
Senator's Name | Title |
Name of Committee |

Sen. Charles Chau | Vice Chairman |
Senator's Name | Title |
Name of Committee |

Attachment 3 (continued)

Sen. Charles Chau | Chairman |
Senator's Name | Title |
Name of Committee |

Senate Transportation Committee
ATTACHMENT 3 (continued) 1987-1988

Sen. Ethel Styles Alexander  Vice Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Name of Committee

Sen. Earlean Collins  Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Transportation Committee
Name of Committee

Sen. Earlean Collins  Vice Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Labor and Commerce Committee
Name of Committee

Sen. Margaret Smith  Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Public Health, Welfare and Corrections Committee
Name of Committee

Sen. Kenneth Hall  Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Appropriations II Committee
Name of Committee

Sen. Kenneth Hall  Vice Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Executive Committee
Name of Committee

1991-1992

Sen. Kenneth Hall  Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Appropriations II Committee
Name of Committee

Sen. Richard Newhouse  Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Commerce and Economic Development Committee
Name of Committee

Sen. Richard Newhouse  Vice Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Consumer Affairs Committee
Name of Committee

Sen. Ethel Styles Alexander  Chairman
Legislator's Name     Title
Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee
Name of Committee

Please copy forms if additional space is required. Thank you.
Margaret J.S. Maddox, Columbus, OH 43206 3-B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Emil Jones</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Emil Jones</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Local Government Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Howard Brokens</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment 3 (continued)
## ATTACHMENT 3-8

### 1991-1993, Continued

#### Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs Held by Black Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Kenneth Hall</td>
<td>Senate Executive Committee</td>
<td>Vice CHAIRMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Emil Jones</td>
<td>Senate Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities Committee</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Margaret Smith</td>
<td>Senate Labor Committee</td>
<td>Vice CHAIRMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Margaret Smith</td>
<td>Senate Public Health, Welfare and Corrections Committee</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Howard Broxson</td>
<td>Senate Transportation Committee</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment 3 (continued)
ATTACHMENT 3-C

Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs Held by Black Members 1967-1968 Continued

Sen. Charles Chew  Minority Spokesman
Legislator's Name  Title
Senate Industrial Affairs Committee  Name of Committee

Sen. Fred J. Smith  Minority Spokesman
Legislator's Name  Title
Senate Registration and Miscellaneous Committee  Name of Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislator's Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment 3 (continued)
February 20, 1991

Margaret J.S. Maddox

Columbus, OH 43206

Clerk of the House
Illinois House of Representatives
State House
Springfield, ILL 62706

RE: Dissertation Research

To the Clerk of the House:

The purpose of this correspondence is to request your assistance in compiling data on the role of black legislators in the nation's General Assemblies since the 1967-1968 sessions. In order to aid in your compilation of these data please refer to the attached forms. Please note that they are short and may be answered in a very short period of time.

I need this information returned to me at the above address or you may fax it to me at work, FAX (614)258-2266. My deadline is March 5, 1991. In the interim if you have any questions I can be reached at home after 5:00pm EST (614). Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret J.S. Maddox
Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science
The Ohio State University

Attachments: 1-3
as of March 15, 1991

I. HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Pursuant to House Rules 12, 25, and 27, the Speaker makes the following appointments to the standing committees and standing subcommittees. Also pursuant to the Rules, the Speaker makes the following appointments of the chairmen of the standing committees and standing subcommittees. (*Indicates ranking minority members):

**AGING AND HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Vice Chair</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Sines</td>
<td>Brading, Core, Nein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maier</td>
<td>Cain</td>
<td>Campbell, James, Verich, Wise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>Haines, Buchy, Byers, Clark, Core, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>Bergansky, Boggs, Logan, Lucas, Mechling, Roberts, Weston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Campbell - Chairman
Cain - Vice Chairman
Abel
Boggs
Cordray
DiDonato
Rankin
Roberts
Skeenn

Watkins*
Lawrence
Nein
O'Brien
Winkler

CIVIL AND COMMERCIAL LAW

Hickey - Chairman
Beatty - Vice Chairman
Hartley
Mahnic
Suster
Tranter
Verich
Vukovich
Walsh

Buchy*
Greenwood
Kasputis
Lawrence
Schuck

COMMERCE AND LABOR

Boggs - Chairman
Hartley - Vice Chairman
Abel
Hagan
James
Koziura
Krupinski
Malone
Mottl
Prentiss
Seese

Corbin*
Blessing
Gardner
Greenwood
Nein
Thompson

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL RELATIONS

Mechling - Chairman
DiDonato - Vice Chairman
Colonna
Healy
Sykes

Thompson*
Greenwood
Kasputis
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS

James - Chairman
Whalen - Vice Chairman
Bergansky
Colonna
DiDonato
Logan
Roberts
Weston

Wachtmann*
Gardner
Myers
Schuck
White

EDUCATION

Gerberry - Chairman
Shoemaker - Vice Chairman
Abel
Bergansky
Cordray
Czarcinski
W. Jones
Maier
Malone
McLin
Mechling
Miller
Prentiss
Weston
Wise

Fox*
Clark
Core
Davis
Gardner
Kasputis
Nein
Watkins
Winkler

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

W. Jones - Chairman
Abel - Vice Chairman
Berganski
Czarcinski
Malone
Mechling
Shoemaker

Gardner*
Nein
Winkler
ELECTIONS AND TOWNSHIPS

Luebbers - Chairman
McLin - Vice Chairman
Abel
Cordray
Koziura
Maier
Sawyer
Seese
Stinziano
Walsh

Clark*
Haines
O'Brien
Sines
Thompson
Wachtmann

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Secrest - Chairman
Bergansky - Vice Chairman
Cera
Cordray
Krupinski
Logan
Lucas
Roberts
Weston

Schuck*
Brading
Doyle
T. Johnson
Lawrence

ETHICS AND STANDARDS

Vukovich - Chairman
Skeen - Vice Chairman
Mallory
Quilter
Sweeney

D. Johnson*
Blessing
Davidson
FINANCE AND APPROPRIATIONS

Sweeney - Chairman
Guthrie - Vice Chairman
Beatty
Boggs
Campbell
Cera
Conley
Czarcinski
Deering
Hickey
C. Jones
Koziura
Mallory
Miller
Pringle
Rankin
Sheerer
Shoemaker
Skeen
Stinziano
Troy

T. Johnson*
Amstutz
Corbin
Amstutz
Corbin
Davidson
Fox
Guerra
Haines
Lawrence
Manahan
Netzley
Thompson

DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Cera - Chairman
Skeen - Vice Chairman
Beatty
Guthrie
Pringle

Davidson*
T. Johnson
Thompson

EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Troy - Chairman
Mallory - Vice Chairman
Conley
Sheerer
Shoemaker
Stinziano

Manahan*
Corbin
Fox
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Deering - Chairman
Koziura - Vice Chairman
Boggs
Hickey
C. Jones

Amstutz*
Guerra
Haines

HUMAN RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE

Miller - Chairman
Czarbinski - Vice Chairman
Campbell
Rankin

Lawrence*
Netzley

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Verich - Chairman
Suster - Vice Chairman
Bara
Beatty
Conley
Gerberry
C. Jones
P. Jones
W. Jones
Mahnic
Mottl
Secrest

Batchelder*
Byers
Greenwood
D. Johnson
Myers
Schuck
Thomas

HEALTH AND RETIREMENT

P. Jones - Chairman
Mahnic - Vice Chairman
Guthrie
Hagan
W. Jones
Maier
Miller
Prentiss
Sawyer
Sheeerer
Sweeney
Whalen

Van Vyven*
Blessing
Brading
Davis
Doyle
Fox
Sines
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Vice Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMAN RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>Rankin</td>
<td>O'Brien*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DiDonato</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>Stinziano</td>
<td>Netzley*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Jones</td>
<td>Batchelder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bara</td>
<td>Buchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cain</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guthrie</td>
<td>Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jones</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krupinski</td>
<td>Van Vyven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahnic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sykes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vukovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSTATE COOPERATION</strong></td>
<td>Seese</td>
<td>Winkler*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mottl</td>
<td>Kasputis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healy</td>
<td>Nein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whalen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDICIARY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE</strong></td>
<td>Tranter</td>
<td>Greenwood*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>Batchelder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cordray</td>
<td>Kasputis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartley</td>
<td>Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hickey</td>
<td>Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vukovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL GOVERNMENT

C. Jones - Chairman
Krupinski - Vice Chairman
DiDonato
Luebbers
Maier
Mechling
Whalen

PUBLIC SAFETY AND HIGHWAYS

Colonna - Chairman
Logan - Vice Chairman
Deering
Hickey
James
Secrest
Sykes
Walsh

PUBLIC UTILITIES

Sawyer - Chairman
Pringle - Vice Chairman
Beatty
Boggs
Cera
P. Jones
W. Jones
Luebbers
Mahnic
Secrest
Seese
Shoemaker

REFERENCE

Bara - Chairman
Czarcinski - Vice Chairman
Gerberry
McLin
Mechling
Mottl
Pringle
Rankin
Sawyer

Davis*
Amstutz
Core
White
Guerra*
Brading
Core
Manahan
Rench
Blessing*
Bateman
Buchy
Byers
Greenwood
Guerra
Van Vyven

Doyle*
Bateman
Davis
Rencher
Winkler
RULES

Riffe - Chairman
Quilter - Vice Chairman
Colonna
Healy
James
C. Jones
Mallory
Sheerer
Skeen
Stinziano

Nixon*
Clark
Davidson
Haines
D. Johnson
T. Johnson

STATE GOVERNMENT

Healy - Chairman
Sheerer - Vice Chairman
Bergansky
Gerberry
Guthrie
Hartley
Maier
Mallory
Malone
McLin
Quilter
Troy
Verich

Rench*
Bateman
Corbin
Guerra
O’Brien
Wachtmann
Winkler

TRANSPORTATION AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Sykes - Chairman
Hagan - Vice Chairman
Bara
Logan
Luebbers
Prentiss
Weston
Wise

Bateman*
Manahan
Myers
Sines
VETERANS AFFAIRS

Malone - Chairman
Mallory - Vice Chairman
Koziura
Seese
Shoemaker
Tranter
Troy

WAYS AND MEANS

Conley - Chairman
Koziura - Vice Chairman
Cain
Campbell
Czarcinski
Deering
Mallory
McLin
Sheerer
Troy
Walsh

Byers*
O'Brien
Wachtmann
White
Thomas*
Amstutz
Byers
Corbin
Netzley
Rench
Watkins
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CHAPTER II


"BEDO's Black Agenda '86: Issues and Answers," a position paper published by BEDO in 1986, 88 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH 43215.

"BEDO Continues Fight for Black Advancement," Columbus Call and Post, February 11, 1988, p. 7B.


Interviews:
Representative C.J. McLin July 4, 1988
Senator William F. Bowen August 16, 1988
Representative William Mallory January 9, 1990
Representative Troy Lee James November 17, 1988
Representative Ike Thompson January 9, 1990
Representative Casey Jones November 17, 1988
Representative I. Ray Miller November 30, 1988
Representative Vernon Sykes September 27, 1988
Representative Thomas Roberts August 27, 1988
Representative Vermel Whalen November 16, 1988
Representative Rhine McLin January 10, 1990


Ohio Act 584 (December 17, 1980). Minority Enterprise Statute.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537: 16 S.Ct.1138; 41 L.Ed. 256 (1896).

CHAPTER III

Act 584, Ohio Minority Enterprise Statute (December 17, 1980).


Interviews:
- Representative C.J. McLin
- Senator William F. Bowen
- Representative Thomas Roberts
- Representative Vernon Sykes
- Representative Troy Lee James
- Representative Casey Jones
- Representative I. Ray Miller
- Reporter Mary Ann Sharkey
- Representative William Mallory
- Representative Ike Thompson
- Representative Rhine McLin
- Senator Theodore "Ted" Gray
- Representative Mike Stinziano
- Representative Barney Quilter

July 4, 1988
August 16, 1988
January 8, 1990
August 25, 1988
September 27, 1988
November 17, 1988
January 9, 1990
November 17, 1988
November 30, 1988
September 14, 1989
January 9, 1990
January 9, 1990
January 10, 1990
January 11, 1990
January 18, 1990
January 24, 1990
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*Columbus Citizen Journal*, May 14, 1975, article on cover page by William Merriman.


________________________, ___; 940-941; 1248 on House Bill 155.
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Columbus Dispatch, "Ohio's population shifts give GOP the edge in redistricting," by Katherine Rizzo, Tuesday, May 21, 1991, p. 3B.


Jewell, Malcolm E., Representation in State Legislatures, (Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky, 1982).
CONCLUSION


Jewell, Malcolm E., Representation in State Legislatures, (Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky, 1982).

News from the NBCSL Newsletter, Ohio State Representative Vernon Sykes, Editor, Volume 1: Issue 2, March 1991, (c/o Post Office Box 06297, Columbus, OH 43206-0297).