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I. Introduction: Voting Rights and Political Reality

Despite the 1870 passage of the Fifteenth Amendment prohibiting denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race, the vast majority of African Americans in the southern United States were legally disfranchised by 1910, and most remained voteless in the Deep South in 1960. (Kousser, 1974; Lawson, 1976: 284) Because the timid 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts proved ineffectual in the face of the refusal of adamantilly discriminatory state and local officials to allow even the most obviously qualified blacks to register to vote, the Civil Rights Movement pressed for a more radical and comprehensive statute. In 1965, after the Selma-to-Montgomery March, Congress responded by passing the Voting Rights Act (VRA) (Landsberg, 2007). Although white southern obstruction of black voting registration swiftly collapsed in the late 1960s, leaders of the old racial order adopted another tactic to hang onto power: They instituted new electoral structures, redrawing lines of local and state election districts to give them safe white majorities or shifting from district to at-large elections to ensure that small geographic areas where African Americans were in a majority were submerged in larger, overwhelmingly white election territories (Parker, 1990). In the 1969 case of Allen v. Board of Elections, the U.S. Supreme Court
A. Who Represents Latino Voters?  

II. Measures of Latino Candidate Success and Power

The first step in answering these questions is to choose the most appropriate definition of the population of interest. The population of interest should be defined in terms of the criteria that are used to measure candidate success and power. For example, the population of interest might be defined as all Latinos who live in a specific geographic area, or all Latinos who are registered to vote in a specific election. The definition of the population of interest should be based on the specific research question being addressed and the data available for analysis.
B. Local Standards for Policy Opportunity
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% LtGov of Voter Registration
\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{County} & \text{1890} & \text{1910} & \text{1930} & \text{1970} \\
\hline
\text{Los Angeles} & 62.2 & 49.0 & 54.3 & 58.7 \\
\text{San Francisco} & 71.7 & 71.4 & 71.3 & 71.2 \\
\text{San Diego} & 66.6 & 67.4 & 68.8 & 69.9 \\
\text{Ventura} & 71.7 & 71.4 & 71.3 & 71.2 \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \text{Democrats, % of Registered Voters} \]

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{County} & \text{1890} & \text{1910} & \text{1930} & \text{1970} \\
\hline
\text{Los Angeles} & 10.2 & 13.0 & 15.3 & 15.3 \\
\text{San Francisco} & 79.7 & 79.7 & 79.7 & 79.7 \\
\text{San Diego} & 63.6 & 63.6 & 63.6 & 63.6 \\
\text{Ventura} & 63.6 & 63.6 & 63.6 & 63.6 \\
\end{array} \]
Figure 11. What Perennials of a District Did it Take to Elect a Latino to the California Assembly? 1994-2002?
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number of districts in which Latino Democratic registration exceeded 70%.

To keep the number of conclusions short in each graph, I have combined the smaller

data points and the numbers presented by Latino Democrats are almost identical to

the overall Latino electorate. In 1994, 57% of the total number of districts

were over 70% Latino. In 1998, 60% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 1998, the difference was 22% compared to 77% in districts over 70%

in 1994. In 2002, 56% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2002, the difference was 25% compared to 75% in districts over 70%

in 2000. In 2006, 54% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2006, the difference was 27% compared to 77% in districts over 70%

in 2002. In 2008, 52% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2008, the difference was 29% compared to 79% in districts over 70%

in 2006. In 2010, 50% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2010, the difference was 31% compared to 81% in districts over 70%

in 2008. In 2012, 48% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2012, the difference was 33% compared to 83% in districts over 70%

in 2010. In 2014, 46% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2014, the difference was 35% compared to 85% in districts over 70%

in 2012. In 2016, 44% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2016, the difference was 37% compared to 87% in districts over 70%

in 2014. In 2018, 42% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2018, the difference was 39% compared to 89% in districts over 70%

in 2016. In 2020, 40% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2020, the difference was 41% compared to 91% in districts over 70%

in 2018. In 2022, 38% of the total number of districts were over 70% Latino. In 2022, the difference was 43% compared to 93% in districts over 70%

in 2020.

The overall Latino registration in California has increased from 63% in 2000 to 79% in 2022. The overall Latino registration in California has increased from 63% in 2000 to 79% in 2022. The overall Latino registration in California has increased from 63% in 2000 to 79% in 2022. The overall Latino registration in California has increased from 63% in 2000 to 79% in 2022.

If we only compare RIG and DREG, we can add in the Senate and con-

gressional districts. For the overall Latino registration is also available. Figure 11.3
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DRECG, the Latino percentage of Democratic Registrants, as the best index of
Democratic power in office, for the rest of this chapter, we turn our
attention to Latino representation in state legislative districts and
the effect of Latino representation on Latino representation in state legislative districts.

In California, the Latino percentage of Democratic registrants has increased from
8% in 1990 to 10% in 1994. This increase in Latino representation is mainly due
to the high registration rate of Latinos, which has helped to increase the Latino percentage of Democratic registrants. In 1994, 6.8% of Latinos were registered as Democrats, while in 1990, only 4.8% were registered.

In 1994, 40% of Latinos were registered as Democrats, compared to 30% in 1990. This increase in Latino representation has been particularly significant in the state legislature, where the percentage of Latinos in the lower house increased from 10% in 1990 to 15% in 1994.

The impact of this increase in Latino representation can be seen in the election of Latino candidates to state legislative positions. In 1994, 11 Latino candidates were elected to the state legislature, compared to only 7 in 1990.

Despite these gains, however, the Latino percentage of Democratic registrants remains below the state average, which is currently at 30%. This suggests that there is still room for further increases in Latino representation in the state legislature.

In conclusion, the increase in Latino representation in the state legislature is a positive development, but there is still room for further increases. It is important for the Latino community to continue registering and voting in order to ensure that their voices are heard in the political process.
The demographic trends created more districts that were hospitable to Latinos. The demographic changes resulting from the 1990 Census increased the number of districts with a Latino majority of 30% or more, which allowed for more candidates to run successfully. However, the number of Latinos elected to the state legislature increased only modestly from 1994 to 1996. In 1994, there were 27 Assembly districts with a Latino majority, and in 1996, there were 35 such districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assembly Districts with Latino Majority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1996, the number of districts with a Latino majority in the California legislature increased significantly. The number of districts with a Latino majority increased from 27 in 1994 to 35 in 1996. This increase in the number of districts with a Latino majority allowed for more candidates to run successfully.

In 1994, there were 27 Assembly districts with a Latino majority, and in 1996, there were 35 such districts. The number of districts with a Latino majority increased significantly from 1994 to 1996.

In the 1996 elections, the number of Assembly districts with a Latino majority increased from 27 in 1994 to 35 in 1996. This increase in the number of districts with a Latino majority allowed for more candidates to run successfully.
In recent years, the use of crossover districts has become more prevalent. These districts, also known as "split-ticket" districts, allow voters to cast a vote for a candidate in one party in one race and a candidate in another party in another race. This allows for a more diverse representation of interests and opinions in the political landscape.

C. The Crossover Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns with Majority of Winning Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party and Elected by Winning Candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presidential Election Results for Districts between 30% and 50% 2000 (Assembly, Congress, and Senate Districts where the Leading Party won in 2011-12 Elections and Presidential Elections of Crossover Districts, 1994-95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Winning Party</th>
<th>Winning Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town 1</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 2</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 3</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Michael Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.2: Districts where the Leading Party won in the 1994-95 and 2000 Elections.
The figures and tables of this chapter are presented as an appendix in in-class.

Each section of the paper—Table 1, Figure 1, Appendix A—contains the text and its corresponding figure or table.

For more information on the appendices, please refer to the full report.

V. Real-World Validation and Legal Concerns

The California Form deems the legal validity and the report's implications.
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