

# The Claremont Institute

For the Study of Statesmanship and Political Philosophy

[Home](#) [Projects](#) [Writings](#) [Events](#) [Become a Member](#) [About Us](#) [Help](#)

## About Local Liberty

Local Liberty is the blog of the **Center for Local Government** at the Claremont Institute.

The Claremont Institute's **Center for Local Government** aims to restore republican government at the local level. This means articulating and applying the fundamental principles of the American Founding: the rule of law, property rights, and morality. Americans should become once again, as James Madison urged, "free and gallant citizens;" "the mutual guardians of their mutual happiness."

## Recent Posts

[LAT's Abortion Reporting](#)  
[What Will Redistricting Do? Rose Institute Study UPDATE](#)  
[Kotkin on Disaster Relief: Local and Federal](#)  
[Redistricting Carnival UPDATED](#)  
[Political Football Redevelopment: NFL Blitzes Taypayers](#)

## Categories

[Budget](#)  
[Bureaucracy](#)  
[California in the Union](#)  
[Cities](#)  
[Conservatism at the Local Level](#)  
[Counties](#)  
[Courts](#)  
[Crime](#)  
[Direct Democracy](#)  
[Environmentalism](#)  
[Ethnicity](#)  
[Events](#)  
[Governor](#)  
[Higher Education](#)  
[Immigration](#)  
[Linkage](#)  
[Local Governance](#)  
[Local Litigation](#)  
[Media](#)  
[Moral Fiber](#)  
[National Security](#)

# Local Liberty

The Blog of the Center for Local Government

[« Kotkin on Disaster Relief: Local and Federal](#)

[LAT's Abortion Reporting »](#)

## What Will Redistricting Do? Rose Institute Study UPDATE

Judging by two somewhat differing newspaper accounts of a Rose Institute study, **Prop 77** (redistricting) will or won't greatly affect Sacramento. The *LA Times* **version** (Nancy Vogel): A predicted six-fold increase in the number of state legislative seats "would be a major increase in competitiveness, the researchers said. At present, there are no competitive congressional districts in California, three in the Assembly and one in the state Senate." But there would be no "dramatic shake-up of political power." Then again not a single seat changed party control in 2004. It's certainly the case that the Democrats would retain power, for at least one election cycle.

The *Sacbee's* **version** (Jim Sanders):

A hotly disputed study of Proposition 77's likely effects concluded Monday that California's redistricting initiative would produce an additional 11 competitive seats in the Legislature and 10 in Congress.

The Rose Institute study, likely to become a centerpiece of debate over Proposition 77, was immediately touted by supporters of the initiative as a boost to their campaign and by opponents as one-sided propaganda.

The *LAT* story referred to a "new academic study." The *Sacbee* story discusses possible motives behind the research.

Bruce Cain, a redistricting expert who was involved in Democratic remapping efforts in the 1980s, lent credence to the Rose Institute report by saying its conclusions appear to be reasonable based upon his own research....

"The Rose Institute is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Republican Party," Steve Maviglio, a spokesman for Assembly Speaker Fabian Núñez, said in a prepared statement....

New Urbanism  
 Progressivism  
 Property Rights  
 Public Unions/Pensions  
 Reapportionment  
 Redevelopment  
 Regulation  
 Religious Freedom  
 Rights  
 Rule of Law  
 Sacramento Shenanigans  
 Schools  
 State Legislature  
 Stem-Cells/Proposition 71  
 Taxation  
 Transportation

Contributors to the Rose Institute's redistricting efforts, although not specifically to the newly released study, include R.B. "Buzz" Wooley, who also has donated \$25,000 to the campaign to pass Proposition 77; and Steve Poizner, chairman of the Yes on 77 committee.

The strong reaction from the Speaker's office seems odd, given the relatively modest conclusions. Yet the Democrats realize that any possibility of change is subversive to their agenda, which requires suppressing competition. And that is the key to understanding the significance of the Rose study: Any change which admits the possibility of dissent poses a regime change possibility in the way Sacramento will conduct itself. See our file of **commentary** on redistricting.

---

**Monthly Archives**

September 2005

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

September 2005  
 August 2005  
 July 2005  
 June 2005  
 May 2005  
 April 2005  
 March 2005  
 February 2005  
 January 2005  
 December 2004  
 November 2004

Make up your own mind: Here's the **Rose Institute study**, which promises updates. The 36-page report contains a lot of reapportionment pornography: grotesquely drawn districts from across the country and in California, which Prop 77 will presumably eliminate here, using traditional standards such as compactness and integrity of counties and cities. (The visuals unfortunately omit Claremont's own senate district, which I take to be an egregious example of the current injustice. See it **here**.)

The study's conclusion on Prop 77's effects:

According to our findings, Proposition 77 will result in a significant increase in competitive districts in California. If Proposition 77 passes, forcing a redrawing of the lines, a Republican swing similar to 1994 could result in Republican majorities in the California State Senate and among the state's Congressional delegation. A similarly large swing to the Democrats could reduce Republicans to less than one-third of each house in the state legislature.

UPDATE: See professor Jack Bunzel's **op-ed** in the *LAT*: "In 2004, only three [congressional] incumbents lost outside of Texas..."

---

**Author Index**

Brian P. Janiskee  
 Conor Friedersdorf  
 Joey Tartakovsky  
 John Eastman  
 Ken Masugi  
 Lindsay White  
 Matthew J. Peterson  
 R. J. Pestritto  
 Richard Reeb  
 Thomas Krannawitter  
 Timothy Wheeler  
 Tom Karako

The Rose report summarizes the benefits of redistricting, below:

Voter apathy resulting from predetermined general election results.

- A decline in candidate quality as candidate recruitment loses importance in guaranteed-win districts.
- The carving up of grassroots political organizations among districts, resulting in increased voter apathy, as it reduces to near-impossibility the opportunity to organize local voters to influence elections.
- An increased reliance on campaign mail (and the money to create and send it) and television advertising as communities are divided and local organizations are



sliced and diced among districts.

• Reduced attention to the concerns of communities as their voters are divided among districts and their power to influence any elected official's election is diminished.

• Contact and communication between elected officials and their constituents lessens as the incentive for elected officials to keep in personal contact with voters is reduced.

• Reduced opportunities for California's rapidly growing Asian American and Latino populations to elect additional members of their communities to state legislative and Congressional office.

• Reduced opportunities to increase the number of women in California's Congressional delegation (currently 19 out of 53 California Representatives are women), although term limits mitigate this impact in the Assembly and State Senate.

• A fundamental erosion in our traditional representative system where candidates first organize locally (for school board or similar office), then organize at the city level, then county, then state legislative and Congressional campaigns. In a gerrymandered situation, those local bases can be sliced and diced, greatly reducing their role and influence in local elections.

Reapportionment | Ken Masugi | September 27, 2005 | 08:44 AM

### Blogroll

#### CALIFORNIA:

[California Club for Growth](#)

[The California Republic Online](#)

#### Contributors to the CRO Blog:

[Carol Platt Liebau](#)

[Patterico's Pontifications](#)

#### Issues:

[Education Wonks](#)

[California Energy Blog](#)

[The Immigration Blog](#)

[Pensionomics](#)

[California Stem Cell Report](#)

#### Journalists:

[SacUnion Blog](#)

[OC Register Blog](#)

[California Insider](#)

#### Politicians:

[State Senator Tom](#)

[McClintock's Blog](#)

[Assemblyman Chuck](#)

[DeVore's Blog](#)

#### Orange County:

[OC Blog](#)

#### OTHER STATES

#### North Carolina:

[The Locker Room](#)

#### South Carolina:

[South Carolinan's for Responsible Government](#)

#### Ohio:

[Buckeye Institute Blog](#)

#### Texas

[blogHouston](#)

#### Washington State:

[Sound Politics](#)

#### NATIONAL:

### TrackBacks

### Comments

Name:

Email Address:

URL:

Comments:

M  
P  
r  
a  
S  
  
-  
  
-  
  
/  
  
T  
I  
p  
F  
p  
r  
  
-  
  
E  
  
E  
/  
E  
  
-  
  
/  
  
E  
C  
C  
J  
C  
fi  
J  
b  
F  
S  
E  
Z  
F  
T  
c  
H  
"  
C  
c  
v  
  
F  
I  
/  
T  
a  
ii  
a  
  
V  
C

**No Left Turns (Ashbrook Center)**

Issues:

Environment:

**The Commons**  
Property Rights:  
**Eminent Domain Watch**

Thinktanks: **Hit & Run (Reason Online)**  
**The Insider (Heritage Foundation)**

Publications: **The Corner (National Review)**  
**Armavirumque (New Criterion)**  
**C-Log (Townhall.com)**

Individuals: **Michelle Malkin**  
**Power Line**  
**Pat Sajak**  
**Hugh Hewitt**

**News/Commentary**

**GENERAL CALIFORNIA:**

**Around the Capitol**

**Rough & Tumble**

**CalNews.com**

**Individual Newspapers:**

*Press Enterprise* Editorials  
*L.A. Daily News* Opinion  
*OC Register* Commentary

**Individual Columnists:**

*OC Register* Steven Greenhut  
*Sac Bee* Daniel Weintraub  
*Sac Bee* Dan Walters  
Jill Stewart

**Periodicals:**

**CPR Online**

**City Journal**

**Radio:**

**Frank Pastore**  
**John and Ken Show**

**Organizations/Resources**



Remember you?

Post

Forget You

V  
r  
s  
p  
M  
i  
F  
E  
t  
g  
a  
c  
e  
a  
C  
F  
J  
S  
t  
C  
  
-  
C  
M  
E  
L  
T  
F  
A  
E  
F  
F  
V  
V  
F  
t  
  
-  
S  
L  
a  
c  
[  
[  
  
-  
E  
E  
t  
v  
r  
[

**National:**

**SPN's State Fiscal Policy Exchange**

**American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)**

**California:**

**The California Local Government Finance Almanac**

**California Institute for Federal Policy Research**

**The Rose Institute of State and Local Government**

**The Center for Government Analysis**

**California Taxpayer's Association**

**Public Policy Institute of California**

**Pacific Legal Foundation**

**Pacific Research Institute**

**Center for the Study of Popular Culture**

**Reason Foundation**

**Television:**

**The California Channel**

**Orange County:**

**Orange County Taxpayer's Association**

**Apartment Association of Orange County**

**Environment:**

**Property & Environment Research Center**

**Republicans for Environmental Protection**

**Ethnicity:**

**Center for Individual Rights**

**Immigration:**

**Center for Immigration Studies**

**Property**

**Rights/Redevelopment:  
Coalition for Redevelopment Reform**

**Defenders of Property Rights**

**Castle Coalition**

**Institute for Justice**

---

Powered by  
Movable Type 2.661

---

[Home](#) [Projects](#) [Writings](#) [Events](#) [Become a Member](#) [About](#) [Help](#)  
Copyright © 2002-2005 The Claremont Institute. Technical problems may be brought to the attention of webmaste