

Are qualified females available for executive posts in Sacramento?

By JENNIFER JENNINGS

While women have done poorly winning high political office in California through the electoral process, they have done even worse penetrating the top levels of state government by appointment. The Capitol complex is overwhelmingly dominated by males. The 100 highest-paying positions in the Legislature are all held by men. There are no women in command positions within the Reagan administration. And no women sit on the state Supreme Court (elective posts that are invariably first obtained by gubernatorial appointment).

An extensive survey of women in state government was conducted last year by Caren Daniels of the Secretary of State's Office, which compiles a roster of state and local officials each year. Here is what Daniels found:

- Of the top 55 officials appointed by the Governor, none is a woman.
- Of the next 101 appointees, some of whom are selected by department heads, only one is female (Dr. Carolyn Vash, chief deputy director of the state Department of Rehabilitation).
- Only six women hold executive position (with salaries of \$25,000 a year or more) in the Reagan administration, and three of these hold jobs legally or traditionally allocated to women.
- No women are on the Governor's cabinet (except ex officio member Ivy Baker Priest, elected state Treasurer).
- The state Personnel Board has not conducted a study on women in California government for seven years.

The Legislature, at least on paper, attempted last year to get more women in policy-making positions by passing a resolution — ACR 36 (Ralph) — urging the Governor to appoint more women to state boards and commissions. The statistics indicate that there has been no great effort by the administration to change.

Who's qualified?

Governor Reagan's appointments secretary, Ned Hutchinson, does not believe there is a lack of women in top state positions, despite the numbers. "I don't think there should be a race or sex criterion in the management of state government," he explained. "There are 250 top-management positions in state government to manage 106,000 employees. We can't gamble on filling these positions. We have to go with those that are qualified, and 90 to 95 percent of those who are trained are

men. There just aren't that many women who are qualified. For Governor Reagan to pick a woman, unproven, would be foolish and discriminatory. What does it matter what sex the office-holder is?"

Hutchinson denies discriminating against women, and cites statistics to support his view. Of 37 women who have applied for judgeships, 14 were appointed; blacks have an appointment ratio of about 50 percent, white males about 13 percent. Hutchinson can't recall having had a woman apply for either a cabinet post or a department directorship. Nor does he think affirmative-action programs are necessary to get more women appointed. All that is needed, he emphasized, is for his office to receive a stack of résumés of qualified, proven women. "We choose whoever is best qualified for the job, he said. "There is absolutely no discrimination in the Reagan administration."

Nor does he feel that women have been discriminated against generally. "I just do not think women have had a bad deal," he commented, "and I don't think society in America owes them anything. The blacks were; the women weren't. Our culture and our society have an evolutionary way. Women have been a privileged segment in American society. Laws have been bent over backwards to protect them. To say that women have been discriminated against and therefore they are owed opportunities is selfish and arrogant. Women have had a tremendous influence so far as government goes. It has only been a recent phenomenon that women have wanted to assert themselves." (He cited as influential women Eleanor Roosevelt, Queen Victoria and Queen Elizabeth II.)

The view of the Reagan administration is not held by the Legislature, which in 1965 created an Advisory Commission on the Status of Women to assess the positions of women in California society. In 1972, the commission was granted permanent status and the word "advisory" dropped. The commission studies:

- Employment practices, both public and private. (A résumé file of experienced women is maintained to help employers hire women.)
- National and state laws affecting the rights of women.
- Education needs of girls and women and how they are being met.
- Economic considerations affecting social attitudes toward women.

Chairwoman Anita Miller and Executive Director Pamela Faust are hesitant to engage in a public debate with Hutchinson for fear of antagonizing the person who can facilitate appointment of more women to state posts in these final months of the Reagan administration. How-

The author, a student at the University of California at Davis, prepared this article while serving an internship with the California Center for Research and Education in Government, publisher of the Journal.

ever, they disagree utterly with him and have made the low representation of women in policy-making positions as one of the commission's major areas of concern.

Two-fold problem

Miller and Faust feel that a two-fold reason explains the paucity of women in responsible state positions. Those in power, they say, simply don't consider women when making appointments; they do not think it important to develop a sexual balance. Secondly, few women envision themselves in these policy positions and thus don't take steps to get them. Miller and Faust sense a dramatic change developing in this attitude, however. "Women tend to look at themselves in terms of qualifications and experience much more critically than men in the same position do," said Faust. "With society's pressures, it is hard for women to see themselves both as women and as being fully qualified."

The commission leaders state that there is "absolutely and unequivocally no doubt that women have been excluded from consideration," but they reject the notion that this is the product of a conscious conspiracy. The problem is that the appointing powers do not make a conscious effort to include women.

Miller and Faust maintain that there is no shortage of qualified women available for appointment to top state jobs. The problem is analyzing what men like Hutchinson mean by "qualification". "If it means having a beard," Miller said, "then obviously no women would qualify." Appointing powers, Faust emphasized, take the attitude that a woman is incompetent until proven otherwise.

Another area of dispute involves the mechanics of appointment. Hutchinson said that a vacancy becomes known through the announcement of a resignation, and the new appointee is selected from résumés received by the Governor's office and among individuals already known to the Governor. The commission leaders consider the procedure to be far less open than Hutchinson suggests. They contend that often there is no public knowledge of resignations until a new appointee has been named. "You have to be a sleuth to find out when and what positions are actually open," commented Miller.

The field of state-supported education holds no greater opportunities at the top level for women than does the Capitol complex. Of 114 key positions in the University of California and the state University and Colleges, only four are women who serve as members of the U.C. Regents and the College Trustees. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Wilson Riles recently attempted to hire a woman as associate superintendent but could find none qualified in the state school system. He discovered that there are no female superintendents of large school districts and that woman administrators of small districts were either unavailable or unqualified for the state job.

Legislative shortcoming

Male dominance also extends into the Legislature, which in recent years has given lip-service to sexual equality. Ida Casillas, assistant to Assemblyman Walter Karabian, last year conducted a study that showed that the 104 highest-paying legislative staff positions were all held by men. The staffs of all 43 standing committees were all headed by male consultants. Karabian concluded that the Legislature had "inadvertently" per-

Women in the Reagan administration

	POSITION	SALARY
Kay Valory	Member, Alcoholic Beverage Control Board	\$14,700
Evelyn E. Whitlow	Chief, Division of Industrial Welfare	\$25,524
Virginia L. Carlson	Superintendent, California Institution for Women	\$27,060
Margaret O'Grady	Chief, Division of Labor Statistics and Research	\$25,524
Ethel Crockett	State Librarian	\$25,776
Nita Ashcraft	Member, Personnel Board	\$10,584
Jean Auer	Member, Water Resources Control Board	\$26,250
M. Joanne Lees	Members, Women's Board of Terms and Parole (Lees, chairperson)	\$11,907
Eleanor Hiller		\$11,245
Lucille Hosmer		\$11,246
Gladys Sanderson	Member, Youth Authority Board	\$26,250
Elizabeth Ziegler	Superior Court Judge	\$37,615
	Municipal Court Judge	\$34,605
Betty Jo Sheldon	Marlon L. Obera	Bessie Dreibelbis
Nancy B. Watson	Bonnie Lee Martin	Mary Pajalich
Rosemary Dunbar	Marie B. Collins	Artemis Henderson

Women in top state offices

Positions	Jobs	Women	% of Women
Administrative	156	1	.6%
State Agency Dept. Heads	61	0	0
Chief Deputies	35	1	2.8%
Deputy Directors	32	0	0
Assistants to Deputy Directors	28	0	0

Women in Judiciary*

Court	Judges	Women	% of Women
California Supreme Court	7	0	0%
Court of Appeals	48	1	2.1%
Superior Court	463	5	1.1%
Municipal Court	359	20	5.5%
Justice Court	222	13	5.9%
Total	1099	39	3.5%

*See CJ, May 1973, p. 160

mitted sex discrimination to exist in the Capitol. He introduced a resolution (ACR 115) calling for implementation of an affirmative-action program wherever inequities are found by the Joint Rules Committee.

Some legislative leaders took offense at the Karabian report, and the resolution died in the Assembly Rules Committee. Karabian then issued a report claiming that the chairman, Assemblyman John Burton, refused to set it for a hearing. The Assembly leadership, however, led the effort to create a Joint Committee on Legal Equality — ACR 33 (Moretti) — to study and recommend changes in California laws that discriminate against women. Mari Goldman, an attorney who had been serving on the staff of Senator Mervyn Dymally, was named consultant of the joint committee. She reported that she is making a special effort to establish lines of communication with women's organizations that are not considered part of the women's liberation movement, so that a wider variety of women's concerns can be attacked.

In recent years, the Legislature has made important strides to help women attain equal rights. But these measures have dealt primarily with the legal aspects of discrimination; they have not served to change the practice by both the Governor and the Legislature to maintain male dominance in appointive positions. 🏠

Only in California: living up to the legend

California has a national reputation as a wacky wonderland of unconventional politics. Many Californians have suspected that the reputation is not totally deserved and that the political aberrations of the biggest state have been magnified for the Eastern eye by the news media. But the events of the current California political season seem to justify the state's reputation. Where else but in California will you find:

The Flournoy phenomenon. Just a few months ago, state Controller Houston I. Flournoy was rated fourth among four major prospective candidates in polls measuring odds of winning the Republican gubernatorial nomination. His chances seemed all but hopeless. Then two of the candidates, Attorney General Evelle J. Younger and former Presidential Counselor Robert H. Finch, decided not to run for the office, and only Lieutenant Governor Ed Reinecke and Flournoy were left in the race. Reinecke was plagued with problems involving a grand jury investigation into his role in an offer by ITT to help finance the 1972 GOP national convention in San Diego.

Reagan's "kitchen cabinet". Faced with the apparent choice between supporting Reinecke or the more liberal Flournoy, the conservatives close to Governor Reagan decided that in the era of Watergate pragmatic politics demand that Flournoy get their support. Flournoy received the backing of virtually all the big names behind the California Republican Party, men like Holmes Tuttle, David Packard, J. H. Hume, Leonard Firestone and Taft Schreiber. Hardly any GOP moneybags were left for Reinecke. Republican leaders apparently decided that Flournoy could win in November and that they had better back him or suffer a catastrophic Watergate-tinged defeat at the hands of the Democrats. Even directors of the California Republican Assembly, a conservative organization that has been strongly opposed to Flournoy in the past, gave the Controller a thunderous ovation at a recent meeting. Observed Deputy Controller Kirk West: "Hugh always has been lucky."

Flournoy-Harmer ticket. After deciding to back Flournoy, the conservatives began promoting a ticket with someone closer to their philosophy, Senator John Harmer, as the party's nominee for Lieutenant Governor. Harmer has a ready-made campaign organization, the half-million or so Mormons in the state who over the last decade or so have become increasingly ac-



Houston Flournoy



John Harmer

tive in politics. Harmer will be running, as it happens, against one of Flournoy's closest political allies, John Veneman, former Assemblyman and undersecretary of the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

L'affaire Angelina. Flournoy's ascent and Reinecke's ITT problems would have won almost all the political headlines — except for the performance of Angelina Alioto, wife of Democratic gubernatorial hopeful Joseph Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco. Upset because she had not been getting the attention she felt she deserved from her husband, Angelina Alioto disappeared for 18 days (taking a tour of California missions) to let her husband stew. She finally returned and publicly assailed her husband for putting politics above spouse. Political strategists couldn't figure out whether Angelina's televised exchanges with her candidate-husband hurt him with women or helped him because of the exposure it gave him in Southern California.

Typical CDC Convention. Meanwhile, the other candidates were working hard trying to lock up the so-called liberal vote for the Democratic primary. The Southern California Chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action picked Representative Jerome Waldie as its number one choice, but also gave a high rating to Secretary of State Edmund G. Brown Jr. (In a previous poll, Brown was the leader with Waldie far behind.) Waldie then tried to lock up the liberal vote at the California Democratic Council convention in Sacramento. As it turned out, the convention was typically indecisive. Waldie was the favorite, but fell 12 percentage points short of getting the 60 percent needed for the CDC's endorsement. The other candidates mounted a stop-Waldie drive, but only Brown (17 percent) and