

From: "Littleton, Christine" <clittlet@conet.ucla.edu>
To: "Enstrom, James E." <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
CC: "Adenika, Pammela" <padenika@conet.ucla.edu>,
"Reed, Kevin" <kreed@conet.ucla.edu>,
"Waugh, Scott L." <swaugh@conet.ucla.edu>
Subject: RE: Respond to Complaint re Lack of Faculty Diversity at UCLA
Date: Mon, 12 May 2014 22:36:59 +0000

Dear Dr. Enstrom:

In my February 27 email to you I stated that "Because UCLA has determined that your complaint lacks merit, there is no role my office can play after the fact." That is still the case. My portfolio does not include the kind of claim you are making, nor does it include non-ladder academic personnel. You are, of course, welcome to pursue whatever avenues are available to you, but neither I nor my office is one of them.

Sincerely,

Christine A. Littleton
Vice Provost
Diversity & Faculty Development
(310) 206-7411

From: James E. Enstrom [mailto:jenstrom@ucla.edu]
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2014 9:27 AM
To: Littleton, Christine
Cc: Adenika, Pammela
Subject: Respond to Complaint re Lack of Faculty Diversity at UCLA

May 12, 2014

Dear Vice Provost Littleton,

Because of lack of response from you to my February 27, 2014 email message, on May 5, 2014 I hand delivered to Pammela Adenika a printed copy of the email messages below and several related pages. In spite of my personal delivery, I still have not received a response from you. Thus, I again request a response to my February 27, 2014 email message. Since you are the UCLA Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity, I particularly want your assessment of the accuracy of the information contained in "THE FELDENSTEIN CASE" Summary. To help you further understand my request, please read the May 12, 2014 Wall Street Journal Op-Ed by Harvard Professor Ruth R. Wisse, "The Closing of the Collegiate Mind" (<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303701304579550340222538088>). Because of the importance of this matter, I am currently pursuing it with other appropriate UCLA officials.

Thank you very much for your response.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.

Date: Thu, 27 Feb 2014 12:40:11 -0800

To: "Littleton, Christine" <clittlet@conet.ucla.edu>

From: "James E. Enstrom" <jenstrom@ucla.edu>

Subject: Clarification of Complaint re Lack of Faculty Diversity at UCLA

Cc: "Adenika, Pammela" <padenika@conet.ucla.edu>

February 27, 2014

Dear Vice Provost Littleton,

I appreciate your prompt response regarding my complaint. However, I believe there is still a role that the UCLA Office of Faculty Diversity can play if I clarify my request to you. First, based on the evidence in my February 26, 2014 email message, I request your personal conclusion (yes, no, or maybe) as to whether I was terminated from EHS because there is lack of academic and political diversity among UCLA faculty and administrators. Second, I request your personal conclusion (yes, no, or maybe) as to whether my February 10, 2014 "THE FELDENSTEIN CASE" Summary (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Felden021014.pdf>) is accurate. Please respond to one or both of these requests, which I consider to be highly relevant to purpose of the UCLA Office of Faculty Diversity.

Thank you very much for your further consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.

At 10:29 AM 2/27/2014, Littleton, Christine wrote:

Dear Dr. Enstrom:

It is my understanding that you already brought a grievance through the Senate processes regarding your non-reappointment and were unsuccessful. I further understand that you have raised the issue in litigation. Because UCLA has determined that your complaint lacks merit, there is no role my office can play after the fact.

Sincerely,

Christine A. Littleton
Vice Provost
Diversity & Faculty Development
(310) 206-7411

From: James E. Enstrom [<mailto:jenstrom@ucla.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 4:58 PM
To: Littleton, Christine
Subject: Complaint re Lack of Academic & Political Diversity at UCLA

February 26, 2014

Vice Provost Christine A. Littleton
UCLA Office for Faculty Diversity
3134 Murphy Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1405
clittleton@conet.ucla.edu
(310) 206-7411

Dear Vice Provost Littleton,

I am writing because you, the UCLA Vice Provost for Diversity and Faculty Development, have been "at the heart of the struggle for equality at UCLA" for over three decades (<http://today.ucla.edu/portal/ut/fighter-for-equal-rights-focuses-179358.aspx>). Please review my formal complaint that I was terminated from the UCLA Department of Environmental Health Sciences (EHS) because I have academic and political viewpoints that differ from the viewpoints of the vast majority of the EHS faculty members and UCLA and UC administrators who played an active or passive decision making role in my termination. I believe that my termination is due largely to the lack of academic and political diversity among UCLA faculty and administrators. The primary evidence to support my complaint is contained in my December 1, 2011 letter to the UCLA School of Public Health Dean Search Chair (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/OlianA120111.pdf>), my January 23, 2012 Letter to the UCLA Epidemiology Program Review Team (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/EnstromA012312.pdf>), and my February 10, 2014 "THE FELDENSTEIN CASE" Summary (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/Felden021014.pdf>). Additional evidence on the lack of academic and political diversity among the UCLA faculty is contained in the January 2003 UCLAProfs.com tabulation (<http://www.uclaprofs.com/articles/affiliation.html>), in the November 3-4, 2008 Los Angeles Times tabulation of 2008 Presidential campaign contributions by UC faculty (<http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/LATimes110408.pdf>), and the April 2, 2012 National Association of Scholars Report "A Crisis of Competence: The Corrupting Effect of Political Activism in the University of California"

(http://www.nas.org/images/documents/A_Crisis_of_Competence.pdf). Important recent perspectives on my termination are contained in the January 17, 2014 UCLA Daily Bruin editorial on selective academic freedom at UCLA (<http://dailybruin.com/2014/01/17/eitan-arom-ucla-should-not-apply-academic-freedom-policy-on-selective-basis/>) and the February 11, 2014 UCLA Daily Bruin editorial on UCLA's litigious approach regarding disputes with faculty (<http://dailybruin.com/2014/02/10/eitan-arom-ucla-litigious-approach-doesnt-give-others-fair-shake/>).

Please send me confirmation that you have received my complaint and that you will fully assess my complaint that I was terminated from EHS because there is lack of academic and political diversity among UCLA faculty and administrators.

Thank you very much for your assistance regarding this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
President
Scientific Integrity Institute
914 Westwood Boulevard #577
Los Angeles, CA 90024-2905
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274

"THE FELDENSTEIN CASE" Summary Prepared by James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H. September 22, 2014 Version

Summary of Position, Political Affiliation, and State Salary of Persons Involved with Enstrom v. UC Regents Lawsuit & Termination Efforts since 2003:

Strong Evidence that UCLA Faculty & Administrators Do Not Have the Academic, Political, and Economic Diversity of California Citizens

First Name	Last Name	Title of Position	Length of Position	Public Info Voter Reg	Public Info on Salaries of State Employees				Total Salary 2008-2011	Average Salary 2008-2011
					2008	2009	2010	2011		
Plaintiff in 2012 Enstrom v. UC Regents Lawsuit										
James E.	Enstrom	SPH & EHS Researcher	Annual	REP	52,620	78,930	55,666	0	187,216	46,804
					(total salary paid from non-State of CA funds)					
Defendants in 2012 Enstrom v. UC Regents Lawsuit with Authority Regarding Termination										
Mark G.	Yudof	UC President	Tenured	DEM	partial year	577,651	560,594	601,359	1,739,604	579,868
Gene D.	Block	UCLA Chancellor & Prof	Tenured	DEM		424,916	408,152	397,183	424,916	413,792
Thomas H.	Rice	UCLA VChan Acad & SPH Prof	Tenured	DEM		236,500	222,310	229,405	292,143	980,358
Carol Eggac	Goldberg	UCLA VChan Acad & Law Prof	Tenured	DEM		284,289	273,369	266,616	280,056	1,104,330
Linda	Rosenstock	SPH Dean & EHS Prof	Tenured	DEM		344,200	334,359	323,527	346,525	1,348,611
Hilary A.	Godwin	SPH Assoc Dean & EHS Prof	Tenured	DEM		174,332	174,936	185,294	179,676	714,238
Richard J.	Jackson	EHS Chair & Prof	Tenured	DEM	partial year	219,116	187,180	216,011	622,307	207,436
Total Average Salary										2,237,980
Other UCLA SPH EHS Faculty Who Voted to Terminate Enstrom in 2010										
Richard F.	Ambrose	EHS Prof	Tenured	DEM		120,000	117,413	120,809	124,157	482,379
John R.	Froines	EHS Prof & CARB SRP Chair	Tenured	DEM		212,025	209,171	206,561	191,120	818,877
Shane S.	Que Hee	EHS Prof	Tenured	Not Reg		115,005	112,002	132,224	151,246	510,477
Wendie A	Robbins	EHS Prof	Tenured	DEM		115,700	122,153	124,890	139,025	501,768
Irwin H.	Suffet	EHS Prof	Tenured	DEM		142,400	143,080	139,160	148,100	572,740
Jane L.	Valentine	EHS Assoc Prof	Tenured	DEM		72,400	72,400	72,400	73,000	290,200
Arthur M.	Winer	EHS Dist Prof	Tenured	DEM		192,900	192,609	166,086	retired	551,595
Total Average Salary										977,975
Other UCLA SPH Faculty Actively or Passively Against Enstrom Since 2003										
Haroutune K.	Armenian	Assoc Dean Acad & Epi Prof	Tenured	AM INDEP		158,607	102,593	105,880	117,823	484,903
Roshan S.	Bastani	Assoc Dean Res & HS Prof	Tenured	DEM		224,269	227,681	230,008	249,032	930,990
Ronald S.	Brookmeyer	Biostat Prof	Tenured	DEM	Not UCLA	Not UCLA	321,000	285,000	606,000	303,000
Roger	Detels	EPI Chair & Former SPH Dean	Tenured	DEM		232,379	230,375	245,933	254,759	963,446
Particia A.	Ganz	HS Prof & ACS Res Prof	Tenured	DEM		337,495	377,339	374,991	349,999	1,439,824
Gerald F.	Kominski	Assoc Dean Acad & HS Prof	Tenured	DEM		203,827	208,800	209,050	224,850	846,527
Beate R.	Ritz	EPI & EHS Prof & CARB SRP	Tenured	Not Reg		189,712	205,595	212,070	205,288	812,665
ZuoFeng	Zhang	EPI & EHS Prof	Tenured	DEM		194,856	179,017	184,550	194,700	753,123
Total Average Salary										1,860,870

Other UCLA SPH Administrators Actively or Passively Against Enstrom Since 2010

Sarah E.	Anderson	Asst Dean Communications	Career	DEM	131,823	123,158	119,302	130,413	504,696	126,174
Susan E.	Fisher	Personnel Manager	Career	DEM	97,073	98,237	98,767	109,249	403,326	100,832
Kathleen D.	Kiser	Assoc Dean Administration	Career	REP	157,353	150,246	145,648	167,700	620,947	155,237
Total Average Salary										382,242

Other UCLA Administrators/Faculty Actively or Passively Against Enstrom Since 2010

Laura Amy	Blum-	Senior Campus Counsel	Career	DEM	157,955	164,707	175,983	182,240	680,885	170,221
Jan	de Leeuw	Stat Chair & Dist Prof	Tenured	Not Reg--Soc	232,000	225,000	209,000	234,000	900,000	225,000
Glen S.	Fichman	Senior Campus Counsel	Career	DEM	164,000	172,000	172,000	184,000	692,000	173,000
Richard H.	Gold	Radiol Prof Recalled	Tenured	DEM	120,038	117,053	105,000	104,982	447,073	111,768
Robert D.	Goldstein	APO Spec Asst & Law Prof	Tenured	DEM	211,600	205,252	178,534	236,500	831,886	207,972
Ann R.	Karagozian	Acad Senate Chair & Eng Prof	Tenured	DEM	191,783	196,961	202,992	209,175	800,911	200,228
Michael S.	Levine	APO Spec Asst & Med Prof	Tenured	DEM	245,350	249,918	257,884	266,692	1,019,844	254,961
Christine A.	Littleton	VProv Diversity & Law Prof	Tenured	DEM	196,267	201,198	216,286	251,875	865,626	216,407
Mary D.	Nichols	Law Prof & CARB Chair	Tenured	DEM	142,992	129,208	125,906	157,022	555,128	138,782
Kevin S.	Reed	VChan Legal Affairs	Career	DEM	215,125	258,240	247,800	265,500	986,665	246,666
Linda P.	Sarna	Acad Senate Chair & Nur Prof	Tenured	DEM	129,645	143,818	161,431	170,266	605,160	151,290
Scott L.	Waugh	Provost & EVChan & Hist Prof	Tenured	DEM	299,868	360,217	350,516	374,916	1,385,517	346,379
Total Average Salary										2,442,674

Other UCOP Administrators Actively or Passively Against Enstrom Since 2007

Steven V. W.	Beckwith	UC Vice Pres Research	Tenured	DEM	388,333	342,249	323,583	328,916	1,383,081	345,770
Lawrence H.	Pitts	UC Provost	Tenured	DEM	partial year	305,984	326,667	350,000	982,651	327,550
Charles F.	Robinson	UC General Counsel & VP Legal	Career	DEM	425,000	416,000	416,000	425,000	1,682,000	420,500
Valerie C.	Shelton	UC Senior Counsel	Career	DEM	147,000	160,000	160,000	168,000	635,000	158,750
Total Average Salary										1,252,571

Other UC Faculty Against Enstrom Since 2003

John R.	Balmes	UCSF Prof & CARB Member	Tenured	DEM	218,208	210,719	213,359	230,035	872,321	218,080
Paul D.	Blanc	UCSF Prof in Res & CARB SRP	Tenured	DEM	37,189	36,776	35,114	35,080	144,159	36,040
Stanton A.	Glantz	UCSF Prof & CARB SRP	Tenured	DEM	218,000	252,000	283,000	258,000	1,011,000	252,750
S. Katharine	Hammond	UCB EHS Chair & CARB SRP	Tenured	DEM	237,202	253,166	252,341	258,270	1,000,979	250,245
Michael L. B.	Jerrett	UCB EHS Assoc Prof	Tenured	Reg?-Soc	143,000	149,000	153,000	155,000	600,000	150,000
Daniel	Sperling	UCD Prof & CARB Member	Tenured	DEM	145,000	151,000	151,000	168,000	615,000	153,750
Total Average Salary										208,500
Total Average Salary										1,269,365

GRAND TOTAL AVERAGE SALARY

10,423,676

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-ellis-uc-bias-20120520,0,6773276.story>

Los Angeles Times

May 20, 2012 [OPINION](#)

Op-Ed

UC problem: When academics are advocates

University of California campuses are tilting to the left as radical activism overtakes scholarly knowledge.



Students walk past the library at UC Berkeley. According to a report by the California Assn. of Scholars, the University of California supports overwhelmingly liberal academia that stifles dissent. (Los Angeles Times / April 6, 2012)

By John M. Ellis and Charles L. Gesheker

May 20, 2012

Political advocacy corrupts academic institutions. Why? Because the mind-set of a genuine academic teacher is in every important respect the opposite of a political activist's. Academic teachers want to promote independent thought and analytical skills; political activists want conformity. The one fosters intellectual curiosity and encourages opposing viewpoints; the latter seeks to shut it down.

This vital distinction is well understood. In California, the state Constitution contains this unambiguous statement: "The university shall be entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom." Yet despite that, a bias to the left is now accepted as a routine part of a University of California education. That's the finding of a recent study by our organization, the California Assn. of Scholars.

Perhaps this is not surprising given that the tilt to the left among college faculty members has been growing nationwide for several decades. At [UC Berkeley](#), the ratio of [Democrats](#) to [Republicans](#) even in the hard sciences had grown to 10 to 1 in 2004, many times what it was 30 years ago, according to a study by Daniel Klein and Andrew Western. In the humanities and social sciences the ratios were 17 to 1 and 21 to 1, respectively.

The visible signs of activism at work are shocking. Why should the mission statement of the sociology department at UC Santa Cruz claim that a "just, free and equal society" may require "fundamental social change"? Sociology classes should help students understand how societies work, but at Santa Cruz, the mission seems to be enlisting students in activism.

Or consider the course description for UC Merced's History 131, which proposes that students study "the way in which the U.S. has aggressively expanded its role on the world stage."

It is a fact that the importance of the United States on the world stage has steadily increased since its founding. It's certainly worth investigating how that happened, and the question of aggressive intent would be one factor to consider against others. But that cannot happen when the only important question has been preempted in the course description.

The catalog description of [UC Santa Barbara](#)'s Feminist Studies 230 reads like a parody, offering the "experiences of women of color, both within the U.S. and globally, with interlocking systems of racism, classism, sexism, homophobia/transphobia, ableism and colonialism."

These tendentious descriptions are reflected in what many students say about their UC education. "Ten weeks of anti-capitalist, anti-globalization rhetoric," said one UC Santa Barbara sociology student about his class.

Even in science classes, the political bias seems unavoidable. A student in Berkeley's Computer Science 61AC wrote, "How does a statement like 'Nothing Saddam has done could be any worse than what [George Bush](#) has done' find its way into a computer science lecture?"

UC administrators protest that these are isolated examples, but research shows they are not. A recent study found that at UC Berkeley and [UCLA](#), 49% of students reported that they had had a course on a controversial subject where the readings were completely one-sided. This is a deeply and dangerously politicized system.

Real academics would consider a department of political science, or of sociology, that lacks one-half of the spectrum of ideas as incompetent. Today's campus proselytizers think it's just fine for the objective they have in mind, which is not educational but ideological.

Where are the high-paid UC administrators expected to exercise quality control? At a recent meeting at the Chico Chamber of Commerce, one of us asked UC President Mark Yudof for his views on classroom politicization. Yudof admitted that it aggravated him. "Professors are there to educate," he said, "not to rouse the troops for a cause."

If he felt this way, he was asked, why wouldn't he say so in a memo to his campus chancellors, telling them to take appropriate action? Somewhat shaken, Yudof could only say: "I could do that. I don't know that it would do much good."

But surely what he meant is that he didn't want to kick that hornet's nest. Taxpayers are annoyed by excessive salaries for administrators; they ought to be even more annoyed at how little they do to earn those salaries.

As the cost of a college education skyrockets, quality sinks. Numerous studies show that an alarming proportion of recent college graduates have not learned to reason, to write, or to read complex material, and know little about American history and our political and socioeconomic institutions.

That happens when radical activism replaces academic knowledge in campus classrooms. The politicized university is an intellectually bankrupt one.

John M. Ellis and Charles L. Gesheker are president and chairman, respectively, of the California Assn. of Scholars. The report they refer to can be found at http://www.nas.org/images/documents/A_Crisis_of_Competence.pdf.

Copyright © 2012, [Los Angeles Times](#)

Los Angeles Times
November 3, 2008

2008 Presidential Campaign Contributions

Top employers of California contributors

Barack Obama

University of California Berkeley (#5)	\$ 281,348
University of California Davis (#21)	110,790
University of California Irvine	56,567
University of California Los Angeles (#3)	342,461
University of California Merced	2,530
University of California Riverside	14,348
University of California San Diego (#16)	130,402
University of California San Francisco (#6)	265,231
University of California Santa Barbara	31,407
University of California Santa Cruz	23,781
University of California TOTAL	1,258,865
<hr/>	
Stanford University (#2)	475,309
University of Southern California (#8)	193,173

John McCain

University of California Berkeley	\$ 350
University of California Davis	531
University of California Irvine	5,401
University of California Los Angeles (#38)	14,671
University of California Merced	0
University of California Riverside	176
University of California San Diego	650
University of California San Francisco	3,050
University of California Santa Barbara	0
University of California Santa Cruz	0
University of California TOTAL	24,829
<hr/>	
Stanford University (#35)	15,100
University of Southern California (#30)	16,320

2008 Presidential Donations Ratio: Barack Obama / John McCain

University of California Berkeley	\$281,348 / \$ 350 =	803.85
University of California Davis	110,790 / 531 =	208.64
University of California Irvine	56,567 / 5,401 =	10.47
University of California Los Angeles	342,461 / 14,671 =	23.34
University of California Merced	2,530 / 0 =	-----
University of California Riverside	14,348 / 176 =	81.52
University of California San Diego	130,402 / 650 =	200.62
University of California San Francisco	265,231 / 3,050 =	86.96
University of California Santa Barbara	31,407 / 0 =	-----
University of California Santa Cruz	23,781 / 0 =	-----
University of California TOTAL	1,258,865 / 24,829 =	50.70
Stanford University	475,309 / 15,100 =	31.48
University of Southern California	193,173 / 16,320 =	11.84
UC, Stanford, and USC Combined	1,927,347 / 56,249 =	34.22
University of San Diego	18,936 / 3,886 =	4.87
Pepperdine University	6,353 / 3,775 =	1.68
California Institute of Technology	0 / 0 =	-----

<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-na-calmoney4-2008nov04,0,6053478.story>
From the Los Angeles Times

ELECTION 2008

California a generous friend of Barack Obama

The state has contributed \$84 million to the Democratic presidential nominee, 20% of his itemized contributions. Republican candidate John McCain has raised less than a third of that here.
By Dan Morain and Maloy Moore

November 4, 2008

California, the ATM for politicians nationwide, has spit out cash for Barack Obama at an extraordinary clip. One of every five dollars he has raised in itemized contributions to his campaign has come from the Golden State.

At last count, in mid-October, the Democratic presidential nominee had withdrawn \$84 million from California, or 20% of his contributions of more than \$200 -- the threshold at which campaigns must disclose detailed information about donors.

The \$84 million was two-thirds more than Obama collected from the next most generous state, New York. It also exceeds the \$83.7 million raised in California for all federal races a decade ago, when the state emerged as the richest source of campaign money.

John McCain got far less from California, a state that is expected today to vote heavily for Obama. The Republican nominee raised \$25 million.

A Times analysis of California's role in bankrolling federal elections also found that the state has contributed a larger slice of the campaign accounts for the major party candidates than in 2004. Obama's take, one-fifth of his itemized contributions, was up from John F. Kerry's 17%. McCain's California contribution was 12%, higher than George W. Bush's 10%.

Federal Election Commission records show that Californians have provided 13% of the \$2.6 billion in itemized donations raised by candidates for president and Congress and by the two major parties. Millions have been sent to hopefuls nationwide, notably Democrats seeking U.S. Senate seats, including Al Franken in Minnesota, Mark Udall in Colorado and Jeanne Shaheen in New Hampshire.

Californians have also sent \$33 million to independent campaign groups.

But nowhere has the state's impact been more apparent than in the presidential race.

About 126,000 Californians made donations to Obama and McCain. Most of the money has come from people who list their occupation as self-employed, retiree, student or homemaker.

Obama tapped employees of Silicon Valley companies, Hollywood studios, law firms, universities, state and local governments, and many others.

Among employers, Obama's single largest source was the University of California, with professors and other employees contributing \$1.3 million.

Among California-based companies, Google employees were Obama's richest source, at \$562,000.

Nationally, Google's employees almost tied Microsoft's as Obama's largest source of money from a single company -- \$727,000 from workers at Google and \$729,000 from those at Microsoft.

McCain's donors hail from real estate, investment and law firms, and a mix of telecommunications, oil and other companies. Employees of the Irvine Co., the Orange County developer, were McCain's largest source, at \$67,000.

Some of these donors have big hopes for the next administration. A few may become ambassadors; others may see their law partners become judges.

Many work in industries that have major interests in Washington, D.C., and will expect access to the next administration.

Many are like William Bloomfield and Jamie Alter Lynton -- true believers.

Neither Bloomfield nor Lynton is sure how much they've raised for their respective candidates. They haven't kept track. Certainly, each raised hundreds of thousands.

Lynton, whose husband, Michael, is chairman of Sony Pictures Entertainment, comes from a politically active family and used to work for CNN. But until Obama came on the scene, she had never gotten so deeply involved in a campaign.

She helped put on perhaps 10 fundraisers for the Illinois senator and spent 30 hours a week volunteering for Obama, a candidate she believes is transforming politics and, she hopes, the nation's reputation in the world.

"Barack Obama asked me to do something for my country. No one had ever asked," Lynton said. "He said, 'We can do this together.' It was an immediate wake-up call. He said there is a path to make this world better, and make this country a better place."

Bloomfield is every bit as passionate for McCain. He had been a modest donor in past elections. But he had never gone all-in for a candidate, until now.

He sold his business -- he provided washing machines and dryers to apartments and colleges in the Western United States -- and moved from Manhattan Beach to Arlington, Va., where McCain has his headquarters.

Now he volunteers full time for McCain, a man he believes could be this century's Abraham Lincoln.

"That is heady stuff for someone who has been in the laundry business," Bloomfield said. He'd do it all over again, "in a heartbeat. It's the best thing I've ever done."

The scores of financial reports that the campaigns have filed with the Federal Election Commission also offer a measure of the candidates' appeal.

Obama's attraction to young voters is evident in his fundraising. He raised \$820,000 from Californians who described themselves as students, to McCain's \$56,000.

Besides the more than \$1 million Obama raised from people who work at the state's university system, he raised \$475,309 from Stanford University employees and \$193,173 from USC workers. McCain raised less than \$57,000 from USC, UC and Stanford employees combined.

One reason Google became a major fount of Obama money is the company's chief executive, Eric Schmidt. He is one of Obama's most energetic backers and appeared on Obama's 30-minute infomercial. Overall, Californians working for major high-tech firms accounted for \$1.9 million to Obama.

Google employees gave just \$12,000 to McCain. On the other hand, employees of the Irvine Co., McCain's top-dollar firm, accounted for less than \$9,000 to Obama.

The Irvine Co. spent \$80,000 on federal lobbying in the first three quarters of the year on issues related to housing, insurance and disaster recovery. In the past, the company battled the government over the reach of the Endangered Species Act.

Google spent more than \$3.1 million lobbying Washington in the first nine months of 2008. Its issues include copyright, broadband access, energy, immigration, privacy, child pornography-related matters and others.

Obama doesn't take money directly from lobbyists. But law firms, including several with offices in California, have lobby arms in Washington and are among his biggest sources.

Attorneys and others at Wilmerhale, a nationwide law firm whose lobby arm represents Google, donated more than \$361,000 to Obama, \$15,000 from lawyers in California.

Hollywood is another major source of Obama's money. Californians who listed major studios as their employer gave Obama more than \$1.8 million during the campaign.

His overall haul from the entertainment industry is far greater. The nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics counts more than \$14 million nationally from the television and movie industry.

Although many celebrities who donate to Obama are driven by ideology, the industry is also a major lobby force. The Motion Picture Assn. of America has spent more than \$3 million on lobbying this year. Lawyers at the association's largest outside lobby firm, Akin Gump, are major donors to Obama, giving him more than \$160,000, of which \$45,000 came from California.

McCain is not without support in the industry. MGM chairman Harry Sloan has hosted two fundraisers at his home and helped raise money at two galas. Noting that polls suggested his candidate could lose today, Sloan said he doesn't believe his efforts were for naught.

If McCain loses, there will "be a battle for the heart and soul of the Republican Party," he said. The better McCain does, the more likely the party could recast itself as more moderate.

"McCain and what he stands for is the Republican Party that I want to support," Sloan said. "It's the tolerant party with the big tent. There is another side of the party that I haven't been as comfortable in."

For the most part, California's green is tinted deeply Democratic blue.

"The country has been going in the wrong direction for the last eight years," said Steve Westly, the former state controller and eBay executive who ran for governor in 2006.

A co-chairman of Obama's campaign, Westly has co-hosted numerous events for the Democratic ticket, including one recently for vice presidential candidate Joe Biden. "Watching Sen. Obama, there is just something different."

Morain and Moore are Times staff writers.
dan.morain@latimes.com
maloy.moore@latimes.com

Times staff writer Doug Smith and data analyst Sandra Poindexter contributed to this report.

<http://www.uclaprofs.com/articles/affiliation.html>



December 29, 2005

[The One-Sided University \(Part Two\)](#)

UCLA Professor Political Party Affiliation

[DOWNLOAD EXCEL FILE](#)

In determining whether UCLA or any other institution is politically one-sided, the primary challenge lies in quantifying the alleged bias. For the purposes of this survey, we have chosen Democrat or Republican affiliation as a natural (and above all, clear) representation of where a professor stands politically. While party registration is certainly not a perfect proxy for a given person's exact politics, it provides a reasonable facsimile. A Democrat-affiliated professor is unlikely to be pro-life, pro-gun, and strongly in favor of tax cuts, just as a Republican-affiliated faculty member is unlikely to favor a welfare state, affirmative action, or a reduction in American military forces.

Our study focused on English, History, Philosophy, Political Science and Sociology, the five largest departments in the social science and humanities divisions, with the Economics faculty serving as a "baseline." While the results were hardly a surprise given our findings in the [political donation survey](#), the results were still stark. With 58.7% of the faculty conclusively identified, the Democrat to Republican count stands at 136 to 11, a ratio in excess of 12 to 1. Even the Economics department, supposedly a refuge of conservatism, still tallies 10 Democrats to only 2 Republicans.

The incredible imbalance represented in these numbers strongly suggests, as does the survey of political contributions, that at UCLA, students are only hearing one side of the story. This same imbalance leads to the biased teaching noted in many of our [professor profiles](#). Not because every Democrat-affiliated professor uses his classroom for indoctrination, but because a 12-to-1 ratio represents a faculty that falls along the entire Democrat spectrum of scholarship and ideology, from mainstream to radical. UCLA students in these Social Science and Humanities divisions of the College of Letters and Science will thus encounter a full range of ideas from one side of the aisle. But a Sociology student studying in his major will *never once* have a Republican professor. Even in the other four departments studied, the one to three Republicans professors will only present to their students a haphazard sampling of Republican- and conservative-oriented thought and research.

This abject failure to preserve intellectual diversity (compounded by the documented political abuses by more extreme UCLA professors) undoubtedly has an effect on student political formation. Just as ominously, this conservative blackout affects students' likelihood to move into graduate study in the field, including Ph.D. programs. Moreover, because doctoral dissertations are done under the direct supervision of a professor, students pursuing conservative scholarship must find a mentor willing to guide study on an idea that the professor considers personally distasteful. And even with that barrier behind him, our hypothetical conservative professor candidate must still win the favor of a faculty hiring committee. Based simply on the ratios discovered in this survey, a typical department's 10-member hiring committee might in any year not have *any* conservative or Republican members, or at most, a single one. As with doctoral mentoring, the professors on the hiring committee would again have to swallow their (presumed) distaste for the content and message of the candidate's scholarship. And, as with doctoral mentoring, the likelihood of this is remote given that the 10-member hiring committee quite likely contains several hard-core radicals who would view conservative ideas as nothing short of ideological fascism.

Methodology:

This survey of the political affiliations of tenure or tenure-track UCLA faculty was conducted in January 2003 at the Norwalk, California Los Angeles County Registrar of Voters. The list of tenure- and tenure-track professors was compiled from the respective department websites, omitting lecturers, visiting and adjunct professors, and joint appointments.

Department	Democrat	Republican	American Independent	Decline to State	Green	IR	Multiple	NP	RM	No Record
Economics	10	2	1	5	0	0	7	0	0	20
English	37	2*	0	4	0	1	8	1	0	13
History	36	3	0	4	0	0	18	0	1	15
Philosophy	6	3	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
Political Science	24	1	0	4	0	0	12	0	1	8
Sociology	23	0	0	3	1	0	8	0	0	10
TOTAL	136	11	1	22	1	1	55	1	2	68

KEY:

"*Decline to State*" is a California voter designation that indicates no public party affiliation.

"*Multiple*" indicates the professor has a common name which returned multiple results. For consistency, no attempt was made to guess which of the voters was the professor, even when geographic location suggested a strong choice.

"*No Record*" indicates that no voter exists in the Registrar's rolls under that name, or a formal derivation thereof.

"*IR*," "*NP*," and "*RM*" were all Registrar codes reported as the party affiliation.