

Minorities and Representation in American Politics



Rebekah Herrick



Copyright ©2017 by SAGE Publications, Inc.

This work may not be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means without express written permission of the publisher.

Minorities and Representation in American Politics

Do not copy, post, or distribute

To
Lori, Neal,
and
Reece Franklin

Minorities and Representation in American Politics

Rebekah Herrick

Oklahoma State University



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

Copyright ©2017 by SAGE Publications, Inc.

This work may not be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means without express written permission of the publisher.



FOR INFORMATION:

CQ Press

An Imprint of SAGE Publications, Inc.

2455 Teller Road

Thousand Oaks, California 91320

E-mail: order@sagepub.com

SAGE Publications Ltd.

1 Oliver's Yard

55 City Road

London EC1Y 1SP

United Kingdom

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.

B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area

Mathura Road, New Delhi 110 044

India

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd.

3 Church Street

#10-04 Samsung Hub

Singapore 049483

Senior Acquisitions Editor: Michael Kerns

Development Editor: Nancy Matuszak

eLearning Editor: Allison Hughes

Production Editor: Tracy Buyan

Copy Editor: Kristin Bergstad

Typesetter: Hurix Systems Pvt. Ltd.

Proofreader: Jan Wickline

Indexer: Virgil Diodato

Cover Designer: Karine Hovsepian

Marketing Manager: Amy Whitaker

Copyright © 2017 by CQ Press, an Imprint of SAGE Publications, Inc.
CQ Press is a registered trademark of Congressional Quarterly Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Herrick, Rebekah, 1960– author.

Title: Minorities and representation in American politics / Rebekah Herrick, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.

Description: Thousand Oaks: SAGE/CQ Press, 2017. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015039009 | ISBN 9781483386836 (pbk. : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Political participation—United States. | Representative government and representation—United States. | Minorities—Political activity—United States. | Sexual minorities—Political activity—United States. | Women—Political activity—United States.

Classification: LCC JK1764. H46 2017 | DDC 323.173—dc23 LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2015039009>

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

16 17 18 19 20 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Brief Contents

List of Spotlights, Tables, Figures, and Maps	xii
Preface	xv
About the Author	xviii
1 Minorities and Representation	2
2 Descriptive Representation and Minorities: Legislatures and Other Elective Offices	28
3 Minorities and Formalistic Representation: Laws, Institutional Design, and Elections	62
4 Policy Representation and Minorities in Legislatures	78
5 Minorities and Symbolic Representation	108
6 Minority Representation and the Judicial Branch	132
7 Representative Bureaucracy	154
8 Public Opinion and Minority Interests	182
9 Minority Groups and Political Resources	210

10	Acculturation, Group Consciousness, and Cohesion among Individuals with Shared Minority Status	234
11	Minorities and Political Participation	262
12	Minority Movements and Interest Groups	286
13	Multiminority Coalitions and the Future of Minority Representation	322
	Glossary	347
	Notes	355
	Index	397

Detailed Contents

List of Spotlights, Tables, Figures, and Maps	xii
Preface	xv
About the Author	xviii
1 Minorities and Representation	2
Who Are Minorities? Race as a Category	6
African Americans	9
Asian Americans	10
American Indians	10
Who Are Minorities? Ethnicity as a Category	14
Hispanics in America	14
Whites in America	16
Who Are Minorities? Gender and Sexual Minorities	17
Women	18
Gender Identity: Transgenderism and Nonconformity	18
Sexual Orientation	19
Representation	21
Overview of the Book	23
Conclusion: Similarities, Differences, and Intersectionality in Representation	24
Key Terms	26
2 Descriptive Representation and Minorities: Legislatures and Other Elective Offices	28
Levels of Descriptive Representation in Legislatures	30
Descriptive Representation in Congressional Leadership	37
State Legislatures	38
Levels of Descriptive Representation in Executive Positions	44
What Affects Levels of Descriptive Representation?	46
Voters	46
Context	49
Candidates	53
The Election of Minority Women	56

Descriptive Representation Is Not Sufficient	57
Conclusion: Similarities, Differences, and Intersectionality in Descriptive Representation	59
Key Terms	60
3 Minorities and Formalistic Representation: Laws, Institutional Design, and Elections	62
Formalistic Representation and the Right to Vote	64
Electoral Systems	71
Institutional Design	72
The Fourteenth Amendment	74
Conclusion: Similarities, Differences, and Intersectionality in Formalistic Representation	76
Key Terms	77
4 Policy Representation and Minorities in Legislatures	78
Key Minority Policy Interests	81
The Economy	81
Education	82
Criminal Justice Reform	84
Military Service	85
Individual Group Concerns	86
Does Descriptive Representation Lead to Substantive Representation?	89
What Affects Policy Representation?	94
Initiative and Referenda Effects on Minority Interests	100
Demonstration	101
Casework/Constituency Services and Pork Barreling by Minority Legislators	105
Conclusion: Similarities and Differences in Policy Representation	105
Key Terms	106
5 Minorities and Symbolic Representation	108
Measuring Minorities' Attitudes	111
Levels of Symbolic Representation	113
Feelings toward the United States	113
Trust	116
Efficacy	120
Presidential Approval	123
Direction of the Nation	124
What Affects the Symbolic Representation of Minorities?	126
Symbolic Legislation: Representing Minorities through Symbolic Actions	129
Conclusion: Decreasing Gaps in Symbolic Representation	129
Key Terms	130

6	Minority Representation and the Judicial Branch	132
	The Court Systems	134
	Descriptive Representation: The Numbers Game	136
	What Affects Descriptive Representation in the Judicial Branch?	141
	Descriptive and Substantive Representation in the Courts	146
	Key Court Cases	149
	Gender Cases	149
	LGBT Cases	150
	Race and Ethnicity Cases	151
	Conclusion: Improving Descriptive Representation but Mixed Record of Courts' Protection of Minorities	152
	Key Terms	153
7	Representative Bureaucracy	154
	The Influence of Bureaucrats on Policy	156
	Level of Passive Representation	159
	Passive Representation at the Federal Level	159
	Passive Representation at the State and Local Levels	165
	What Affects Passive Representation?	169
	Affirmative Action	169
	Other Influences on Passive Representation	174
	The Effects of Passive Representation on Active Representation	177
	Conclusion: Similarities and Differences in Minority Representation in the Bureaucracy	180
	Key Terms	181
8	Public Opinion and Minority Interests	182
	Attitudes toward Racial and Ethnic Minorities	184
	Attitudes toward Women	187
	Attitudes toward LGBT Persons	188
	Attitudes toward Affirmative Action	190
	Attitudes toward LGBT Issues	193
	Attitudes toward Abortion	195
	Attitudes toward Immigration	195
	Social Desirability Biases in Surveys	198
	Influences on Americans' Attitudes toward Minority Interests	199
	Conclusion: Varied but Increasing Acceptance of Minorities and Their Issues	209
	Key Terms	209
9	Minority Groups and Political Resources	210
	Size and Distribution of Minority Populations	212
	Racial and Ethnic Minorities	213
	Women	217
	LGBT Persons	219

The Voting Eligibility of American Minorities	220
Citizenship	220
Age	222
The Socioeconomic Status of Minorities	223
The Civic Engagement of Minorities	229
Volunteerism	229
Religiosity	230
Conclusion: Variation among Groups in Their Resources	232
Key Terms	233
10 Acculturation, Group Consciousness, and Cohesion among Individuals with Shared Minority Status	234
Acculturation: The Extent to Which Minorities Are Part of the Dominant Culture	237
Group Consciousness: The Extent to Which Minorities See Group Status as Politically Important	239
Discrimination among Minorities	243
The Group Identity of American Minorities	245
Group Cohesion: Level of Shared Beliefs, Values, and Attitudes among Individual Minorities	248
Religion	249
Political Ideology	251
Party Identification	253
Vote Choice	256
Variation by Nationality	256
Effects of Acculturation and Group Consciousness on Voting Cohesion	258
Conclusion: Similarities, Differences, and Intersectionality among Minority Individuals	260
Key Terms	261
11 Minorities and Political Participation	262
The Vote	264
Other Forms of Political Participation	269
Explaining Political Participation	274
The Impact of the Minority Vote	281
Efforts to Reach Minority Voters	282
Conclusion: Increased Participation and Power but Differences Remain among Groups	284
Key Terms	285
12 Minority Movements and Interest Groups	286
The Civil Rights Movement	288
The Chicano Movement	293
The American Indian Movement	297
The Asian American Movement	299
Women's Movements	300

The LGBT Movement	305
Social Movement Theories	309
Interest Groups	313
African American Interest Groups	314
Hispanic Interest Groups	315
Asian American Interest Groups	316
American Indian Interest Groups	316
Women's Interest Groups	317
LGBT Interest Groups	318
Summary	320
Conclusion: Much Change since the 1950s	320
Key Terms	321
13 Multiminority Coalitions and the Future of Minority Representation	322
Multiminority Coalitions	324
Views of the Masses	326
Commonality	326
Prejudice and Stereotypes	328
Perceptions of Competition	329
Behavior	329
Coalitions among Elites	331
The Future: Trends in Representation	335
Minorities of the Future (Past and Present)	338
Muslims	338
Atheists	340
The Economically Poor	342
Final Thoughts: Should Minorities Be Lumped Together or Split into Different Groups?	344
Key Terms	346
Glossary	347
Notes	355
Index	397

List of Spotlights, Tables, Figures, and Maps

Spotlights

Spotlight 1.1	Facebook Has at Least Fifty-six Gender Categories	5
Spotlight 1.2	Minorities around the World	6
Spotlight 1.3	Immigrants in Europe	7
Spotlight 2.1	Representative Jeannette Rankin	33
Spotlight 2.2	Senator Hiram Rhodes Revels	34
Spotlight 2.3	Representative Barney Frank	36
Spotlight 2.4	Descriptive Representation of Minority Women outside of the United States	43
Spotlight 3.1	Ten Questions from the 1965 Alabama Literacy Test	66
Spotlight 3.2	Quotas	73
Spotlight 4.1	HIV/AIDS in the World	87
Spotlight 5.1	Brief Discussion of Sampling and Statistical Inference	112
Spotlight 5.2	Immigrants and Trust in Europe	119
Spotlight 5.3	A Glass Mysteriously Half Full	125
Spotlight 6.1	Justice Thurgood Marshall	137
Spotlight 6.2	Women Judges in Europe and the Americas	138
Spotlight 6.3	Justice Sonia Sotomayor	139
Spotlight 7.1	President Obama's Cabinet	158
Spotlight 7.2	Secretary Colin Powell	162
Spotlight 7.3	Secretary Madeleine Albright	163
Spotlight 7.4	Affirmative Action in South Africa	170
Spotlight 8.1	Reputable Polling Organizations	185
Spotlight 8.2	Attitudes toward Minorities in Europe	200
Spotlight 9.1	Citizenship Requirements around the World	221
Spotlight 9.2	Gender and Foreign-Born Economic Disparities in Europe	228
Spotlight 10.1	Feminist Consciousness in Russia	242
Spotlight 11.1	Voter Turnout by Gender across the Globe	266
Spotlight 12.1	Brief Biographies of Some Key Leaders of the Civil Rights Movement	292
Spotlight 12.2	Brief Biographies of Leaders of the Chicano Movements	296
Spotlight 12.3	Biographies of Two American Indian Leaders	299
Spotlight 12.4	Brief Biographies of Key Leaders of the Women's Rights Movement	304
Spotlight 12.5	LGBT Movement in Namibia	306

Spotlight 12.6	Brief Biographies of LGBT Leaders	309
Spotlight 13.1	Muslims in Western Europe	339

Tables

Table 1.1	Breakdown of Asians by Nationality (in Thousands)	11
Table 1.2	Breakdown of Hispanics by Nationality (in Thousands)	16
Table 2.1	Ratio of Percentage of Minorities in State to Percentage of Minorities in State Legislatures in 2013	39
Table 2.2	Demographic Traits of Congress Members' Districts by Minority Status of Member	51
Table 4.1	The Effects of Descriptive Representation on Policy Representation	104
Table 4.2	Minority Population, Public Opinion, Party, and Policy Representation	104
Table 6.1	Ratio of Percentage of Minorities on State Supreme Courts to Percentage of Minorities in the Population	142
Table 6.2	Presidential Appointment of Minorities to the Appeals and District Courts	144
Table 7.1	Minority Appointment to the Cabinet by President	160
Table 7.2	Breakdown of Federal and Civilian Employment by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender	164
Table 7.3	Occupational Category by Group, 2012	164
Table 7.4	Passive Representation in the States by Race and Gender: Ratio of Civil Servants to Population	166
Table 8.1	Effects of Contact with Minorities on Support for Minority Policy	205
Table 9.1	Minority Populations in Swing States and Large States	215
Table 9.2	Income and Education by Race and Ethnicity	224
Table 9.3	Income and Education by Race and Ethnicity Broken Down by Gender	227
Table 10.1	How Much LGBT People Have in Common with Each Other (Percentage in a Group Who Say They Have a Lot in Common with Another Group)	246
Table 10.2	Religion by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender (Percentage of Each Group That Shares a Faith)	250
Table 10.3	Gender and Race Differences on Ideology (Percentage of Each Group That Is Liberal, Moderate, or Conservative)	253
Table 10.4	Party Identification by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (Percentage of Each Group Identifying with the Parties)	255
Table 10.5	Acculturation, Consciousness, and Cohesion among Different Asian Nationalities	257
Table 10.6	Acculturation, Consciousness, and Cohesion among Different Hispanic Nationalities (by Percentage)	258
Table 11.1	2012 Participation Rates According to the ANES (Percentages)	271
Table 11.2	2012 Participation Rates by Race and Gender (Percentages)	272
Table 11.3	Interest in National Affairs by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender (Percentages)	276
Table 11.4	Citizens Feel a Duty to Vote, by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender	278
Table 13.1	Minorities' Vote for President in 2012 (Percentages)	330
Table 13.2	How Good Would It Be for There to Be a Women President?	331
Table 13.3	Multiracial Coalitions in Congress: Support of Different Groups for Different Causes	333

Figures

Figure 2.1	The Percentage of Minorities in the House of Representatives from 1869 to 2015	31
Figure 2.2	The Percentage of Minorities in the Senate from 1869 to 2015	32
Figure 2.3	Percentage Who Will Vote for Minority Candidates	47
Figure 4.1	Minority Policy by Direct Democracy	102
Figure 4.2	Welfare Benefits, Immigration, and Hate Crime Laws by Political Culture	103
Figure 5.1	Gender Differences in Level of Trust	117
Figure 5.2	Trust among African Americans and Whites	118
Figure 5.3	Gender Differences in Efficacy	121
Figure 5.4	Efficacy by Race and Party	122
Figure 7.1	Scatterplot of African American Bureaucrats and Legislators	175
Figure 7.2	Scatterplot of Hispanic Bureaucrats and Legislators	176
Figure 7.3	Scatterplot of Women Bureaucrats and Legislators	177
Figure 8.1	Why Americans Believe African Americans Have Low Socioeconomic Status	186
Figure 8.2	Americans' Views toward Sex Roles	189
Figure 8.3	Americans' Attitudes toward LGBT Persons	190
Figure 8.4	Americans' Attitudes toward Affirmative Action	192
Figure 8.5	Americans' Attitudes toward LGBT Rights	194
Figure 8.6	Americans' Views on Abortion, 1995–2014	196
Figure 8.7	Americans' Attitudes toward Immigration	197
Figure 9.1	Percentage of Minority Populations over the Years	218
Figure 9.2	Trends in Per Capita Income by Race	225
Figure 9.3	Trends in Per Capita Income by Gender	226
Figure 11.1	Turnout for African Americans and Whites, 1952–2012	265
Figure 11.2	Voter Turnout for Men and Women, 1952–2012	267

Maps

Map 9.1	African American Population, Percent by County	214
Map 9.2	Hispanic Population of Any Race, Percent by County	216

Preface

The United States is rapidly diversifying. Current predictions suggest that in about one generation, whites will no longer be the majority of Americans.¹

Not only are there a greater number of racial and ethnic minorities, but each minority group is diversifying as well. The increase in the number of first-generation blacks from Africa and the Caribbean is diversifying the African American community, Hispanic immigrants from Central and South America are diversifying the Hispanic community, and southern and southeastern Asian immigrants are diversifying the Asian American community. In addition to ethnic and racial diversification, there is growing recognition of diversity with regard to sex and gender. There are people who identify as straight men, straight women, gay men, lesbian, asexual, pansexual, bisexual, transgender, and transsexual, as well as people who are intersex.

Unfortunately, the way textbooks tend to approach minorities and politics is to examine groups in isolation. While examining race, ethnicity, or gender in isolation allows for great detailed understanding of individual groups, it misses the importance of understanding the similarities and differences in the politics between the different minority groups, and the dynamic interfaces of multiple groups. For example, the effects of electoral systems vary by minority groups. Candidates of minority groups such as African Americans who still see significant levels of segregation benefit from single-member districts; however, minority groups that are not segregated, such as women, do not benefit from a district with a single member. However, changes in Americans' attitudes toward race, ethnicity, and gender have had universally positive effects, improving the electoral prospects of all minority groups.

Examining multiple groups in one text also facilitates greater discussion of intersectionality and intergroup cooperation. Intersectionality suggests there is a matrix, such that each combination of race, gender, class, and ethnicity offers people unique experiences and sources of power and domination.² For example, non-Hispanic white men have different political interests than African American

or Hispanic men or white women. Intergroup cooperation concerns the degree to which different groups work together for shared goals. Finally, a book that integrates race, ethnicity, and gender is more efficient since teachers will only have one textbook and the different minority groups will be examined in a similar fashion. A key goal of the textbook is to systematically examine the politics of several minority groups.

The main minority groups discussed in the book are women; gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) Americans; Hispanics; American Indians; Asian Americans; and African Americans. This is not a complete list of important minority groups but includes the groups that have received the most attention by scholars and results in a manageable number of groups to examine.

In order to integrate the discussion of the different groups, I use a representational framework; this is particularly appealing because political minorities are often defined as groups who are underrepresented. Thus, exploring their levels of representation and what affects representation is to explore the essence of minority politics. Additionally, it helps facilitate a discussion of the main topics concerning minorities in American politics: political participation, public policy, identity, public opinion, elite behavior in all three branches of government, court cases, and elections.

The representation of minorities is multifaceted. Not only are there numerous minority groups, but representation also has many forms and meanings.³ Representation can involve electing representatives who look like America, having representatives who work to advance constituents' interests, having a system designed to give constituents a voice, or ensuring the people believe the government serves their interests.

Given the complexity of minorities and representation, a goal of this text is to try to digest what is known about how minorities are represented in a way that is simple enough that undergraduates can understand minority representation and what affects it, yet thorough enough to offer a fairly complete picture. In doing so, students should get a sense of the differences and similarities between the different minority groups. What factors have similar effects on the representation of African Americans, Asian Americans, American Indians, Hispanics, women, and LGBT (lesbian, gay men, bisexual, and transgender) individuals? How do these groups differ in their levels of these factors? And what factors have different effects on these groups?

Taxonomists, scientists who categorize groups, can be broken into two categories: lumpers and splitters. A lumper is known for "submerging many minor varieties under a single name, whereas a splitter does the opposite, naming the varieties as subspecies or even full species."⁴ As students read the book, they may want to consider whether lumping minorities together or splitting them into categories is more appropriate. Do we learn more about minorities in American politics by examining them as several distinct groups who share underrepresentation or as one group with individuals who have more in common than not? This book does not purport to answer the question but leaves it up to students to decide for themselves.

Since much research on minorities in America has been multidisciplinary in focus, this book draws on theories outside of mainstream political science. However, this book is decidedly a book on politics. Of interest are topics such as the frequency of and importance of minority office holders, whether policies reflect minority interests, minority voting behavior, and what affects these phenomena. Of less interest are broader societal implications or less direct influences on minority political behavior. After the introductory chapter, the book explores levels of representation for each minority group, and what affects those levels. The next section explores in more detail the factors that affect representation, such as resources; group assimilation, consciousness, and cohesion; public opinion; political behavior; and social movements.

The book uses “Spotlight” boxes to explore some specific issues related to each chapter’s topic. While many of these boxes focus on minority representation outside of the United States and biographies of key minority political figures, some boxes are designed to illustrate key points or discuss methodological issues. The biographical boxes examine people who are important symbols of minorities in American politics and whose lives illustrate what it takes for minorities to increase their representation. The international boxes indicate to students that minorities around the world face many of the same challenges that are faced by minorities in the United States.

This book was written with the aid of many people, and I would like to thank them here. The feedback I received from those who reviewed this book’s proposal and early manuscript proved invaluable: Linda Beail, Point Loma Nazarene University; Monique Bruner, Rose State College; Deirdre Condit, Virginia Commonwealth University; Kenneth Fernandez, Elon University; Brian Frederick Bridgewater State University; Ewa Golebiowska, Wayne State University; Eduardo Magalhães, Simpson College; Karen Own, Reinhardt University; Sandra Pavelka, Florida Gulf Coast University, and especially David Wilkins, University of Minnesota. I would like to thank Anthony Gonzalez, who helped me gather much of the information on descriptive and policy representation, and Grant Armstrong, who helped me collect information on interest groups. I also want to thank Oklahoma State University for helping to fund these research assistants. I also want to thank Leslie Baker, Ravi Perry, Erica Townsend-Bell, Eve Ringsmuth, Lori Franklin, Elizabeth Herrick, and Emily Herrick, who looked at various drafts of the manuscript. Their comments and help were critical. The book could not have been completed without the editors who have helped me through the various stages of the process: Sarah Calabi, Nancy Matuszak, Raquel Christie, Tracy Buyan, Kristin Bergstad, Amy Whitaker, and Allison Hughes—a special thanks to them. Finally, I want to thank the anonymous reviewers whose comments helped greatly improve the book.

About the Author

Rebekah Herrick is a professor of political science at Oklahoma State University. Her research interests focus on issues of representation, particularly as they relate to gender and LGBT Americans. Her teaching interests concern U.S. elections, minorities, and legislatures. Her recent books include: *Representation and Institutional Design* and *Representing America: The Citizen and Professional Legislator in the House of Representatives*. Her research has appeared in *Journal of Politics*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Social Science Quarterly*, *American Politics Research*, and *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*.

CQ Press, an imprint of SAGE, is the leading publisher of books, periodicals, and electronic products on American government and international affairs. CQ Press consistently ranks among the top commercial publishers in terms of quality, as evidenced by the numerous awards its products have won over the years. CQ Press owes its existence to Nelson Poynter, former publisher of the *St. Petersburg Times*, and his wife Henrietta, with whom he founded Congressional Quarterly in 1945. Poynter established CQ with the mission of promoting democracy through education and in 1975 founded the Modern Media Institute, renamed The Poynter Institute for Media Studies after his death. The Poynter Institute www.poynter.org is a nonprofit organization dedicated to training journalists and media leaders.

In 2008, CQ Press was acquired by SAGE, a leading international publisher of journals, books, and electronic media for academic, educational, and professional markets. Since 1965, SAGE has helped inform and educate a global community of scholars, practitioners, researchers, and students spanning a wide range of subject areas, including business, humanities, social sciences, and science, technology, and medicine. A privately owned corporation, SAGE has offices in Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, and Singapore, in addition to the Washington DC office of CQ Press.

Chapter 1

Minorities and Representation

The first woman to make a serious run for president was not Hillary Clinton, and the first African American was not Barack Obama. Rather, the first woman and the first African American to toss her hat into the ring was Rep. Shirley Chisholm (D, NY) who did so in 1972. Although she was never favored to win, she did get 430,000 primary votes and 151 convention delegates by building a coalition of women and African American voters.¹ Her race for president and her congressional career were structured by her race and gender and the interplay of the two. Although she was African American, many African leaders did not back her campaign because they felt it was time for a black man and she was too tied to gender concerns. In addition, many women's groups did not support her because they did not think an African American woman could win.² In her elections prior to 1972, her race and gender played a role as well. In her first bid for Congress in 1968, she faced James Farmer, who had been head of the civil rights organization Congress for Racial Equality and who made her gender an issue in the campaign.³ Of her election for the New York State Assembly four years earlier she said:

I met with hostility because of my sex from the start of my first campaign. Even some women would greet me, "You ought to be home, not out here." . . . one man about seventy lit into me. "Young woman, what are you doing out here in this cold? Did you get your husband's breakfast this morning? Did you straighten up your house? What are you doing running for office? This is something for men."⁴

In office, she was an advocate for women, African Americans, and other minorities. She started by hiring only women staffers, half African American and

half white,⁵ and was a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus. She fought for greater access for minorities to attend college, increased social service spending, was against apartheid in South Africa, against the war in Vietnam, and for abortion rights. She also had to deal with colleagues who told racist and sexist jokes. To demonstrate that she was not wanted in Congress, she was assigned to the Committee on Agriculture, since it would not help her represent her Brooklyn district.⁶

Rep. Chisholm's political career cannot be understood simply by knowing she is African American nor can it be understood simply by knowing she is female. As one biographer stated, today "Chisholm would be considered a womanist politician, meaning that for her, feminist politics were tridimensional. They were driven by the need to eradicate a sexism that was inextricably bound by racism and classism."⁷ Yet most minority and politics textbooks and classes examine groups in isolation. They examine gender and politics, Hispanics and politics, African Americans and politics, and so on. While this approach has the advantage of allowing for a great understanding of each minority group, it makes it difficult to see the broader picture of what might unify minority groups or what

Shirley Chisholm's portrait is unveiled in the Cannon caucus room. Attending are Congressional Black Caucus Chairwoman Barbara Lee (D, CA), House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D, CA), Rep. Donna Edwards (D, MD), and Rep. Maxine Waters (D, CA). Chisholm was the first African American woman to be elected to the U.S. Congress, and the first to run for president. The portrait was painted by Kadir Nelson.
(Scott J. Ferrell/Congressional Quarterly/Getty Images)



might make each group's experiences and power sources unique. For example, although minorities in the United States are united by having faced discrimination, the nature of that discrimination varies. African American men did not get the right to vote until 1870 with the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment, and women did not get the right to vote until 1920 with the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment. Although the Constitution gave African American men the right to vote before it gave women the right, most African Americans were effectively disenfranchised by state voting laws designed to deny them the right to vote until the 1960s. Other groups too were affected by many of these and other laws. In addition, Asian Americans' and American Indians' voting rights have been affected by laws and Supreme Court decisions barring them from becoming citizens and, along with Hispanics, English-only ballots. Yet, while most groups have been denied voting rights at some point, no laws or court decisions have directly denied lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgender people (LGBT) voting rights, although as women, lesbians were denied the franchise until 1920. Thus, while minorities, with the exception of white gay men, have been denied their right to vote, the process and timing of their disenfranchisement has varied.

Examining each group individually also complicates examining **intersectionality**. Intersectionality suggests there is a matrix, such that each combination of race, gender, class, and ethnicity offers people unique experiences and sources of power and domination.⁸ For example, women of color who are victims of sexual violence are treated differently from white women by social services, the judicial processes, feminist groups, and antiracism groups.⁹ For example, compared to non-Hispanic white women, women of color often have a more difficult time contacting the authorities for protection because of cultural, economic, language, or trust of police issues, and when they do, they often find fewer services or protection due to language or racial stereotypes. The specific racial, ethnic, and gender mix of an individual can even influence the effects of electoral systems on the electability of candidates. It is likely that African American men candidates are advantaged where cities or states are broken into districts, and that white women benefit from at-large systems, but that Hispanics and African American women are less affected by the electoral system.¹⁰

To understand the political experiences and power of minorities, this book focuses on several complicated questions concerning political representation. It focuses on governments and asks questions such as: To what degree have minorities gained positions in power? To what degree does the government serve minority interests? What affects whether the government serves minority interests? What is the likelihood of multiminority coalitions? And what are the prospects for the future of minority representation?

The answers to these questions are only going to become more important in the years to come as the United States is rapidly diversifying. Current predictions suggest in about a generation non-Hispanic whites will no longer be a majority in the United States.¹¹ Not only are there more racial and ethnic minorities, but each group is diversifying as well. The increase in the number of first-generation blacks

from Africa and the Caribbean is diversifying the African American community, Hispanics from central and South America are diversifying the Hispanic community, and southern and southeastern Asians are diversifying the Asian American community. Moreover, there is a growing recognition of diversity with regard to sex, gender, and sexual orientation (see Spotlight 1.1). There are people who identify as straight men, straight women, gay men, lesbians, as well as transgender and transsexual men and women and gender nonconformists. The diversity and intersectionality of these groups mean the issues of minorities in politics become even more complicated. In order to understand representation of the numerous minority groups, it is important to know what the terms *political minorities* and *representation* mean. This chapter offers an overview of key minority groups and representation.

Spotlight 1.1

Facebook Has at Least Fifty-six Gender Categories

In February 2014, Facebook expanded the gender options its users can check in their profile or timeline to at least fifty-six.¹² While the two categories of male and female may seem sufficient to a majority of Americans, it is insufficient to fully match the array of genders possessed by all Americans. The computer developer responsible for the change, who identifies as transwoman (transitioning from man to woman) said, "All too often transgender people like myself and other gender nonconforming people are given this binary option, do you want to be male or female? What is your gender? And it's kind of disheartening because none of those let us tell others who we really are. . . . This really changes that, and for the first time I get to go to the site and specify to all the people I know what my gender is."¹³ The change received much support from LGBT groups, but was seen as unnecessary by others who believe that there are only two sexes or genders. To select one of the new categories, Facebook users need to type an option under the custom category, and Facebook will accept certain options. Although Facebook did not release the different options, Oreums of Slate discovered 56: agender, androgyne, androgynous, bigender, cis, cisgender, cis female, cis male, cis

man, cis woman, cisgender female, cisgender male, cisgender man, cisgender woman, female to male, FTM, gender fluid, gender nonconforming, gender questioning, gender variant, genderqueer, intersex, male to female, MTF, neither, neutrois, non-binary, other, pangender, trans, trans*, trans female, trans male, trans* male, trans man, trans* man, trans person, trans*person, trans woman, trans* woman, transfeminine, transgender, transgender female, transgender male, transgender man, transgender person, transgender woman, transmasculine, transsexual, transsexual female, transsexual male, transsexual man, transsexual person, transsexual woman, and two-spirit.

Many of these terms are synonyms, such as *Trans man*, compared to *Trans* man*, or *transgender man*. Others terms may seem like synonyms but have important distinctions. For example, *Ciswoman*, which means that a person was born female and identifies as a woman, differs from *woman* in that it is an effort to relate to transgender individuals. Although the fifty-six gender options may have some redundancy and overstate the point, they emphasize that there are many ways that individuals can identify with a sex or gender.

Who Are Minorities? Race as a Category

Minorities are defined as groups of people who are underrepresented in and by the government in that they lack power and do not have adequate access to decision makers. A group is a collection of people who share an interest, ancestry, language, culture, or other trait. Groups are not the same as organizations. Organizations have a structure, such as leadership, headquarters, or membership, while groups are collections of people who share a trait. Although minority groups are often thought of in terms of having small numbers of people, the key distinguishing trait is that they have inadequate political power for their interests to be reflected in governmental policy.¹⁴ While there are countless minority

Spotlight 1.2

Minorities around the World

The United States is not the only nation that has treated minorities poorly and struggles with how to ensure their rights. South Africa had a brutal system of apartheid that separated black and white South Africans, allowing whites to have significantly more power and wealth. Today, many countries in Africa have significant conflict between tribes or groups of people, many of which have resulted in genocide and civil wars, such as those in Rwanda, Sudan, and Ethiopia. In Latin America, the indigenous people often have lower socioeconomic status and have limited say in decisions affecting their communities.¹⁵ In several Latin American countries, there are also sizable black populations. Although Latin American countries tend to have interracial mingling and have had less of a history of legal discrimination than the United States, black Latin Americans' lives are shaped by race.¹⁶ In Asia as well there are minority groups with similar issues. For example, in China there are several ethnic minorities, best known may be the Tibetans, Uighur, and Mongols. These people have rebelled against the Chinese government because of loss of culture, and economic and power concerns.¹⁷

Many European countries are made up of people with different ethnic heritages and languages. In Belgium, for example, the nation is divided between

Dutch-speaking Flanders in the North and French-speaking Wallonia in the South. The tensions between the two can be severe at times. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the conflict between the two sides delayed the formation of a government for months.¹⁸ Mayors have been prevented from taking office because they have campaigned using French, schools have been segregated by language, and many feel greater identity to Flanders or Wallonia than Belgium.¹⁹ Language is also related to a conflict in Spain between Catalans and the government in Madrid. Catalonia is on the northeastern part of Spain, and residents there speak Catalan as their native language. Catalans believe that they send more money to Madrid than they get in return and want a greater say in how taxes are raised and spent. The tensions are severe enough that there are calls for an Independent Catalonia. In a nonbinding referendum on November 9, 2014, a supermajority of Catalans voted to leave Spain.²⁰ The Catalans are not the only minority group wanting to leave Spain. There has been a militant group working on Basque independence. The issues of Spain, the United Kingdom, and Belgium are just the tip of the iceberg. If all the separatist movements in Europe were successful, there would be close to thirty-five new nations.²¹

groups, some are more important politically in that their shared interests are affected by governmental policy.

The most common minority groups can be distinguished by race (African Americans, American Indians, and Asian Americans), ethnicity (Hispanics), gender (women), and sexual orientation (lesbians, gays, and bisexual). In addition to these groups there are people of different religions, including atheists or Muslims, or economic minorities such as the poor, who share some of the characteristics of racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual minorities. Every part of the world faces problems of affording limited rights and powers to minorities (see Spotlights 1.2 and 1.3). However, to make the text manageable, it focuses on minorities that have received the greatest scholarly attention: those characterized by race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. Within these categories the greatest attention will be paid to African Americans, Hispanics, women, and gays and lesbians for similar reasons, but where information is available, Asian Americans, American Indians, and transgender individuals will also be discussed.

Race is a way to categorize individuals by physical traits (often color of skin) attributed to a shared ancestry. Throughout U.S. history different categories of people have been defined by race. For example, at one time being Jewish

Spotlight 1.3

Immigrants in Europe

Immigrants form an important minority group in Europe. Many European countries have had an influx of immigrants seeking greater freedoms and economic security in the past decades. About 16% of Austria; 15% of Sweden, Belgium, and Spain; 13% of Germany; and 12% of Norway, the United Kingdom, and France are foreign born.²² Many of the immigrants were recruited to Europe from North Africa, South Asia, and the Caribbean during the boom years following World War II; but by the 1970s with a slowing economy there was a trend in Europe to stop the flow of immigration.²³ However, since most states continued to allow family members of immigrants to migrate, immigration has continued. These new groups have brought different cultural traditions and languages and often are concentrated in lower economic groups. This has led to some conflicts and the rise of some nationalist parties. For example, in 2012 France's National Front

Party, headed by Marine Le Pen, garnered 18% of the vote for president, its most.²⁴ The National Front Party is clearly anti-immigration, supporting legislation on strict immigration limits and that discriminates against non-nationals.

Although there is considerable variation by nation, Europeans generally have a negative view about immigration. For example, 70% of people in Greece believe that immigrants are a burden on their nation and take jobs and social benefits.²⁵ This compares to 60% of Italians, 52% of Poles and French, 46% of Spaniards, 37% of the British, and only 29% of Germans. Similarly, a significant percentage of Greeks and Italians want less immigration, 86% and 80%, respectively. A smaller percentage of people from other European nations want less immigration: 57% of the French, 55% of the British, 47% of the Spaniards, 44% of Germans, and 40% of Poles.

was considered a race. However, today few Americans would include Jewish people as a group to be protected by race-based laws. Because racial classifications and how society reacts to a group change with time, they should be considered **social constructs**. A social construct is a category that has meaning because society treats those in that category uniquely, but the category lacks any intrinsic meaning. For example, Americans who are African American are thought by many to have traits and a subculture that differ in some ways from those of the dominant white race. Thus, society often treats African Americans and whites differently. But the differences are not the results of genetic or biological markers, but rather peoples' perceptions of a difference. Thus, if a society treats a group of people with a shared inherited physical trait differently, it becomes a race. The racial categories used by the U.S. census, as well as most political scientists, include white, African American or black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. The last three groups, native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders and Asians, are often placed in the category of Asian American.

There is a movement among some native Hawaiians to be included under laws protecting indigenous people or American Indians.²⁶ The Hawaiian movement has its roots in the 1970s efforts to protect the land but has grown to a larger movement to recognize the native Hawaiian language, culture, and sovereignty. Since the United States started occupying Hawaii in 1898, there has been little recognition of the culture and rights of native Hawaiians. The movement is an effort to regain a culture and sovereignty. There are divisions in the movement as to whether to work within the current power structure and remain part of the United States or to try to have independence.

A challenge today as well as in the past is determining who fits into a racial category. Although the United States is not the ideal melting pot, many Americans are of multiple races. For example, Tiger Woods, the professional golfer, has a mother of mixed ancestry but is primarily Thai. His father too is of mixed ancestry but is primarily African American and white. Thus, he cannot simply be categorized as one race. Similarly, although President Barack Obama identifies as African American, his mother was white, and his mother and maternal grandparents raised him.

Historically, a person's race was often determined with a **blood quantum** approach. This means the government determined a person's race based on the percentage of her ancestry that was of a minority race. For example, individuals with African American mothers and Asian American fathers would be 50% African American and 50% Asian American. This method was used extensively for determining who was African American. The percentage of blood that was needed for an individual to be classified as African American varied from state to state, but individuals would be considered African American for purposes of Jim Crow laws or antimiscegenation laws if one-quarter to one-sixteenth of their ancestry was African American.²⁷ **Jim Crow laws** were laws found predominantly in the South during the early to mid-1900s that segregated the races in schools, transportation, and other public places. A series of Supreme Court cases declared

these laws unconstitutional. One of the best known cases in this area is *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1954), which ruled segregated schools violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (see Chapter 3 for a discussion of the equal protection clause). Antimiscegenation laws are laws that prevent people of different races from marrying. These laws have not been allowed since the Supreme Court ruled in *Loving v. Virginia* (1967) that they violate the equal protection clause of the Constitution. Today the most common approach used by the census and researchers to determine an individual's race is self-identification. Individuals who claim to be white are considered white; those who claim to be African American are African American, and so on. With the recent censuses, individuals have been able to indicate that they have a multiracial ancestry or identification. As a consequence, the census makes a distinction between people who list one race as their only race and those who list one race as one of more than one race.

African Americans

African Americans or blacks are people of non-Caucasian African²⁸ descent. The terms *black* and *African American* can be used interchangeably, unless referring to blacks who are not American or who identify more with the Caribbean. These individuals either do not identify as Americans or Africans. A recent Gallup survey indicated that most African Americans (61%) do not have a preference between the terms, but among those who do, most prefer African American (24%) to black (13%).²⁹ Since the term *African American* is preferred by those who have a preference, the term *African American* will be used in this book.

African Americans first arrived in the Americas in 1619 as indentured servants, but the slave trade quickly resulted in many more African Americans arriving in the Americas. Although in the United States we think of African American slaves arriving in the U.S. colonies, many African slaves also arrived in Latin America. For example, people of African descent are the dominant race in Haiti and Jamaica and make a sizeable minority in the Dominican Republic.³⁰ Although most African Americans in the United States are descendants of slaves who arrived on the continent, there are a growing number of African Americans who came to the United States from Caribbean nations and have the double minority status of being African American and Hispanic; about 4.5% of African Americans in the United States are Hispanic.³¹ Not all Caribbean people are Hispanic, as the French or British settled some islands. For example, Shirley Chisholm's parents immigrated to New York from the Caribbean, and she spent a few childhood years in Barbados, which is English speaking, with her grandparents. There are also many African Americans who were born in Africa. These blacks started immigrating to the United States in earnest in the last half of the twentieth century. In the 1990s alone, 900,000 black people came to the United States from the Caribbean and 400,000 from Africa.³² By 2007 almost three million of the thirty-seven million African Americans were foreign born.³³ Although

the frequency of foreign-born African Americans has risen dramatically, the growth in the percentage of Americans who are African American has seen more modest gains. According to the 1990 census, 12.1% of Americans identified as African American, in 2000 the number was 12.9%,³⁴ and by the 2010 census 13.6% of Americans were African American.³⁵

Asian Americans

Although Asian Americans only make up about 5.6% of the U.S. population, they are the fastest growing minority group.³⁶ Between 2000 and 2010, the U.S. Asian population grew 45.6%.³⁷ Even though African Americans are diversifying with the growing number of first- and second-generation Americans, the diversity among Asian Americans is even greater. *Asian Americans* include people whose ancestors come from nations as diverse as India, Vietnam, China, Japan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and the Philippines. Table 1.1 presents population size by the different Asian nationalities. Although Americans with ancestry from these nationalities are categorized as Asian American, these individuals do not share a common culture, language, religion, or history in the United States.

The first Asian nationality to arrive in the United States in large numbers was the Chinese, who in the mid-1800s were recruited to provide cheap labor to work in gold mines and build railroads. The Japanese came later, first to Hawaii and then the west coast to work in agriculture. Both groups tended to prosper but faced discrimination.³⁸ For example, neither group could become naturalized citizens until the mid-1900s. In 1943, Congress passed the Magnuson Act allowing Chinese settlers to become naturalized citizens, and in 1952 Congress passed the Walter McCarran Act that allowed Japanese and other Asian immigrants to become naturalized U.S. citizens. During World War II, Japanese Americans were also forced to live in internment camps, which resulted in many Japanese Americans losing their property and freedom.³⁹ Starting in the mid-twentieth century, Asians from more diverse nations started to come to the United States in larger numbers. Asians from Southeast Asia, such as Vietnamese, Laotian, and Hmong, came to the United States in fairly large numbers following the Vietnam War, which lasted roughly from 1960 to 1975. Southern Asians, such as Indians, have also started to come to the United States in greater numbers in recent years. They differ from other Asians in appearance, looking more similar to Caucasians than other Asians but with darker skin.⁴⁰ While Asians as a group increased their numbers about 45% between the 2000 and 2010 census, the number of Asian Indians increased almost 70%.⁴¹

American Indians

There are many terms used to refer to people indigenous to the United States: American Indians, Native Americans, First People, Native nations, and Indigenous peoples. Although any of these, or several other terms, can be used to

TABLE 1.1 Breakdown of Asian Americans by Nationality (in Thousands)

Nationality	Number claiming nationality	Nationality	Number claiming nationality
Asian Indian	2,844	Laotian	191
Bangladeshi	129	Malaysian	16
Bhutanese	15	Maldivian	<1
Burmese	91	Mongolian	14
Cambodian	232	Nepalese	52
Chinese	3,347	Okinawan	3
Filipino	2,256	Pakistani	364
Hmong	248	Singaporean	3
Indonesian	63	Sri Lankan	39
Iwo Jiman	<1	Thai	167
Japanese	763	Vietnamese	1,548
Korean	2,424	Other	219

Source: Data from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf>, Table 5. Based on respondents who listed just one race and nationality.

describe individuals, different scholars, tribes, the government, and the people prefer specific terms for different reasons. Instead of participating in the debate of which term is best, this text will simply use the term *American Indians* since survey data suggest it is the preferred term.⁴²

American Indians include people who lived in what is now the United States when Europeans first started to settle in the Americas and comprise only about 1.7% of the U.S. population.⁴³ The small number of American Indians depresses their political power, as does their diversity. There are well over 500 different tribes recognized by the federal government, making American Indians a very diverse group. The cultures and languages of Midwestern Sioux or Lakota, southwestern Navajo, southeastern Cherokee, or northeastern Iroquois are all very different. In addition, they differ in the degree to which they are recognized by the federal government, Congress, the courts, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Each has its own way to recognize American Indians and their tribes. The BIA is responsible for implementing many federal policies concerning American Indians. In addition, some tribes are recognized by states, and others have no governmental recognition. There is also variation as to whether or not they live on or have ties to a reservation. American Indians do, however, share a history of their lands being taken over by the U.S. government. There is also a special relationship

between the federal government and American Indians referred to as the “Trust Responsibility.”⁴⁴ In essence, the U.S. government is obligated, through treaties where tribes gave land to the United States, to protect tribes, ensure their well-being, and respect tribal sovereignty and lands. Many American Indian peoples and cultures also suffered from forced assimilation policies. These policies were designed to make American Indians lose their cultures and adopt the European influenced American culture. Starting in the middle of the nineteenth century, many American Indian children were taken from their homes and forced to attend boarding schools in order to lose their Indian language and culture. During the mid-1900s, the Urban Relocation Program provided money to American Indians to encourage them to leave reservations and move to cities, where it was thought they would fully assimilate into the dominant U.S. culture and society. While many participated in this program, others chose to remain on reservations. But what may have had the most significant negative effect on American Indian cultures was the allotment of private land to American Indians.⁴⁵ Such policies destroyed the collective nature of their cultures.

The story of American Indians and U.S. citizenship is complex. Although U.S. citizenship afforded American Indian men the possibility of the vote during the nineteenth century, it often came at a cost. American Indians were seen as citizens of tribes or nations that the United States saw as sovereign. Thus, to become a U.S. citizen they would have to give up their tribal membership and property. For some it would also involve giving up their culture. For example, some native nations were given the opportunity to become U.S. citizens on the condition they learned English and adopted Euro-American customs.⁴⁶ Citizenship was usually given to American Indians who participated in the allotment programs. The Fourteenth Amendment’s citizenship clause that affords citizenship to anyone born in the United States would seem to give American Indians citizenship. However, the Court ruled in *Elk v. Wilkins* (1884) that even American Indians who had left their nation were not citizens because they were still subjects of their tribe. Citizenship was, finally, afforded all American Indians born in the United States with the 1924 Indian Citizenship Act. However, several nations, including the Five Civilized Tribes, initially refused membership.⁴⁷ As Wilkins and Stark note,

This is one of the unique realities, that tribal members are citizens of three polities—their nations, the United States, the state—that make the study of indigenous people such a dynamic pursuit. For if a native person’s tribal citizenship is an active one and he or she resides on or near Indian Country, he or she has rights as an Indian that may be adversely affected by federal plenary power. At the same time, such Indians enjoy certain protections, services, and, benefits because of their treaty or trust relationship with the federal government that are unavailable to other individuals or racial or ethnic groups in the nation.⁴⁸

However, even after citizenship was granted questions about whether American Indians could vote remained, and many states with large populations of American Indians set up roadblocks to their enfranchisement.⁴⁹



Many American Indian children were sent to boarding schools to become assimilated. This photo is of the Carlisle Indian School, Carlisle, Pennsylvania.
(© CORBIS)

Being American Indian is not only a racial classification, but for many it represents a social and cultural way of life, often including membership in a particular tribe. Tribes have sovereignty in their territories, which means they have their own laws and tribal governments that are not subject to U.S. federal laws in the way that U.S. cities and states are. Although some tribal nations increase their budget through casino revenues, and some tribes possess lucrative mineral rights to their land, many tribes and their members lack financial resources.

Questions over who is a member of a tribe are not without debate. One way to determine tribal membership is through the Dawes Roll. Between 1898 and 1914, individuals who met certain requirements that proved their membership in one of the Five Civilized Tribes (Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Seminoles) could sign the Dawes Roll and receive an allotment of land. Although the purpose of the allotment was to help assimilate American Indians by destroying their communal cultures, today it enables individuals who can trace their lineage to this roll to claim membership to one of these tribes. In the Hawaiian movement there is an effort to create a roll so that indigenous Hawaiians can create a governing body similar to American Indian tribes.⁵⁰ In many cases the tribe determines membership, and there can be controversies over who is a member. A continuing controversy among American Indians exists over tribal membership for the Freedmen.⁵¹ The Freedmen are decedents of African American slaves who were owned by the Cherokee and later became free and full members of the tribe. According to treaties, they are entitled to Cherokee membership. However, in 2011 the Cherokee voted to amend their constitution and removed the Freedmen

from their membership rolls.⁵² After legal proceedings, the Freedmen's Cherokee citizenship was restored, but their status remains controversial.

Wilkins and Stark identify four ways American Indians differ from other minority groups.⁵³ First, they are indigenous to the United States and, as a consequence, make up nations. Second, and relatedly, the government has had to negotiate with tribes as sovereign entities. As a consequence of this, tribal rights are not based on the Constitution but on treaties, so in many ways their relationship is extra-constitutional. Third is the trust relationship or doctrine noted earlier. Finally, there is congressional plenary power. This means that the federal government, not the states, can negotiate treaties and that Congress has absolute powers to affect American Indians. These differences have had some benefits in that they allowed the government to make special programs for Indians, such as Indian health care, education, housing, and taxation, and allowed BIA to give preferential hiring to American Indians. It has also had negative effects in that it allows the government to prevent some American Indians from doing things other Americans can do, such as sell land.

Who Are Minorities? Ethnicity as a Category

Whereas race concerns physical traits from biology, **ethnicity** concerns categories of people based on shared cultural traits, such as language or religion. People who share a race often share an ethnicity in that they share a religion and language, and people who share an ethnicity are often of the same race. However, the terms *race* and *ethnicity* are distinct. For example, Hispanics are people in the United States who come from Spanish-speaking nations, such as Mexico, Spain, and many nations in the Caribbean and Central and South America. These include several races: African American (particularly from the Caribbean), American Indian, and white. In fact, most people from Latin America are Mestizo, meaning they are of a European and American Indian heritage. Even though race and ethnicity are separate concepts, ethnic minorities and racial minorities are similar in that they are treated differently by society in negative ways, such as inadequate education, job discrimination, and powerlessness. Although several ethnic groups have faced discrimination at some point in U.S. history, such as the Irish, Polish, or Italians,⁵⁴ today Hispanics are the dominant minority ethnicity.

Hispanics in America

Hispanics⁵⁵ or Latinos are individuals who speak Spanish as their native language or are of a nationality that speaks Spanish. Although the terms *Hispanic* and *Latino* are often used as synonyms, some people have strong preferences for one term or other. However, surveys tend to suggest that neither term is preferred by most Hispanics or Latinos. A 2012 survey of Hispanics and Latinos indicated that 51% of respondents had no preference between the terms

Hispanic or *Latino*, 33% prefer *Hispanic*, and 14% prefer *Latino*.⁵⁶ Since *Hispanic* is the term preferred by those who have a preference, *Hispanic* will be used in this book. According to the 2010 census, Hispanics make up 16.3% of the U.S. population; this is a larger group than African Americans, Asian Americans, or American Indians.⁵⁷ Not only is the Hispanic population large, but it grew dramatically in the first decade of the twenty-first century. Between the 2000 census and the 2010 census, the Hispanic population grew 43%.⁵⁸ Although the Hispanic population continues to grow, the rate of growth has declined since the recession that began in 2008. By 2013 the Hispanic population was estimated to be 17.1%, about a 0.5% increase in three years.⁵⁹ As with Asian Americans, Hispanics come from diverse nationalities. Table 1.2 lists the population size of the different nationalities classified as Hispanic by the U.S. census. People from these nations have had different experiences in the United States.

Prior to 1848 and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican-American War, much of the Southwestern and lower Midwestern parts of the United States were Mexican territory. With the treaty, Mexicans living in what is now the United States were given the opportunity at the time to become U.S. citizens. Unfortunately, many who opted to become U.S. citizens lost their property and faced discrimination when many states did not recognize them as citizens and failed to protect their property.⁶⁰ As will be discussed in later chapters, Mexicans who have immigrated to the United States have continued to face discrimination and segregation.

Although Central and South Americans first immigrated to the United States in the 1800s, they started to arrive in larger numbers in the late twentieth century. Many of these people fled their homelands because of political instability, such as civil wars and political persecution. There are strict limits to the number of immigrants that can come to the United States, and many Mexicans and Central and South Americans choose to do so illegally. Although some Central and South Americans could apply for political asylum, many come illegally, since it is difficult to prove the need for asylum. An issue with classifying individuals as Hispanic is that Spanish is not the national language in all Latin American nations. For example, people who live in Brazil speak Portuguese and those in Belize speak English, yet have much in common with others living in Central and South America. As a result, some definitions include Brazilians and Belizeans as Hispanic, and some do not.

Gaining legal immigration status is easier for Cubans and is not an issue for Puerto Ricans. Cubans, who first arrived in large numbers in the United States following Fidel Castro's takeover of Cuba, have faced few obstacles once on U.S. soil. These refugees by and large have been welcomed in the United States. For example, the United States has a "wet foot, dry foot" policy.⁶¹ If Cubans make it to dry land, they can stay in the United States legally, but if they are found in the ocean, they will be deported to Cuba. Puerto Rico has been part of U.S. territory since the 1890s, and people born in Puerto Rico have been citizens since 1917. Nevertheless, they face discrimination similar to other Hispanics when on the mainland. For example, Puerto Ricans report similar rates of discrimination as other Hispanics.⁶²

TABLE 1.2 Breakdown of Hispanic Americans by Nationality (in Thousands)

Nationality	Number claiming nationality	Nationality	Number claiming nationality
Argentinean	101	Nicaraguan	178
Bolivian	42	Other Central American	104
Chilean	69	Other South American	58
Colombian	471	Panamanian	92
Costa Rican	69	Paraguayan	9
Cuban	1,415	Peruvian	234
Dominican	765	Puerto Rican	4,624
Ecuadorian	261	Salvadoran	655
Guatemalan	372	Spaniards	100
Honduran	218	Uruguayan	19
Mexican	31,798	Venezuelan	92

Source: Data from Table 1 in Ennis, Rios-Vargas, and Albert, *Hispanic Population: 2010*, <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf>, accessed September 26, 2014.

Whites in America

Racial and ethnic minority groups are often compared to whites, Caucasians or Anglos. The term *white* refers to people of European and Middle Eastern ancestry. The terms *white* and *Caucasian* are usually used when referring to race. Since many Hispanics are white, the term *Anglo* is often used to refer to whites who are not Hispanic. Thus, throughout this book the term *whites* will be used when examining race, and *Anglos* when looking at ethnicity. When comparing Hispanics, African Americans, Asian Americans, and American Indians, the terms *Anglos* and *non-Hispanic whites* will be used.

Although today we tend to treat whites as a monolithic group, there is diversity among non-Hispanic whites that has severely divided them in the past. In Colonial America, for example, Rhode Island was founded when Roger Williams fled religious persecution in the Massachusetts colony. Starting in the 1800s and continuing until the mid-1900s, the Irish, Italian, Greek, and Polish experienced large-scale discrimination.⁶³ For example, when the potato famine hit Ireland in the mid-1800s and the Irish fled in large numbers to the United States, they were not welcomed with open arms by the dominant ethnic group, British. Businesses advertised that they would not hire Irish, and they had very difficult times finding employment.⁶⁴ Resentment toward the largely Catholic Irish led to segregation,

whose effects can still be found in large cities. To deal with discrimination, they became active in the labor movement, created Irish organizations, and eventually grew ties with the Democratic Party.⁶⁵ Their political power was strongest in areas with large Irish communities, but eventually Irish were seen less as an immigrant minority and more as a part of America. However, even when John F. Kennedy ran for president, his Irish roots affected some voters. Although each European group shared the experience of trying to survive in a new land that was unwelcoming, they did not share religion, language, or history, and Americans with European ancestry have not always been seen as a homogeneous group. Today these ethnic groups are largely treated as a single group, and many, if not most, white Americans' lineage includes multiple European ethnicities. Nevertheless, Anglos, as well as racial and ethnic groups, differ in many important ways such as gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation. These differences affect their political experiences and power, and will be the topic of the next section.

Who Are Minorities? Gender and Sexual Minorities

Although the terms *gender* and *sex* are used interchangeably in common language, they do not mean the same thing. **Sex** refers to the biological differences between males and females. The terms *male* and *female* are used to refer to an individual's sex. Females tend to have two X chromosomes and can give birth, whereas males tend to have one X and one Y chromosome, and produce sperm. Although sex is often treated as a dichotomous trait (having only two categories), there is variation among males and females. For example, some people who are otherwise male have an X chromosome. In addition, some people are intersexed. *Intersexed* individuals are born with both male and female reproductive organs. Although we will not be discussing the representation of intersexed people, there are organizations created to advocate on their behalf, such as the Intersex Society of North America or Advocates for Informed Choice.⁶⁶ **Gender**, on the other hand, is less concerned with biological differences and is more concerned with how men and women differ due to societal pressure or socialization. Thus, that women are more likely than men to be bank tellers has little to do with biological differences between men and women but is the result of a variety of societal and environmental forces, as well as job hierarchies.⁶⁷

Gender, like race, is a social construct. Some feminists argue individuals are trained how to act as men and women in society and reinforce gender differences by "doing gender," or acting consistent with societal expectations, and if individuals did not perform their gender, gender differences would diminish or disappear altogether.⁶⁸ When referring to gender, the norm is to use the terms *men* and *women*. The key gender minority is women. Some may also consider lesbian, gays, bisexual, and transgender as gender minorities, but to emphasize the uniqueness of these groups, they will be discussed separately as sexual and gender identity minorities.

Women

According to the 2010 census, women make up 50.8% of the population.⁶⁹ Thus they are not a numeric minority, though they are a political minority, since women have faced discrimination and are not represented as well as men in government. For example, women make up about 20% of Congress, no woman has ever been president, and like racial and ethnic minorities, many issues important to women get little attention from policymakers. For much of U.S. history women could not vote, own property, initiate a divorce, attend many schools, or hold certain jobs. Further, women were seen as property of their husbands, and men could do as they wished with their property. As a consequence, marital rape and domestic violence were not crimes. Today conditions for women are much better, but women are still underrepresented. For example, although wives are no longer their husbands' property, they can own property, can vote, and there are laws against overt discrimination, few women are in the state legislatures that are passing laws regulating their health care and reproductive choices. In addition, the sexual assault of women in the military is a significant problem that has only recently received much attention.

Making up just over half of the population, women are a very diverse group of people. They come from all races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, economic situations, and so on. These traits tend to interact, such that each mix of gender, race, and class has unique experiences and politics. Edith Barrett finds that although African American women state legislators share some issue concerns with African American men and share others with white women, they have a unique, and unified, set of issue priorities.⁷⁰ For example, she found that while about 74% of African American women prioritized health care and education, fewer than 64% of legislators who were white women and men or were African American men prioritized education, and less than 56% of the other groups prioritized health care. Hispanic women legislators also approach legislating differently from Hispanic men.⁷¹ For example, Fraga, Lopez, Martinez-Ebers, and Ramirez find that Hispanic women legislators are more likely than their male counterparts to prioritize representing the interests of minority groups, building consensus, and resolving conflict. As will become clear throughout this book, African American women are unique in their high levels of civic engagement and political participation (see Chapter 2). Women of different minority groups also differ some in policy concerns. For example, American Indian women are significantly more likely to be raped than other women, and their rapes are less likely to be prosecuted, in part because tribal governments have no authority over nontribal members. Thus, future chapters will note racial and ethnic differences among women and men where appropriate.

Gender Identity: Transgenderism and Nonconformity

Related to gender is gender identity. **Gender identity** refers to the sex individuals identify with and act as in society. As a political concept, it concerns transgender

individuals. *Transgender* is an umbrella term for individuals who do not identify with their birth sex, and transsexuals are people who specifically wish to be of the other sex. Whereas transsexuals wish to be of their nonbirth sex, transgender people may or may not wish to transform their bodies to be of the other sex; the defining trait is that they do not follow the gender norms of their birth sex. Although many transsexual people have surgery to change their appearance to better reflect who they feel they are, sexual reassignment surgery is not needed to be transsexual. The percentage of transgender people is unknown, but Gallup estimates 0.3% of Americans are transgender.⁷² A related term is *gender nonconformity*. **Gender nonconformity** refers to not identifying or presenting oneself as any one gender or sex. For example, someone who is androgynous would be considered a gender nonconformist. Although transgender individuals can be seen as a gender minority, they usually organize with gays, lesbians, and bisexuals for political reasons and will be discussed more in the section on sexual orientation.

Sexual Orientation

In addition to race, ethnicity, and gender minorities, another group of minorities is based on sexual orientation. Related to gender and sex is sexuality. *Sexuality* refers to “desire, emotional involvement, and fantasy, as enacted in a variety of long- and short-term intimate relationships.”⁷³ Some people are attracted to individuals of their own sex, some people are attracted to individuals of the other sex, and some people are attracted to both or all sexes. When discussing the primary sex of an individual’s attraction, the term *sexual orientation* is used. **Sexual orientation** refers to whether individuals are romantically attracted to people of their own sex, people of the other sex, both sexes, or neither sex. Non-gays and non-lesbians, or straight people, are attracted to people of the opposite sex. Gay men are attracted to men; lesbians are women attracted to women, and bisexuals are attracted to men and women. In addition, individuals who are asexual are not interested in having sex with others, and people who are pansexual are attracted to people of a variety of sexes and gender identities. Although theorists differ as to whether or not individuals’ sexual orientation should be determined by behavior or identity,⁷⁴ it is common to rely on self-identification. That is, it is common to categorize people as gay, lesbian, or straight exclusively on whether they claim to be gay, lesbian, or straight. However, some people who are attracted to or have relationships with others of the same sex do not identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual, and vice versa.

In reference to gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, it is common to use the acronym LGBT. The T in the acronym stands for transgender. Other acronyms are used that are more expansive. For example, LGBTQIA stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, and ally. Since transgender politics are usually discussed with gay and lesbian politics, this text will do so as well.

As with the other minority groups, LGBT have suffered and continue to suffer from discrimination. Although there have not been organized efforts to

prevent LGBT Americans from voting, laws have discriminated against LGBT. Prior to the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, gays and lesbians were denied basic rights: gays, lesbians, and transgender Americans could be fired, assaulted, or denied services with no legal protection. Homosexual behavior was even punishable by prison. It has only been since 2012 that gays and lesbians could serve openly in the military, and in 2015 President Obama's administration began plans to allow transgender individuals to serve. LGBT still lack protection from employment discrimination in most states.

Although transgender people are placed in the same category as gays and lesbians, their issues and concerns differ. For example, key issues for transgender people are being able to change their sex on government documents, intersex restrooms, having insurance cover hormone therapy or reassignment surgery, police harassment, or laws based on gender identity as opposed to sexual orientation.⁷⁵ For example, some states' antidiscrimination laws cover sexual orientation but not gender identity. In these states, gay and lesbian workers are protected, but transgender workers are not. Research, too, finds that transgender people are not highly likely to be gay or lesbian.⁷⁶ Transgender people may also be among the most underrepresented groups as there are only a handful of transgender elected representatives, and there are few groups that speak only for their interests.

The percentage of LGBT Americans is difficult to pin down, but a recent Gallup poll estimated that about 3.5% of Americans identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender.⁷⁷ This figure is similar to other recent estimates.⁷⁸ However, surveys likely underestimate the number of LGBT Americans due to respondents being unwilling to disclose their sexual orientation to survey interviewers.⁷⁹ A recent experiment that used a procedure to make it virtually impossible to know how an individual respondent answered a question on sexual orientation found a 65% increase in the number of respondents saying they were not heterosexual.⁸⁰

Racial, ethnic, and gender minorities and LGBT are similar in that they share a history of discrimination, share many interests, and share the resistance or ambivalence of the majority of Americans to the expansion of policies, such as affirmative action, that are beneficial to their interests. They also share some similarities in the factors that affect their representation. For example, they all tend to have a greater number of representatives where voters support Democratic candidates. However, there are some very clear differences. For example, different minority groups have different strengths, such as Asian Americans tend to benefit from having high levels of socioeconomic status (high levels of education and income), but African Americans tend to have high levels of group consciousness and voter turnout. In addition, being LGBT, and to a lesser extent being Hispanic, is less visible than sex or race. Thus, it may be easier for individuals in these groups to blend into the larger political, social, or economic landscape. Also, since Hispanic and Asians Americans are more likely to be immigrants, they face unique challenges, such as voting ineligibility, lower levels of acculturation, and group cohesion and consciousness. In addition, other Americans may see them as a greater threat to the American way of life.

Representation

If minorities are defined as groups of individuals lacking adequate representation, we should ask, what is representation? Representation, according to Hanna Pitkin, means bringing present something that otherwise is not present.⁸¹ This definition is too abstract to be very helpful in understanding minorities, and Pitkin offers much refinement. She notes that representation really has four meanings or types: descriptive, formalistic, symbolic, and substantive.⁸²

Descriptive representation concerns whether representative bodies resemble the people they are to represent in that their membership corresponds to the demographic makeup of the people. Pitkin quotes John Adams, who stated that a representative legislature “should be an exact portrait, in miniature, of the people at large as it should think, feel, reason and act like them.”⁸³ It is likely impossible for U.S. legislatures, city councils, or similar bodies to be perfect mirrors, and it would not be a good thing if they were. Good policy would not likely come from a legislature that has proportional numbers of ill-informed, disinterested, or apathetic people. However, few would argue that racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual minorities do not need to be in positions of power for them to increase their substantive representation. Jane Mansbridge suggests that descriptive representation is needed for a group when it does not trust that others can represent its interests, and policies do not reflect its interests. This would tend to include the minorities discussed in this text.⁸⁴ There are debates as well as to how many minorities are needed in a legislative body for a group to be represented. It is likely that the answer depends on the diversity of that group.⁸⁵ Women, who make up over 50% of the population and have lower levels of cohesion than the other minority groups, may need more members to fully represent their interests than a more homogeneous group.

Descriptive representation has been examined from a minority politics perspective asking: to what degree are individuals of minority groups in decision-making positions, what affects the degree of descriptive representation, and what difference does it make to policy representation? Indeed, much research suggests that descriptive representation is a key ingredient to the creation of policies beneficial to minorities.⁸⁶ Generally, though, it is thought that descriptive representation is important for minorities since (1) it provides role models that can empower other minority individuals, (2) it can help compensate for past and present violations, (3) it helps make sure minority interests will be heard, and (4) it can make democracy stronger.⁸⁷ Since descriptive representation is important to minorities’ rights and political power, it is critical to understand what affects it. Much more will be said about this in the following chapters, but levels of descriptive representation are affected by district traits, such as racial makeup, ideological and partisan leanings, and socioeconomic status;⁸⁸ resources of minority groups, such as organizations and money; voters’ views of minorities;⁸⁹ and candidates’ decisions.⁹⁰

Formalistic representation also affects descriptive representation. It concerns how representatives get their authority to make decisions and how they are held

accountable.⁹¹ In a democracy, formalistic representation is closely related to elections. Some of the most notorious laws that limit minority descriptive and policy representation include those preventing minorities from voting. As noted earlier, prior to the 1900s, most minorities could not become naturalized citizens and/or vote. Even after the federal law or Constitution gave minorities the right to vote, many states enacted laws to effectively disenfranchise them. These laws included not allowing American Indians living on reservations to vote, white primaries, grandfather clauses, and literacy tests (Chapter 3 will discuss these in more detail). States have also effectively limited descriptive and substantive representation through gerrymandering: drawing districts to either pack their vote (over-concentrate minorities in one district) or crack their vote (divide the minority vote into so many districts that it has little influence in any district). Many today believe that efforts to require government-issued photo IDs or laws that ban felons from voting disproportionately disenfranchise racial minorities.⁹²

Substantive representation, also called **policy representation**, concerns whether representatives or the government act in a manner that affects their constituents' interests. To examine minorities' policy/substantive representation, one approach is to focus on what increases the likelihood that policies thought to be beneficial to minorities become law. It is difficult to determine whether a policy is in a group's interest or not. One approach to estimating a minority group's interests is to rely on the policies supported by organizations advocating on behalf of the group. For example, Rodney E. Hero and Caroline Tolbert, who were interested in determining whether Hispanic legislators were more likely to support legislation important to Hispanics, operationalized⁹³ Hispanic legislation as legislation supported by the Southwest Voter Research Institute (see Chapter 12 for a description of this group).⁹⁴ Another common approach to operationalizing, or measuring, minorities' interests is for researchers to use their expertise to develop a definition that reflects a group's interests and then use that definition to determine which legislation or policies are beneficial to a minority's interests. For example, Michelle Swers defines women's issue as "issues that are particularly salient to women because they seek to achieve equality for women; they address women's special needs, such as women's health concerns or child care; or they confront issues with which women have traditionally been concerned in their role as caregivers, such as education or the protection of children."⁹⁵ She then examined individual bills introduced in Congress and determined whether they were "particularly salient to women because they seek to achieve equality for women" in the ways specified by her definition. What is less common is to ask minorities their policy preferences. However, Katherine Tate used such an approach when she matched African American members of Congress's votes on legislation with the results of a survey of African American voters.⁹⁶

The fourth type of representation is *symbolic* or "*stand for*" representation.⁹⁷ It focuses on how people, places, and things can "stand for" or be a symbol of something else such as a rainbow has come to represent LGBT rights, or a black fist the power of African Americans. The power of symbols is their ability to "evoke feeling or attitudes."⁹⁸ Since **symbolic representation** concerns how

people feel about or react to the government, some research on minorities' symbolic representation has focused on minorities' attitudes toward the government and policymakers.⁹⁹ To get a sense of how minorities perceive the government and its officials, Chapter 5 examines how individuals of different minority groups evaluate the government and their members of Congress. Later chapters will also examine whether minorities' attitudes about government and politics are affected by descriptive representation.

Schwindt-Bayer and Mishler note that Pitkin expected the four types of representation to fit together.¹⁰⁰ Formalistic representation, the rules of the game, can make it easier or harder for minorities to participate and affect their descriptive, policy, and symbolic representation. Descriptive representation increases policy and symbolic representation, as having minority policymakers at the table helps their interests be heard. In addition, minorities who believe their interests are being represented are likely to feel better about the nation and have higher levels of symbolic representation. To test Pitkin's model, Schwindt-Bayer and Mishler examined women's representation in thirty-one nations in the mid-1990s. They found that the model generally works well, particularly as it relates to descriptive representation.

Overview of the Book

Pitkin's treatment of representation, which sees representation as multifaceted, including descriptive, formalistic, substantive, and symbolic representation, is used to organize this book. The next six chapters focus on minorities' levels of representation. It examines the level of descriptive representation in elected offices, particularly legislatures, and the immediate factors affecting these levels. It examines formalistic representation, or how gerrymandering, voting laws, and electoral systems can affect the ability of minorities to vote, as well as affect the electability of minority candidates. In addition, it examines the Fourteenth Amendment's equal protection clause, which is the backbone of many protections held by minorities. Chapter 4 also explores the policy or substantive representation of racial, ethnic, and gender minorities, and LGBT. It identifies the key policy concerns of minorities and how descriptive representation and other factors affect policy representation. This section also explores symbolic representation by examining minority individuals' support for the government and its symbols. Since some of the issues of minority representation are unique to the judicial branch and the bureaucracy, separate chapters will examine issues of representation in these branches.

Chapters 8 through 12 examine the conditions that affect minority representation. The first section notes that public opinion, the characteristics of minority groups, and interest groups affect the degree to which minorities have descriptive and policy representation, but it does not explore public opinion, the characteristics of minorities, or interest groups per se; these are examined in the second section. It explores Americans' attitudes toward minorities and policies that affect their interests, such as affirmative action, immigration, and same-sex marriage. Chapter 9 explores the resources or conditions held by each group that can

influence its levels of representation, such as population size, population distribution, rates of citizenship, age, and socioeconomic status of individuals within a group. This section also explores the civic engagement of individuals in minority groups, as that also affects groups' political power. The ability of minority groups to mobilize these resources depends on the cohesiveness of the people within each group. And this will be explored by examining the degree to which individuals of each minority group hold similar beliefs, values, and attitudes, such as party identification and ideology, as well as their sense of shared fate. The extent to which people of the different minority groups are politically active is also explored, since their political participation affects their representation. Since interest groups are critical for any group to influence policy, Chapter 12 examines key interest groups and movements that have worked on minority rights. The concluding chapter examines the likelihood that the different minority groups will see greater representation in the future. It brings together implications of the earlier chapters and indicates what public opinion, interest groups, and the minority group resources suggest about the prospects for minorities' voices being heard in the future. Relatedly, it explores the likelihood that multiminority coalitions, which can benefit minorities collectively, will be formed. Finally, although the book focuses on racial, ethnic, and gender minorities, and LGBT, the concluding chapter also looks at three other minority groups that are becoming more significant: Muslims, atheists, and the poor.

Conclusion: Similarities, Differences, and Intersectionality in Representation

This chapter introduced readers to minorities and representation. Minorities are individuals who make up groups of people who are underrepresented. The key minority groups in the United States are based on race (African Americans, Asian Americans, and American Indians), ethnicity (Hispanics), gender (women), and sexual orientation (gays and lesbians). Although these groups differ in many fundamental ways, they share a history of discrimination and lack a voice in public policy. These similarities and differences help structure their political demands. For example, that members of each minority group have experienced discrimination in education has resulted in each group being particularly concerned about access to a good quality education. Yet there are some differences in their concerns for education. For Asian Americans and Hispanics there is often a language component to the concerns, and LGBT students are often afforded less legal protection from bullying than others (see Chapter 4). Among Hispanics there are differences too. Some Hispanic nationalities have large numbers of members who came to the United States without documents and are concerned about access to public schools, while Cubans and Puerto Ricans, who have legal status, are less affected by policies denying education and services to undocumented immigrants.

It is also important to remember that individuals have a gender, a race, an ethnicity, and a sexual orientation, and the collection of traits individuals possess affects their political power. The experiences of women of color with the government often differ from that of white women, whether these women are public officials, bureaucrats, or citizens requesting governmental services. While this intersectionality is a theme that will be explored throughout the book, a couple of examples at this point will help illustrate this point. Women who are not proficient in English will undoubtedly have a more difficult time getting governmental services, particularly if they speak a less common language. Racial stereotypes of African Americans can also make it difficult for them to win sexual assault cases.¹⁰¹ Elected officials who are also women of color are also often ignored or excluded from proceedings.¹⁰² Mary Hawkesworth notes that in Congress there is an

ongoing racing-gendering in the institutional practices of Congress and in the interpersonal interactions among members of Congress. Through tactics such as silencing, stereotyping, enforced invisibility, exclusion, marginalization, challenges to epistemic authority, refusals to hear, legislative topic extinctions, and pendejo games, Congresswomen of color are constituted as “other.” In committee operations, floor debates, and interpersonal interactions, they are treated as less than equals in various ways that carry palpable consequences for their identities and their policy priorities. They are forced to deal with institutional dynamics and interpersonal relations that constitute them as subordinate.¹⁰³

These examples concern women of color, but white men, too, have a race and gender that interact to affect their power, albeit resulting in their power being greater than if they were women or not white. In addition, sexual orientation and social class interact with race and gender to affect individuals’ power and representation. White men who are poor or gay are likely to have less power and privilege than white men who are wealthy and straight. Nevertheless, to keep this book manageable, this text will focus more on the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender than the intersections involving class and sexual orientation.

To provide some structure to understanding the role of the politics of the many types of minorities and their intersectionality in the United States, this book examines representation. *Representation* is a broad term that has four key forms: descriptive, formalistic, substantive/policy, and symbolic. This book is designed to help the reader understand the degree to which each minority group has representation, what affects their levels of representation, and what the prospects are for greater representation. The various minority groups share some aspects of representation but not others. As will be discussed in later chapters, while all the minority groups discussed here lack proportional numbers in our political institutions, women, LGBT, and African Americans tend to vote at similar or higher rates than Anglo men, but Asian Americans and Hispanics tend to vote at lower rates because large percentages of these groups have recently immigrated to the

United States. The next chapter will explore descriptive representation, what are the current levels of descriptive representation for each minority group, and what are the immediate conditions that affect it.

KEY TERMS

Blood quantum (p. 8)	Gender identity (p. 18)	Sex (p. 17)
<i>Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka</i> (1954) (p. 9)	Gender nonconformity (p. 19)	Sexual orientation (p. 19)
Descriptive representation (p. 21)	Intersectionality (p. 4)	Social constructs (p. 8)
Ethnicity (p. 14)	Jim Crow Laws (p. 8)	Substantive representation/policy representation (p. 22)
Formalistic representation (p. 21)	<i>Loving v. Virginia</i> (1967) (p. 9)	Symbolic representation (p. 22)
Gender (p. 17)	Minorities (p. 6)	
	Race (p. 7)	