

The Future Effectiveness of Racial-Political Coalitions in American Politics

Jason D. Rivera
Rowan University

DeMond S. Miller
Rowan University

Deborah D. Wright
Rutgers University

Racial-political coalitions have been successful in accomplishing their goals to various degrees; however, the most successful coalitions are those that tend to be broader in scope and address the concerns of all the ethnic groups that comprise them. After achieving broad goals, a racial-political coalition often attempts to extend beyond its initial purposes to pursue more specific political interests. Such pursuits tend to have detrimental affects on the ability of the coalition to continue to exist as it was originally conceived. This article explains some of the dynamics behind racial coalitions' tendency to be ineffective when pursuing special interests, as opposed to more general, inclusive goals. Moreover, it emphasizes racial-political coalitions' potentiality to survive and succeed in the absence of social problems that are recognized by a majority of racial-political coalition members. To help ensure the sustainability of racial-political coalitions, the authors propose their deconstruction, after initial coalition goals are met, into coalitional-confederations.

Minority groups within the United States have historically utilized the strength of coalitions to pursue their political interests. The height of the successful use of coalitions occurred in the 1960s with the Civil Rights Movement, when blacks, whites and Latinos formed political alliances in the pursuit of social justice and economic equality. The gains won by civil rights coalitions generations ago continue to impact life in contemporary America through federal legislative initiatives. In the contemporary political landscape, however, there seems to be a lack of social problems inherently affecting minorities to the extent that they must form coalitions similar to those in the sixties. Many of the

coalitions formed during the 1960s grew out of the sociological definition of a social problem as “a social condition or a pattern of behavior that harms some individuals or all people in a society and that a sufficient number of people believe warrants public concern and collective action to bring about change” (Kendal 2007, 4). As racial and ethnic inequality grew, the fair treatment of certain segments of the population was called into question; Due to the practices of the dominant group that had harmful impacts on members of subordinate groups, coalitions formed. However, with the passage of laws and a change in attitudes regarding social inequality, notions of what warrants public concern have changed, and an apathy regarding the need for attention to these matters, via laws, public policy initiatives and programs, has subsided. To the extent that social problems and public policy issues can be framed in terms of both civil rights and general public welfare, racially-defined coalitions can sustain their efficiency; however, not in the same configuration indefinitely.

According to public administration perspectives, there has been a lack of the coherent, overarching, and formal social problems¹ that contribute to the continued existence of racial-political coalitions. The lack of formal social problems exists in reference to racial-political coalitions because ethnic members of these coalitions tend to view certain issues differently than non-ethnic members; therefore, defining what issues are considered social problems varies. The question that must be addressed for the future is: Would the members of a racial-political coalition benefit more by developing new coalitions to pursue their own specific interests, thereby dismantling the initial racial-political coalition, or by continuing to pursue political agendas through the initial racial-political coalition, which then acts as a normal, free-standing organization?

Defining a Coalition

In general, coalition is a term that has come to be accepted as defining the temporary alliance of parties, individuals or states/nations for joint action towards some cause (Rodriguez 1996). Based on this definition, coalitions can occur between any set of actors as long as they are pursuing a common goal,² and as long as the official alliance between the actors is temporary. Rodriguez’s (1996) definition does not note that coalitions need to be inherently political—unless there is the predisposition to assume that all human action is political. Under this predisposition, all coalitions are political. For the purposes of this discussion, however, human action will be defined as political when it occurs under political pretenses of elections, lobbying, social program distribution, government resource allocation and distribution, and any other action that officially interacts with the government structure in the pursuance of altering the political landscape.³ The creation of

¹ For a social problem to exist, the social concern must drive official responses on the behalf of the entire society, not just merit academic conversation, and must be further endorsed and legitimized by certain forces within the society (Blumer 2000). Blumer (2000) explains that a social issue or concern must proceed through a process of perception, legitimization, at least some manner of remedial planning, and implementation to actually qualify as a social problem.

² Coalitions that form around a common purpose and put aside their specific agendas to work on an inclusive common goal are also called shared core coalitions (Wiley 2003).

³ According to Miller and Rivera (2007), the political landscape is both the environment in which power is executed to affect governmental action and decision-making, and the interpretation of these actions and decisions at all levels of the government. Further, the landscape is not limited to

a coalition occurs through the process of decision-making, political or otherwise, whereby a subgroup of the total population reaches a decision by rules it has accepted. It is this subgroup and its internal dynamics that is a coalition (Riker 1962).

Commonly, coalitions are associated with politics and the pursuance of power—by any means power is defined. In this context, coalitions are at odds with other groups pursuing their common goals and mission; through navigating, manipulating, and altering the political landscape, these alliances become political coalitions. Political coalitions seek to advance their goals and missions by increasing power in the political landscape through elections and legislative changes that benefit group members. By gaining power over the political landscape, political coalitions hope to alter the environment in such a way that makes it more difficult for competing groups, or groups holding contrary missions and goals, to be successful or even survive. For these purposes, coalition governments, in which political parties are composed of many different groups with varying interests, emerge; however, as allied groups, they strive to gain power within the political landscape to block competing political parties and their goals.

A coalition's identity is as much an outcome of the members' perceptions of ethnic heritage, racial phenotype, cultural background, and degree of acculturation as it is about common goals (Phinney 2003, 2006). Racial coalitions appear to emerge as alliances between ethnic groups that have been socially categorized as members of the same phenotypic race.⁴ These alliances between different ethnic groups can be created to pursue actions that are not inherently political, such as the pooling of resources to survive. In this way, the racial coalition does not attempt to alter the political landscape in any way to gain power; it simply cooperates with different ethnic groups, who have been socially categorized as the same race, to exist. Historically, however, racial coalitions, or in some cases pan-racial/ethnic movements, have developed in the pursuance of political power, as in the case of pan-Germanic, pan-Arab, or pan-Slav movements. These historical developments have made the term "racial coalition" synonymous with political action, which is not necessarily the only reason for a coalition's creation. When racial coalitions pursue political goals and attempt to gain power within or over the political landscape, they can then be considered racial-political coalitions. Racial-political coalitions seek to gain power within or over the political landscape so that their interests are acknowledged and addressed in the same way as a political party's platform. As with regular political coalitions, racial-political coalitions attempt to gain control of the political landscape to impede the success of other groups and make their interests paramount.

Political and Racial-Political Coalition Dynamics

According to Zander (1985), it is exceedingly important for a political coalition to have a measurable mission or objectives so that coalition members can observe how

the official tangible actions of government, but also involves the social understanding underlying the actions and the bureaucracy responsible for implementing decisions.

⁴ A racial coalition may not conform to scientific classifications of human races, but to societal notions of separate races. Examples include Asians, blacks, whites, Hispanics, Arabs, Arians, etc. The point is that society has an infinite number of races depending on who defines what constitutes a race.

they are progressing toward their ends. Measurable missions or objectives indicate what should change and what events are acceptable as evidence that their goals are being achieved. As a measure of their progress, political coalitions during the Civil Rights Movement needed to convince the white majority of society, or the “ingroup” (Wallace 1997) within Congress, that minorities were equal to them. Wallace (1997) explains that it is only when those in power accept others as equals that they become willing to engage in informed conversation over seemingly competitive threats to their power.

Precise and measurable missions and objectives are extremely important because they unite political coalition members behind an ideology and a goal that are in the interests of all members. Therefore,

... a coalition is said to exist to the extent that there is an agreement (for whatever reason on each side, whether tacit or explicit, voluntary or coerced, and including cooptation) among two or more participants to pool their resources in pursuit of some common goal (Wallace 1997, 113).

According to Kadushin et al. (2005), individuals are motivated to join a racial-political coalition by the pursuit of general notions of “what everyone wants” or what benefits everyone within that specific racial classification. More specifically, political coalitions usually tend to form over issues of who gets what, when, and how (Rodriguez 1996), and how certain groups can get more. The attraction of similar values or expressed missions mirrors the manner in which political parties prefer to form coalitions to pursue their objectives by allying themselves with other parties that are ideologically close to their own beliefs (Volden and Carrubba 2004). Social equity in reference to voting, equal access to education, and access to the workplace are just a few issues in which racial-political coalitions have been successful in achieving their objectives; however, when racial-political coalitions attempt to narrowly focus their goals to items that benefit certain ethnicities within their ranks, as opposed to the whole, they jeopardize their ability to function effectively (Kadushin et al. 2005). Although having objectives that are too narrowly focused can be harmful to the sustainability of racial-political coalitions, the alliances themselves do have a significant advantage that cannot be overlooked.

Specifically, coalitions have the advantage of being able to compensate for the weaknesses an individual may have in getting something done. According to Caplow (1968; Wallace 1997), for a group or individual to “go-it-alone” and be successful, the group or individual must be the most dominant of all the competing groups or individuals in regards to resources and mobilization. Regardless of how potentially beneficial it is for an individual or group to “go-it-alone,” the chances of failure are high when they are confronted with stronger competitors. Additionally, if they do fail, they are solely responsible for all the associated costs (Wallace 1997). Coalitions and, more specifically, disjointed coalitions,⁵ therefore aid in cost sharing and the pooling of power in the face of competing coalitions or interests:

⁵ Watts (1996, as cited in Dash 2004, 7) observes that “[a] disjointed coalition is one in which the participation of groups or factions have a shared goal, and that goal is instrumental to the realization of more important specific goals that are not shared. Participants band together for

Backed by the pooled strength of its partners, each ally in a coalition increases its chances of winning and sharing in the pot, while the costs to each partner of competing—and of losing, if that should happen—tend to be reduced (Wallace 1997, 115).

Cooperation to pass desirable legislation/bills in Congress is the main objective of racial-political coalitions. Carrubba and Volden (2000; Volden and Carrubba 2004) explain that, in government, political coalitions actively use logrolling as a means to increase the chances of getting a bill passed in Congress.⁶ Logrolling practices utilized by political coalitions allow all participants the opportunity to gain the advantages of cooperation with a decreased risk of failure due to a decrease in competition. Moreover, these types of political coalition practices are what legislators, policymakers, and activists keep in mind when attempting to solve social problems (Congress of the United States of America 1998; Kadushin et al. 2005). In this same manner, racial-political coalitions also attempt to decrease the overall competition between ethnic groups within the coalition so that more benefits for the total racial-political coalition can be gained.

The potential strength that political coalitions have in stimulating legislative change is a quality that nation-states have always sought to discourage among their ethnic and racial populations (Enloe 1981; Wallace 1997). Although there are several ways in which governments attempt to discourage the formation of racial-political coalitions, within the American political system individualism is emphasized:

...the principle of *individualism* (the ultimate go-it-alone strategy) has been used by those who wield the American state power as a weapon with which to break up coalitions within and between various ethnic, racial, and foreign-nationality groups inside its boundaries: 'For all ethnic groups in the United States, European, Indian, Black, Chicano, Chinese, the heavy hand of ideological individualism has thwarted ethnically-based mobilization or...converted it quickly into merely a collaborative effort by group members to acquire individual benefits' (Enloe 1981, as cited in Wallace 1997, 116).

It is the utilization of individualistic ideologies that tends to have detrimental effects on the effectiveness of racial-political coalitions after generally inclusive objectives have been accomplished and more narrowly defined interests are pursued. For example, multi-racial-political coalitions composed of blacks and Latinos have been successful in

strategic reasons in order to pursue or project their particularistic desires...In such coalition groups band together because they do not believe that they have sufficient resources to articulate successfully their goals by themselves."

⁶ Although logrolling is effective in promoting cooperation, Carrubba and Volden (2000, as cited in Volden and Carrubba 2004, 525) note that there is potential for cooperation to fail: "...each bill must be voted on independently and legislators who have their bills passed early on in the logroll then have an incentive to defect and not vote for other's bills subsequently. In fact, the only incentive for these legislators not to defect from the logroll is the fact that there will be future logrolls from which they do not want to be excluded."

fighting in favor of using affirmative action at colleges and universities. When it comes to issues of immigration, however, blacks and Latinos are no longer potential partners. The partnership between the groups breaks down because pursuance of legislation to liberalize immigration is contrary to the agenda of blacks who tend to harbor anti-immigration sentiments, which are aligned with the ideologies of the white majority (Dash 2004).

Generally, contemporary coalitions are not temporary alignments, as Rodriguez (1996) describes, but rather “formal, multipurpose, and long-term alliances” (Chavis 1995; Kadushin et al. 2005) that tend to become freestanding organizations (Kadushin et al. 2005). Hochschild and Rogers (2000, as cited in Dash 2004, 9) explain that “coalitions do not develop fully enough to have significant impact over time unless participants are willing to take risks, are able to develop trust over time, and believe that they are fighting for a larger shared purpose.” As observed in Dash’s (2004) example of black and Latino coalition cooperation, without the presence of seriously inclusive social problems that affect all coalition members, the racial-political coalition (not to mention multi-racial-political coalitions) tends to fail to become coherent. Chavis’ (1995) notion that coalitions have become free-standing organizations in contemporary society may be true in so far as an initially successful coalition may wish perpetuate its success by continuing the coalition indefinitely; however, this course of action seems to be detrimental to the future success of racial-political coalitions because of their internal dynamics. Due to the problems associated with these internal dynamics, freestanding coalitions eventually break down, making them temporary from a historical and political perspective, as Rodriguez indicates (1996).

Problems Associated with Racial-Political Coalitions

Racial-political coalitions attempt to emphasize the shared commitments and life experiences of their members to form durable, symbolic attachments (Kaufmann, 2003); however, relationships break down when one member’s interests are pursued over other members’ interests. The tendency for racial-political coalitions to pursue more ethnically specific concerns in the absence of more broadly inclusive interests can be partly attributed to the lack of a pan-racial identity. In reference to Latinos, socioeconomic heterogeneity and different national subgroups are barriers to pan-ethnic identity (Lopez and Espiritu 1990; Kaufmann 2003).

For example, Latino racial-political coalitions generally allow Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans membership due to their population size within the United States; however, these three ethnic groups vary in socioeconomic status and geographic location. Chicanos and Puerto Ricans share closer historical and social class experiences because their presence in the United States has its roots in the conquest and colonization of their ancestors. This resulted in their ethnic groups, as a whole, being placed in the lowest level of the working class and in a position in which they have faced not only economic exploitation, but also racial and gender discrimination (Rodriguez 1996). Alternatively, Cubans initially came to the United States as affluent political refugees and were welcomed by American society as anti-communists. This allowed them to be more economically successful than Chicanos or Puerto Ricans because they were not forced into the lower levels of the working class (Rodriguez 1996). Although Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans are proportionally the largest Latino groups within the United States,

they are by no means the only ones. The immigration of peoples from other Central and South American countries has further diversified Latino ethnicities within the United States, resulting in Latino groups that do not necessarily share any class or historical experiences. This lack of common experiences results in varying interests among Latinos as a whole and separates the subgroups into rivaling factions (Rodriguez 1996; see also Kadushin et al. 2005).⁷

Varying ethnic interests are an issue that all racial-political coalitions must negotiate when attempting to build organizational relationships. Like Latinos, Asian and African American racial-political coalitions also face divergences among their memberships. Just as Rodriguez (1996) describes different ethnic interests among Latinos, so do Kim and Lee (2001) observe that there is significant internal heterogeneity in Asian coalitions, resulting in concerns that emerge along ethnic and national lines. Some ethnic groups within Asian racial-political coalitions feel that their specific interests are neglected while other members' interests are better addressed (even in reference to broad social issues such as access to education), a perception which creates friction between, for example, Chinese, Korean and Filipino members (Kim and Lee 2001; see also Dong 1995; Ong 2000; and Yamamoto 1999).

Within African American coalitions, conflicts arise due to smaller subgroup influences over the entire group (Rogers 2004). According to Rogers (2004), subgroup struggles occur in African American racial-political coalitions when ethnic groups such as Afro-Caribbeans or continental Africans attempt to secure descriptive representation and political influence for their own distinct ethnic constituencies, thereby decreasing the influence of African American leaders. Struggles among the varying ethnic groups can be politically motivated by prejudices against one another:

As the dominant minority group in the Democratic Party, in fact, African-Americans have been able to control a significant share of the material rewards. Mobilization by Afro-Caribbean newcomers, or any other minority group for that matter, could potentially threaten their hold on these political prizes. Entrenched African-American elites thus have a rational interest in maintaining the status quo and resisting Afro-Caribbean mobilization (Rogers 2004, 303).

Thus a racial-political coalition can break down due to political struggles for national influence within the coalition itself, not necessarily because of other competing political coalitions. Internal struggle for political control of the group occurs not only in African American coalitions, but also in Latino and Asian coalitions (Rodriguez 1996; Kim and Lee 2001). A racial-political coalition's, or, for that matter, any coalition's internal conflicts are further complicated and its members further antagonized by other politically

⁷ Jones-Correa and Leal (1996; Wiley 2003) maintain that Latino self-identity emerges on specific political issues, as opposed to a common Latino political agenda. Latino pan-ethnicity and Latinos' varying ability to cooperate politically seem to emerge only over issues that are overtly inclusive of all ethnic groups, such as bilingual education, and not necessarily over American immigration policy (i.e., Puerto Rican and Cuban views on immigration versus those of Mexican and other Central American, South American and Caribbean immigrant populations).

competing coalitions. Competing political coalitions that are not constructed along racial and ethnic lines benefit from the internal ethnic rivalries that weaken racial-political coalitions; therefore, they attempt to take advantage of ethnic struggles as a means of destabilizing racial-political coherence (Wallace 1997).

Although differences among each ethnic group's rival interests may jeopardize the overall effectiveness and stability of a racial-political coalition, prejudices held by ethnic groups also contribute to their eventual destabilization. According to Dash (2004), hostility between ethnic groups in a coalition may manifest itself in the form of disagreement over interests; however, ethnic hostility may also be motivated by traditional ethnic prejudice. These "socially learned feelings of dislike and aversion, as well as the stereotypes that undergrid such outlooks that occasion ethnic conflict" (Bobo and Massagli 1994, as cited in Dash 2004, 13), occur in the absence of the overall coalition's pursuit of all-inclusive interests. Newton (1992; Rodriguez 1996, 192) believes that even though ethnic groups do have the potential to effectively pursue political interests together, they must do so in a manner that allows all members to have concordant voices and presences.⁸ Racial-political coalitions need to have common interests (Roybal 1992; Rodriguez 1996) and inherent respect for all their members to survive in any political landscape (Wallace 1997).

Building Racial-Political Coalition Cohesion through Deconstruction

The interests of the composite ethnic groups of a racial-political coalition may conflict with those of other coalition members, which create situations where they do not want to work together. In such cases, a strategy must be devised to minimize internal racial-political coalition conflict. One strategy that may aid in limiting the detrimental internal conflicts is the deconstruction of the racial-political coalition after initial consensus goals are achieved. Because the development of racial-political coalitions is based on the development of social capital among individual ethnic groups, the breakdown of social capital is detrimental to the inner structure of the coalition, whether due to ethnic prejudices or conflicts of interests.

To avoid the breakdown of social capital, the ethnic group members of a racial-political coalition must retain trust in each other; however, when racial-political coalitions move past their initial goals and attempt to address individual ethnic groups' interests, trust between the ethnic groups diminishes. This diminution occurs because the groups do not trust each other to aid them in their own interests, either because they do not reciprocate sentiments about specific issues or because they just do not feel a particular cause is significant. When the level of trust diminishes among the members of the coalition, the social capital of the coalition is reduced, as is its ability to effectively form a coherent unit. What remains is a dysfunctional coalition ultimately breaking apart

⁸ Ethnic prejudices allude to the obstacles of multi-racial-political coalitions. In studying multi-racial-political coalitions composed of Latinos and blacks, there are easily observable issues of discrimination. Jones-Correa (1998; Wiley 2003) notes that when Latinos come to the U.S., they are forced to choose their identity as either black or white (specifically in reference to the census), a situation in which few first-generation Latino Americans self-identify as black, even if they come from countries that have a significant African heritage. This conscious decision to disassociate their identity from the black community places a discrimination obstacle on cooperation between the groups, therefore resulting in less coalition formation between blacks and Latinos.

into its original ethnic subdivisions with new expectations about each other that may decrease their ability to work together in the future, barring some all-inclusive social problem.

Coalitions should deconstruct after their initial consensus goals are met. By deconstructing the coalition, its member groups limit potential internal conflict related to issues that some intra-group members support and others do not. Deconstructing the coalition prior to the development of internal conflicts will help retain the trust members developed through their positive interactions. Retaining trust allows for the maintenance of social capital among the individual groups that fosters future cooperation. We maintain that at the point of deconstruction, racial-political coalition members cease to be racial-political coalition members and effectively act as a *coalitional-confederation*.

As a coalitional-confederation, different ethnic groups can build advantageous relationships with each other voluntarily if their own specific political interests are aligned, while remaining affiliated with the original coalition, should they need to come together again in the future. Those groups with dissimilar interests, who usually concentrate on issues specific to their ethnic group or that do not support the particular interests of other groups, can choose not to cooperate with one another. The ability of these groups to opt out of action helps prevent the conflict between the groups that would arise if they had stayed together as one larger unit. Groups can choose to act or not act on certain issues, and not feel forced into making concessions to other racial-political coalition members when they are opposed to a certain course of action. Moreover, functioning as a confederation allows for the possibility of all the groups coming together in the future when there is a political interest or social problem that requires all of them to cooperate again. This cycle of coalition building, breakdown into confederation, and coalition rebuilding helps to limit the internal group conflict that would occur if the racial-political coalition attempted to be a freestanding organization. In this way, the groups that make up the racial-political coalition limit their interaction to situations where they want to cooperate with one another and avoid situations when they do not and are forced to solely because they are a part of a coalition and must all support of each other to be successful.

By limiting their interactions to those that build positive relationships, racial-political coalition members encourage social capital to develop between them even when they are acting independently as a confederation. The relationship among the various ethnic groups is transformed into a loosely connected organization, in part because of race, but more so because of the groups' varied collective ethnic experiences, shared goals, and the degree to which they build "social networks, the reciprocities that arise from them, and the values of these for achieving mutual goals" (Schuller et al. 2000, 1). Thus, positive relationships are preserved through the deconstruction of the larger coalition. Racial-political coalitions will actually gain more by occasionally deconstructing themselves than they would by attempting to stay together in the absence of social problems that are inclusive of all the members of the coalition.

Future Implications for Racial Coalitions

Although racial-political coalitions have had success in securing inclusive social reforms, their future ability to address social problems that have direct beneficial effects on all members of the coalition is problematic. It is not disputed that when interests are

aligned, racial-political coalitions constitute an effective medium for pursuing political goals. According to Rodriguez (1996), the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, in addition to several other national Latino coalitions,⁹ believes that there are significant advantages to racial-political coalitions; however, there is a large dependency on both federal finances and the individual members of the coalitions to cover the costs of political activism. Financial dependence on coalition members within a multi-ethnic racial coalition jeopardizes the existence of the coalition in the face of internal struggle because supporters that form internal interest groups may not wish to continue to finance the broader coalition, thereby depleting the organization of needed resources.

To keep a coalition together, it is often necessary to cater to one side more than another, especially when negotiating tactics. If a member prefers high-profile confrontational tactics, [he/she] might dislike subdued tactics, thinking they are not exciting enough to mobilize support. At the same time, the low profile, conciliatory members might be alarmed by the confrontation advocates, fearing they will escalate the conflict and make eventual victory more difficult to obtain (Spangler 2003, 2).

Racial-political coalitions can continue to be viable mediums for pursuing the political and social agendas of minorities; however, competing internal interests among members can destabilize the coalition. This is not to say that each ethnic group that comprises a racial coalition should stand on its own and pursue its own political interests because that would make the political environment all the more competitive.¹⁰ Although coalitions may be viewed positively because they aid in decreasing the presence of possible competing groups, a negative effect of coalitions is their ability to enhance member groups' political positions at the same time as discouraging them from dissenting or forming their own political coalitions.

In the absence of all-encompassing social problems, strategies that foster cooperation among the ethnic groups comprising larger racial-political coalitions must be created so that the actors become more cohesive in relation to their interests, and constructive relationships are maintained. Cohesiveness in racial-political coalitions decreases the ability of outside forces to take advantage of ethnic prejudices and weaken the overall effectiveness of the group in the political arena (Dash 2004). Within a political environment like that of the United States, where emphasis is placed on individuality, racial-political coalitions must deconstruct their individual member groups while bringing stakeholders together to stand as one. This can be accomplished by setting specific ethnic interests and ideologies aside, thereby benefiting society as a whole. However, when a lack of salient issues arises and the crisis that once brought the

⁹ Other national Latino coalitions include: the National Council of La Raza, the National Coalition of Hispanic Health and Human Services Organizations, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda, and the National Puerto Rican Coalition.

¹⁰ Isaak (1988, as cited in Anderson 2006) explains that public policy is the product of group struggle (Group Theory). Increasing the number of competing groups decreases each group's access or opportunity to express viewpoints to legislators.

ethnic organizations together has passed, the potential for the emergence of individual ethnic interests and ideologies can appear and harm the overall sustainability of the coalition. Therefore, in order for racial-political coalitions to be successful in the future, social problems must also be common-interest problems, affecting a large broad-based constituency; otherwise, racial-political coalitions must deconstruct themselves into coalitional-confederations so that future coalition success is possible.

Jason D. Rivera is a research associate at Rowan University in the Liberal Arts and Sciences Institute for Research and Community Service. His recent research has dealt with public policy related to disaster mitigation, relief and social justice, the reconfiguration of landscapes and their affect on local and global politics, racial-political coalitions, race/ethnic relations, and improving university and community relations. He has contributed to various journals and books, including *JPMSP*, *Space and Culture: An International Journal of Social Spaces*, the *Journal of Black Studies*, the *Journal for the Study of Radicalism*, the *International Journal of the Humanities*, *Sociological Spectrum*, *Through the Eye of Katrina: Social Justice in the United States*, *The Socio-Political Dimensions of Globalizing Landscapes*, *The Sociology of Katrina: Perspectives on a Modern Catastrophe*, and co-authored *Hurricane Katrina and the Redefinition of Landscape*. He can be contacted at riveraja@rowan.edu.

DeMond S. Miller, Ph.D., is an associate professor of sociology and the director of the Liberal Arts and Sciences Institute for Research and Community Service at Rowan University. He has worked as a principal investigator facilitating research projects involving environmental issues and community satisfaction. His primary areas of specialization are environmental sociology, disaster studies, the social construction of place, community development, and social impact assessment. He has presented several professional papers and published in journals such as *The Researcher*, *The Qualitative Report*, *The Journal of Emotional Abuse*, *Space and Culture: An International Journal of Social Spaces*, *International Journal of the Humanities*, the *Journal of Black Studies*, and *The Journal for the Study of Radicalism*. He can be contacted at millerd@rowan.edu.

Deborah D. Wright has over 25 years of experience in non-profit, higher education and corporate settings. Her training and expertise in systems development, organizational psychology, and personnel and institutional capacity development have helped a variety of systems move towards performance excellence. She is currently working as a deputy director within the philanthropic field to strengthen the capacity of charitable organizations serving New Jersey. She can be contacted at wrightdd@verizon.net.

References

- Anderson, James E. 2006. *Public policymaking: An introduction*. 6th ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Blumer, Herbert. 2000. Social problems as collective behavior. Berkeley: University of California.
<http://www.criminology.fsu.edu/transcrime/articles/SocialProblem.htm>.
[Accessed December 7, 2006].

- Bobo, L., and M.P. Massagli. 1994. Black and latino conflict with Asians: Less difference than meets the eye? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Albuquerque, NM, March 10–12.
- Caplow, T. 1968. *Two against one*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Carrubba, C. J., and C. Volden. 2000. Coalition politics and logrolling in legislative institutions. *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 261-277.
- Chavis, D. M. 1995. Building community capacity to prevent violence through coalitions and partnerships. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved* 6: 234-245.
- Dash, H. 2004. Negative perceptions and low opinions: Testing the unspoken limits to Black-Latino political coalitions. Ph.D. diss., Emory Univ. UMI nr. 1419301.
- Dong, S. 1995. Too many Asians: The challenge of fighting discrimination against Asian-Americans and preserving affirmative action. *Stanford Law Review* 47: 1027-1057.
- Enloe, C. 1981. The growth of the state and ethnic mobilization: The American experience. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4: 123-136.
- Guinier, Lani and Gerald Torres. 2002. *The miner's canary: Enlisting race, transforming democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hochschild, J. and R.R. Rogers. 2000. Race relations in a diversifying nation. In J. S. Jackson, ed. *New directions: African Americans in a diversifying nation*. Washington, DC: National Policy Association.
- Isaak, Alan C. 1988. *Scope and methods of political science*. Chicago: Dorsey Press.
- Jones-Correa, M. 1998. *Between two nations: The political predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jones-Correa, M, and D. L. Leal. 1996. Becoming Hispanic: Secondary panethnic identification among Latin American-origin populations in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(2): 214-254.
- Kadushin, C., M. Lindholm, D. Ryan, A. Brodsky, and L. Saxe. 2005. Why it is so difficult to form effective community coalitions? *City & Community* 4: 255-275.
- Kaufmann, K. M. 2003. Cracks in the rainbow: Group commonality as a basis for Latino and African-American political coalitions. *Political Research Quarterly* 56: 199-210.
- Kendall, Diana. 2007. *Social problem*. 4th ed. Boston: Pearson, Allyn and Bacon.
- Kim, C. J., and T. Lee. 2001. Interracial politics: Asian Americans and other communities of color. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34: 631-637.
- Lopez, D., and Y. Espiritu. 1990. Panethnicity in the United States: A theoretical framework. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 13: 195-218.
- Miller, DeMond S. and Jason D. Rivera. 2007. Landscapes of disaster and place orientation in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. In *The sociology of Katrina: Perspectives on a modern catastrophe*, ed. D. L. Brunson, D. Overfelt, and S. Picou, 141-154. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Newton, F. C-R. 1992. Interview by David Rodriguez. Tape recording. June 19. National Hispanic Leadership Agenda National Office, Washington, DC.
- Ong, P. M. 2000. The affirmative action divide. In *The state of Asian Pacific America: Transforming race relations, Volume IV*, ed. P. M. Ong. Los Angeles: LEAP

- Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute and UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
- Phinney, J. S. 2003. Ethnic identity and acculturation. In *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research*, ed. K. M. Chun, P. Balls Organista and M. Gerardo, 63-81. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- 2006. Ethnic identity exploration in emerging adulthood. In *Emerging adults in America: Coming of age in the 21st century*, ed. J. J. Arnett and J. L. Tanner, 117-134. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Riker, William H. 1962. *The Theory of Political Coalitions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rodriguez, D. 1996. Latino national political coalitions: Struggle and challenge. PhD diss., Univ. of California Riverside. UMI nr. 9707054.
- Rogers, R. R. 2004. Race-based coalitions among minority groups: Afro-Caribbean immigrants and African-Americans in New York City. *Urban Affairs Review* 39: 283-317.
- Roybal, E. R. 1992. Interview by David Rodriguez. Tape recording. December 22. Edward R. Roybal Federal Building, Los Angeles, CA.
- Schuller, T., S. Baron, and J. Field. 2000. Social capital: A review and critique. In *Social capital: Critical perspectives*, ed. S. Baron, J. Field and T. Schuller, 1-38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spangler, B. 2003. Coalition building. *Beyond Intractability*. http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/coalition_building/. [Accessed December 9, 2006].
- U.S. Congress. House. Drug Free Communities Act of 1997. HR 956. Public Law no. 105-20. CR H3176-3178. 105th Cong. GPO.
- Volden, C. and C.J. Carrubba. 2004. The formation of oversized coalitions in parliamentary democracies. *American Journal of Political Science* 48: 521-537.
- Wallace, W. L. 1997. *The future of ethnicity, race, and nationality*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Wiley, Maya D. 2003. Structural racism and multiracial coalition building. Report to the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Institute on Race and Poverty.
- Yamamoto, E. K. 1999. *Interracial justice: Conflict and reconciliation in post-civil rights America*. New York: New York University Press.
- Zander, A. 1985. *The purposes of groups and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.