

American Enterprise Institute

The Project on Fair Representation

Edward Blum
Visiting Fellow
American Enterprise Institute
1150 Seventeenth St. NW
Washington, DC 20036
202.862.5800

Executive Summary of the Bullock-Gaddie Report
Voting Rights Progress in New York

The 1970 Voting Rights Act made three counties of New York – Bronx, Kings (Brooklyn), and New York (Manhattan) – subject to the preclearance provisions of Section 5. Two of the counties (Bronx and Kings) also tripped the minority language trigger included in the 1975 Act.

Over the last quarter century, Latino registration and participation in New York state has generally tracked with the national trends for Latinos. In contrast, black registration and turnout has compared unfavorably with that in the rest of the nation.

African Americans have substantially increased the share of public offices that they hold since the three boroughs came under the coverage of Section 5. Latino officeholders remain far fewer in number than blacks and Latinos have enjoyed little growth in their numbers of officeholders and have even gone backwards in school board representation. Greater numbers of Blacks and Latinos have joined New York City's

congressional and state legislative delegations. Minorities hold most of the three covered boroughs New York city council seats.

Exit polls conducted among New York City voters reveal that white, black, and Latino voters generally support Democrats in national and statewide elections. In exit polls for mayoral elections, Anglos opposed minority voters in the past but since the late 1990s black and Hispanic voters have cast a sizeable minority of their votes – over 40% - for white, Republican mayoral candidates. Ecological regression estimates for Bronx, Kings, and New York Counties show that only in Bronx County do white and minority preferences differ.

An Assessment of Voting Rights Progress in New York

Prepared for the American Enterprise Institute

Charles S. Bullock, III
Richard B. Russell Professor of Political Science
Department of Political Science
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Ronald Keith Gaddie
Professor of Political Science
Department of Political Science
The University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK 73019

An Assessment of Voting Rights Progress in New York

New York is one of the states only partially covered by the Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The 1970 version of the legislation extended coverage to three boroughs of New York City (Bronx, Kings, and New York). The trigger mechanism that caught New York picked up jurisdictions that had a prerequisite for voting and in which registration or turnout in the 1968 presidential election fell below 50 percent of the voting age population. New York employed a literacy test until the 1970 Voting Rights Act banned these prerequisites and this was the “test or device” that helped trigger the preclearance requirement. While only three counties are covered, and these do not constitute much of the landmass of New York, but because of their population density they contained 28 percent of the state’s population as of 2000.

The 1975 Voting Rights Act trigger mechanism also identified two of the three counties (Bronx and Kings) making them subject to the language minority provision of that statute. This legislation focused on low participation rates among linguistic minorities defined as American Indians, Asian Americans, Alaskan Natives, or people “of Spanish heritage.” The 1975 trigger mechanism focused on participation in the 1972 presidential election. If more than five percent of the voting age citizens belonged to a single language minority group as of November 1, 1972, registration and election materials were provided only in English at that election, and fewer than 50 percent of the voting-citizens were registered to vote or voted in that election, then the jurisdiction became subject to the preclearance requirement. The new legislation considered the failure to provide election-related materials in the language of a sizeable component of

the electorate to be the equivalent of a literacy test and thus a test or device that might impede registration or voting.

According to the 2000 census, New York ranked third in the nation among states in terms of the size of its Latino population. New York had 2,867,583 Latinos compared with almost 11 million in California and 6.7 million in Texas. Three-fourths of New York's Latino population lived in New York City. With more than 2.1 million Latinos, New York City places first among municipalities in terms of the size of its Hispanic population with over 400,000 more Latinos than in Los Angeles.

Over time, the Latino population of New York City has become more diverse. As recently as 1970, Puerto Ricans constituted 68 percent of the city's Latino population.¹ While they remained the largest component of the Hispanic population in 2000, and numbered almost 790,000, Puerto Ricans comprised little more than a third of the city's Latino population. Dominicans were the second largest group among Latinos with more than 400,000 in 2000. The third largest group, Mexicans, had slightly less than half the number of Dominicans. All told, the Latino population accounted for 27 percent of the city's population.

The heaviest concentration of Latinos lives in the Bronx where they constituted 48 percent of the 2000 population. Latinos make up 27 percent of the population in New York County and almost 20 percent of the King's County population. The largest number of Latinos, 644,705, live in the Bronx but the second largest number, more than half a million, live in Queens County which is not one of the counties subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

¹ "Census 2000: New York City" found at <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/ayala/centro/Census2000>.

The three counties subject to Section 5 have a total of 1,640,659 African Americans as of the 2000 census. This constituted 54 percent of all blacks living in the state in 2000.

Minority Registration and Turnout

New York, like most states, does not maintain registration or turnout data by race. Consequently the best source for materials on the ethnicity of political participants in the Empire State is the surveys done after each congressional election by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Since 1980 estimates of registration and turnout by ethnicity have been available for each state. The information on registration and turnout are self-reported and, consequently, tend to overestimate actual levels of participation. Despite some inflation in the participation rates these estimates can be used for comparative purposes across time and across states on the assumption that the inflation is of similar magnitude across time and space. Moreover, these are the kinds of estimates that the Census Bureau used in determining whether low registration or turnout rates made jurisdictions subject to the trigger mechanisms included in the 1970 and 1975 versions of the Voting Rights Act.

Table 1 presents the Census Bureau estimates of registration of racial and ethnic groups in New York state and nationwide. Since all of New York is not subject to Section 5, statewide figures cover many of the state's residents who live in areas not subject to the preclearance requirement. For 1980 and 1982, the Census Bureau reports estimates for the largest 30 metropolitan areas. The estimates for the New York metro area also include territory not in the three boroughs covered by Section 5 but better matches up

with the Section 5 coverage area than do statewide figures. Comparisons of the statewide and metro figures provide an indication of the similarities in participation rates for the two a quarter of a century ago. Perhaps the statewide figures for later years do as well at capturing what is happening in the city and its boroughs covered by Section 5.

The figures for Hispanic registration in New York in Table 1 show relatively little variation over time. At the outset of the time period, 35.5 percent of the voting age Latinos, compared with 62.4 percent of the whites of voting age, had registered to vote. A quarter of a century later, the registration rate among Latinos stood at 38.2 percent compared with a 64 percent registration rate for whites. The registration figures for blacks were 46.5 percent in 1980 and 49.7 percent in 2004. With two exceptions (1984 and 1986) between 31.1 percent and 38.3 percent of the voting-age Latinos reported registering. Among whites, the range is also narrow going from a low of 59.5 percent of those of voting age in 1982 to 66.3 percent of the age eligible in 1984 who claimed to have registered. Among blacks, the lower end of the range is 45.2 percent of the age eligible reporting being registered in 1982. At the upper end, 54.7 percent of the age eligible claimed to be registered in 1984.

(See Table 1)

For purposes of comparison, nationwide figures on registration appear in the bottom half of Table 1. As with the figures for New York, the national figures show relatively little variation for any of the three groups. Also, as with the New York state data, Latinos nationwide are substantially less likely to register to vote than are whites or blacks.

The national figures show a much smaller difference in the registration rates of whites and blacks. While in New York whites always report registering at higher rates than do African Americans with recent difference frequently being well about 12 percentage points, national differences are typically much less. In 2000, the national figures show whites registering at a rate only two percentage points greater than do blacks. The most pronounced difference nationwide came in 1980 when 68.4 percent of the Anglos compared with 60 percent of the African Americans reported having registered.

In the 1980s, the rate of registration for Latinos nationwide exceeded that in New York with the exception of 1984 when the Latino registration of 45.1 percent in New York is an outlier. (Given the much lower reported rates of Hispanic registration in New York before and after 1984, the figures for that year may be the result of sampling problems.) Beginning with 1990, the registration rates for Latinos in New York exceed those nationwide except in 1994 when the estimates for the two groups are essentially identical. Even in the years when Hispanics report higher rates of registration in New York than nationwide, the differences are small with the largest occurring in 1992 (3.3 percentage points) and 2004 (3.9 percentage points).

The only slightly higher rates of reported registration among New York's Hispanics than those nationwide is somewhat surprising since the New York Latino community is more heavily Puerto Rican than is the Latino population of the nation as a whole. Puerto Ricans make up 36.6 percent of the New York state Latino population compared with only 9.6 percent of the Latino population nationwide. Since Puerto Ricans have American citizenship, they are eligible to register once they meet local

residency requirements. For that reason, one might anticipate higher rates of participation in the New York Hispanic community than elsewhere.

While the registration rate among New York Latinos exceeds that for Latinos nationwide, the same cannot be said for African Americans. Throughout the quarter century chronicled in Table 1, the rate of registration for African Americans nationwide exceeds that for New York and often by sizable amounts. The differences always exceed ten percentage points except in 2002 and occasionally reach 15 percentage points. With the exception of 2002, there is little to indicate that the gap between New Yorkers and the rest of the nation is being reduced.

Latino and African-American registration figures in the early 1980s in the New York City metropolitan area are quite similar to those for the entire state. White registration in the metro area ran several percentage points below that for the state.

Table 2 reports turnout rates by ethnic group for the state of New York and nationwide. The see-saw pattern that is frequently observed with higher turnout in presidential years than for mid-term elections is readily apparent for all three ethnic groups in New York. Despite this variation, Latinos vote at lower rates than do the other two groups throughout the period. The highest rates of Hispanic voting come in the presidential years of 1984, 1992 and 2004 when turnout exceeded 30 percent. At the other extreme, just under 20 percent of the Latino adults reported participating in the mid-term elections of 1986, 1994 and 2002.

(See Table 2)

Throughout the period, whites reported voting at rates at least 20 percentage points greater than did Latinos although in no year did the difference exceed 30

percentage points. Whites also voted at higher rates than blacks with the extent of the difference narrowing towards the end of the period. For 1998-2002, white turnout exceeded black turnout by about 10 percentage points. In several earlier years such as the presidential years of 1980, 1988 and 1992, whites voted at rates more than 15 percentage points greater than did blacks.

Black voting rates have not increased over the last quarter century. In mid-term elections, the range in black turnout is quite narrow extending from 32.5 percent in 2002 to 37.3 percent in 1982. In presidential years, the highest black turnout came in 1984 when 47.3 percent of the African Americans went to the polls. The lowest level of participation came in 1980 when 40.4 percent of the state's African Americans voted. In the most recent presidential election, 43.6 percent of the potential black electorate cast ballots.

The lower half of Table 2 provides national participation rates. During the 1980s, New York Latinos voted at lower rates than those nationwide except for 1984. Beginning in 1990, New York Latinos have voted at higher rates than Latinos nationwide except in 1994. The most recent data from the 2004 election show one of the largest differences with the turnout rate for New York Latinos being 31 percent compared with the national figure of 28 percent.

Throughout the quarter century, African Americans have higher turnout rates nationally than in New York. The differences in presidential years are typically 8 - 10 percentage points although in 2004, the difference reached 12.5 percentage points. In the mid-term elections, the national rates come closer to approximating those for New York

although black turnout in the Empire State continues to run as much as seven percentage points below the national figure.

Minority Officeholding

For three decades, the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies did regular surveys to determine the numbers and identity of African American elected officials. Table 3 shows that from 1970 through 2001, the year of the most recent survey, the numbers of African-Americans holding office in New York has more than quadrupled from 75 to 325. The number almost doubles from 1970 to 1971 as a result of a tripling in the number of black school board members. By 1980, the Empire State had 200 African Americans holding office and that number increased by half again as of 1993.

(See Table 3)

The number of blacks holding county office has grown gradually from four to twenty during the course of the three decades. Municipal officeholding by African Americans has increased five fold during the period from 12 to 63. During the 1970s, most of the black officeholders served on school boards. While service on a board of education remains a popular position for African Americans the share of the officials holding that kind of post had declined to less than 40 percent of all black officeholders as of 2001.

The growth of Hispanic elected officials has come far slower than the growth in African American office holders. According to data collected by NALEO and reported in Table 4, the number of Latino officeholders in New York state increased from 65 in 1984 to 73 in 2000, after peaking at 91 in 1992. County officials have remained very few,

while municipal officials increased from 3 to 14. Very few Latinos serve in county offices with most sitting on school boards. However, school board seats held by Hispanics fell by 40 percent, from a high of 55 in 1992 to just 33 by 2000.

(See Table 4)

Minorities in Congress

As World War II was coming to a close and Franklin Roosevelt won his fourth term as president, the black electorate in Harlem chose one of its own to represent it in Congress. Adam Clayton Powell became the second African American in Congress as he joined William Dawson who represented a predominately black district on the Southside of Chicago. Powell rose in the ranks of the Democratic Party and ultimately chaired the Education and Labor Committee at the time that it approved President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty.

Although continuously re-elected, Powell was denied a seat in the 90th Congress as a result of corruption allegations. The seat was declared vacant; Powell ran and won it again. He did not take his seat in the 90th Congress but did win yet another term and served in the 91st Congress. By this time, Powell had lost interest in Congress' day-to-day activities and spent most of the time on his boat in the Bahamas. This neglect of his responsibilities resulted in four challengers emerging in the Democratic primary. Against this large field, Powell came up 150 votes short and was replaced by Charles Rangel a member of the State Assembly. As shown in Table 5, Rangel continues to hold that seat and has now become one of the most senior members of the House. Should Democrats win control of the House, the 18-term Rangel would likely chair the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

(See Table 5)

When Rangel first arrived in Congress, he found himself the delegation's junior African American. Two years before Rangel's first election, Shirley Chisholm had become the first African-American woman to serve in Congress. In 1972, Chisholm mounted a bid for the presidency that won her a handful of delegates. On her retirement from Congress in 1982, Chisholm was succeeded by Major Owens, who continues to hold the seat in the 109th Congress.

The nearby 11th District has also had an African-American member of the House with continuous service beginning in 1983. The fourth New York congressional district that has been represented by an African American since 1986 is the 6th District. Unlike the other three, it is not in one of the counties subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The 6th District lies just to the east of the area covered by the VRA and is in Queens. For the last four Congresses it has been represented by Gregory Meeks.

In 1970, Herman Badillo, who had served as president of the Bronx borough and run unsuccessfully for mayor of New York City in 1969, became the first Puerto Rican elected to Congress. As shown in Table 6 he held the 21st district, which when redrawn after the 1970 census, was 44 percent Spanish-origin. After another unsuccessful bid for mayor in 1977, Badillo resigned from Congress to become one of the chief assistants to Mayor Ed Koch, whom Badillo had endorsed when his own candidacy came up short.

(See Table 6)

In the special election to fill the vacancy created by Badillo's resignation, Robert Garcia won the seat while running as a Republican. Garcia ran on the Republican label

after he lost the Democratic nomination to a fellow Latino, Louis Velez. Although elected as a Republican Garcia caucused with the Democrats.

The 1980 census showed the 21st district to be 54 percent Hispanic-origin, but it also showed that as a result of a massive exodus from the district, it was the least populated in the nation having lost half of its population during the decade. The changes needed to bring the district population in line with the one-person, one-vote requirement resulted in the share of the population of Spanish-origin dropping to 51 percent in the new district renumbered as the 18th.

In 1990, the Latino seat passed to Jose Serrano, who, like his predecessor, had previously served in the state Assembly. Like Badillo, but unlike Garcia, Serrano was born in Puerto Rico. By 1990, the 18th district had become 60 percent Hispanic-origin.

After redistricting, Serrano represented the 16th district which had a 57 percent Hispanic-origin in population. In 1993 he was joined by a second Puerto Rican native when Nydia Velazquez won in the 12th district which was 57 percent Latino.

Velazquez triumphed in a district gerrymandered in order to achieve an Hispanic majority. The district tied together Latino concentrations in Brooklyn, Queens and Manhattan. Some referred to the district as the “Bullwinkle District” because of its resemblance to the cartoon character. *Politics in America, 1998* describes the creation of the 12th district represented by Velazquez as follows.

Unlike blacks, who live in geographic concentrations, Hispanic immigrants settled in disparate low and middle-income communities scattered across the city’s five boroughs. Mapmakers had to go block-by-block to build a district that could reasonably ensure an Hispanic’s election. The result was the 12th, one of

the most unusually shaped House districts in the nation's history. It follows a widely meandering path through parts of three New York City boroughs, Queens, Brooklyn, and Manhattan.²

A successful challenge was brought against the Velazquez district charging that it violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment because considerations of race and ethnicity predominated in its creation. The new district drawn in time for the 1998 election reduced the Hispanic concentration to slightly below half (48.5 percent). The district remained Democratic and Velazquez had no trouble winning reelection.

As of 2006, Latinos continue to hold two New York congressional seats. Nydia Velazquez has acquired sufficient seniority that should Democrats take control of the 110th Congress, she would be in line to chair the Small Business Committee. Her colleague, Jose Serrano, has worked his way up the seniority roster on the powerful Appropriations Committee and in a Democrat – controlled House would likely chair one of its subcommittees.

A third New York district has a Latino plurality. The 15th District, represented by Charles Rangel since 1970, is 48 percent Hispanic origin, the same level of concentration as found in the Velazquez district. The most serious challenge that Rangel has faced came from Adam Clayton Powell, IV, whose father had previously represented the district for almost 30 years. The younger Powell was raised in Puerto Rico and is black. Should Powell succeed Rangel, he would become the third member of the delegation with Puerto Rican roots.

² Philip D. Duncan and Christine C. Lawrence, *Politics in America, 1998* (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 1997), p. 996.

The 7th District which is east of the 12th, 15th and 16th districts also has a substantial Latino population. In this district Latinos constituted almost 40 percent of the 2000 population. The redistricting necessitated by the invalidation of the Velazquez district resulted in the 7th District becoming more of a Bronx district and less a Queens district. Continuing demographic trends perhaps augmented by membership turnover and/or redistricting are likely to result in additional districts that elect Latinos to Congress from New York.

Minority Legislators

At the end of the 1960s, 13 African Americans served in the New York legislature. While not all of these came from the boroughs subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, most did. Table 7 shows that over the next three decades the number of African Americans serving in the legislature has more than doubled in each chamber. Growth in the black membership in the Senate has been slow but consistent. In the House, the large increases have come immediately after redistricting. In the first House seated immediately after the 1983 redistricting, the number of African Americans increased from 11 to 15. A decade later, with another new plan in place, the number of Black representatives jumped from 17 to 21. By 2001, African Americans held 11.5 percent of the Senate seats almost 15 percent of the House seats.

(See Table 7)

Two residents from New York City are the first Puerto Rican women to serve in state legislature. In 1978 Olga Mendez became the first Puerto Rican to be elected to a state senate and in a 1994 special election, Carmen Arroyo, became the first Puerto Rican

women elected to the lower chamber of a state legislature. Overall Hispanic representation has been slowly growing, and is mainly located in the three Section 5 counties. The number of Hispanic senators, set at two in 1985, grew to five by 2003, while the number of Hispanic assemblymen increased from five to ten over the same period (see Table 8). For the years for which we could obtain data, there was never more than one Hispanic legislator in the New York Senate or Assembly, respectively, elected from outside Bronx, Kings, and New York Counties.

(See Table 8)

New York City Elections

The nation's largest city has had an African-American mayor, David Dinkins, elected in 1989 but defeated in his reelection bid by Rudy Giuliani. In 2005 Latino, Fernando Ferrer, won the Democratic mayoral nomination without a runoff. In winning the nomination, Ferrer succeeded where an earlier Latino, Herman Badillo (a former member of Congress), had failed repeatedly more than a generation earlier. Ferrer fared poorly however, in the general election against incumbent Republican mayor Michael Bloomberg. Ferrer had previously served as the Bronx borough president.

The current Bronx borough president Aldopho Carrion, Jr., is of Puerto Rican descent, and is the only current minority borough president in the three Section 5 counties. Below the borough level, minority candidates are currently very successful in winning election. Of the 34 city council seats elected from the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Manhattan in 2005, nineteen are held by black, Hispanic, or multiethnic representatives, including six of eight in the Bronx (three black, three Hispanic), nine of sixteen in

Brooklyn (seven black, two Hispanic), and four of ten from Manhattan (two black, three Hispanic – one of whom is bi-ethnic).

Racial Voting Patterns

This section presents data from two sources: exit polls from local and national contests for New York City; and ecological regression estimates of racial group preferences for the 2000 general elections for national and state legislative offices.

Exit poll data indicate that white and minority preferences are usually distinct and different, both within the Democratic primary and in general elections for city office, but generally the same in general elections for major national and statewide offices. Table 9 presents exit poll data for four local contests – Democratic primaries for mayor and council president in 1989, which featured black and Hispanic candidates, respectively, and the 1989 and 1993 mayoral general elections between black Democrat David Dinkins and white Republican Rudolph Giuliani. In all three mayoral contests, most whites did not vote for the black candidate. Two-thirds of whites voted against Dinkins in the 1989 primary, and 60 percent opposed him in the general election. In 1993 Dinkins' white share fell nearly 10 points, from 37.2 percent of the white vote in 1989 to just 27.4 percent. Black support for Dinkins holds constant across the three contests. His support from Hispanics is greater in the 1993 general than in the 1989 Democratic primary.

(See Table 9)

The 1989 primary for city council president experienced substantial voter rolloff from the mayoral primary, but the vote for the incumbent split along ethnic lines. The

Hispanic challenger polled a plurality of the Hispanic vote, while the incumbent was the most popular candidate with white, black and other voters.

Exit poll data collected in 1997 and 2001 – but not reported in Table 9 because we could not locate breakouts or the raw data – registered further erosion in Hispanic support for Democratic mayoral nominees. In 1997, according to the exit poll, Rudolph Giuliani held Democratic nominee Ruth Messenger to 57 percent of the Hispanic vote. Four years later, Republican Michael Bloomberg pulled 43 percent of the Hispanic vote in an open seat contest.³ The black vote has also shifted toward Republican mayoral candidates. Exit poll data were not collected for the 2005 mayoral race in New York City, but homogenous precinct analysis by John H. Mollenkopf, director of the Center for Urban Research at the City University of New York Graduate Center, estimated that Michael Bloomberg attracted half of the black vote,⁴ compared to just 28 percent of the black vote four years earlier, and a paltry 4.3 percent for Giuliani in 1993. The white vote lined up solidly behind Republican candidates in all mayoral elections since 1989.

Recent national election polls within New York City reflect the perception of New York as a Democratic counterweight to Republican, upstate New York. For six statewide contests since 1998, in only one – George Pataki’s 1998 reelection bid for governor – does the white vote stand in opposition to the minority vote in Gotham. As reported in Table 9, the white vote for other Democrats ranges from just 51 percent for Hillary Clinton in 2000 to 74.4 percent for Charles Schumer in 2004. The lowest black support for any Democrat is 78.4 percent for governor in 1998 – the one contest where

³ Mirta Ojita, “City’s Hispanics Shift, Moving Toward G.O.P.” *New York Times*, November 8 2001, Page D-5.

⁴ Sam Roberts, “Mayor Crossed Ethnic Barriers For Big Victory,” *New York Times*, November 10 2005, Page A-1.

the Democrat gets less than 90 percent of the black vote. The lowest Hispanic Democratic vote is also in 1998, when 75 percent of the Hispanics favored Pataki's Democratic opponent Peter Vallone. Whites always give less support to Democratic nominees than do other ethnic groups with and they average 33.3 percentage points below black support for statewide Democrats. Nonetheless most New York City whites support Democrats in statewide exit polls.

Ecological regression analysis using precinct data for 2000 gathered by David Lublin and Steven Voss,⁵ shows Anglos and minorities generally voting together in two of the three covered boroughs (see Table 10). In Kings County (Brooklyn) and New York County (Manhattan), minority and Anglo voters had the same majority preferences for every office except US Senator in Kings, where two-thirds of the whites opposed Hillary Clinton. In the Bronx, Anglo and Hispanic preferences were highly polarized, and no realistic black estimates could be derived. As a caution, we should note that the precinct-level analyses were conducted borough-wide. No indicators of district assignment were included in the Lublin/Voss data for the congressional and assembly races, so district-specific contextual effects may be masked.

(See Table 10)

Conclusion

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act has covered three New York counties – Bronx, Kings (Brooklyn), and New York (Manhattan) –the 1970. Bronx and Kings also tripped the minority language provision of the 1975 Act. Latino registration and participation in

⁵ David Lublin and D. Stephen Voss. 2001. "Federal Elections Project." American University, Washington, DC and the University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.

the state generally tracks with national trends for Latinos, while black registration and turnout in New York lags that exhibited by African Americans in the rest of the nation.

The numbers of African Americans holding public office have increased substantially through the three decades of VRA coverage. Latinos have registered very few gains and have even lost ground in school board representation. New York City's congressional and state legislative delegations have witnessed increases in the numbers of seats held by Blacks and Latinos. Minorities hold most of the New York city council seats from the three covered boroughs.

Exit polls conducted with city voters show that whites, blacks, and Latinos generally prefer Democrats in presidential and statewide contests. Ecological regression estimates for Bronx, Kings, and New York Counties show that only in the Bronx do white and minority preferences differ. Exit polling for mayoral elections reveal that Anglos once usually opposed the preferences of other racial and ethnic groups, but that by the end of the 1990s and in the most recent decade black and Hispanic voters have cast a sizeable minority of their votes – over 40% -- for white, Republican mayoral candidates.

Notable progress has been made in minority officeholding and white and minority voters have shown flexibility in their voting preferences, with a general tendency to vote together as Democrats in most partisan elections. Differences in the degree of support have not impeded the election of minority officeholders, though most minority officeholders represent minority constituencies. A continuing problem in New York is the persistent lag in the registration of Latinos and the participation of Latinos and blacks

in voting. Black and Latino registration lag states such as Georgia and Texas, respectively, while Latino participation is on par with that observed in Texas.

TABLE 1

REPORTED REGISTRATION BY RACE IN NEW YORK, 1980-2004

| | 1980 | 1982 | 1984 | 1986 | 1988 | 1990 | 1992 | 1994 | 1996 | 1998 | 2000 | 2002 | 2004 |
|---------------|------|------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| NEW YORK | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latino | 35.5 | 33.0 | 45.1 | 28.8 | 32.6 | 34.1 | 38.3 | 31.1 | 37.8 | 35.2 | 35.3 | 35.5 | 38.2 |
| White | 62.4 | 59.5 | 66.3 | 60.0 | 63.5 | 60.0 | 66.1 | 61.7 | 65.1 | 61.3 | 63.2 | 62.5 | 64.0 |
| Black | 46.5 | 45.2 | 54.7 | 48.5 | 49.5 | 48.7 | 49.7 | 45.9 | 52.5 | 48.3 | 51.9 | 50.4 | 49.7 |
| NATIONAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latino | 36.3 | 35.3 | 40.1 | 35.9 | 35.5 | 32.3 | 35.0 | 31.3 | 35.7 | 33.7 | 34.9 | 32.6 | 34.3 |
| White | 68.4 | 65.6 | 69.6 | 65.3 | 67.9 | 63.8 | 70.1 | 64.6 | 67.7 | 63.9 | 65.6 | 63.1 | 67.9 |
| Black | 60.0 | 59.1 | 66.3 | 64.0 | 64.5 | 58.8 | 63.9 | 58.5 | 63.5 | 60.2 | 63.6 | 58.5 | 64.3 |
| New York City | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latino | 34.4 | 34.3 | Not Reported after 1982 | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 58.5 | 56.3 | Not Reported after 1982 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | 46.4 | 45.2 | Not Reported after 1982 | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Various post-election reports of the U.S. Bureau of the Census

TABLE 2

REPORTED TURNOUT BY RACE IN NEW YORK, 1980-2004

| | 1980 | 1982 | 1984 | 1986 | 1988 | 1990 | 1992 | 1994 | 1996 | 1998 | 2000 | 2002 | 2004 |
|---------------|------|------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| NEW YORK | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latino | 27.8 | 23.4 | 37.5 | 19.8 | 28.4 | 23.3 | 32.6 | 19.8 | 28.6 | 23.4 | 29.4 | 19.5 | 31.0 |
| White | 57.8 | 50.9 | 60.8 | 46.0 | 57.2 | 44.1 | 61.1 | 48.9 | 55.1 | 44.8 | 55.1 | 41.5 | 57.4 |
| Black | 40.4 | 37.3 | 47.3 | 35.8 | 41.3 | 33.2 | 43.4 | 34.7 | 42.4 | 34.6 | 45.7 | 32.5 | 43.6 |
| NATIONAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latino | 29.9 | 25.3 | 32.6 | 24.2 | 28.8 | 21.0 | 28.9 | 20.2 | 26.7 | 20.0 | 27.5 | 18.9 | 28.0 |
| White | 60.9 | 49.9 | 61.4 | 47.0 | 59.1 | 46.7 | 63.6 | 47.3 | 56.0 | 43.3 | 56.4 | 44.1 | 60.3 |
| Black | 50.5 | 43.0 | 55.8 | 43.2 | 51.5 | 39.2 | 54.0 | 37.1 | 50.6 | 39.6 | 53.5 | 39.7 | 56.1 |
| New York City | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latino | 26.0 | 24.1 | Not Reported after 1982 | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 53.1 | 47.3 | Not Reported after 1982 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | 40.3 | 38.3 | Not Reported after 1982 | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Various post-election reports of the U.S. Bureau of the Census

TABLE 3
NUMBER OF AFRICAN-AMERICANS ELECTED OFFICIALS IN
NEW YORK 1970-2001

| Year | Total | County | Municipal | School Board |
|------|--|--------|-----------|--------------|
| 1970 | 75 | 4 | 12 | 25 |
| 1971 | 142 | 4 | 16 | 84 |
| 1972 | 163 | 6 | 16 | 103 |
| 1973 | 164 | 6 | 15 | 101 |
| 1974 | 174 | 9 | 18 | 105 |
| 1976 | 171 | 9 | 20 | 94 |
| 1977 | 186 | 9 | 24 | 106 |
| 1978 | 183 | 8 | 23 | 107 |
| 1980 | 200 | 7 | 30 | 106 |
| 1981 | 197 | 7 | 31 | 104 |
| 1984 | 240 | 8 | 30 | 137 |
| 1985 | 246 | 8 | 35 | 135 |
| 1987 | 250 | 11 | 40 | 126 |
| 1989 | 252 | 13 | 37 | 127 |
| 1991 | 277 | 14 | 37 | 134 |
| 1993 | 299 | 16 | 47 | 136 |
| 1995 | -----No Report from Joint Center for 1995----- | | | |
| 1997 | 311 | 17 | 58 | 126 |
| 1999 | 305 | 17 | 56 | 125 |
| 2001 | 325 | 20 | 63 | 125 |

Source: Various volumes of the *National Roster of Black Elected Officials* (Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political Studies).

TABLE 4
 NUMBER OF HISPANIC ELECTED OFFICIALS
 IN NEW YORK, 1984-2000 (SELECT YEARS)

| Year | Total | County | Municipal | School Board |
|------|-------|--------|-----------|--------------|
| 1984 | 65 | 1 | 3 | 51 |
| 1986 | 65 | 1 | 4 | 51 |
| 1989 | 71 | 2 | 4 | 51 |
| 1991 | 76 | 2 | 5 | 49 |
| 1992 | 91 | 2 | 13 | 55 |
| 1999 | 78 | 1 | 14 | 39 |
| 2000 | 73 | 2 | 14 | 33 |

Source: Various volumes of *The National Directory of Latino Elected Officials* (Los Angeles: NALEO Educational Fund).

TABLE 5
AFRICAN AMERICANS SERVING IN CONGRESS FROM
NEW YORK, 1969-2005

| | | Congressional Districts | | | |
|------|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | 12 th | 18 th | 11 th | 6 th |
| 1969 | Shirley Chisholm | | Adam Clayton Powell | | |
| 1971 | Shirley Chisholm | | Charles Rangel | | |
| 1973 | Shirley Chisholm | | Charles Rangel | | |
| 1975 | Shirley Chisholm | | Charles Rangel | | |
| 1977 | Shirley Chisholm | | Charles Rangel | | |
| 1979 | Shirley Chisholm | | Charles Rangel | | |
| 1981 | Shirley Chisholm | | Charles Rangel | | |
| | | | 16 th | | |
| 1983 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | |
| 1985 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Alton |
| | Waldon* | | | | |
| 1987 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Floyd Flake |
| 1989 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Floyd Flake |
| 1991 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Floyd Flake |
| | | 11 th | 15 th | 10 th | |
| 1993 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Floyd Flake |
| 1995 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Floyd Flake |
| 1997 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Floyd Flake |
| 1999 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Gregory |
| | Meeks | | | | |
| 2001 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Gregory |
| | Meeks | | | | |
| 2003 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Gregory |
| | Meeks | | | | |
| 2005 | Major Owens | | Charles Rangel | Edolphus Towns | Gregory |
| | Meeks | | | | |

* Won a special election in 1986.

TABLE 6

LATINO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM NEW YORK

| | | |
|------|------------------|------------------|
| | 21 st | |
| 1971 | Badillo – 30%* | |
| 1973 | Badillo-44% | |
| 1975 | Badillo | |
| 1977 | Badillo | |
| 1979 | Garcia | |
| 1981 | Garcia – 54% | |
| | 18 th | |
| 1983 | Garcia-51% | |
| 1985 | Garcia | |
| 1987 | Garcia | |
| 1989 | Garcia | |
| 1991 | Serrano – 60% | |
| | 16 th | 12 th |
| 1993 | Serrano-59% | Velazquez-57% |
| 1995 | Serrano | Velazquez |
| 1997 | Serrano | Velazquez |
| 1999 | Serrano | Velazquez – 49% |
| 2001 | Serrano – 63% | Velazquez |
| 2003 | Serrano – 63% | Velazquez – 49% |
| 2005 | Serrano | Velazquez |

Percentages indicate the share of the district’s population that is of Hispanic-origin.

*This is the percent Puerto Rican and not for the percent of the population that is of Hispanic origin. Michael Barone, Grant Ujifusa and Douglas Matthews, the *Almanac of American Politics, 1972* (Gambit, 1972), p. 549.

TABLE 7

AFRICAN-AMERICANS IN THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE, 1969-2001

| Year | Senate | | Assembly | |
|------|--------|---------|----------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 1969 | 3 | 4.92 | 10 | 6.67 |
| 1971 | 3 | 4.92 | 9 | 6.00 |
| 1973 | 3 | 4.92 | 11 | 7.33 |
| 1975 | 4 | 6.56 | 10 | 6.67 |
| 1977 | 4 | 6.56 | 10 | 6.67 |
| 1979 | 4 | 6.56 | 12 | 8.00 |
| 1981 | 4 | 6.56 | 11 | 7.33 |
| 1983 | 4 | 6.56 | 15 | 10.00 |
| 1985 | 4 | 6.56 | 16 | 10.67 |
| 1987 | 4 | 6.56 | 16 | 10.67 |
| 1989 | 5 | 8.20 | 16 | 10.67 |
| 1991 | 5 | 8.20 | 17 | 11.33 |
| 1993 | 5 | 8.20 | 21 | 14.00 |
| 1995 | 5 | 8.20 | 21 | 14.00 |
| 1997 | 6 | 9.84 | 21 | 14.00 |
| 1999 | 6 | 9.84 | 21 | 14.00 |
| 2001 | 7 | 11.48 | 22 | 14.67 |

Source: Various editions of the *National Roster of Black Elected Officials* (Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies).

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF HISPANIC STATE LEGISLATORS
 IN NEW YORK AND SECTION 5-COVERED COUNTIES, 1985-2003, SELECT
 YEARS

| Year | New York State | | Covered Counties | |
|------|----------------|----------|------------------|----------|
| | Senate | Assembly | Senate | Assembly |
| 1985 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| 1987 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 5 |
| 1989 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 1991 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| 1993 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 6 |
| 1999 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| 2003 | 5 | 10 | N/A | N/A |

TABLE 9

RACIAL PREFERENCES IN NEW YORK CITY EXIT POLLS

| | Party | White | Black | Hispanic | Others |
|--|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| <i>1989 Mayoral Democratic Pmy.</i> | | | | | |
| Koch (W) | Dem (I) | 66.7 | 3.4 | 38.8 | 33.3 |
| Dinkins (B) | Dem | 25.9 | 94.2 | 57.5 | 63.0 |
| Others | Dem | 7.1 | 1.4 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| <i>1989 Council President Dem. Pmy.</i> | | | | | |
| Mendez (H) | Dem | 10.0 | 23.4 | 40.9 | 28.8 |
| Stein (W) | Dem (I) | 73.0 | 43.9 | 32.7 | 64.4 |
| <i>1989 Mayoral General</i> | | | | | |
| Giuliani (R, W) | Rep | 59.5 | 1.4 | | 22.5* |
| Dinkins (D, B) | Dem | 37.2 | 98.2 | | 74.0* |
| Others | | 3.3 | 0.6 | | 3.5* |
| <i>**Other* includes Hispanics in 1989 gen. elec. Poll</i> | | | | | |
| <i>1993 Mayoral General</i> | | | | | |
| Giuliani (R, W) | Rep. | 70.9 | 4.3 | 32.6 | 47.5 |
| Dinkins (D, B) | Dem (I) | 27.4 | 95.4 | 66.1 | 50.1 |
| Others | | 1.7 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 2.4 |
| <i>1998 General Election</i> | | | | | |
| <i>Governor</i> | | | | | |
| | Dem | 44.3 | 78.4 | 75.0 | 51.3 |
| | Rep (I) | 46.6 | 10.8 | 20.8 | 35.9 |
| | Others | 9.0 | 10.8 | 4.2 | 12.8 |
| <i>US Senate</i> | | | | | |
| | Dem | 64.8 | 92.3 | 88.8 | 81.4 |
| | Rep (I) | 35.2 | 7.1 | 10.2 | 18.6 |
| | Others | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| <i>2000 General Election</i> | | | | | |
| <i>President</i> | | | | | |
| | Dem | 63.8 | 96.4 | 87.0 | 72.1 |
| | Rep | 29.0 | 2.4 | 11.6 | 18.6 |
| | Others | 7.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 9.3 |
| <i>US Senate</i> | | | | | |
| | Dem | 51.0 | 94.0 | 91.3 | 80.5 |
| | Rep | 45.2 | 5.4 | 8.7 | 14.6 |
| | Others | 3.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 4.9 |
| <i>2004 General Election</i> | | | | | |
| <i>President</i> | | | | | |
| | Dem | 57.7 | 92.0 | 86.7 | 78.7 |
| | Rep | 39.7 | 6.0 | 11.2 | 19.7 |
| | Others | 2.6 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| <i>US Senate</i> | | | | | |
| | Dem (I) | 74.4 | 91.9 | 87.6 | 83.1 |
| | Rep | 17.5 | 5.4 | 6.2 | 10.1 |
| | Others | 5.8 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 6.8 |

TABLE 10

OLS ESTIMATES OF SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS OF OFFICE, BRONX COUNTY, KINGS COUNTY, AND NEW YORK COUNTY, 2000

| County/ Office | White | Black | Hispanic |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <i>Bronx County</i> | | | |
| President | <0.0 | --- | 100.0 |
| US Senate | <0.0 | --- | 100.0 |
| US House | <0.0 | --- | 99.9 |
| State Senate | <0.0 | --- | 100.0 |
| State Assembly | <0.0 | --- | 95.4 |
| <i>Kings County</i> | | | |
| President | 55.8 | 99.1 | 100.0 |
| US Senate | 32.2 | 99.7 | 100.0 |
| US House | 55.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| State Senate | 76.4 | 98.0 | 100.0 |
| State Assembly | 69.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| <i>New York County</i> | | | |
| President | 83.5 | 92.4 | --- |
| US Senate | 37.0 | --- | --- |
| US House | 86.1 | 94.6 | --- |
| State Senate | 89.8 | 97.7 | --- |
| State Assembly | 93.6 | 99.1 | --- |

Note: Blank cells returned unrealistic (negative) turnout and vote estimates.