1

Latino Mayors and the Evolution of Urban Politics

Marion Orr and Domingo Morel

The face of America is changing, and so is its city politics. As late as the early 1960s, Latinos were almost totally excluded from city politics.* By the early 1980s, as Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (2003, p. 4) documented, "Latinos rose from exclusion to positions of authority as mayors, council members, and top managers and administrators" in local governments. Today, the vast majority (67 percent) of Latino elected officials in the United States serve at the municipal level on school boards, city councils, and county commissions, as mayors, and in other local elected offices. The number of Latino mayors, for example, has increased steadily over the past thirty years; it climbed from 139 in 1984 to 247 in 2009, an increase of 78 percent (NALEO 2010). Although Latino mayors are concentrated in the West and the Southwest, cities around the country, in the Northeast, the Midwest, and the South, also have Latino mayors. Latinos have been elected mayor in large cities, including Albuquerque, New Mexico; Miami, Florida; El Paso, Texas; Denver and Colorado Springs, Colorado; and Los Angeles and San Jose, California, among others.

This book focuses on the rise of Latino mayors and on their governing styles and policies. Why focus on Latino mayors? Because Latinos were almost invisible in post–World War II municipal politics, few urban scholars

* This text uses the terms "Latino" and "Hispanic" to "describe all individuals, foreign, and U.S.-born, who have ancestry in any of the Spanish-speaking nations of Latin America" (Garcia Bedolla, 2014, p. 3).

predicted their ascendancy to the city's highest office. Although their numbers have increased over the past thirty years, we know little about the rise of Latino mayors, the paths they have taken to the mayoralty, their governance experience once they have been elected, and how their mayoralties have affected the communities they represent. Put simply, the rise of Latino mayors has been a remarkable American story, but it also tells us something about ethnic succession, changing urban demography and political contexts, and the future of cities.

Winning the mayor's office typically signals the political coming-of-age of the racial or ethnic group of the person who holds the position. Ethnic and racial transitions of the mayor's office have long been a feature of American urban politics. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Irish and Italian political leaders began to capture the mayor's office for the first time in Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, New Haven, and other cities (Eisinger 1980). In the late 1960s, the United States began to witness a process of racial transition in which African Americans were elected to urban executive positions for the first time (Colburn and Adler 2001; Nelson and Meranto 1977; Rich 1989, 2007; Thompson 2006). Today, another process of ethnic and racial transition is occurring as Latino politicians replace white and African American politicians in city halls, including election as mayors (Filandra and Orr 2013; Sonnenshein 1999; 2003).

This volume presents case studies of Latino mayors in five large U.S. cities and one large urban county: Federico Peña of Denver, Colorado; Henry Cisneros, Ed Garza, and Julián Castro of San Antonio, Texas; Carlos Giménez of Miami-Dade County, Florida; Antonio Villaraigosa of Los Angeles; Eddie Perez and Pedro Segarra of Hartford, Connecticut; and Angel Taveras of Providence, Rhode Island. We have attempted to strike a balance in putting together this volume, blending essays that examine some of the most important pioneers with essays that explore the range of conditions and experiences that Latino mayors have confronted. This volume includes essays on Latino mayors in Sun Belt cities, such as San Antonio, Miami, and Los Angeles, and on Latino mayors in Snow Belt cities, such as Hartford and Providence.

In the remainder of this chapter, we provide a context for the case studies. We emphasize that Latino political incorporation is occurring at a particular stage and era in the economic, social, and political history of American cities. We explore the rise of Latino mayors within the context of the changing American city. To understand Latino mayors as a leading force in Latino political incorporation, we take a look back. First, we provide an examination of mayors during the period of the industrial city (roughly the 1830s to the 1930s), when ethnic Europeans, especially the

Irish, gained the mayor's office and political incorporation. Mayors were especially attentive to the provision of services and public works projects. Factories sprang up with little help from city hall. It was a period of centralized manufacturing and civic vitality in many cities. During this period, the mayor's job was seldom especially complicated.

Next, we stress that Latino mayors are coming to power in a context different from that of African American mayors. Black mayors came to power during the period of the redevelopment city (roughly the 1940s to the 1980s). The redevelopment city got under way in the post–World War II years, when the city was adapting to the automobile, hemorrhaging from white flight, and responding to deindustrialization. The redevelopment city saw African American mayors working in close alliance with downtown investor interests to revitalize downtowns, restore historic buildings, and expand transit systems.

We focus on the emergence of Latino mayors as an important facet of politics in the postindustrial city (roughly the 1990s to the present). Latino mayors are coming of age politically at a time when the U.S. economy is concerned with providing services based on knowledge, information, and technology more than with producing goods. It is shifting from a manufacturing to a service-based economy. In the postindustrial city, Latino mayors are working in a changing urban context in which concerns about downtown economic revitalization have given way to a heightened focus on other issues, such as education, immigration, affordable housing, and gentrification.

After this sketch of the changing political and economic contexts within which mayors have had to operate, the remainder of the chapter focuses on the contemporary scene and the rise of Latino mayors. First, we examine demographic change. However, in order to understand the office of mayor as an instance of "Demography is destiny," it is important to appreciate that other variables come into play. We call attention particularly to (a) the infrastructure of organizations and the ecology of civic engagement they form and (b) the skills that key actors (often the mayor) display in building coalitions. We further argue that these community organizations and leadership skills are brought into play in an urban context of constraints and opportunities. The nature of these constraints and opportunities varies with the times.

Mayors and the Industrial City

Latino mayors face a dramatically different situation from that of the mayors who governed during the era of the industrial city. From roughly the

1830s to the 1930s, the city was the epicenter of American industry. This was the period of the industrial city. A key function of the industrial city was to provide the infrastructure necessary for industrial growth. Roads and bridges for transportation, massive sewers to carry off industrial waste, and large supplies of water to furnish the huge factories were among some of the public works projects required for large-scale industrial production. In other words, mayors of the industrial city were heavily involved in city building (Kantor 1995). City governments also maintained public infrastructure, provided routine public services, enforced regulations, and maintained public safety.

Industrialization brought an urban explosion as factories sprang up in waterfront cities and diverse populations flocked to work in them. Between 1820 and 1919, 33.5 million European immigrants, mainly from Ireland, Russia, Poland, and Italy, arrived on American shores (Judd and Swanstrom 2006, pp. 26–37). The cities bore the brunt of this immigration. By 1870, 44 percent of New York City's residents had been born outside the United States; 48 percent in Chicago were foreign born, as were 49 percent in San Francisco (Judd and Swanstrom 2006, pp. 27–32). Cities tended to serve as processing centers for wave after wave of poor, lesser-skilled immigrants beginning their way up the economic ladder of material success. For example, the Irish were the first European ethnic group to migrate in massive numbers directly into the American industrial city (Erie 1988). The Irish immigrants who crowded into the segregated ghettos faced tremendous challenges. According to one account, living conditions in the Irish ghettos were "brutish, oppressive, and surrounded by open hostility" (Harrigan and Vogel 2000, p. 62).

As the nation's urban population continued to grow, the industrial city became an increasingly complex economic, political, and social organization. By the 1820s, cities were well on their way to adopting governmental structures similar to the national model. Mayors (elected citywide) served as chief executives, and citizens chose city councils (elected from districts) to perform legislative functions. During this earlier period, however, city councils were typically the dominant players in formulating municipal policy. Americans' lingering desire to avoid anything that resembled the British monarchy kept the city's chief executive position comparatively weak. Urban historians Howard Chudacoff and Judith Smith (1988, p. 151) observed that "before 1850 most mayors could exert only limited control over municipal policy." It would take cities several decades to persuade state governments to begin to deliver more authority in piecemeal fashion to the mayor's office (Frug and Barron 2008). One of the first such grants was authority given to the mayor to appoint and remove city administrators.

This shift not only brought more centralization to political authority and made it more popularly responsive but also opened the door for the development of the patronage system and machine-style politics (Erie 1988). Although there was no universal pattern, control of the office of mayor took on great importance.

By the 1860s and 1870s, a new style of city politics emerged in most large U.S. cities. Before the huge waves of European immigrants, political power in many American cities was controlled by a very small group of economic elites consisting of white Anglo-Saxon Protestants or Yankees (Kantor 1995). As the industrial city developed, new kinds of political leaders emerged. These new leaders were less affluent career politicians whose base of support was lodged in the segregated ethnic wards. The decentralized structure of the urban political system, combined with mass suffrage and ethnic residential segregation, created a new political climate in which social and political relationships became highly interconnected. In order to organize voters within and across the ethnic-based wards and to ensure their support, the new career politicians depended on the city budget (i.e., patronage jobs and contracts) to provide for the needs of their constituents. Patronage became the mechanism that held the political organizations or machines together. It provided the incentives for voter mobilization and allowed machine-style mayors to command large electoral majorities (Erie 1988; Trounstine 2008).

Irish Political Incorporation and the Industrial City

No other group took greater advantage of machine politics than the Irish (Erie 1988). Irish immigrants had the advantage of speaking English. Although Roman Catholicism was looked on with suspicion by certain segments of the dominant society, it served as a common bond, drawing the Irish community closer together. The broad patchwork of Irish Catholic parishes that developed provided an additional institutional structure for organizing Irish voters in the ghetto neighborhoods. Activist Irish Catholic priests used the church as an agency for mobilizing Irish communities. All these variables and factors, combined with the huge demographic changes, opened the way for the Irish eventually to control the mayor's office in many cities.

The Irish not only had advantages in organizing capacity and ethnic-group consciousness but also were beneficiaries of timing. They came to power in urban politics during the era of the industrial city, in which mayors worked in an environment characterized by economic growth and expansion. For example, the construction activity that was characteristic of

the industrial city brought city hall into a close working relationship with local business leaders. For large and established businesses that had acquired a fixed stake in the industrial city (especially utility and transit companies), an alliance with the mayor's office was mutually beneficial (Kantor 1995, pp. 41–75). Machine politics structured elections and provided some political stability to city hall. By aligning with the local machine, businesses could have the security of knowing whom they were dealing with in city government. Business leaders were also given a strong voice in shaping economic policy. As Kantor (1995, p. 60) explained, "The major struggles over economic policy could take place within the business community. Once a consensus was achieved there, the centralized system of bribe-giving and favor-trading would assure the implementation of developmental decisions." Alliances with machine politicians have always been valuable to city business leaders.

Governing the Industrial City

The Irish mayors who governed the industrial city had at their disposal opportunities offered through patronage and machine-style politics (Erie 1988). Consequently, in many U.S. cities, the Irish controlled the vast majority of public-sector jobs as city clerks, policemen, firemen, and laborers. The Irish were able to "move solidly into the mainstream of American society" largely because of their group's control of the city's public- and private-sector patronage jobs (Harrigan and Vogel 2000, p. 68). Irish political control of the city became an avenue for group advancement. Steven Erie (1988) has persuasively argued that the Irish crowded into the largely low-paying, blue-collar urban public sector jobs. As a consequence, in socioeconomic status, the Irish lagged behind other ethnic groups who focused on more group effort in business and the professions. Nevertheless, Erie (1988, p. 261) acknowledged, "The Irish experience demonstrates some potential for group economic uplift through the local political process."

Mayors could depend on businesses to make jobs available to their people in exchange for providing those businesses favorable action on construction and other contracts. For example, under Mayor James Michael Curley, Boston spent lavishly on public works projects, building new schools, hospitals, and courthouses (Beatty 1992). Private contracts were awarded to businesses after they had agreed to hire individuals sent by Curley's political operatives. By all accounts, Curley centralized the powers of patronage in his own hands and distributed public works jobs in a way that enabled him to retain the loyalty and support of his Irish working-class electoral base.

Douglas Rae (2003) contrasted the mayoralty of Frank Rice (1910–1917), who served as mayor of New Haven during the height of the industrial city, with the mayoralty of Richard Lee (1954–1970), who held the position during the 1950s and 1960s. Rae's cross-time comparison highlighted some of the distinctive features associated with being a mayor during the era of the industrial city. His analysis reminds us that the capacity of mayors to govern varies in different contexts (see also Flanagan 2004). Mayor Rice's administration was labeled the "sidewalk republic" as an acknowledgment of his regime's reputation for providing a high level of "routine" services like street cleaning and maintenance, garbage collection, public schools, parks, sewers, and sidewalks for the citizens and commercial interests of the city (Rae 2003, pp. 183–211). Rice focused his limited powers on executing routine municipal-government services and did not undertake any grand plans to transform New Haven.

The industrial city was a place of opportunity and social mobility for millions of European immigrants and their offspring. Rae helps us appreciate how mayors who led cities during the industrial era could rely "in overwhelming degree on market forces" to "sustain opportunity" and "to attract and retain taxpaying citizens" (Rae 2003, p. 203). Mayors of industrial cities were fortunate to occupy city hall during the era when cities had strong urban manufacturing economies capable of creating a "powerful stream of wages and investment capital to energize the city" (Rae 2003, p. 18). During this period, the interests of important sectors of the business community were inextricably interwoven with those of the city government. When European immigrants began to pursue political incorporation, control of the mayor's office ultimately led to the infiltration of Irish and Italians into the private economic sectors of the city. The bustling economy characteristic of the industrial-city era helped keep the city moving.

Mayors and the Redevelopment City

The period of the redevelopment city was a transition between that of the industrial city and that of the postindustrial city. From roughly 1940 through the end of the 1980s, cities were adapting to the decline of the industrial city. Concerted efforts were devoted to rebuilding and rescuing decaying downtowns of the old industrial city. During this period, the relationship between city politics and economics became ever more apparent, and mayors began to "actively" seek solutions to problems like traffic congestion and urban blight (Salisbury 1964, p. 790). During the period of the redevelopment city, civic and political elites led the effort to revitalize downtowns and waterfronts and expand transit and transportation choices.

The federal government was a strong partner in promoting urban renewal and trying to arrest urban distress.

Governing the Redevelopment City

The period of the redevelopment city was a time of economic and social transition for cities. Cities were adapting to the age of the automobile and deindustrialization (Bluestone and Harrison 1984; Teaford 1990). In the 1930s and 1940s, mayors became actively involved in plans to adapt their downtowns to address traffic congestion caused by the rising use of the automobile (Teaford 1990, pp. 19–21). The automobile also caused businesses and people to push out farther from downtown, away from the central core of the industrial city. Census figures for 1940 confirmed that many U.S. cities, including Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland, suffered a decline in population. During the 1930s and 1940s, property values in downtown business districts, including St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Detroit, dropped precipitously (Teaford 1990). In cities across the country, business and civic leaders grew increasingly concerned about the commercial decline of cities' central business districts. In May 1940, a national business magazine exclaimed that big cities were "economically speaking . . . rotting at the core" (quoted in Teaford 1990, p. 19).

Mayors of the postwar redevelopment era worked to revitalize their cities within the context of deindustrialization. During the period of the industrial city, goods were almost entirely produced in large factories in a single city and then shipped to consumers and producer markets. However, after World War II, and especially after the mid-1960s, the increased mobility of capital allowed corporations to locate and relocate with much more flexibility and led to the economic decline of many central cities. Technological developments fundamentally altered the manufacturing process so that an ever-larger portion of the labor force found work in the service sector of the economy. Soon the service sector of the city economy grew at such a rate that it quickly surpassed manufacturing employment, the key labor market during the era of the industrial city. Numerous communities that were dependent on manufacturing suffered a long-term decline. Central cities became impoverished relative both to their prior condition and to their surrounding suburban municipalities. Cities became poorer and blacker. Soon many cities were losing population, a significant reversal from the days of the industrial city.

Mayors of the redevelopment city had to do more than focus on routine service provision. The context had changed. The Housing Act of 1949 and later the urban-renewal programs of the 1960s heightened the federal

government's involvement in urban economic development. Supported on the one side by the city's access to federal funding and on the other by the commitment of local businesses to invest in the downtown, mayors formed strong coalitions with downtown corporate interests. Mayors now were at the center of the effort to demolish and change the urban landscape in the hope of redeveloping the city's economically troubled downtown (Salisbury 1964). They were aided by a cadre of professional technicians and planners trained in understanding the complexity of redeveloping existing urban environments (Mollenkopf 1983). Blocks and blocks of slum housing were razed. Roads were rerouted, and miles and miles of interstate highways were laid. Large, transformational endeavors with heavy involvement from city hall became routine in the redevelopment city (Stone and Sanders 1987; Fainstein et al. 1986). Deindustrialization made the job of mayor much more challenging and complicated. In addition to providing routine public services, mayors were now involved in "solving or alleviating particular problems" (Salisbury 1964, p. 788).

Black Politics and the Redevelopment City

Black mayors came to power in a context of urban constraints and opportunities different from that in which European immigrants had begun to pursue political incorporation in the early twentieth century. Like the rise of Irish American mayors generations earlier, the rise of black mayors was connected to demographic change in the city. During the late 1890s and into the early twentieth century, millions of African Americans from the rural South migrated to the cities of the urban North and West. Historians began to call this the Great Black Migration (Lemann 1991; Wilkerson 2010). During the Great Depression, black in-migration to northern urban centers slowed, but it picked up again during the 1940s and did not begin to taper off until the 1970s. It is estimated that by the 1970s, five million to six million African Americans had left the rural small towns of the South and had made their residence in Washington, D.C., New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, and newer cities in the West, such as Oakland and Los Angeles. Blacks also made their way out of rural southern towns and into southern cities like Atlanta, Birmingham, and Memphis. In the same years, central cities such as Detroit and Newark were changing from overwhelmingly white to predominantly African American.

As whites fled the cities, the percentage of the black population increased, giving African American voters electoral clout. However, as the case studies in this volume make clear, demographic change alone is not enough to capture electoral control. People must organize and be mobilized

(Dreier 2007; Orr 2007). A strong sense of racial-group consciousness and a desire for equality were central factors for the political mobilization of blacks during the first half of the twentieth century (Dawson 1994; Shingles 1981). The passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act opened public accommodations to blacks, and the 1965 Voting Rights Act outlawed the legal tactics used to restrict black voter participation. But despite these historic achievements, the African American community was still in a crisis. This was especially the case for the growing percentages of blacks living in the nation's central cities. Throughout the 1960s, surveys showed that African Americans consistently judged government services—schools, parks, recreation, garbage collection, and, above all, the police—to be less adequate than whites, even those whites living in the same cities (Jones et al. 1978).

From the mid-1960s to the late 1970s, specially targeted voter-education and registration drives in southern and northern cities added millions of blacks to the rolls of eligible voters. Black voters formed the bases for a new black politics (Preston, Henderson, and Puryear 1987; Walton 1972). The symbol of the new black urban politics became the African American mayor (Persons 1993). The election of big-city African American mayors began first in Cleveland (Carl Stokes) and Gary, Indiana (Richard Hatcher) in 1967. In 1970, Newark elected Kenneth Gibson as its first black mayor. Black mayors were elected for the first time in Detroit, Atlanta, and Los Angeles in 1973 and in Washington, D.C., in 1974. Black mayors signaled the gradual institutionalization of black political power in urban America.

Black Mayors and the Redevelopment City

The redevelopment city created a particular set of constraints and opportunities for black mayors. Black mayors were faced with the task of trying to attract investment capital to their cities during an era when geographic place, transportation access, physical infrastructure, and other locational advantages no longer tied businesses to a specific locale. They formed alliances with big corporations to invest in urban development, especially in declining downtown central business districts, and, armed with federal urban-redevelopment grants, fully embraced corporate-centered strategies for urban revitalization. This was the approach of black mayors in Detroit, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Newark, Washington, D.C., and other cities. Detroit's Coleman Young became one of the chief proponents of urban redevelopment focused on corporate investment in downtown business districts (Rich 1989; Young and Wheeler 1994). Los Angeles mayor Tom Bradley is also credited with transforming the city's downtown with "gleaming skyscrapers" and leading "the grandest downtown building program of any

American city" (Sonenshein 2003, p. 60; 1999). Black mayors became key players working with business leaders in a tight coalition to boost investor confidence in downtowns and stimulate urban revitalization.

Forging a governing regime with white economic elites created a special challenge for black mayors. Scholars criticized black mayors for too enthusiastically pursuing the corporate-centered approach to urban redevelopment (Nelson 1990; Preston 1990; Reed 1988; Whelan, Young, and Lauria 1994). They argued that corporate-centered downtown policies created unbalanced urban growth. Black mayors had to reassure their largely African American electoral base that they had not "sold out" to the white economic elites (Reed 1988, p. 101). Coleman Young, for example, forcefully argued that his emphasis on downtown urban redevelopment was in the "interest of nourishing" Detroit's poor and black neighborhoods (Young and Wheeler 1994, p. 315). Young and other black mayors who led cities during the redevelopment era maintained that the best strategy for improving the black condition was to expand job opportunities in the private sector throughout the city. However, critics charged that black mayors were too deferential to white economic elites and failed to give sufficient attention to the needs of low-income neighborhoods.

One of the consistent themes across much of the literature on the politics of the redevelopment city is that African American mayors were able to win elections by gaining the overwhelming support of black voters. However, once they were in office, black mayors tended to forge governing coalitions with the city's corporate elite and investor interests. Urban scholars make a distinction between an electoral coalition and a governing coalition. As we will see in the coming chapters, Latino mayors win office with strong support from Latino voters. However, once they are in city hall, they find that their governing agenda is pulled in the direction of the city's business community. Latino mayors, like other big-city mayors, are sympathetic to facilitating the economic growth of the city. The result is that they are likely to be drawn into an alliance with the city's corporate community.

When black mayors came into office in the 1960s and 1970s, some analysts wondered whether the "reforms" (at-large elections, direct primary elections, nonpartisan elections, city-manager systems, and expanded civil service coverage) adopted in the early twentieth century in many cities to wrest political control from the Irish machines and rid the cities of corruption would limit the mayors' ability to translate political power into black social and economic advancement (Friesema 1969; Preston 1976; Welch 1990). For example, in an essay published in the early 1970s, Francis Fox Piven (1973, p. 380) observed that blacks were gaining political power in the city "at a time when public employment has been pre-empted by older

groups and is held fast through civil service provisions and collective bargaining contracts." "Most public jobs," Piven (1973, p. 380) added, "are no longer allocated in exchange for political allegiance, but through a 'merit' system based on formal qualifications." Black mayors, however, used aggressive affirmative-action programs to increase representation of African Americans in municipal government, including police departments (Browning, Marshall, and Tabb 1984; Eisinger 1982; Karnig and Welch 1989; Keller 1978; Rich 1989; Saltzstein 1989). Today, a substantial proportion of the African American middle class is employed in the government sector, including municipal employment (Dawson 1994, pp. 29–33). In addition, black mayors used their public authority to expand minority participation in city contracting and purchasing (Holmes 2011; Rich 1989; Stone 1989). During Maynard Jackson's two terms as mayor of Atlanta, the percentage of city contracts awarded to African American business firms rose substantially, from 2 percent in 1974 to 30 percent in 1980 (Holmes 2011, p. 174). These accomplishments suggest that black mayors were able to make a difference in the public sector.

Mayors and the Postindustrial City

Latino mayors are emerging as significant players in the postindustrial city. The postindustrial city is different from the redevelopment city. One of the distinguishing features of the postindustrial city is the rise and dominance of large multilocational corporations in local economies (Kantor 1995, pp. 77–111; Sassen 2001; Savitch 1988). These huge multilocational corporations are much larger than the businesses that dominated the economy during the industrial city and "control the movement of most goods, services, and capital throughout the United States" (Kantor 1995, p. 90). Because of their large size, many of the postindustrial corporations have multiple administrative and operational units often scattered across several locations. Advancement in telecommunication technologies, such as computers and fiber-optic cable, provided for greater efficiency in production and distribution, allowing huge corporations to disperse their production activities in different locales. The dispersal of production activities has meant that cities increasingly compete economically among themselves to be the site for the large corporations' decentralized operations (Peterson 1981).

In the postindustrial city, heavy industry no longer dominates the economy. The economy of the postindustrial city is characterized by a shift to service industries. Ever-increasing proportions of jobs are found in professional and personal services, such as health care, finance, insurance, in-

formation technology, and retail sales. In the postindustrial city, job growth has shifted to service industries and highly educated workers. Richard Florida (2002, p. 8) wrote that the postindustrial city has also spawned a new "creative" class, "people in science and engineering, architecture and design, education, arts, music and entertainment, whose economic function is to create ideas, new technology and/or new creative content."

The restructuring of the urban economy transformed the city's labor market. In the postindustrial city, the polarization of city occupations is more apparent. Educated and skilled workers benefit from the service-oriented economy. For example, Florida (2002, p. 9) wrote that in the postindustrial city, the creative class is "dominant in terms of wealth and income." There are a number of high-end and high-skilled positions for managers and professionals at the top and more low-paying service jobs (cleaning, cooking, waiting tables, stocking shelves) at the bottom. The entire economic restructuring process has left unskilled and semiskilled inner-city workers with significantly fewer opportunities for gainful employment. This has posed a particular dilemma for blacks and Latinos, two of the last racial/ethnic groups to arrive in the cities in large numbers (Wilson 1996). Blacks and Latinos are also underrepresented among those with higher education. Cities that had once served as processing centers for lesser-skilled immigrants preparing themselves for economic advancement now have become large repositories for workers with lessened economic prospects.

The politics of the postindustrial city also differs from the politics of earlier eras, and governing the postindustrial city differs from governing the redevelopment city. Established patterns of decision making were altered when large multinational corporations took over locally based companies and businesses (Heying 1997). The tight coalition of downtown commercial interests of banks, railroads, department stores, and local newspapers that Salisbury (1964) found held great sway during the postwar redevelopment era pulled back its involvement in civic and political affairs. In the postindustrial city, universities, medical centers, metropolitan business associations, environmental groups, and cultural institutions are taking a leadership role in local affairs (Katz and Bradley 2013; Maurrasse 2001; Rodin 2007; Stoker, Stone, and Horak 2015). Nonprofit foundations are also playing critical roles in the postindustrial city. In Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and other cities, program officers and staffers of large foundations like the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Ford Foundation are seeding programs devoted to improving housing and addressing other needs in poor neighborhoods, providing research and data analysis on important policy matters, and helping empower low-income communities

struggling to survive amid the changes and challenges of the postindustrial city.

Issues that were not high on the action agenda during the period of the redevelopment city have been elevated during that of the postindustrial city. Stone and Stoker (2015), for example, showed that leaders of the postindustrial city now view economic growth and neighborhood improvement as complementary goals. The postindustrial city is situated within the context of a "back-to-the-city" movement, in which young professionals are carving out urban space within the central city (Ehrenhalt 2013; Hyra 2008). Developers and real estate agents have been selling young hipsters the idea that it is not necessary to move downtown to achieve a sense of urbanity. The young professionals pulled to the city by the huge multilocational corporations want to stay in happening places in neighborhoods that offer activities. During the postwar redevelopment period, the class divide played out at the neighborhood level in many U.S. cities and featured battles over downtown renewal and slum clearance. The class cleavage was between a corporate elite determined to make the downtown attractive to the middle class and businesses and poor, working-class people resisting neighborhood displacement (Ferman 1996; Stone 1976;). Back then, the class struggle over neighborhoods was symbolized by the bulldozer. Today, in the postindustrial city, displacement remains an issue, but now the issue is gentrification. More middle-class families (often whites), particularly singles and young married couples priced out of more expensive areas, have moved to formerly poor areas of the city, especially neighborhoods that are close to the work and entertainment opportunities of downtown (Freeman 2006; Hyra 2008). As Myron Levine (2015, p. 60) explained:

> Gentrification brings a new sense of vitality and a number of more specific benefits to cities. New investment helps to stabilize declining neighborhoods, upgrade residential structures, and increase an area's attractiveness to future investment. Gentrified areas also help a city to attract workers with advanced technological and specialized skills, the sort of talented workforce that a city needs in order to compete for high-tech, legal, and financial service firms. Neighborhood upgrading expands the municipal tax base, yielding higher property-tax revenues and local income-tax receipts.

However, researchers have found that gentrification in communities can be a double-edged sword (Freeman 2006; Hyra 2008). As Lance Freeman (2006, p. 93), an urban planner, put it, "Gentrification brings both

cheer and grief." Critics argue that gentrification can have harmful impacts, especially on poor, working-class families who are pushed out of neighborhoods because of rising housing values (Hyra 2008). Freeman (2006, p. 162) showed that "displacement haunts residents of gentrifying neighborhoods." Levine (2015, p. 56) explained, "Globalization intensifies the pressures underlying neighborhood gentrification. . . . Gentrification, in turn, helps to make a city attractive to global corporations that seek a talented workforce."

Globalization has made innovation and human capital critical driving elements in the economic fortunes of postindustrial cities. Public education is of vital importance to the viability of postindustrial cities. Trying to make the city appealing to the "creative class" creates a different set of challenges and opportunities. As multinational and multilocational corporations recruit more college-educated professionals with school-age children to work in the postindustrial city, issues related to public education and school reform become more salient. Moreover, survey research shows that education has long been one of the most important policy issues confronting Latino communities (Fraga et al. 2012). In many cities, more and more immigrant parents are organizing and pressuring school districts and local officials to address the needs of the changing population (Clarke et al. 2006; Fraga and Frost 2011; Orr and Rogers 2011; Orr et al. 2016; Su 2009). Governors and other state officials are increasingly monitoring the performance of city schools and prodding school districts to turn around failing city schools (Morel 2018). It is not surprising that in the postindustrial city, mayors are paying much more attention to public education than mayors who governed during the era of the redevelopment city (Henig, Hula, Orr, Pedescleaux 1999; Henig and Rich 2004; Orr 1999; Rich 1996; Viteritti 2009; Wong et al. 2007). For example, despite the jurisdictional barriers and their limited formal authority in school affairs, several of the Latino mayors covered in this volume have developed ways to influence local public education.

The increase in the Latino population and the need for expanded public services occurred as cities grappled with economic challenges related to the transformation from an industrial to a postindustrial economy. The typical postindustrial city struggles with balancing revenues with expenditures. In other words, many Latino mayors are leading municipal governments that are suffering from fiscal stress (Filandra and Orr 2013; Ladd and Yinger 1989). Federal cutbacks in social services and welfare programs have placed a bigger burden on city-government budgets. State revenue is a decreasing share of city budgets. Mayors of postindustrial cities struggle to make ends meet.

Latinos and the Postindustrial City

Racial/ethnic succession in the mayor's office is driven significantly by demographic change. The next sections examine the profound and interrelated demographic shifts occurring in the United States, shifts fueled by the growing Latino population. As we show, the Latino population not only is growing substantially but also is becoming more diverse and much more dispersed than it was thirty years ago. However, we emphasize that although demography is very important, its impact is not spontaneous. Such things as organization and leadership skills play a vital part. We remind readers of the important role of community organizing in the process of Latino political incorporation.

Immigration and Demographic Change in the Postindustrial City

Without question, population change prepares the ground for political change. One of the most significant changes in American politics over the past thirty years has been the demographic transformation of the Latino population, that is, the size and proportion of Latinos living in the United States. The Latino population in the United States grew nearly 60 percent between 1990 and 2000 and increased 43 percent between 2000 and 2010. The 2010 census showed that Latinos are now the fastest-growing and largest (16.3 percent of the population versus 12.6 percent for African Americans) minority group in the country, and this increase is largely fueling the trend toward whites being less than 50 percent of the U.S. population around 2050. The demographic change is being felt across the country. Over half the U.S. Latino population is concentrated in the southwestern states. Latinos, mostly of Mexican origin, have always had a significant presence in the Southwest, but over the past forty years, the number of Latino immigrants from Mexico and other Latin American countries has increased in states like Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. Latinos of Puerto Rican descent have been a significant presence in parts of New York, Florida, and Illinois since the middle of the twentieth century. Florida has been home to a large population of Cuban immigrants who came to the United States after Fidel Castro's rise to power in 1959.

The most important observation about these population changes is that Latinos are more dispersed than ever before. Who would have predicted that Latinos would move in large numbers to places like Lawrence, Massachusetts; Durham, North Carolina; Cicero, Illinois; Manchester, New Hampshire; and Providence, Rhode Island? Every year, all of the nation's

largest cities become more Latino than the year before. The current growth in the Latino population is driven not by immigration but by native population birth. Between 2000 and 2008, the increase in native births was almost double that of foreign-born immigrants. Of the nearly 47 million persons of Hispanic origin living in the United States, about 29 million were born in the United States. The native-born now represent approximately 62 percent of all Latinos (Fraga et al. 2012, pp. 4–11). As Fraga and his colleagues (2012, p. 8) observed, "Latinos are substantially younger than the overall population, and Latinos born in the United States are younger than those immigrating from abroad; as a result, Hispanics will disproportionately contribute future population growth in the United States for the foreseeable future."

The cities in this volume vary in the size of their Latino populations. However, over the past three decades, each city has experienced significant Latino population growth. The cities in this volume with the largest share of the Latino population, Los Angeles, California (49 percent), Miami, Florida (70 percent), and San Antonio, Texas (63 percent), had roughly an 8 percent increase in their Latino populations between 1990 and 2010. Denver, where Latinos constituted 23 percent of the city's population in 1990, saw similar growth. Its Latino population grew by 9 percent between 1990 and 2010. The cities in our volume with the largest growth in their Latino populations were in New England. Hartford's Latino population grew by nearly 12 percent, and the Latino population of Providence, Rhode Island, grew by nearly 23 percent between 1990 and 2010.

Another major transformation of the Latino population in the United States since the 1980s is its increasing diversity. Latinos of Mexican ancestry still represent the largest percentage (64 percent) of the U.S. Latino population. Puerto Ricans make up about 9 percent, and Cubans constitute 3.5 percent of the Latino population. However, demographic data reveal that between 1990 and 2010, immigrants from Central America and the Latin Caribbean reduced the percentage of Puerto Ricans (from 12 percent to 9 percent) and Cubans (from 4.7 percent to 3.5 percent) as a proportion of the U.S. Latino population. As a result of substantial immigration from South America, Central America, and the Latin Caribbean, Dominicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Colombians, and those from unspecified countries now make up approximately 22 percent of the U.S. Latino population.

The mayors discussed in this volume are, in part, products of these demographic changes, but they have presided over cities that span the entire diversity of the U.S. Latino population. Three of the cities studied in this volume have populations where persons of Mexican origin constitute the

majority of their city's Latino population (Denver, Los Angeles, and San Antonio). Puerto Ricans represent the largest share of the Latino population in one city, Hartford (78 percent), and the second-largest share of the Latino population in Providence, Rhode Island (22 percent). Following Latinos of Mexican and Puerto Rican origin is a cluster of Latino subgroups that represent between 3 and 4 percent of the overall Latino population in the United States. Within this cluster are Latinos of Cuban and Dominican origin. Latinos of Cuban origin, who constitute roughly 4 percent of the Latino population in the United States, are concentrated in southern Florida. In Miami-Dade County, one of the localities in this study, Latinos of Cuban origin make up nearly 50 percent of the county's Latino population. Finally, Dominicans, who represent 3 percent of the Latino population in the United States, are the largest Latino population in Providence, Rhode Island (37 percent). Although Dominicans are the smallest of the major subgroups covered in this study, the Dominican population in the United States has increased by 85 percent since 2000, and Dominicans are one of the fastest-growing Latino groups in the United States (Pew Research Center 2013).

Barreto and Segura (2014, p. 23) have cautioned us not to overstate the increased level of diversity and have noted that Mexican Americans "dominate the [national] conversation" concerning Latinos. Nevertheless, it is clear that the U.S. Latino population now includes diverse subgroups. Moreover, the historical experiences of each subgroup vary significantly, and these differences shape political opinions and policy preferences. Many Cubans who came to the United States as refugees when Castro took over (and the generation after them) are motivated by strong anticommunism and are much more Republican and conservative than other Latino groups (Garcia Bedolla 2014, pp. 131–165). Puerto Rico is part of the United States, and therefore, every Puerto Rican born on the island or the mainland is automatically a U.S. citizen. Given their legal status as Americans, it is not surprising that immigration is not an immediate policy concern of Puerto Ricans (García Bedolla 2014, pp. 104–130; Jennings and Rivera 1984). Immigrants from El Salvador arrived in the United States in the 1980s after fleeing a brutal civil war in which the United States aligned itself with that country's repressive leadership. The U.S. government denied many Salvadorans asylum status, and some observers have argued that among Latino immigrants, Salvadorans have had the most negative experience with the U.S. government (Garcia Bedolla 2014, pp. 205–211). Hence it is not surprising that Salvadorans hold the most "restrictive definitions" about what it means to be "American" (Silber Mohamed 2014, 2017, p.96). Salvadorans also constitute the second-largest undocumented population (after Mexicans) in the United States. Unlike Puerto Ricans and Cubans,

Salvadorans living in the United States have an immediate concern about U.S. immigration policy.

As was suggested earlier, Latinos have moved to small midwestern suburban America and into old New England towns. In general, there has been a more widespread and less selective distribution of the Latino population. The Latino population is no longer concentrated in the western and southwestern states. There are growing Latino populations across the country. According to a Pew Research study, "One of the most prominent features of the growth of Hispanics since 1990 has been the dispersal of Hispanics to new destinations. . . . There are now many Hispanics residing in counties that until 1990 had small Hispanic populations" (Fry 2008). In 2000, the Latino population exceeded 10 percent of the total population in ten states. As evidence of their growing national presence, the 2010 U.S. Census revealed that the Latino population exceeded 10 percent of the total population in seventeen states. The Latino population has seen its greatest growth in "new-destination" areas in southern states like Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Virginia (Fraga et. al. 2010). Between 1990 and 2000, for example, the number of Latinos living in Arkansas increased 337 percent; in Georgia, 300 percent; and in North Carolina, 394 percent. Fraga et al. (2010, p. 6) observed that Latino growth rates in the South are "substantial" and "have significant political implications" for the region.

Immigration and the growth of the Latino population are changing the racial and ethnic landscape of cities in New England, a region not known for racial diversity (Torres 2006; Hero 2007). From the mid-1940s through the 1960s, hundreds of thousands of Puerto Ricans came to Massachusetts, Connecticut (Barber 2017) and Rhode Island (Itzigsohn 2009) to work in the declining urban manufacturing industries. Although their overall numbers were small compared with the size of Mexican American populations in the Southwest, Puerto Ricans have long been the dominant Latino group throughout southern New England (Torres 2006). However, today, the Dominican population in the United States, once concentrated in New York City, has swelled New England's Latino population (Itzigsohn 2009). "About one-quarter of Latin American and Caribbean immigrants to New England during the 1990s came from the Dominican Republic. Spanish-speaking South Americans—Colombians, Peruvians, and Ecuadorians—represented 15 percent, while Central Americans—Guatemalans, Hondurans, and Salvadorans—were 9 percent of the region's Latin American and Caribbean immigrants" (A.A. Barreto 2006, p. 295). Dominicans have also taken up residence in Florida and New Jersey. Although the Latino population is expected to continue to grow in the southwestern states, demographic

trends suggest that Latinos will continue to increase their share of the population in states throughout the United States.