

ETHNIC, RACE, AND COALITION POLITICS IN POSTINDUSTRIAL URBAN AMERICA

ADAM COHEN and ELIZABETH TAYLOR, *American Pharaoh: Mayor Richard J. Daley—His Battle for Chicago and Nation*. Boston: Little, Brown, 2000, pp. 614, map, illustrations, notes, bibliography, index, \$26.95 cloth.

DAVID R. COLBURN and JEFFREY S. ADLER, *African-American Mayors: Race, Politics, and the American City*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001, pp. viii, 266, bibliography, notes, index, \$32.50 cloth.

WILLIAM JULIUS WILSON, *The Bridge over the Racial Divide: Rising Inequality and Coalition Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999, pp. 163, figures, tables, notes, bibliography, index, \$19.95 cloth.

During the past two decades, urban historians and sociologists have contributed a growing body of scholarship on housing segregation, urban poverty, and politics in the postindustrial city. These scholars agree that deindustrialization has decimated the American working class, and as a result, central cities are besieged by low-wage employment, underemployment, and crime, all of which disproportionately affect African Americans.¹ Since World War II, urban politics in a number of cities have shifted from an ethnic or white southern-controlled machine or party to a black, Jewish, white liberal, Latino coalition. Consequently, the resulting multiracial coalitions have regularly elected black mayors in major cities who sought to reform city government and improve race relations. When black mayors emerged, major businesses had relocated to the suburbs or to foreign nations, costing their cities thousands of jobs. Black mayors had the difficult task of governing cities with declining economies and high expectations from African Americans. Moreover, the postindustrial economy contributed to growing income and wealth inequality in America. Collectively, these three texts examine four significant themes in postindustrial urban history: race, ethnic, and coalition politics; institutional racism; structural inequality; and poverty.

Adam Cohen and Elizabeth Taylor's *American Pharaoh* is a well-researched documented political biography of Richard J. Daley, the six-term

mayor (1955-1976) and president of the infamous Cook County Democratic Committee of Chicago. Chapter 1, titled "A Separate World," describes Daley's maturation in segregated Chicago. Born in 1902, Daley, a devout Irish-Catholic, lived in the working-class neighborhood of Bridgeport located in Chicago's Bungalow Belt. The Catholic church, family, neighborhood, and politics shaped Daley's values of authority, loyalty, and hard work. The authors argue that Daley's ideology was a "conservatism that prevailed in Bridgeport . . . and white ethnic working class America" (p. 7). The authors portray Daley's Chicago as a microcosm of conservative, northern, white, ethnic urban America. Growing up in a racially separate world solidified his conservative ideas on race, civil rights, and liberalism. Consequently, white ethnics viewed Daley as a mayor, but he also acted as a feudal lord who "protected" his white constituency from the expanding Black Belt menace. In fact, the authors speculate that Daley, who "always remained secretive about the riots" (p. 36), may have participated in the violence that led to the 1919 Chicago race riot. Whether he participated in the riot or not, we may never know, but his commitment to a segregated Chicago was nurtured as a youth, reinforced and rewarded by society.

The three central themes of the text are Daley's authoritative control and operation of the Democratic machine, his modernization and segregation of Chicago, and his law-and-order conservatism during the Chicago Freedom Movement and antiwar demonstrations in Chicago. The period between 1955 and 1966 marked the summit of Daley's political power on a local, state, and national level. Between 1955 and 1966, Daley developed the Loop, constructed segregated housing, delayed civil rights activity, and emerged as one of the most important figures in the Democratic Party. The period between 1967 and 1976 represented the slow decline of the machine's power. The civil rights and Black Power movements, the Vietnam War, police brutality during the Democratic National Convention, President Richard Nixon's antimachine administration, and numerous corruption scandals dissipated Daley's power.

Cohen and Taylor describe Daley's patronage as the fundamental base of Chicago's politics. Throughout his administration, Daley's first and last concern was power, and he commanded an extensive reward and punishment system. Chicago's Democratic machine operated similar to a church or a lodge. The machine required the patronage workers to contribute five percent of their incomes to the machine, sell raffles, and attend mandatory fund-raisers, such as dinners and golf tournaments. According to the authors, at the apogee of Daley's power, the machine possessed forty thousand patronage jobs that translated into approximately 400,000 votes. This patronage benefited the white working class, many of whom received jobs regardless of their qualifications. In addition to patronage jobs were thousands of eight- to ten-month "temporary positions." If a ward failed to deliver the proper number of votes, precinct workers lost their jobs and the patronage positions they controlled. Although Republicans condemned Daley's patronage and nepotism, these

practices mirrored white, elite Protestant politicians. Nevertheless, Daley's ethnic model of patronage politics provided economic benefits to the white ethnic working class, who, like Daley, believed that they had worked hard and had earned their positions without any assistance. There was no consideration of the system of white ethnic privilege that Daley practiced.

According to Cohen and Taylor, Daley's greatest contribution was the development of the Loop (downtown Chicago). Daley passed the 1958 plan that sought to build highways, upper income housing, and parking lots in an effort to prevent businesses and middle-class whites from shopping and fleeing to the suburbs. During Daley's administration, the codified language of race, class, and urban space in postindustrial America was clear. Downtown development, that is, the civic center, O'Hare Airport, the Sears Tower, and urban renewal, connoted a white space that was safe and invited a white, upper income clientele. Chicago's Republican business elite applauded Daley's vision and supported him for the next two decades. Daley's plan received national attention as his administration revitalized downtown Chicago. To pay for Daley's development plan and thousands of patronage workers during each year of his administration, Chicago sales and property taxes increased.

As Daley developed the Loop, the authors assert that simultaneously he created the "State Street corridor," the largest concentration of black public housing in America. Before Daley was elected mayor in 1955, the former liberal Chicago housing director Elizabeth Wood tried to conservatively integrate housing, by using the "Neighborhood Composition Rule" (p. 71). The policy stated that Chicago public housing must be eighty percent white and twenty percent black. As the number of black public housing applicants increased and started to move into white neighborhoods, whites openly resisted. When Daley took over, open housing was a closed issue. Daley's development policies intentionally prevented the expanding Black Belt from spilling over into white ethnic neighborhoods. Cohen and Taylor note that the fourteen-lane Dan Ryan Expressway is a vivid reminder of race and place in Chicago. The expressway created a barrier that divided black and white neighborhoods.

Chapters 9 through 11 are devoted to Daley's response to the Chicago Freedom Movement. Daley was anti-open housing, and his position stiffened after the 1963 mayoral election. In the 1963 election, Daley's margin of victory declined because Daley's Polish opponent, Benjamin Adamowski, received a large number of Polish votes, and Daley's loyal Italian first ward voters voted for Adamowski because Daley placed the Chicago campus of the University of Illinois in their ward. Another cause for Daley's declining number of supporters was Daley's proposal to increase taxes in 1962 to pay for urban renewal. Chicago voters rejected the bond issue because they interpreted urban renewal as assisting poor blacks and higher taxes. The authors maintain that Daley interpreted the 1963 election as northern white conservative ethnic backlash. Others, such as sociologist Steven Steinberg, have suggested that 1963 signaled a "liberal retreat" from race.² After the election, Daley catered even more

to white ethnic voters. In addition, with civil rights issues such as open housing and desegregating public schools, Daley was ensured that the “silent six” black aldermen would oppose any civil rights initiative (p. 305). Black alderman realized that if they supported civil rights, they would lose patronage jobs in their wards.

In 1966, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Council conducted numerous marches in Chicago to protest racism in the Chicago Real Estate Board. Eventually, King and the movement leaders convened a meeting with Daley, the Chicago Real Estate Board, and other city officials. Throughout the entire campaign, Daley remained one step ahead of King by addressing complaints, such as cleaning up dead rats in public housing. Daley’s press statements about desegregating public housing had to assure white ethnics that their communities would not be integrated while simultaneously providing black leaders and voters a degree of hope that Daley would integrate public housing. As the authors note, Al Raby, the local Chicago movement leader, was not as optimistic as King and realized that Daley’s remarks about open housing were just empty rhetoric without any concrete policies. At the end of the summit, King agreed to stop marching and Daley agreed to establish a committee to explore open housing. The results of the summit favored Daley and white Chicago. In fact, after the 1967 election, Daley regained the white voters he had lost in the previous election.

Although Daley’s popularity grew in Chicago, by 1967, national political events such as the Black Power movement and the Vietnam War challenged Daley’s political conservatism. Cohen and Taylor contend that Daley believed in the political process. If an individual had a problem, the best way to solve it was with the ballot and not by protesting and rioting. After King was assassinated in 1968, a riot ensued in Chicago, during which Daley allegedly ordered the police “to shoot to kill any arsonist” (p. 455). Daley criticized the press for misquoting him, but the damage was done. Daley’s controversial statement gave him a reputation as a law-and-order antidemocratic mayor. During the 1968 Democratic National Convention, Chicago police officers brutalized demonstrators and even some media officials. National television captured this catastrophe and provided anti-Daley and anti-political machine bashers ammunition to expose Chicago’s political corruption.

Cohen and Taylor cite a number of political events during the last four years of Daley’s administration. For example, a number of machine loyalists such as former Illinois Governor Otto Kerner were arrested for bribery. Second, Jesse Jackson challenged Chicago’s exclusive Democratic machine delegate selections, and third, Republican President Richard Nixon’s administration sought to end bossism in urban politics. Even black Congressman Ralph Metcalf split with Daley in 1971. In spite of the dissension, Daley was reelected to a sixth term in 1976, and more important, he was never indicted on any charges. The authors declare that the political scandals never tarnished Daley’s honest image.

American Pharaoh aptly demonstrates the power of Daley's machine, and it contributes to the growing literature on civil rights and black protest in northern cities.³ The journalistic-style prose allows readers to become part of the backroom dealings of Chicago politics. The text provides an insightful analysis of the controversial 1960 presidential election. The authors conclude that Daley improved the Loop, preserved white neighborhoods, and provided a generation of supporters with patronage jobs. Cohen and Taylor maintain that Daley was "backward looking, power hungry and bigoted" (p. 558). The book, however, fails to analyze class tensions in the white ethnic community. Cohen and Taylor's monolithic definition of the "white ethnic" ignores the diversity in ideology within the white ethnic community, as well as the more liberal second-generation middle-class ethnics who embraced open housing and an end to bossism. In addition, the authors devote no attention to the agency of the black community because they narrowly focus on the actions of black leaders and politicians.

African-American Mayors is a collection of nine essays that explicate the rise of black mayors in large cities from 1967 to 1996. Jeffrey Adler's introduction and David R. Colburn's chapter "Running for Office: African American Mayors from 1967 to 1996" investigate the social and political/economic forces that created black mayors. According to Adler, black migration, white flight, deindustrialization, and New Federalism shaped the political/economic landscape for black mayors. As a consequence, black mayors had to fight poverty with less federal money and had to create jobs when companies vacated the city. Moreover, some black mayors confronted an intransigent or, at times, a racist city council and a nonsupportive party. Black mayors increased the number of black city employees, but the severe urban economic crisis made it difficult for black mayors to provide a large number of patronage jobs that their white ethnic mayors provided during the fifties and early sixties. Colburn's chapter compares and contrasts sixty-seven black mayors in cities with more than fifty thousand people and explores the impact of race in their campaign strategies. All sixty-seven mayors graduated from college, except Coleman Young of Detroit, and many had obtained an advanced degree. Colburn refutes the myth that most black mayors were "civil rights-activist-turned politician" (p. 28). Black mayors' paths to power varied, but not one jumped from protest marches into politics. To get elected, black mayors stressed coalitions, and during their campaigns they used nonracial rhetoric such as better housing, education, and improving the economy. Colburn concludes that black mayors failed to eradicate poverty, but they improved urban politics by providing opportunities not only for blacks but for all citizens.

Essays by James B. Lane and Leonard N. Moore chronicle the administrations of the nation's first two black mayors, Richard Hatcher of Gary, Indiana, and Carl Stokes of Cleveland, Ohio. A black and liberal white business coalition elected both mayors. Their platforms included redeveloping downtown businesses, eradicating poverty, fighting crime, and increasing employment.

During the Hatcher and Stokes administrations, however, the federal government decreased spending for poverty programs, and more important, deindustrialization devastated the economies of both cities. In addition to the massive loss of jobs, Moore discusses some class issues in the black community. In Cleveland, the black middle-class residents opposed Stokes's building low-income housing in their neighborhoods. Stokes viewed these middle-class voters as roadblocks to political reform. Lane and Moore contend that Hatcher and Stokes increased the number of black municipal employees and improved the lives of a number of citizens. Both authors state that the Hatcher and Stokes administrations exhibited the "limits of black power" (p. 102). According to Moore, Stokes believed that city hall and federal money could eliminate structural inequality. Lane argues that Hatcher relied on federal spending to alleviate poverty but he only "treated the symptoms of Gary's ills without curing the disease" (p. 73). Black political power was not enough to address decades of structural inequality that plagued urban areas.

Roger Biles's and Heather R. Parker's essays analyze the "politics of race" in New York and Los Angeles, specifically exploring race relations and racial political rhetoric during the Tom Bradley and David Dinkins administrations. Both metropolises contain substantial African American populations, only between eighteen and twenty-five percent of each city's total. Parker argues that Tom Bradley was a political pragmatist who genuinely believed in meritocracy and color-blind politics. A black, Latino, liberal white, Jewish coalition elected Bradley mayor, and during his entire twenty-year career, he intentionally avoided using race and spoke in "color-blind rhetoric" (p. 156). Bradley believed that his political rewards in the black community demonstrated his commitment to black voters. According to Parker, during Bradley's administration, African Americans received a large number of government positions and contracts. But for some middle-class blacks and a majority of working-class blacks, this proved insufficient. The black middle class who benefited from Bradley's policies may not have agreed with Bradley, but they viewed him as a better choice than a white candidate. On the other hand, working-class blacks criticized Bradley's nonracial approach and wanted substance and not just race symbolism. Parker concludes that Bradley's critics failed to realize that "Bradley's leadership reflected his political values" (p. 172).

According to Roger Biles, David Dinkins was elected mayor during a national economic downturn when New York was experiencing fiscal problems. To balance the budget, Dinkins cut city spending and laid off some workers, but he gave a wage increase to teachers and city workers, who possessed strong unions and supported Dinkins. In addition to the economic recession, a number of nationally known racial and police brutality incidents occurred. When Yusuff Hawkins, a black teen, was murdered in a white section of Brooklyn, Dinkins had promised voters that he could improve race relations in New York City. But a recession and rising crime rates provided proof for Dinkins's political adversaries such as prosecutor Rudolph Giuliani to

interpret the mayor as soft on crime, and the black community interpreted Dinkins as soft on the police.

Arnold Hirsch's essay compares and contrasts the black mayors Ernest Dutch Morial of New Orleans and Harold Washington of Chicago. Hirsch contends that a unique black local political culture shaped both Morial's and Washington's campaigns and administrations. Hirsch notes that Morial was active in the New Orleans NAACP and a member of the "radical black Creole community" (p. 109) of New Orleans.⁴ On the other hand, the black wards of Chicago's Democratic machine groomed Washington. Both men had support from the black middle class, and Hirsch asserts that a strong black base and an overconfident and divided white community allowed both men to win their campaigns. The author notes that one major difference between the two individuals was patronage. In New Orleans, black political patronage was novel, was encouraged, and represented black political nationalism. In Chicago, patronage was part of the political process, but Washington campaigned as a reform mayor; therefore, some black patronage workers worried about losing their rewards.

Ronald Bayor's essay on black mayors in Atlanta reveals the similar problems that other black mayors faced in their respective cities, such as loss of jobs, poor housing, and white political resistance. For example, when Maynard Jackson was elected mayor in 1973, initially he confronted the Atlanta white power structure. By 1977, Jackson realized that he had to reach out to the white business elite to obtain funds to develop and attract businesses to downtown Atlanta. Jackson's relationship with Atlanta's business elite reveals the political pragmatic reality that all mayors encounter. Mayors Maynard Jackson, Andrew Young, and Bill Campbell increased the number of black city employees and contracts but failed to adequately improve housing and employment opportunities for poor African Americans. All three mayors supported the trickle-down theory of economics, whereas downtown development created jobs and capital for all its citizens. Bayor is correct when he states that racism has declined in Atlanta, but "class divisions in the black community became more prominent" (p. 196) after black mayors gained control of city hall.⁵

African-American Mayors provides an accurate interpretation of the role of black mayors in the postindustrial city. All the essays demonstrate that black mayors created democratic governments. Some whites erroneously believed that when black mayors took over they would "racialize" urban politics and marginalize white voters. Black mayors endorsed meritocracy and equal opportunity. However, many working-class blacks interpreted the relationships black mayors fostered with the white business elite as catering to the interests of whites. All the essays reveal that black mayors emerged during a period of massive economic change where the service industry replaced the manufacturing sector in the city. Most Americans failed to understand this

significant shift. As a consequence, some whites erroneously blamed the mayor's race while some blacks attributed the mayor's class for the urban crisis.

All of the authors note that black mayors used affirmative action to increase the number of black employees while acknowledging that affirmative action failed to repair structural inequality. Obviously, affirmative action has had a major impact in white-collar professions and in the civil service. However, in spite of the increase of black professionals, black unemployment remains twice the rate of whites. According to law professors Lani Guinier and Gerald Torres, affirmative action is an "individual-access model" that "tend[s] to reinforce rather than upset the underlying structures of power."⁶ At the same time, the essays inadequately assess the impact of class in the black community.⁷ Some scholars may feel uncomfortable analyzing or discussing the color caste system in some urban southern cities such as New Orleans and Atlanta. Urban historians must continue to explore the class dimensions to uncover the impact of racism and classism on urban black politics.

The Bridge over the Racial Divide is a short and insightful work that examines the biggest problem in postindustrial America: income inequality. In chapter 1, Wilson defines two types of racism—biological and cultural. He contends that most Americans do not subscribe to biological racism, in which one race is biologically superior to another, but he believes that a number of white Americans endorse the "cultural deficits" of race theory (p. 17). This theory posits that lower income black and minority students are culturally disadvantaged and are unable to overcome their cultural deficits. Wilson argues that the cultural deficit theory is institutionalized in American educational institutions but suggests that in spite of racism, blacks and whites can form grassroots, progressive multiracial organizations. According to Wilson, the growth of economic inequality will force more Americans to understand the economic impact of globalization.

During the past twenty-five years, real wages have declined and poverty has escalated in the city. Two decades ago, blue-collar laborers composed the bulk of the American middle class. According to Wilson, when large corporations relocated to developing nations that contained a cheaper labor force, it left some blue-collar workers unemployed or on the fringes of the American middle class. The new service economy demanded low and unskilled labor, and as a result, businesses replaced American laborers with immigrants who, in most cases, did not demand equal wages. Wilson contends that these shifts are "neutral economic forces" (p. 45) and not racial; therefore, American workers need nonracial and multiracial solutions. These neutral economic forces affect all Americans, but as Wilson asserts, they disproportionately affect African Americans. Consequently, working-class blacks compete with cheaper immigrant labor. Wilson states that black economic issues are part of larger structural American economic problems.

Wilson maintains that most Americans share similar beliefs about employment, education, health care, and taxes. In order for a multiracial organization to function, all individuals must focus on issues that benefit the entire group. Moreover, the multiracial organization should not be a third political party but a nonpartisan group that pressures both parties to focus on bread-and-butter issues, such as health care, the economy, and education. Citing psychological and experimental studies, Wilson notes that “cooperative situations enhance *social perspective taking*” (p. 81). In other words, a multiracial organization may provide a forum to discuss race and other differences. Wilson maintains that the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) founded by Saul Alinsky in Chicago during the fifties was one of the nation’s most successful multiracial coalitions. The IAF was composed of local grassroots and religious organizations and has chapters across the country. The most successful IAF chapter is in San Antonio, called Communities Organized for Public Services (COPS). COPS has received millions of dollars to repair streets and to build libraries and parks in poor neighborhoods. According to Wilson, COPS employs “a race-neutral strategy” (p. 87). For example, COPS has a large number of Spanish-speaking members, but it will not discuss potentially divisive race issues, such as bilingual education or affirmative action.⁸

Chapter 4 examines the political impact of affirmative action. Wilson and other scholars argue that affirmative action should emphasize class and not race.⁹ Wilson contends that affirmative action disproportionately benefits “advantaged minorities” (p. 95) and fails to improve the lives of poor blacks and whites. Wilson suggests that college admissions should create a “*flexible, merit-based* criteria of evaluation” (p. 102) that emphasizes all aspects of the application and not just the SAT scores. According to Wilson, affirmative action should be renamed “*affirmative opportunity*” (p. 111) because that term connotes opportunity and meritocracy—two values that all Americans cherish. Wilson argues that an individual could belong to the IAF and remain part of a race-based organization, but to attract African Americans, the multiracial coalition leaders must not abandon affirmative action and must assure blacks that they support affirmative opportunity.

Wilson’s analysis on structural inequality and poverty is timely. In clear and concise prose, he outlines to a lay and scholarly audience that American inequality will only escalate. Globalization is nonracial as it strives to find cheap labor. There are a few flaws, however, with Wilson’s analysis of racism. Wilson suggests that to construct a coalition, the focus should be about individuals and not about institutional racism. Pragmatically, Wilson is correct; one organization cannot eradicate institutional racism. However, racism exists and is institutionalized in schools, in some churches, in media, and in popular culture. Members of coalition groups should try to discuss to members in their social institutions about race and inequality to advocate change. More Americans may participate in a multiracial coalition if their perspectives on race and class are challenged in the comfortable settings of their communities.

Another blemish is Wilson's conceptualization of the affirmative action debate. Conservative critics and some media portray affirmative action as a "black only" policy, but statistics indicate that white women have benefited the most from affirmative action. Throughout the entire chapter, Wilson depicts affirmative action as a black beneficiary-only policy. This analysis heightens the animosity that most white and even some black Americans have about the policy. Wilson's recommendation for a flexible merit-based criterion for college admission is admirable, at best, but remains overly optimistic on the good faith of college admission officials, who Wilson states may believe in the cultural deficits theory. Guinier and Torres note that admissions to the University of Texas Law School have been based on income and not race, as most whites incorrectly assume.¹⁰ Guinier and Torres's analysis describes the University of Texas Law School affirmative action debate as a class rather than a racial matter. The IAF is a commendable program, and Wilson should have provided readers with interviews or profiles of IAF members. This information would have informed the reader of how individual members embraced the ideology of a multiracial coalition.

According to a recent *New York Times* article, economist William Frey stated that America has a "barbell economy of extreme have and have nots."¹¹ However, the barbell has not struck enough Americans over the head to realize that the urban crisis of unemployment and poverty is on the rise and blaming African Americans has been a convenient smokescreen for the causes of American poverty and crime. Urban historians and other social scientists must continue to stress the structural impact of globalization and alert all Americans that the postindustrial urban crisis may be improved with a progressive form of coalition urban politics.

—David A. Canton
Connecticut College

NOTES

1. Arnold Hirsch, *The Making of the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago 1940-1960* (Cambridge, 1982); Paul Kleppner, *Chicago Divided: The Making of a Black Mayor* (DeKalb, 1985); Douglass Massey and Cathy Denton, *American Apartheid and the Making of the Underclass* (New York, 1993); Kenneth L. Kusmer, "African Americans in the City since World War II," in Kenneth W. Goings and Raymond A. Mohl, eds., *The New African American History* (New York, 1995); Thomas Sugrue, *Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton, 1996); and William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York, 1996).

2. Steven Steinberg, *Turning Back: The Retreat from Racial Justice in American Thought and Policy* (Boston, 1995), 107-8.

3. James R. Ralph Jr., *Northern Protest: Martin Luther King Jr., Chicago, and the Civil Rights Movement* (Cambridge, 1993); and Christopher Reed, *The Chicago NAACP and the Rise of the Black Professional Leadership, 1910-1966* (Bloomington, 1997).

4. For a history of the Civil Rights movement in Louisiana, see Adam Fairclough, *Race and Democracy: The Civil Rights Struggle in Louisiana, 1915-1972* (Athens, 1995).

5. Ronald H. Bayor, *Race and the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Atlanta* (Chapel Hill, 1996).
6. Lani Guinier and Gerald Torres, *The Miner's Canary: Enlisting Race, Resisting Power, Transforming Democracy* (Cambridge, 2002), 116.
7. These works examine the social and political networks of the black elite: Williard B. Gatewood, *Aristocrats of Color: The Black Elite, 1880-1920* (Bloomington, 1990); and Lawrence Graham, *Our Kind of People: Inside America's Black Upper Class* (New York, 1999). For a fictional account of the black upper class, see Yale law professor Stephen Carter's bestseller, *The Emperor of Ocean Park* (New York, 2002).
8. This article examines grassroots mobilization in San Antonio during the Great Society and briefly mentions the origins of Communities Organized for Public Services: William Clayson, "The Barrios and the Ghettos Have Organized! Community Action, Political Acrimony and the War on Poverty in San Antonio," *Journal of Urban History* 28 (2002): 158-84.
9. Carol M. Swain, *The New White Nationalism in America: Its Challenges to Integration* (Cambridge, 2002). She contends that affirmative action should be class based.
10. Guinier and Torres, *The Miner's Canary*, 67-71.
11. *New York Times*, June 5, 2002.

David A. Canton received his doctorate in history from Temple University in 2001. He is currently the Jacob and Hilda Blaustein Assistant Professor of History at Connecticut College, and he teaches courses in twentieth-century urban history and African American history. His research interest is the civil rights struggle in northern cities from 1920 to 1965.