

### News

- Office Hours are now from 2:00 to 6:00 PM. Tell Students to make a note of it.
  - Explain the attendance policy if you feel that you are not getting proper attendance levels.
- 

### Quiz #1

Answer the following five (5) questions (worth 1 point apiece):

- Name one (1) specific thing Robert Moses was responsible for building.
  - Name one (1) of the 10 things Wyly, Glickman, and Lahr say that we need to know about American cities.
  - What form of speech was recently deemed unconstitutional?
  - What was the one-sentence definition we came up with for Urban Politics?
  - Name one of the five characteristics of urban areas.
- 

### Today's Blueprint

- **Overlap from last class discussion:** In the last class, we came up with a working definition of Urban Politics (UP). This session, we will add to that definition.
    - Judd and Swanstrom inform us that, in addition to the “urban” and the “Political” components to the topic, *UP involves the complex interactions between individuals, institutions, and resources in both the public and private spheres.*
      - Public = City government (i.e. the power)
      - Private = The public sector (i.e. voters, laborers, etc.)
    - Judd and Kantor let us know that *American cities are stand-alone economic and political units.*
      - No two cities are exactly alike: Urban areas tend to develop their own unique laws and political styles. The same goes for suburbs. In fact, the latest tally (1992) suggests that there are over 86,692 independent municipal governments in the U.S.A.
  - **The Evolution of American Cities:**
    - Criminally brief historical overview of the political development of American Cities.
      - The Colonial Town
      - The Early Republic
      - Party Machines
      - The Reform Movement
- 

### Historic Overview

The political development of American cities can best be thought of in terms of periods of development, evolution, and change.

#### 1. The Colonial Town (1610 - 1770s):

- The first Europeans hit America around 1610.

- They moved west from VA, MA.
- The first settlements were mercantile/commercial towns.
- Most of the colonists were either merchant class (known as merchant elites) or aristocrats who were descendents of colonial families.

The English colonized the Americas at an impressive rate:

- By 1700, there were about 250,000 Europeans settlers
- By 1775, there were about 2.25 million
- FYI: In 1774, Philadelphia was the world’s 2nd largest English city...

The thing to remember about the colonial period is that, at this time, America was a nation of towns. On the one hand, these were far from urban. On the other hand, while the agrarian systems dominated the world at the time, American towns were not quite agrarian either.

- Economic patterns consisted of local charters granted by England as business enterprise
- As a result, leadership was in hands of those who chartered business

In short, colonial town politics were a kind of self-rule, corporate style of governance.

- Since colonists were distant from Crown (separated from Britain’s rule), towns assumed much autonomy.
- This also gave towns the leeway to engage in “development projects.” For example, city officials initiated needed “fix me up” or city development assignments and make citizens “pay” for these projects with the sweat of their backs. In other words, citizens’ labor was considered the “tax” they had paid to the towns for the town’s projects.
- Leaders and merchants formed alliances (coalitions) for the sake of civic boosterism, “boosting” the image of the town to promote economic growth for their personal gain.

The later colonial era:

- Characterized by a definite shift toward a yeoman society: movement to farms.
- FYI: A yeoman is a freeman, who owns land.

## 2. The Early Republic (1789 – 1860)

In the Early Republic period, we get to the idea that American cities are, first and foremost, economic units. The economic focus of American cities makes them different from the typical (Euro/Western Empire) conceptualization of what cities should be:

Other Cities:	American Cities:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resembled the autonomous city-states of ancient Greece. (See quote on p. 2 of Judd and swanstrom).</li> <li>• Were commerce and trading centers.</li> <li>• Territorially Sovereign (don’t answer to nobody)</li> <li>• Have political and military authority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were not as self-sufficient as the city-states of yore.</li> <li>• Were also commerce and trading centers.</li> <li>• Not territorially sovereign</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centers of religion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City governments fragment America, so it is obvious that each American city wields its own political authority within its territory. However, these cities do not have military authority.</li> <li>• Non-religious: the fact that the Pledge of Allegiance has been censored is testament to the importance of keeping church and state separate.</li> </ul>

...One should note that, from 1790 to 1860, the U.S. goes from about 5% urban to about 20% urban. One should also note that entrepreneurial cities originated in the Early Republic period as well. Such cities shared the following traits:

- *They were cities of economic specialization.* For example, Chicago specialized in stockyards and New York specialized in finance. Kansas City specialized in slaughterhouses, and Pittsburgh specialized in steel.
- *Entrepreneurs used cities as “land development corporations.”* A good example of this was the effort to bring “civilization” to the “West.” The west was settled via towns/cities. In fact, the Westward expansion was just as the consequence of a “National Urban Policy” as much as it was due to manifest destiny. In other words, the western expansion of towns was done by municipal entrepreneurs and by prairie “pioneers.”

Just another FYI: The first wagons made to California in 1840.

The Early Republic was the age of **Jefferson** and the anti-urbanists. The Jeffersonian critique of the city in America is an ongoing theme in UP:

- Jefferson (1785) saw economic cities as flawed and corrupt
- The mobs of cities are to pure democracy what sores are to the strength of the human body.
- For Jefferson, crowds, the pursuit of commerce, etc. are the recipes for tyranny/ mob rule. Virtuous living occurs where people not depend on mass sentiment.

(Probably against Jefferson’s wishes) The Early Republic is also the age of **Jackson** and the expansion of the franchise:

- From 1828 to 1832, the American electorate (nearly) doubles in size
- There is also substantial growth in industry, commerce, party machines
- New organizations evolved in cities to contest elections (i.e. the Volunteer Fire Departments provided the framework for new genre of urban political organizations. These organizations were:
  - Mass-based
  - Egalitarian (open to men of limited means)
  - Offered fellowship and social recognition
  - Built by working class efforts
  - Hierarchical in leadership

Finally, in addition to the coming of age of these mass-based political parties and organizations the Early Republic period was characterized by:

- Immigration and early industrialization
- A rise of class conflict, social/racial/ethnic diversity in cities

*A tangent is in order. This is where Urban Politics meets Political Psychology:*

The US population is a mosaic. As JFK once said: “we are a nation of immigrants.” Even the Native Americans emigrated across a land bridge from Asia. There are more people of Irish ancestry and Jewish decent here than in Ireland and Israel. There are more Blacks in the U.S. than in some African nations and there are more Italians in NY than there are in Venice. Therefore, the population is heterogeneous as a nation, but there are homogenous communities. No one particular group can claim the American experience because it has been collective. But is our diversity a strength or a downfall?

- **Ethnicity:** an *ethnic group* is a group that is socially distinguished or set apart by others or by itself primarily through national origin, religion, or culture (for example, the Italians, the Catholics, and the Jews).
- **Race:** Similarly, *Racial groups*: are a way of designating human categories and explaining human behavior. These labels have varied over time, ranging from ancestral (the race of Abraham) to biological, (Negroid vs. Caucasoid) to sociological (relating to social status) to legal (similar to ethnocentrism) classifications of people.
- The racial/ethnic factor has led to political conflict worldwide: the English vs. the Irish, the Serbs vs. the Croats, etc.
- Ethnic conflicts have revolutionary potential, organizing politics by forming racial and ethnic groups:

- A primary group (or foundation group) is the group that you are socialized within and defines who you are. It provides boundaries of cohesion and conflict/divisiveness.
- Group attitudes can lead to group conflict because, by forming a group, you automatically designate those who are not members of your group “outsiders.” These factors unite some while excluding others, and it is a political unpleasant fact. James Madison (Federalist #10) warned about this political cliquishness (or factions, as he called them).

...Okay, tangent over. By 1870, half of US urban population was foreign born, and by the year 1900, 40% of US population was urban. The increased immigration and diversity provide an excellent segue into the next section...

### 3. Party Machines: 1865 - early 1900s

After the 1830s, in the spirit of Jacksonian Democracy, politics becomes a contest of the common man (of mass mobilization)

- Elections became more frequent
- More local offices were now elected (as opposed to being appointed)
- Jackson granted universal White suffrage (Blacks and Women will not get the right to vote until later).
- Elections were NOT simply won with money, as was once the case

Increasing immigration patterns, racial and ethnic diversity/conflict, rapid industrialization, and Jacksonian Democracy combined to contribute to the emergence of machine politics:

- City party organizations as a business venture with mass-based support.
- Good at mobilizing racial and ethnic voters.
- Politicians tend to act in the interest of themselves and those of her racial/ethnic group.
- Specialize in “tit-for-tat” style of political leadership—officials buy public loyalty and favors with jobs, cash, contracts, special services, construction projects, etc.
  - Machine maintains itself by providing stuff to supporters at all levels (block, precinct, ward, district, city).
    - People would work/vote for party in exchange for:
      - Help finding housing, turkey of Thanksgiving,
      - Assistance with police, a menial job, etc.
- Neighborhood/precinct leaders:
  - Delivers blocks of votes to party
  - Leader returns favors to neighborhood
- Public-level politics:
  - In 19th Century, there are no Federal programs: no food, housing, language, and unemployment aid.
  - Party machines fill void of charity and government, and they respond to immigrant needs
- Earliest machines include Tammany Hall in NY (Irish machine).
- Characterized by “patronage politics” if you go along, you get along.
- At higher levels of machine, functionaries (hacks) benefit from rewards provided by machines.
- *How Machines work (machine/corporate relationships):*
- To fund low-level rewards, and mid-high level rewards, organization must profit from politics
- Machine leaders grant contracts in exchange for kick-backs
- Accordingly, businesses award construction contracts to leaders on the machine
- Leaders, in turn, provide selective policing in exchange for such payments
- In fact, it is common for leaders on the machine to solicit/accept bribes in exchange for monopolies
- Employ as many loyalists as possible (high taxes), sometimes, even giving them job titles and salaries w/o duties.

...While machines clearly benefited some, not everyone was pleased with them (especially people outside the “circle” of the machine group). The biggest hecklers of machine politics were the reformers.

#### **4. The Reform Movement** (late 1900):

Critiqued political machines:

- It is an inefficient way to run a city
- Many citizens outside of machine are paying to feed it (i.e. property owners and legitimate business owners)
- They were exclusionary
- Machines promoted corrupt electoral practices

The reformers wanted to replace political machines with a more professional city government, but in the end, businesses and rich people (the main proponents of reform) really only wanted to get ethnic officials out of office so that they could advance their own interests.

---