Acknowledgments

Some important journeys begin by chance.

This book project was nurtured by the Building Resilient Regions (BRR) network sponsored by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and led by our friend and colleague Margaret Weir of UC Berkeley. The seed was planted as the BRR data working group, led by Manuel Pastor, assembled a database that we could use to select case study comparisons for the project as a whole. It was impossible not to see the disparate economic trajectories of American regions or the profound demographic impact that immigration was having on them. Armed with this data, the BRR members decided to explore four key metropolitan challenges: persistent economic decline; rapid growth, often on the suburban fringe; the shifting geography of poverty; and responses to fast-growing immigrant populations.

The two editors have long been steeped in the literature on the new regionalism, metropolitan equity, and race relations. All the topics on the BRR agenda appealed to us: figuring out how to rekindle growth, address sprawl, or tackle economic distress in inner-ring suburbs. But the challenge of immigrant integration holds a special meaning for us. We have written frequently on this topic, developed research centers charged with exploring it, and actively engage with immigrant-supporting activities. Little did we know that this dynamic topic would become even more volatile as we studied it: over the course of this project, immigration politics whipsawed from the restrictionist wave in Arizona and the South to the welcoming attitudes in California and the Midwest, from the brink of reform in 2013 to its utter collapse and dissolution into executive actions in 2014. Our team was certainly trying to focus on a moving target.

It became increasingly clear to us, however, that the significant variation in metropolitan receptivity to immigrants revealed not only what helped or hindered immigrants from finding their place, but was a primary dimension of regional collaboration. If regional actors are at each other's throats about their new neighbors, they are also not likely to find consensus on how best to achieve economic growth or reduce poverty. Struggling with strangers, in short, works against regional resilience.

We must thank a lot of people for helping us reach that insight. Most important are our coauthors, all of whom agreed to develop a (more or less) common theoretical framework, case study protocol, and approach to writing. Els de

Graauw, Juan De Lara, Jaime Dominguez, Diana R. Gordon, Michael Jones-Correa, Paul G. Lewis, Doris Marie Provine, Rachel Rosner, and Jennifer Tran proved to be thoughtful and dedicated collaborators—and they also join us in thanking the informants in the metropolitan regions they visited for sharing their insights.

We also need to thank our research staff members for their exemplary help. On the quantitative side, Justin Scoggins and Jennifer Tran of the USC Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration (CSII) helped assemble and then perfect the BRR database used in this volume, while Mirabai Auer, Alejandro Sanchez-Lopez, and Vanessa Carter, all of CSII, used and supplemented that data to create the tables, charts, and maps in this volume. Steven Romalewski and Joseph Pereira of the CUNY Graduate Center's Center for Urban Research also assisted in the initial development of the database and other quantitative exercises along the way.

On the qualitative side, CUNY's Marta Pichardo Medina provided early assistance for the New York case study, while Robert Chlala and Stephanie Canizales of CSII helped update several of the case studies and edit the manuscript. Heddy Nam and Vanessa Carter did manuscript copyediting and assembly, with Vanessa playing her usual amazing role as chief writing supervisor for both the first and second drafts of the full manuscript. Completion would not have been possible without the organizing talents of CSII program manager Rhonda Ortiz, who reminded us that task lists and deadlines were our friends. And, finally, thank you to the rest of the staff and student researchers of USC CSII, whose flexibility and teamwork made it possible to move this book through to publication.

We benefited greatly from our years of discussions with members of the BRR network. They helped us test early ideas and shared their wisdom. Our program officers at MacArthur, Erika Poethig (now at the Urban Institute), and then vice president for U.S. programs (and now president) Julia Stasch provided guidance and direction as well as financial support. Margaret Weir, the brilliant leader of the BRR network, provided intellectual advice and held us to account—and we needed both as we tried to steer our research team. All the other members of that network informed our thinking, with special nods of appreciation to Bill Barnes, Katherine Foster, Bill Lester, Amy Liu, Sarah Reckow, and Todd Swanstrom.

Many colleagues outside the BRR network gave us valuable feedback; they included Shannon Gleeson, Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, Dowell Myers, Mai Nguyen, Karthick Ramakrishnan, Audrey Singer, Roberto Suro, Jody Agius Vallejo, Monica Varsanyi, and William Vega, as well as two anonymous reviewers for this press. Thank you to the James Irvine Foundation for providing supplemental funding to support a meeting in December 2013 to solicit important feedback on the manuscript. Special thanks are due to Joshua Hoyt, executive director of the National Partnership for New Americans, who gave an extensive

critique of the manuscript at that meeting in December 2013, reassuring us that we were on the right track *and* reminding us of how central the agency of immigrants themselves has been in shaping their contexts of reception. We knew this, having worked with so many advocates for immigrant integration in our respective metropolitan areas. But in an analytic world that often focuses on institutions, organizations, and acronyms, he reminded us that that this arena is also full of activists, indeed movement leaders, who include not only immigrant advocates but business, labor, religious, and civic figures who refuse to let fear and separation divide their regions. This volume seeks to understand what factors and strategies lead some regional climates to welcome immigrants and others to resist them—but we have enough of what BRR researcher Sarah Reckow once called "normative gumption" to hope that this work is not just good social science, but an admonition for all of us to work toward a more receptive approach.

After all, some important journeys also begin without clear final destinations. Those who have come to America have made a choice, but they have also been driven by weak economies, civil wars, and political persecution, all of which were the luck of the draw in place of birth. The progress one makes on the journey reflects not just the determination of the travelers but also help from those who extended their hands along the way. We thank all those that helped us on this trek of research and writing and hope that the result contributes to a more welcoming America.

<div style="text-align: right;">

John Mollenkopf, New York
Manuel Pastor, Los Angeles

</div>

UNSETTLED AMERICANS

THE ETHNIC MOSAIC

Immigrant Integration at the Metropolitan Scale

John Mollenkopf and Manuel Pastor

In April 2010, the Arizona legislature passed a law (SB 1070) requiring local law enforcement and public agency officials to determine the immigration status of an individual when they had "reasonable suspicion" that the individual might be an undocumented immigrant. A maelstrom of national debate ensued, with advocates of the legislation arguing that the state was right to protect itself against a surge of "illegals," while opponents suggested that Arizona would soon fall into racial profiling and scare away hardworking legal immigrant residents.

What happened in Phoenix didn't stay in Phoenix: state and local political leaders in Alabama, Georgia, and elsewhere worked to pass legislation aimed at what some called "enforcement through attrition"—the notion that local authorities should enforce their own interpretation of immigration law in such a way as to make life so difficult for undocumented residents that they would leave the country on their own. These actions both reflect and drive public opinion, which, especially within the Republican voting base (Pew Research Center 2014), disapproves of granting benefits to illegal immigrants. As tempers heated between those supporting more restrictive policies and those supporting less restrictive policies, the only thing on which both sides seemed to agree was that local authorities were taking a long-established federal responsibility into their own hands (Gulasekaram and Ramakrishnan 2012).

The local action in recent years has not been confined to those who are hostile to immigrants, legal or not. The country's largest protest against SB 1070 took place on May 1, 2010, in Los Angeles—and the city's mayor and its Catholic archbishop welcomed the protesters at the end of their march. In New Haven,

Connecticut, far from chasing away the undocumented, city authorities developed a new approach by granting municipal ID cards to undocumented residents and other city residents. San Francisco has adopted a series of measures to raise pay and increase benefits for immigrant workers, as well as adopting a municipal ID card. New York City has just followed suit.

Meanwhile, immigrant advocates in the state of Illinois have persuaded state and city leaders to promote "immigrant integration," including the development of new immigrant services and a campaign to encourage naturalization. And in late 2010, Utah, one of the nation's most conservative states, adopted the so-called Utah Compact, an agreement between business, civic, religious, and immigrant leaders to conduct a civil conversation about immigration, devise local strategies to further immigrant economic and social advancement, and "oppose policies that unnecessarily separate families"—a clear dig at the enforcement-happy approach of Arizona and its southern copycats.[1]

In 2013 in California, the state passed a slate of immigrant integration bills. They ranged from reinstituting driver's licenses for undocumented Californians to the Trust Act—slowing deportations and protecting families—to two further measures to prevent retaliation against immigrant workers. All these bills came twenty years after the state had initially chosen immigrant exclusion through Proposition 187, a measure aimed at denying all public benefits, including education, to undocumented immigrants. Other 2013 bills made advances in the areas of workers' rights and employment, health and human services, and language access and education (California Immigrant Policy Center 2013).

The geographic (and temporal) diversity in attitudes toward immigrants underscores a key point: while the federal government has the formal responsibility for determining how many immigrants come into the country and for preventing those who lack permission from entering, it falls to local and regional jurisdictions to frame the living experience of immigrants. In this context, local and regional coalitions of civil leaders set the political tone for whether localities welcome new immigrant populations or resist their presence (Rodríguez 2014).

This geographic diversity in "warmth of welcome" has been particularly pronounced since the mid-2000s, mostly because the ongoing stalemate over revising federal immigration law prompted states and localities to take matters into their own hands, with local political "entrepreneurs" on both sides being influenced by movements and countermovements in the national debate (Varsanyi 2010; Gulasekaram and Ramakrishnan 2015). But even if the federal government eventually reconsiders and actually does change national immigration policy—something made more likely by the increasing number of Asian and Latino voters who overwhelmingly rejected anti-immigrant rhetoric in the 2012 elections (Pastor et al. 2014)—local jurisdictions will play a central and crucial role in

determining how reforms gets implemented and what it will mean for the daily lives of immigrants and their neighbors.

A second key aspect of the situation is that immigrant populations have been growing rapidly outside the core urban areas with long traditions of receiving immigrants. Not only has this taken place in the new receiving areas of the South, but it is also occurring in full force in the suburbs (Singer 2008; Wilson and Svajlenka 2014). As a result, immigration policy should likely be thought of not just in terms of controlling borders but also in terms of local policies that either welcome immigrants and promote their welfare or attempt to take enforcement into local hands. Paying closer analytical attention to this "spatial turn"—that is, to the geographic variation of the warmth of immigrant reception—is also consistent with a larger shift in sociology, economics, and political science toward understanding how spatial arrangements and contexts play an important part in explaining broader outcomes. An important development in this regard has been a renewed focus on regionalism, particularly on how the national economy is constituted by metropolitan regions with coherent economies but fragmented governance. The need for action at a regional scale poses the challenge of constructing—or the consequences of failing to construct— ~~new political~~ metropolitan coalitions to ~~face~~ the challenges of regional growth (Benner and Pastor 2012; Brookings Institution 2010; Dreier, Mollenkopf, and Swanstrom 2001).

This book focuses on how metropolitan regions are responding politically to the challenge of integrating new immigrant communities. By immigrant integration, we simply mean the extent to which new immigrant communities are making economic, social, and civic progress, and closing gaps with the native-born mainstream. While a great deal of research has been done on this broad question, the research reported here is distinctive in two respects. First, we are interested in how different kinds of localities react *politically* to the challenge of integrating immigrants: How do local political and civic and community leaders respond? How do they seek to frame the question of the rise of new immigrant communities? What policy responses do they propose and adopt? How do immigrants themselves seek to shape the narrative and the policy package? Second, we explore the *metropolitan* dimension of this dynamic. We wish not only to understand the political responses in the central cities where immigrants have traditionally been concentrated, but also in their new suburban concentrations. And we want to know the extent to which central city and suburban actors influence each other, either informally or through regional alliances or institutions. What shapes central city responses? Do suburban responses differ? Does the longer central city history and legacy of immigrant-serving activities spill over into the suburbs—or not? And what role do counties and states play?

These two foci stem from our belief that the rate of progress for immigrants and their children is not just a function of their own human or social capital, but also reflects the contours of their locations and how they interact with the native-born (Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, and Waters 2004). We believe these place-based variations will have long-term consequences. We recognize that current snapshots of immigrants' progress do not capture their longer-term trajectories. What looks like a poor immigrant community today may be a launching pad for success for later generations. Careful cohort work has shown that most immigrants make progress across generations, something that focusing on recent arrivals often obscures (Myers 2008). However, the warmth of welcome can help determine whether a first location is a stepping-stone or a sinkhole.

While metro areas matter for migrants, migrants also matter for metro areas. International migration is a key factor reshaping metropolitan America. Like many large forces of transformation, it can produce benefits—immigrants add to the labor force, contribute taxes, and start new businesses. However, cities, regions, and states have some good reasons to worry when the immigrant influx is large and fast and/or consists mainly of low-income and poorly educated individuals, particularly those without authorization. These conditions can produce significant fiscal costs for local jurisdictions called upon to provide face-to-face services (such as law enforcement, primary education, or health services) to new and different groups who may not speak English and who are unfamiliar with local standards and programs. Clearly, it is expensive to promote intergenerational upward mobility by providing primary, secondary, and higher education, nearly all of which is paid for by states and localities.

Immigration policy thus has a fundamental asymmetry: the federal government determines how many and what type of immigrants to admit, but local governments mount the programs that integrate them. At present, the federal government provides little direct aid to assist local governments in doing so. In the aggregate, immigrants seem to have a net positive impact on metropolitan economies. Economists are finding mounting evidence that immigrants have a neutral to complementary impact on the existing native-born workforce (Card 2005; Ottaviano and Peri 2012; Peri 2006)—and even those who more staunchly stood on the side of substitutionary effects have softened (Aydemir and Borjas 2010; Borjas, Grogger, and Hanson 2009, 2012). Immigrants may also have more of a disposition to entrepreneurship, another boon for local economic activity (Vallejo 2013). Immigrant communities also lean toward environmentally friendly mass transit, with housing and work patterns that encourage more sustainable development, a concern of increasing importance to America's metro areas (Kersten et al. 2012).

It is also the case that that immigration correlates strongly with metropolitan economic growth (think Houston versus Cleveland). Of course, this relationship

is partly circular: immigrants move toward economic opportunity, and, indeed, they can often find such opportunity even amid decline (Fiscal Policy Institute 2009; Waldinger 1999). But there are causal arrows as well: our econometric work on nearly two hundred U.S. metropolitan regions shows that regions with a larger immigrant share at the beginning of a time period subsequently have greater growth, even when we hold constant such factors as the presence of manufacturing or the initial unemployment rate (Benner and Pastor 2012, 48). And the popular literature is now filling with examples of small declining mill towns that have been helped to rebound by new immigration.

~~But~~ while the rise of new immigrant communities may revitalize neighborhoods, boost real estate values, and bolster the workforce in residential construction, landscaping, and related activities, new immigrants, who tend to have lower incomes and larger families than the native-born population, can impose some real fiscal challenges for the local governments that need to provide them with education and social services. Some research suggests that rapid recent immigration can also disconcert the majority group's sense of cultural integrity and erode social solidarity (Putnam 2007). But this is not an automatic outcome. Others find that neighborhood disadvantage (for example, the lack of housing or jobs and a deteriorating physical environment) matters more for local solidarity than diversity per se; such disadvantage undermines local confidence in future work and prospects and disrupts collective identity and sense of community belonging (Fieldhouse and Cutts 2010; Forrest and Kearns 1999; Twigg, Taylor, and Mohan 2010). And other research shows that public policy can mediate the effects of diversity: countries with institutional initiatives aimed at immigrant integration and economic equity see little to no declines in social cohesion (Kesler and Bloemraad 2010). We believe that, on balance, deliberate actions to encourage receptivity to demographic change can also produce positive gains for regions and for America.

Others agree. Some regions have tried to use public policy to shift the balance toward positive responses, turning the rising immigrant presence to their advantage, diminishing its negative effects, containing conflicts generated by the arrival of new migrants, and promoting educational and labor market advances by immigrants and their children. In a fully proactive region, central city and suburban parts of the region may engage in informal or formal collaborations. In most regions, however, the urban core responds with positive measures, but suburban jurisdictions are much less welcoming and regional collaboration is limited, particularly around issues of immigrant integration. Quite a few unwelcoming regions react negatively across the board to the new immigration, resulting in political squabbles that may damage regional prospects in other arenas (for example, by projecting a retrograde image that makes the region less attractive to talented and generally tolerant skilled workers).

This book seeks to better understand the forces, actors, and strategies shaping regional responses to the challenge of immigrant integration and to draw lessons about how to promote more coherently positive responses. As indicated, we believe that encouraging positive regional responses to new immigrants will generate a long-term payoff in economic growth, political cooperation, and greater eventual social cohesion. We understand that some do not share this opinion—that they are "unsettled" by those who are now settling in America—and this book is not primarily about trying to convince them. Rather, we start from the premise that immigrant integration is useful for metro regions and work to understand the conditions under which it does or does not happen.

About the Volume

Scholars who have examined the question of why local political actors respond positively or negatively to rapid recent immigration in the United States and Western Europe have often focused on individual attitudes (which, when aggregated, presumably drive the actions of local politicians) and in how those individual responses are shaped by local political opportunity structures and other contextual factors, including the tenor of national politics (Hochschild and Mollenkopf 2009; Hopkins 2010; Ramakrishnan and Wong 2010). Others have focused on how the introduction of new immigrant minority communities alters the dynamics of political competition among native-born racial and ethnic groups in different settings (Mollenkopf 2013). This clearly differs depending on whether the city has had a history of white-black conflict and competition or has been more fluid (with significant presence, for example, of native-born Latinos).

Inevitably, we must place the political meaning of the rise of new immigrant minority groups in the context of the history of the civil rights movement in the given locale. This takes on a different valence in the South, where the region's white majority is composed largely of white Protestants, as compared to the North, where a region's white majority has much more Catholic or Jewish immigrant ancestry. Finally, we must distinguish between what goes on at the level of official policy and day-to-day practices by front-line public workers. Some scholars have suggested that even when the larger political atmosphere is heated, workers in public agencies may practice receptivity by flying "under the radar" to assist immigrants, especially the undocumented, in ways that local public opinion might not accept were these practices to become visible (Jones-Correa 2008a; Marrow 2009).

The rapid rise in immigration since 1980 certainly predisposes some members of the local native-born population toward opportunistic anti-immigrant

responses; lacking past experience with immigrants, many places in the South or even the suburban parts of traditional receiving regions lack the institutional flexibility or responsiveness to forge ~~new political alliances~~. In these settings, local political entrepreneurs—that is, those seeking to make political gains and build political careers—may wish to mobilize anti-immigrant sentiment as a way to shift the political balance in their favor, with considerable anecdotal evidence suggesting that conservative grassroots activists and Republican political strategists believe that taking anti-immigrant positions favoring national and local enforcement can stir up their base for electoral campaigns. (Of course, pro-immigrant political entrepreneurs in settings favorable to them also try to mobilize sentiment to support their positions.)

The rapidity and recency of immigration do not, by themselves, preordain an unfavorable outcome for immigrants. Silicon Valley, for example, has a particularly high share of foreign-born, and it has given a quite positive reception to both high- and low-skilled immigrants, belying an iron link between scale and speed of change on the one hand and local politics on the other. In any case, we know that having a long history of large immigrant populations, Democratic elected officials, and a dense network of immigrant-serving social service and immigrant advocacy organizations all seem to work in favor of warmer receptions (de Graauw, Gleeson, and Bloemraad 2013). Certainly, the mix between unskilled workers and highly educated professionals influences the response, partly because it affects how easy it is to negatively "racialize" immigrants.

In short, the authors of this volume try to go beyond a simple focus on the scale of new immigrant arrivals and look at how the different parts of that stream interact with the local political structure and each other. We explore these relationships in seven metropolitan areas, comparing responses to the rise of new immigrant communities both *across* older and newer receiving destinations and *within* each of them—looking both at the central cities where immigrants initially concentrate but also the suburban and exurban areas where they are increasingly finding homes. We measure positive urban and regional receptivity primarily through the adoption of new programs to promote immigrant integration, the redesign of existing programs to take account of new immigrant client groups, the enforcement approach taken by local governments toward undocumented immigrants, and the degree of cooperation between local governments, nonprofit service delivery organizations, and immigrant advocacy groups. We measure negative receptivity in terms of the presence of anti-immigrant mobilization, the adoption of strong enforcement measures, and the failure to provide necessary basic services like translation in everyday transactions with local government.

Key Themes

Three themes emerge from our work. The first is that negative responses are more likely to flourish when there is greater "demographic distance" between the newly arriving immigrant groups and the native-born populations. At one end of the spectrum are situations where largely low-skilled, often undocumented immigrant populations from Mexico and Central America arrive in areas with white Protestant majorities, as in the case of Phoenix. Such receiving contexts, almost by definition, have little past experience with integrating earlier immigrant groups. On the other end of the spectrum, highly heterogeneous immigrant populations, including well-educated along with low-skilled members, may arrive in contexts of reception in which the native-born populations are also highly heterogeneous, as in New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles. Of particular interest are southern cases, where "demographic distance" must be measured not only against native whites, but against African Americans (for perceptive analyses of Atlanta, Nashville, and small-town North Carolina see Marrow 2009 and Winders 2013). The presence of great demographic distance inclines many old-timers to perceive newcomers to be outside the mainstream and likely to generate more demands for service than they contribute to the local tax base. Conversely, regions respond more positively when they have already "mainstreamed" earlier waves of immigrants who coincidently became a constituency base (that is, voters).

A second theme emerging from our case studies is that while demographic characteristics certainly shape the terrain on which political reactions take place, local actors have latitude, and adopt strategies that reflect not just demographics but also the political cultures, structures, and dynamics of the receiving regions. Our examples highlight the importance of several particular characteristics of the receiving contexts. One is the presence of conservative populist political entrepreneurs, usually but not always in the Republican Party, who see political benefits from adopting strong enforcement measures against undocumented immigrants and negatively stereotyping or racializing immigrants more generally; they can, of course, sometimes be countered by pro-immigrant political entrepreneurs, but such contexts require some underlying mobilization of immigrant communities and their allies, most likely in places with an already long-settled immigrant population. Conservative anti-immigrant populists mainly tap into anxieties among native whites that their dominant positions may be at risk, but may also highlight labor market and residential competition between immigrants and native-born minority groups. This echoes findings by Ramakrishnan and colleagues (Gulasekaram and Ramakrishnan 2012, 2015; Ramakrishnan and Wong 2010) that Republican political orientations are one of the strongest predictors of the proposal and adoption of anti-immigrant legislation

at the local level. On the other hand, the presence of pro-immigrant political forces, whether labor unions, immigrant-serving nonprofits, or the Democratic Party, may temper this tendency. In particular, our cases highlight an aspect not generally considered in the literature: that regional business leadership groups can play a positive role. If such leaders believe that promoting a sense of welcome is good for the regional business climate, they can be a counterweight to anti-immigrant political entrepreneurs.

Finally, all the cases highlight the differences between the central city settings in which immigrants formerly concentrated and the suburban settings in which they are now increasingly locating. While immigrants are still moving to big cities, the center of gravity of immigrant settlement is rapidly shifting outward. And suburban contexts of reception are quite different: the density of residential concentrations is much lower; the development of institutions serving immigrant communities is just beginning, if such institutions are present at all; suburban political jurisdictions have far less governmental capacity (often by choice); and suburban schools have less experience with ethnic and racial and linguistic diversity. Reactions have often been quite negative in these locales; Vicino, for example, in *Suburban Crossroads* (2013), dissects the cases of Carpentersville, Illinois; Farmer's Branch, Texas; and Hazelton, Pennsylvania.

And it is not just the preexisting character of suburbs; immigrant communities in suburban settings have a different character from those in central cities. Drawing on Zelinsky and Lee, Brettell (2008, 165) has stressed the non-clustered style of place making (or "heterolocalism") by Indian immigrants outside Dallas, with commercial enterprises like supermarkets and event spaces becoming nodes for interaction among widely spread-out families. Arguably, the suburban settings reinforce all the other barriers to civic mobilization among immigrants, like recency of arrival and lack of political knowledge.

Our cases also highlight the difficulties that immigrant advocacy organizations based in the traditional central city receiving areas have in beginning to operate on a regional basis. None of our study areas show what could be called a fully integrated regional or metropolitan response, although the San José area (which is encompassed by a single county, Santa Clara County) has so many municipalities with large immigrant populations that county government has become a significant pro-immigrant actor. Immigrant advocates in Chicago have also projected their influence into the suburbs by getting the State of Illinois to take a number of positive steps. The conclusion returns to some of the ways in which stronger and more favorable metropolitan responses can be developed.

Which Regions?

This book grows out of the "Building Resilient Regions" (BRR) research network that was funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and guided by our colleague Margaret Weir at the University of California, Berkeley. As part of this larger research network, we coordinated our list of cases with the regions being studied by other working groups looking at economic decline, rapid growth, the suburbanization of poverty, and transportation and environmental challenges. Collectively, the network agreed to focus on twenty metropolitan areas. From those, we initially chose six to study immigrant integration: three longtime recipients of immigrants (New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles), and three more recent destinations (Charlotte, Phoenix, and San José). We eventually distinguished and selected a seventh metro area, the so-called Inland Empire of Southern California (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties), because it constituted a new receiving metropolis juxtaposed beside another large and traditional receiving area (Los Angeles).

New York and Los Angeles are obvious choices because they are the two biggest traditional gateways (with Singer [2008] classifying the former as "continuous" and the latter as "post World War II"). These metropolitan areas have a highly diverse set of new and "mature" immigrant communities (with three in ten immigrants in the United States living in one or the other, along with slightly more of their children). They provide a matched pair with complicated mixes of immigrants and natives but also with core cities with well-developed infrastructures for immigrant organizing, advocacy, and service that sometimes work outside the central cities but may also not fully stretch across the entire metropolitan area. Both have recently been the subject of major studies on the trajectories of second-generation youth (Kasinitz et al. 2008; Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, and Waters 2004; Telles and Ortiz 2008). Finally, immigrants are moving straight into the suburbs of both regions, blurring the historical patterns of initial arrival in the central city followed by spillover into adjacent suburbs, and allowing us to examine variation in response *within* metropolitan areas.

We chose Chicago to round out our trio of traditional receiving areas and San José as an exemplary new receiving area. Both have large and diverse immigrant populations, and both have done more than many areas to adopt successful immigrant integration policies. Chicago has experienced migration from Mexico and Eastern Europe, which has spread away from the central city over the last decade. San José, the biggest city in Silicon Valley, is a relatively new immigrant destination that has attracted Asian immigrants to its sprawling primary city and northern suburbs (some of which are now cities in their own right), as well as Mexican immigrants to its southern and eastern agricultural areas.[2] Both regions

also have nationally notable immigrant integration programs; learning why and how these programs evolved can provide a better understanding of what explains positive responses, as well as useful policy lessons for the future.

The two new destinations of Charlotte and Phoenix have offered welcomes that contrast with each other as well as with that of San José. While not without tensions and gaps in service delivery, Charlotte has been relatively welcoming, or at least not overtly hostile, partly because its business and civic leadership wants to present the city as a model for North Carolina and the "New South." Phoenix has offered a decidedly cooler reception, with its county sheriff, Joe Arpaio, serving as a celebrated example of a local law enforcement official taking up the enforcement of immigration law—although the central city itself has not shared the anti-immigrant impulse to the same extent as the county and the state. The Inland Empire, as mentioned, sits beside, but at some distance from, a traditional gateway, Los Angeles, but its immigrant presence is much newer than that in LA, and the rapid recent increase of its immigrant population dramatically changed local political dynamics. (In this respect, it is an interesting comparison with the east end of Long Island, discussed in the New York chapter.) These cases illustrate how the absence of an institutional infrastructure for immigrant integration magnifies the challenges for achieving such integration, but also how the presence of other civic infrastructures can provide a scaffold for integration, if the relevant actors make a different set of political calculations.

How the Analysis Was Done

While we try to synthesize and draw broad lessons from the whole body of work presented here, this is, in fact, an edited collection. However, it differs from most edited volumes because we have crafted it as a single enterprise, not just a set of loosely related chapters. The two coeditors convened a team of researchers who developed a shared analytical and research framework and met periodically through the research process to share results, refine the framework, and think through policy implications. The researchers conducted historical background research and interviewed a mix of regional actors with a standard interview protocol and a common set of questions. Els de Graauw, John Mollenkopf, and Diana Gordon covered New York, with initial research assistance from Martha Pichardo, while Jaime Dominguez examined Chicago, Michael Jones-Correa studied Charlotte, Paul Lewis and Doris Marie Provine covered Phoenix, and Manuel Pastor, Rachel Rosner, Jennifer Tran, and Juan De Lara (in various combinations) examined Los Angeles, San José, and the Inland Empire.

All the researchers joined in developing common interview protocols, provided the whole team with field notes, and participated in debriefings. In

synthesizing the case studies, the editors went back to the researchers with questions, did supplemental research, and sought feedback from the group about whether our preliminary conclusions reflected their field experiences. Some of our conclusions are more speculative than others. These are, after all, just seven cases, albeit complemented by our broader research experience in other settings. We try to indicate clearly which hypotheses we think are better tested and confirmed in the data and which need further research.

In the end, of course, each author is responsible for her or his own contribution—and the reader will notice analytic differences (as well as varied writing styles). But as the coeditors, we have sought to synthesize our colleagues' discoveries in our introductory and summary chapters—and as so often happens in such projects, we have long ago forgotten where our ideas end and their (usually better) ideas begin. We thus take full responsibility for whatever shortcomings might be found here and only modest credit for whatever nuggets of wisdom readers may take away.

A Road Map to the Book

The next chapter offers a brief history of immigration trends in the United States and how the various flows have intersected with the question of regional receptivity, making its spatial variation an important topic of research. We then present a detailed profile of the cases using historical and recently released U.S. Census data. We detail the nature of immigrant flows to the central cities and suburbs of the seven metropolitan regions and contrast them with the native-stock populations. The chapter highlights the importance of the specific mixes of immigrants and native-born populations in particular contexts of reception—especially in terms of continuity of flows, socioeconomic status, national origin, and likely undocumented status—and the political implications of the resulting "demographic distance" between the new immigrants and the native-born populations. We also highlight differences between central cities and inner and outer suburbs in all the cases.

The chapter specifically points to the importance of the presence or absence of relatively higher-income and more-educated immigrants, the size composition of different immigrant groups, the share of undocumented immigrants, the social position of immigrants compared with native-born minority groups, and the presence or absence of an immigrant heritage among native-born whites. We argue that these general factors set up the conditions under which the native-born mainstream might or might not "racialize" immigrants or consider them to be a distinctly separate population. The spatial distribution of immigrants within

metropolitan areas may influence native responses as well. But to truly understand the variations in the patterns of political responses to immigrants, one must get to the institutional structures, political cultures, and political opportunity structures within and between the various metro regions.

The following chapters shift from this qualitative analysis to specific examples, with the first three taking up more traditional gateways and the next four the newer locations. Chapter 3 opens the set of chapters on traditional immigrant gateways. In this first section, Els de Graauw, Diana Gordon, and John Mollenkopf examine the case of New York, with a comparison between the welcoming actions of the city government and conflicts and hostilities in an outer suburb. They suggest that the variation between central city and suburb demonstrates several key lessons: the importance of a heritage of celebrating immigration to setting a regional tone; the importance of a sizable immigrant vote within a strong party system at the mayoral level; and the importance of interaction between, on the one hand, suburban political figures who as part of their political strategy see gains in excluding immigrants, and, on the other, advocates who have promoted pro-immigrant measures. We also consider the role of Mayors Michael Bloomberg and Bill de Blasio locally and nationally and suggest that while Bloomberg's contribution to national immigrant integration efforts was perhaps idiosyncratic, it highlights the importance of business leadership that we also find in other cases.

In chapter 4, Jaime Dominguez also takes up immigrant integration in the context of a strong political machine, ~~traditional~~ black-white cleavages, and intense neighborhood identification and competition in Chicago. These factors created an opening for white Democratic mayors to include Latino immigrants in their voting base as white ethnic voting declined, a strategy that did not prevent an insurgent Latino candidate from challenging the mayor in 2015. More broadly, Dominguez suggests that the presence of Eastern European immigrants has diminished the appetite of greater Chicago's native-born white population to "racialize" the immigrant integration debate. He points to variation between different suburbs and also underscores the importance of immigrant-oriented social services at the county and state level won by immigrant social justice organizations; he argues that some suburbs have been more welcoming because immigrant advocacy groups followed a conscious strategy to influence suburban policies. City-based immigrant activists achieved this broader influence through positive actions taken by state government. Finally, he considers whether the presence of regionalist efforts "spill over" to a more positive frame around immigrant integration.

In chapter 5, Manuel Pastor, Juan De Lara, and Rachel Rosner consider the city and county of Los Angeles, a place where immigrant communities have

built their power through social movements that are now reshaping the regional political landscape. They find that, through their participation in broader multi-issue, multiethnic coalitions oriented toward leadership development, community organizing, and pragmatic policy change, these actors have helped press policy makers and secured wins for immigrant communities in policy arenas from labor to education. While Los Angeles may appear to have less-visible institutions for immigrant integration than do other regions, these social movements have increased the political penalties for anti-immigrant rhetoric and actions by integrating with the region's movement for progressive change. The authors also examine a different sort of suburb from those considered in several other cases, one where half the residents are immigrants and where they and their allies have taken hold of the reins of local government. However, the authors conclude that even with the work social movements have done both to shape direct policy and to build longer-term political power, these groups must spend considerable effort securing the implementation of policy. As such, much work remains to institutionalize immigrant integration in the region, and cementing durable changes may require stronger participation from business and philanthropic partners.

In chapter 6, Juan De Lara looks at California's San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, also known as the "Inland Empire" and once a white Republican outpost. African Americans and Latino immigrants and nonimmigrants have transformed the Inland Empire by moving there for cheaper housing. The sudden changes, and the political mismatch between the prevailing leadership and the new demographics, have produced a wave of anti-immigrant activism. De Lara draws parallels to the Phoenix case in terms of rapidity of change, demographic difference between old and young, and fragmentation and weakness of the business community, as well as the absence of political mobilization among the new immigrants. Added to the mix: as the housing market collapsed after 2007, many new residents are now stuck in the Inland Empire without employment, with a tenuous grip on housing, and without the social service infrastructure of more traditional receiving locations. This contrast with Los Angeles allows us to examine variation within one of the most far-flung metropolitan areas in the United States.

Michael Jones-Correa's study of Charlotte, North Carolina, which makes up chapter 7, starts off the chapters on new destinations. The case points both to the advantages and limits of business leadership. He argues that Charlotte has long had a business elite concerned about the city's role as a national financial center in the New South. Under their influence, Charlotte took a leadership role on school desegregation, downtown development, and regional economic strategies. This served to constrain anti-immigrant politics as Latino immigrant communities grew rapidly within the city and county. Nonetheless, the ground

shifted as a former Charlotte mayor became an anti-immigrant governor, playing to a conservative Republican legislature, and some local anti-immigrant political figures picked up this lead. The example points to the lack of services in newer destinations, including suburbs, but also how elite opinion can constrain many conservative populist impulses.

The opposite is true of Phoenix. In chapter 8, Doris Marie Provine and Paul Lewis explore a place made famous in the immigration field by an energetic county sheriff who has cracked down on undocumented immigrants. However much this served his political career, the authors argue, his actions also respond to the sentiments of a native majority made uneasy by the rapid growth of immigrant communities, a significant presence of unauthorized immigrants, and their overwhelmingly Mexican national origin. These conditions have enabled Sheriff Arpaio, among others, to inflame the situation. At the same time, the larger political response has been enabled by a long-standing metropolitan fragmentation and lack of regional business leadership.

The San José / Silicon Valley metropolitan area is dissected by Manuel Pastor, Rachel Rosner, and Jennifer Tran in chapter 9. It is a hopeful case—and so good for offering the last word. The authors note that immigrant population here has grown even more rapidly than in any other case in the book, but the region nonetheless offers a welcoming atmosphere and has taken important public and philanthropic steps to spur immigrant integration. The authors argue that the diversity in skills and national origins of the immigrant population helps to "deracialize" the issue; moreover, the valley's business elites rely on high-skilled immigrants, yielding positive attitudinal spillovers to less-skilled immigrants. The high degree of regional business collaboration in the Silicon Valley on promoting technology industries reliant on high-skilled immigrants has led business to be a local force for immigrant integration and a national force for comprehensive immigration reform.

In the concluding chapter, the editors cull the central themes from the cases, reexamine the factors that drive positive and negative responses to the new immigration, and seek to unpack the political dynamics by which they play out. We also highlight the metropolitan spatial dimension of these dynamics. We then examine the implications for research and practice. On the practice side, we suggest some new federal policies that would speed immigrant integration, promote receptivity, and defuse tensions. We go beyond our cases by highlighting some "best practices" developed around the country, noting which ones work, why, and where. Finally, we highlight what we believe to be the most important remaining research questions and explain how building on the case study method used here could help answer them.

We hope that the reader will close this book with three thoughts in mind. The first is simply to understand that the metropolitan dimension is an important

part of the immigrant integration challenge. This topic is beginning to receive more attention partly because, as the data presented in the next chapter highlight, immigration has been moving to the suburbs. Research and practice both need to operate on a metropolitan and regional scale. We trust that the ways in which we have used a regionalist lens and a comparative case study and mixed-methods approach will contribute to that development. Second, we hope reading this volume will underscore for the reader that immigrants have experienced a great range of different receptions within and across metropolitan regions and that our work has identified some of the main demographic structures and political dynamics that help to predict the challenges any region will face.

Finally, we have also highlighted the ways in which metropolitan leaders, particularly from the business community, but also from civic organizations, labor unions, and social movements, play an important yet often overlooked role in shaping regional reactions to immigrants. Civic and political leaders may rally public opinion to recognize new immigrant communities and support public policies and programs that mitigate the service challenges they pose, thus making the most of immigrant potentials. On the other hand, civic and political leaders may rally public opposition to immigration, fostering harsher enforcement toward unauthorized immigrants and chilling the reception of new immigrants in ways that underutilize or even reject their talents. In short, structural elements may shape the field of action, but in the end public will and political courage have great influence on the outcomes. Both will be needed if the nation is to do a better job at integrating immigrants and building resilient regions.