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**I. INTRODUCTION**

_When future scholars of immigration and urban studies look back at the last decade of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first century, they are likely to view this time as a critical moment in the evolution of the American city, an era when a suburban immigrant nation first emerged (Hardwick 2008: 31)._  

**A. BACKGROUND**

Increasing rates of immigration have led to shifts in immigrant settlement in United States at the beginning of the 21st Century. Whereas immigrants to the U.S. historically concentrated in traditional immigrant receiving gateways, today they are increasingly settling in areas with little or no history of immigrant settlement (Donato et al., 2008; Massey and Capoferro 2008; Hardwick 2008; Singer 2008). It is especially the case for the largest U.S. minority group, Latinos. Today the majority of U.S Latinos (both native and foreign-born) reside in locales in which they make up less than half of the population (Suro and Tafoya 2004), many of which are historically white suburban communities. Yet, despite the growing body of studies detailing demographic trends and patterns, we know relatively little about intergroup relations in new destinations. Further, increasing diversity complicates traditional understandings of ethnic and racial relations formulated on a white/black paradigm. Hence, exploring new immigrant gateways at this historical juncture present a key opportunity to understand how increasing national ethnic and racial diversity plays out in everyday encounters, interacts with local neighborhood social structures, and shapes intergroup relations in historically white locales.

Of particular interest to scholars are the relationships in new destinations between whites and Mexicanos, the largest Latino ethnic group in the United States. Whereas relationships between whites and racial minorities have been remarkably static and rigid, white/Mexicano
relations have been argued to be more fluid and malleable (Bonilla-Silva 2004; Almaguer 1994; Murguia and Forman 2003). Exploring these relationships is warranted in light of the growing number of U.S. Latinos. By the year 2000, Latinos surpassed blacks as the largest minority group in the U.S, with those of Mexicano ancestry and origin being the most numerous (Census 2002). As Mexicano numbers grow nationally, they are becoming a noticeable presence in all facets of U.S. life. Whereas Mexicanos were more likely to live to live among co-ethnics and other Latinos or concentrated in the Southwest and traditional immigrant gateway cities they are now increasingly migrating to, and settling in, historically white locales. For instance, Mexicanos in Chicago have historically concentrated in three communities (South Chicago, Pilsen and Little Village). Beginning in the 1980s, Mexican immigrants began to bypassing old immigrant gateways and settling in historically white city neighborhoods and nearby suburbs. Neighborhood institutions such as schools and churches may adapt to Mexicanos’ needs by providing services in Spanish, while local businesses increasingly offer ethnic-oriented services. However, a growing Mexicano presence in these communities often heightens white residents’ concerns about neighborhood well-being (Kefalas 2003; Wilson and Taub 2006). Neighborhoods that have undergone white to Mexicano transition then offer a vantage point from which to explore key substantive and theoretical questions about everyday interactions, the construction of group boundaries, and the current and future state of ethnic and racial relations in the U.S. more broadly.

B. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine intergroup relations in a new immigrant gateway, post white to Latino succession. Specifically, I explore how neighborhood succession engenders
intergroup tensions in political, religious, and cultural dimensions of community life. I pay particular attention to how whites residents react to changes associated with neighborhood succession and how Latino residents respond and navigate these reactions. A core theme in this dissertation revolves around the concept of group threat, whereby white residents perceive the growing numbers of Latinos as a threat to social privilege and well-being within the spheres of neighborhood politics, religious institutions, and community cultural events. In doing so, I aim to uncover how white/Latino relations are shaped by local contexts and facilitate or impede newcomers’ integration into neighborhood life.

C. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This work aims to further our knowledge and contribute to the growing body of research on ethnic and racial relations and new destinations by filling some gaps in the literature. First, explorations of neighborhood racial and ethnic relations overwhelmingly examine white/black contexts (Anderson 1990; Krysan et al., 2009; Johnson and Shapiro 2003; Massey and Denton 1994; McMahon 1996; McGreevy 1998; Sugrue 2005). These works find whites are resistant to living in neighborhoods with blacks which in turn contributes to high rates of racial residential segregation and isolation. However, whites do not exhibit the same apprehension toward the presence of Latinos as they do of blacks (Hutchings and Bobo 1996; Kefalas 2003), nor are Latinos as highly geographically isolated as African Americans (Suro and Tafoya 2004). This suggests that factors other than race influence whites’ attitudes toward, and interactions with, fellow Latino residents. Hence, examining white/Latino neighborhoods would advance our knowledge of intergroup relations in an increasingly diversifying context.
Secondly, the majority of studies of Latinos in new destinations explore either emerging (Brettell 2008; Marrow 2005; 2008; 2009; Oberle and Lit 2008; Odem 2008) or pre-emerging immigrant gateways (Skop and Buentello 2008; Smith and Fursueth 2008). Singer (2008) posits that there are three distinctive types of new destinations in the United States: emerging, pre-emerging, and re-emerging gateways. Emerging gateways refer to locales which have seen a marked increase in the number of foreign-born residents since the 1980s. Pre-emerging gateways are those whose immigrant population began soaring in the 1990s. What both of these types of gateways share is no history of immigrant settlement. The third type of new immigrant destination, or re-emerging gateways, do have a history of immigrant settlement prior to 1980. The defining characteristic of re-emerging gateways is the percentage of foreign-born individuals that exceeded national averages prior to 1930 and after 1980. Though these settlements served as immigrant gateways during the first quarter of the 20th century, the population of foreign-born waned after the passage of the 1924 Immigration Act, bringing international migration to the U.S. to a trickle. However, with the ratification of the 1965 Immigration Act, the gates to international migration were reopened. Thus, this suggests that re-emerging gateways have at one time or another had the social institutions in place to facilitate immigrant integration. However, to date there has been little research examining how a not so distant history of immigrant settlement shapes residential attitudes toward newcomers and whether community institutions continue to have the foundations in place to facilitate immigrant integration.

Third, we know less about intergroup relations in new immigrant gateways, post-Latino succession. This is particularly the case for historically white suburban neighborhoods that now serve as re-emerging destinations. Most studies up until this point have examined either emerging or pre-emerging gateways, many of which that focus on multi-racial contexts and
mostly on immigrant populations (Brettell 2008; Marrow 2008; Price and Singer 2008). However, not all Latinos live in racially diverse new destinations nor are all immigrants. Rather, many second and third generation Latinos in new destinations have shared neighborhoods and local institutions with whites well before the 1980s. A few have undergone Latino succession. However, despite increasing patterns of neighborhood change, we know less about if, and how, Latino succession reshapes interactions and relations. Hence, historically white communities that have undergone Latino succession can provide a window to future to understand how white/Latino relations will unfold in emerging and pre-emerging immigrant gateways.

D. THE LOCAL CONTEXT: AUGUSTA POST-LATINO SUCCESION

This dissertation examines white/Latino relations in a re-emerging gateway, Augusta, a historically white suburban town in the U.S. Midwest. Though a relatively small community when it was founded in 1882, Augusta’s population grew steadily over the first three decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Driving population change was European immigrant settlement, and particularly, migrants from Italy. By 1930, almost half of Augusta’s population was second generation (45.7\%). The passing of the 1924 Immigration Act essentially brought immigration to a trickle and transformed Augusta from an immigrant gateway to a white American suburban community. Yet, Augusta maintained a distinctive ethnic character and identity. However, the passing of the 1965 Immigration Act re-opened the doors to immigration to the United States. Once again, Augusta became an immigrant destination for immigrants. In the late 1970s the number of Latino residents —the majority being of Mexican ancestry or origin—began to grow in Augusta. Between 1990 and 2000, Augusta transitioned to a Latino majority, going from 30.2\% to 53.9\% Latino, while the percentage of white residents decreased from 66\% to 40.5\%
(U.S. Census 2000). During this 10 year span, Mexicanos became a significant presence in Augusta’s social, cultural, and institutional life. The number of Mexicano ethnic-oriented businesses and festivals grew while local schools and churches began offering services in Spanish. On the surface, the absence of noticeable conflict amidst change in Augusta suggested that relations were fairly amicable. However, previous research on Augusta suggests that acceptance can be coupled with resistance (Martinez 2007). Many of Augusta’s long-term white residents were concerned about the negative impact of Latino succession on neighborhood well-being. White residents’ concerns revolved around perceived increases in gang activity, graffiti, and crime which they attributed to demographic change. Others noted feelings of alienation from a local Catholic church, where they felt Mexican culture was being pushed on them. These instances of acceptance and resistance suggest, as do other studies on similar communities (Badillo 2004; Flippen 2001; Millard and Chapa 2004; Sizemore 2004; Wilson and Taub 2006), that white/Mexicano everyday relations remain complex and, ultimately, calls for further study.

E. THEORY AND BACKGROUND LITERATURE

1. Theory and Paradigm in Studies on U.S. Ethnic and Racial Relations

   a. Theoretical Perspectives on Ethnic and Racial Relations

Scholars have longed tried to theoretically explain ethnic and racial relations in the United States (Barrera 1979; Blalock 1968; Blauner 1972; Bonacich 1972 Bonilla-Silva 2010; Omi and Winant 1995; Park 1950; Warner and Srole 1945). Feagin and Feagin (1999) argue that these approaches generally fall within two types of theoretical camps. The first are order theories. Order theories emphasize inclusion or “the orderly integration and assimilation of particular racial and ethnic group to a dominant culture and society” (Feagin and Feagin 1999: 35). The most widely applied
have been theories of assimilation (Gordon 1964; Park 1950). Assimilation refers to the “process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments and attitudes of other persons and group and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life” (Park and Burgess 1969: 735). Though mostly used to explain factors and processes of groups’ integration into a social system, assimilation served as “the foundational concept for the study of ethnic relations” (Alba and Nee 2003: 1). iii

Based on European immigrants and their American born children’s integration into the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) dominant culture in in the United States, assimilation theorists posit that divisions between majority/minority groups will diminish over time and that these groups will become indistinguishable from each other. Assimilation theory has its roots in Robert Park’s (1950) race relations cycle which posited that relations between dominant and minority groups followed a linear process of contact, conflict, and accommodation and, eventually, assimilation. Fostering assimilation, Gordon (1964) later argued, was structural assimilation, or, the extent to which dominant and minority groups entered into primary relationships. For instance, despite social and economic divisions between early WASPS and European immigrants, intergroup differences decreased over time fostered by increasing rates of intermarriage and decreasing levels of residential segregation (Lieberson 1980).

Recently assimilation theorists have expanded theories of assimilation to explain the processes of integration for non-white immigrants from Asia, Africa, and Latin America and their U.S, born children. The segmented assimilation model (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993) posits that the first generation’s background characteristics, coupled with the external obstacles that the second generations encounter, factor into how future generations will fare. Unlike earlier assimilation theories which assumed a linear model of assimilation,
segmented assimilation accounts for why some groups may not enter the “American mainstream.” Proponents of the segmented assimilation model posit that the children of Mexican immigrants are put at distinctive social and economic disadvantages relative to other groups and attribute this to high levels of undocumented immigration, lower patterns of educational attainment, and upward economic mobility (Portes and Rumbault 2001). In turn, Mexican immigrants are less likely to transmit the types of social and economic resources that enhance upward socioeconomic mobility.

The second approach used to explain intergroup relations are power-conflict theories (Feagin and Feagin 1999). The power conflict approach encompasses theories of internal colonialism (Barrera 1979; Blauner 1972), class antagonism (Bonacich 1972), and racial formation (Omi and Winant 1994). The power-conflict perspective posits that intergroup group relations remain strained because of systematic oppression by the dominant group. From this viewpoint, minority groups encounter greater barriers to upward socioeconomic. Power-conflict perspectives are often used to explain the relationships between whites and racial minorities. For instance, white social, political, and economic dominance in the U.S. is seen as reducing chances of upward socioeconomic mobility for those of African, Asian, Native American, and Latino ancestry. Though public support for white racial supremacist attitudes have fallen out of favor and overt racist polices dismantled, power-conflict theorists see racial inequalities embedded within the structure of U.S. society (Bonilla-Silva 2001). Hence, white/non-white relations are fraught with tension.

Though helpful in explaining dominant/minority group relationships to a certain degree, assimilation and power-conflict approaches are problematic when used to explain the relationships between whites and people of color. Early assimilation approaches were based on
the experiences of European-origin groups. Though European immigrants and their U.S. born children experienced various types of discrimination, they eventually came to be seen socially and politically as white. In turn, they were allotted the social, political, and economic benefits associated with whiteness while non-whites were continually excluded from accessing the same resources. Further, the segmented assimilation which focuses on the integration of non-whites is limited because it focuses on socioeconomic outcomes rather than intergroup relations. For instance, many upwardly mobile third and fourth generation Chinese and Asian Americans in the U.S. encounter racial discrimination despite achieving higher levels of upward social mobility over time (Tuan 1998). Essentially, order theories do not fully explain the experience or persistence of interracial tensions throughout U.S. history.

Like assimilationist theories, power-conflict perspectives also limit our understandings of these inter-group relationships. Both internal colonialist (Feagin and Feagin 1999) and neo-Marxist perspectives of class (Bonilla-Silva 2001) overestimate intra-ethnic similarities. Though U.S. blacks, Asians, and Latinos may share a racial or pan-ethnic identity, they are internally diverse along social, economic, and racial lines. In addition, though racial formation theory acknowledges the shortcomings of these perspectives, it gives “undue emphasis to ideological perspectives” (Bonilla-Silva 2001: 31) and misses out on how these relationships are constructed along social and economic lines in everyday life. Because of these limitations, assimilation and power-conflict theories leave a narrow scope from which to examine majority/minority relationships. Given the limited scope of theory, how then can we better understand the relationships between these groups? To answer this question, we must first explore the framework most commonly used to explore white/non-white relations—the white/black paradigm—which provides a starting point to understand these relationships more broadly.
b. *The White/Black Paradigm of Race Relations*

Studies of intergroup relations in the U.S. have overwhelmingly focused on the relationships between white and black Americans (Bonilla-Silva 2001; Du Bois 1903; Feagin 2000; Massey and Denton 1993; Myrdal 1944; Schuman et al. 1997). Due to a long and vivid history of racial strife, the white/black experience is often implied and invoked in discussions about U.S. race relations. Although in the post-1960s Civil Rights Era, racist attitudes as well as racial prejudice and discrimination are no longer publically popular in the United States, race continues to play a factor in everyday white/black contact and interactions. Race influences where whites live (Kefalas 2003; Wilson and Taub 2006), send their children to school (Johnson and Shapiro 2003; Lewis 2004), and their romantic preferences (Bonilla Silva and Forman 2000; Frankenburg 1993).

Because of the extensive focus on the white/black experience in the U.S., social analysts often view race relations from within the white/black paradigm. Warner (2005) defines a paradigm as “a way of seeing the world, a representation, a picture or narrative of the fundamental properties of reality (64).” Yet there has been some debate about the extent to which the white/black paradigm remains useful for representing whites’ relationships with other groups (Almaguer 1994; Flores and Benmayor 1999; Feagin 2001). Race scholars such as Joe Feagin (2001) argue that the white/black paradigm remains useful for studying race relations because it accounts for the origins and persistence of racism today. He writes:

“…white elites and the white public have long evaluated, reacted to, and dominated later non-European entrants coming into the nation from within a previously established and highly imbedded system of anti-Black racism (2001: 204-205).”

Ideas about Asian and Latino inferiority were historically rooted in whites’ beliefs about African Americans’ innate biological and cultural inferiority. Early U.S. Courts deemed those with
traceable Black, Indian, or Asian ancestry ineligible for U.S. Citizenship (Haney Lopez 1996). Influenced by the eugenics movement in the late 19th century, white law makers pushed for reforms that would “preserve the nation’s superior [white] stock and remove the biologically unfit” (McKee 1993: 58). Though these laws were directed toward “less desired” immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, they also disenfranchised significant portions of Mexicanos. For instance, despite initially granting Mexicanos in the American Southwest political rights associated with citizenship, U.S courts denied many from rights associated with citizenship because of their Native American ancestry (Almaguer 1994).

Despite the significant contributions that the white/black paradigm adds to the study of race relations, other researchers (Almaguer 1994; Flores and Benmayor 1999; Kim 1999) have argued that when applied to white/Mexicano relations, this framework is ultimately limited in three ways. First, it constructs a binary view of race relations, equating relationships between whites and all non-whites. However, when compared to other groups, white/Mexicano relations have at times been relatively more harmonious (Almaguer 1994; Foley 1999). Central to informing these relationships were whites’ perceptions about Mexicanos’ racial status, both vis-à-vis themselves and other groups. For instance, white Anglos in the American Southwest viewed many Mexicanos as more racially closer to themselves than blacks, Asians, and Native Americans (Almaguer 1994). Similarly, some Mexicanos saw themselves as racially white and supported white supremacist ideologies and policies, often at the expense of blacks (Guglielmo 2006). Contemporary research echoes these findings. Whites are more willing to live near (Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996) and intermarry with Latinos (Qian 2002) than with African Americans. This suggests that there is more social distance between whites and blacks than between whites and Mexicanos.
Second, Almaguer (1994) contends that a white/black paradigm presupposes that intergroup relationships are rigid and symmetrical. That is, despite phenotype, class, and citizenship status, all relationships between whites and people of color are similar. When looking at white/black relationships quantitative measures, this view seems to hold: even after controlling social and economic factors, African Americans are more likely to live in racially homogeneous neighborhoods (Massey and Denton 1993; Krysan and Farley 2002) and have fewer financial resources (Oliver and Shapiro 2006) than white Americans. Further, research suggests that whites continue to harbor more negative views of African Americans, reflected in the persistence of anti-black racial attitudes (Schuman et al. 1997; Bobo, Kluegel, and Smith 1996), and discrimination in public places (Feagin 1991) and in the labor market (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004; Royster 2003).

However, white Americans’ relationships with Mexicanos were not always as rigid or symmetrical as they were with African Americans. Studies that focus on the historical nature of these relations indicate that factors such as phenotype, class, and gender played a significant role how both groups evaluated each other. For instance, whites in 19th century California often made distinctions between upper-class, lighter skinned Mexicanos and those who were working class and darker skinned. In fact, many Anglo men married the daughters of Mexicano land-owning elite (Almaguer 1994). Upper class Mexicanos, too, often made distinctions between themselves and working class Mexicanos, many of whom had Native American ancestry (Haney Lopez 2003; Almaguer 1994). These relationships continue to be complicated today and shaped by numerous social factors (Murguia and Forman 2003). Murguia and Forman (2003) argue that whites’ attitudes are colored by perceptions of social distance. They found that whites are more likely to feel warmer to upper class. English speaking, Protestant Mexicanos—all of which are
strongly linked to a white Anglo Saxon Protestant normative ideals. Though this suggests that there is a clear preference for “whitened” Mexicanos, it is evident that other characteristics continue to mediate whites’ perceptions of this group.

Similarly, contemporary Mexicanos’ feelings towards whites also reflect a complicated view of race relations as noted in surveys. Drawing on data from the 1990 Latino Political Survey (de la Garza et al. 1998), Murguia and Forman (2003) show that Mexicanos, as a group, hold more favorable attitudes towards whites than of blacks. Yet these attitudes change when controlling for nativity and educational levels, with more highly educated, native born, Mexicanos reporting warmer views towards both whites and African Americans (although they are more positive towards the former). Other research findings also suggest that Latinos’ racial identities influence their views of whites (Flores-Gonzales 1999). For instance, those who primarily identify in ethnic (i.e. Mexican, Puerto Rican) or pan-ethnic terms (Latino) feel less warm toward whites. Hence, Latinos identities are context-bound and are influenced by their understanding of race (Flores-Gonzales 1999; Rodriguez 2000) and social background (Tafoya 2004), and ultimately reveal that these relationships are much more fluid and dynamic than the white/black model suggests.

A third reason why the white/black paradigm remains limited when applied to white/Mexicano relationships rests on the notion that the U.S. racial structure is a static, two-tiered system. However, some scholars (Bonilla-Silva and Embrick 2006; Bonilla-Silva and Glover 2004) have suggested that a three-tiered, or Latin Americanized, racial structure, has emerged in the United States, consisting of three groups: collective whites (Anglos, assimilated white Latinos, and some Asian Americans), honorary whites (light-skinned Latinos and most Asian American groups), and collective blacks (African Americans as well as dark-skinned
Latinos, Asian Americans, and immigrants). Latinos location within the tri-racial structure is then influenced by various factors. Research by Murguia and Saenz (2002) lend support to the tri-racial structure. They find that when compared to darker skinned co-ethnics, lighter skinned Mexicanos in the U.S. fare better economically, are more likely to be English dominant, and have more social interaction with Anglos. Therefore, phenotype remains a salient factor in life outcomes, as well as social experiences, for all Mexicanos. These findings suggest that Mexicanos’ varying racial identities and other background characteristics cannot be fully understood through a white/black racial paradigm and lends support for the Latin Americanization model of race relations.

The white/black paradigm of race relations, though insightful in some ways, remains limited when applied to contemporary white/Mexicano relations in the United States. Framing these relations as dichotomous, rigid, and operating within a two-tiered, static, racial structure, limits our understanding of these relations and specifically, how they operate in everyday local contexts. In order to accurately explain contemporary and speculate about the future of white/Mexicano relations, we must contextualize these relationships. In the following section I review how studies have gone beyond the white/black paradigm of racial relations by examining the concept of threat.

2. Group Threat Theory
The concept of threat has been central to the study of ethnic and racial relations in the United States (Blalock 1967; Blumer 1958; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Dixon 2006). Group Threat Theory (GTT) posits that feelings of threat arises when a one group sees themselves in direct competition with another group over access to social, economic, and or political resources (Blalock 1967; Dixon 2006). The sense of threat in turn gives rise to negative perceptions of out-
groups. With regard to ethnic and racial relations in the United States, GTT has often been applied to explain relations between whites (the dominant group) and non-whites, or racial minorities (subordinate groups). The earliest studies employing GTT applied it to explain white/black relations in the United States (Blumer 1958; Blalock 1967).

In light of increasing immigration from Asian and Latin American counties, social scientists have begun applying GTT to explain intergroup relations in multiethnic and multiracial contexts (Bobo and Hutchings 1996: Dixon 2006). These findings reveal that perceptions of group threat are mediated by social, economic, and political threats that non-whites pose to whites in these social contexts. One key finding is that race and ethnic background, among other factors, matter in perceptions of group threat (Bobo and Hutchings 1996). For instance, Bobo and Hutchings (1996) find that whites view the presence of blacks as a greater threat than non-black minorities. They also find that non-black minorities (specifically Asian and Latinos) view blacks as a greater threat than other groups. It is also important to note that contextual factors, external to race, also influence perception of group threat. Perception of group threat can be fueled by members of a dominant group’s perception that a minority group harbors claims or infringes on the former’s proprietary claims to social, economic, or political resources, among others (Blumer 1958).

The concept of threat is useful because its applicability to explain different forms of intergroup conflict across different dimensions. Threats may be material (tangible) or symbolic (non-tangible). Claims over material resources are more tangible and are generally directly linked to physical and economic well-being. A review of the history of U.S. ethnic and racial relations reveals that whites have laid racial claims to jobs and neighborhoods. Symbolic claims, on the other hand, are non-tangible assertions, and refer to the ideas about who should have
access to resources. As Blumer (1958) states, it is what “ought to be” (p. 5). Though these claims are distinct from one other, they often work in tandem. For instance, Almaguer (1994) analyses of Anglos’ relationships with Indians, Mexicans, and Asians in 19th century California were informed by ideas of manifest destiny. Manifest destiny refers to a racial ideology that justified white supremacy. In turn, Anglos drew on symbolic (white Anglo racial supremacy) to justify material claims (lands and jobs) to combat Mexicanos’ accusations of discrimination.

However, studies on U.S. ethnic and racial relations have underutilized the concept of threat to explain the multiple trajectories of intergroup relationships. These limitations lay within how group threat has been applied and measured. First, with few exceptions (Bobo and Hutchings 1996), the majority of studies exploring the role of threat still focus on white/black contexts. Though correct in estimating the significance and salience of race in group relations, its primary and narrow application limits its analyses to a dichotomous color line. Increasingly, scholars have begun to expand their racial analyses beyond the white/black paradigm of U.S. race relations (Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bonilla-Silva and Embrick 2006; Murgia and Forman 2004), finding that whites’ attitudes and relationships with non-whites are influenced by other characteristics beyond race, such as class, skin-tone, and language. These findings suggest that U.S. ethnic and racial relations at the beginning of the 21st century are not static but fluid, situational, and contextual and will continue to be so in light of increasing national diversity. This calls for social scientists to broaden their analysis of ethnic and racial relations by going beyond the experiences of a few groups. However this means applying useful concepts such as threat in their analysis. In doing so, we are better able to better understand how social contexts shape the trajectory of outcomes.
Second, the majority of studies employing threat as an analytical category draw on survey data. Though survey data provides a holistically valuable insight to how group threat varies along differential dimensions, it does not reveal how threat operates and plays out in everyday lives. Micro-level, qualitative studies on ethnic and racial relations have been fruitful for understanding how race (and ethnicity) shapes interactions and everyday lives. Qualitative case studies exploring intergroup relations point to the importance of understanding the role of context-specific events and situations shape intergroup relations in neighborhoods (Kefalas 2003; Wilson and Taub 2006), schools (Lewis 2003) as well customer and worker interactions (McDermott 2006; Lee 2002). These findings indicate that intergroup relations are situational and context-bound. Hence, qualitative examinations of everyday life in multi-ethnic and multiracial spaces provide a key opportunity to understand the myriad of trajectories that majority/minority group relations follow. In the next section, I review previous studies which have examined white/Latino relations in one local context: neighborhoods.

3. White/Mexicano Relations in Local Contexts: Neighborhoods

In light of increasing numbers of Latinos in the United States, there has been a growing scholarly interest in their settlement in historically white localities (Mclaughlin et al. 2002; Millard and Chapa 2004; Sizemore 2004; Valdes 2000; Wilson and Taub 2006). Many of these studies focus on Latino residents’ incorporation and experiences with local institutions (Flippen 2001; Millard, Chapa, and McConnell 2004). Whereas there has been a long history of excluding Mexicanos from participation in community life in the United States (Acuna 2000; Haney Lopez 2004), today neighborhood institutions and community organizations often work to facilitate Latino newcomers’ integration. Schools are increasingly offering bilingual education, reaching out to Spanish monolingual parents, and aiming to improve Latino students’ educational outcomes.
Local religious (and mostly Christian) institutions often reach out to Latinos by providing worship services in Spanish as well as incorporating distinctive ethno-religious practices (Badillo 2004; Christerson, Edwards, and Emerson 2005; Flippen 2001). Some also serve as social and political advocates for Latino families, many of whom who are undocumented immigrants (Davis, Martinez, and Warner 2010). Often local community leaders and organizations often work together, forming collaborative relationships to address Latinos social and material needs with an aim to integrate Latinos and promote neighborhood residential well-being. In these ways, Latinos are significantly influencing institutional practices and are an increasing visible presence in communities across the United States.

Yet, at the same time, some long-term white residents in these same communities are concerned about the impact Latinos are having on neighborhood institutions and community life. In schools, white parents voice discontent over funding for bilingual education programs while tensions arise between white and Latino students over the use of Spanish during the school day (Millard, Chapa, and McConnell 2004). Local church leaders must tread lightly when addressing Mexicano parishioners’ social and cultural needs for fear of alienating long-term white congregants (Martinez 2007). These tensions may spill over into local politics, often in the form of proposals for English-only policies or housing ordinances capping the number of residents per household. In one case, a community granted police officers the right to detain individuals who were believed to be undocumented immigrants (Hartman and Press 2007).

Underlying divergent contexts of reception are white residents’ perception of threat. There seem to be two factors mediating whether white residents view their Mexicano counterparts as a threat. The first is whether white community members see Mexicanos upholding neighborhood-based norms. Maria Kefalas’s (2003) work on Beltway, a
predominately white neighborhood in Chicago, found that many white residents welcomed Latino neighbors so long as they were perceive to uphold the neighborhood moral order; keeping up the appearance of their homes, watching their children, and working actively to deter crime. A second factor informing white residents’ receptions of Latino newcomers is whether whites saw them as allies against the encroachment of other racial minorities, and particularly, African Americans (Flippen 2001; Wilson and Taub 2006). For instance, Chenoa Flippen’s (2001) study on Dover, a Chicago neighborhood that had undergone white to Latino transition, found that though white residents displayed animosity over increasing Latino numbers, both groups shared concerns about the busing of African American students into local schools. Both groups eventually organized around these interests and successfully lobbied against busing of black students into their neighborhood schools.

Theories on group prejudice support and help explain these periods of intergroup collaboration. Allport (1954) argued that intergroup tensions will decrease (albeit momentarily) when groups share a common adversary who they perceive as a greater threat. As previous studies show (Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Taylor 1998; Kefalas 2003), whites are more resistant to living near African Americans than Asians and Latinos. White/Latino collaboration is then more likely to occur when they share a neighborhood and live near African Americans. In such contexts, whites and Mexicans may become allies against what they see as a greater threat. It is in this way that context and perceptions of threat may alter intergroup relations at particular socio-historical moments.

Scholars (Flippen 2001; Kefalas 2003; Wilson and Taub 2006) have begun to explain the various degrees of group conflict and cohesion inside these neighborhoods. Those working within social organizational frameworks (Flippen 2001; Wilson and Taub 2006) offer that
intergroup tensions arise when racial minorities’ entrance into neighborhoods threaten white social organization. Wilson and Taub (2006) argued that whites’ response to Latinos in the Chicago communities of Dover (Flippen 2001) and Beltway (Kefalas 2003) differed because of the threat the latter posed to the former group’s social organizations and institutional practices. Whites in Dover voiced more discontent because they saw Mexicans as a significant threat to neighborhood organizational life. Though Kefalas (2003) found that Beltway’s whites were concerned about increasing Latino numbers, they did not display similar concerns to the same extent as did white Dover residents. Wilson and Taub (2006:171) attribute these differences to white residents’ perceptions of an out-group threat. In Dover, white residents already had a sense that they had “lost the battle” (Flippen 2001: 171), while those in Beltway were still able to come together (even informally) to influence neighborhood stability. Therefore, the extent to which intergroup collaboration and conflict occurs within these communities depends on relative group size and perceptions of out-group threat.

Hence, structural and organizational changes associated with ethnic and racial shifts in neighborhood composition factor into the extent that whites perceive Latinos as a threat. However, too often absent from these conversations are the everyday experiences that give rise to these feelings. Studies drawing on everyday experiences between whites and Latinos in the contexts of romantic relationships (Frankenburg 1993), schools, (Bettie 2003; Lewis 2004) and churches (Christerson, Edwards, and Emerson 2005), reveal how these relations and interactions are socially constructed. Seeing how these relations are influenced and structured by context (within public spaces, institutions, and private homes) provides a vantage point to better understand the situational, and often contradictory, nature of these relationships.
Such analyses must also situate everyday interactions in neighborhoods within the broader, national context. Issues pertinent to U.S. Mexicanos such as the impact of large and undocumented immigration on American social and cultural life and the resurgence of nativism must be taken seriously in any present-day analysis of white/Mexicano relations. For instance, my previous research on Augusta (Martinez 2007) found that white residents referenced larger discussions around citizenship, undocumented immigration, and assimilation when expressing views of Mexicano residents. For some, Mexicanos were seen as a threat, not only to the local neighborhood, but to national well-being and overall American identity. Hence linking everyday interactions and the broader context of these relations can provide a more holistic picture about the ways in which these relationships are continually reconstructed.

F. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In light of increasing national diversity, a growing scholarly interests new immigrant destinations, and theoretical limitations in explaining white/Latino relations, it is pertinent to ask the following questions: (1) How do white residents react to Latino neighborhood succession? (2) How does group conflict play out across dimensions of neighborhood life? (3) How do neighborhood-based social structures, organizations, and practices facilitate or impede Latino residents’ integration? (4) What do these findings suggest about the future of white/Latino relations in new destinations? (5) What are the implications for theories of ethnic and racial relations?

I argue Latino neighborhood succession heightens white residents’ perception of group threat. This threat is manifested in political, religious, and cultural dimensions of neighborhood life. White residents of Augusta are able to stave off, to a degree, some changes associated with neighborhood succession. This is due to high levels of white residential social organization,
facilitated by their status as long-time residents, strong ties to local social institutions, and continued access to influential community leaders. Thus, relative to Latino residents, white residents occupy a structurally privileged position within particular dimensions of neighborhood life. Some Latino residents react by calling into question disparities between whites and Mexicano residents, while others work within the system to facilitate Latino residential integration. The findings suggest Latino neighborhood succession in new destinations does not always ensure Latino residential integration or transmission of power. In turn, this calls for scholars of ethnic and racial relations to examine how local social contexts and place-based mechanisms shape neighborhood relations and immigrant integration in new destinations.

G. CHAPTER OVERVIEW

In what follows, I describe how I studied Augusta, the history of the neighborhood, key substantial findings, and their implications for understanding relations in an increasingly diversifying society. Chapter 2 details the research methodology used in data collection. I begin by laying out the justification for the methodology (ethnography) and the selection of the research site. I then describe how I obtained access to the community and the types of methods I used to collect various forms of data. In chapter 3 I provide a historical overview of Augusta. I begin by describing the economic factors that gave rise to European immigrant settlement in neighborhood as well as the formations of community institutions between the 1880s and 1940s. I then follow up with a description of the post-World War II economic boom and its impact on neighborhood life and development. Lastly, I describe the period of neighborhood transition between the 1970s and 2000s, with a focus on Latino migration and settlement patterns and early encounters between white and Mexicano residents.
Chapters 4, 5, and 6 are substantive chapters that address the research questions. In chapter 4, I describe how and why Augusta remains segmented along ethno-political lines. I uncover how ethno-racial interests overlap with political interests, and reinforce differential access to power. I then focus on how Mexicano middle-class professionals work to integrate Latino residents within a highly polarized ethno-political structure and navigate ethno-political cleavages in an effort to facilitate Latino integration. Chapter 5 explores how a group of white ethnic, and mostly Italian American Catholic, parishioners collectively organize to brand a white ethno-religious identity to one of Augusta’s churches, despite Latino succession. In particular, I examine the impetus behind and strategies to make place. Chapter 6 shifts focus to Augusta’s three annual festivals to explore how intergroup relations play out in public spaces. I uncover the variety of ways that Latinos experience marginalization through social conclusion and informal policing.

In Chapter 7 I conclude with an overview of key research findings. I highlight the contributions of this research in understanding neighborhood succession, the insight of group threat, and the importance of examining social contexts in analyzing intergroup relations. It also addresses some of the shortcomings of this project and how it can be improved. I conclude this section with some final thoughts about how scholars, community leaders, and institutions can work toward the well-being of all residents who reside in U.S. neighborhood undergoing social change.
II. METHODOLOGY

A. WHY AN ETHNOGRAPHY?

This research project is ethnographically based. Ethnographic studies have been fruitful for uncovering how race and ethnicity remain significant for whites (Hartigan 1999; McDermott 2006) and non-whites’ (Bettie 2003; Lewis 2004) everyday lives. Ethnographic methods allow researchers to see how racial and ethnic meanings and differences are constructed and reconstructed within social contexts. For instance, research shows that racial (Rockquemore 2002; Waters 2001) and ethnic identities (Alba 1990; Gans 1979; Waters 1990) are context bound, often depending on who is around, the racial/ethnic background of the interviewer, and the purpose of the research (Espiritu 1992; Nagel 1994; Rodriguez 2000). In addition, ethnographic field work has been helpful for uncovering how people racialize themselves and others (Lewis 2004). For instance, Lewis (2004) found that variables such as skin tone, language, culture, names and class factor into how elementary grade school students racialize each other. Though these ascriptions and inscriptions are constructed within everyday interactions, they are informed by larger ideas about race and ethnicity imbedded within a broader racial structure. Therefore, ethnography remains helpful for exploring the way in which white/Mexicano everyday interactions are shaped by perceptions of social distance and group threat, and enable researchers to link micro-processes to larger social forces and structures.

Ethnographic research has methodological and theoretical implications for uncovering intergroup dynamics and relations between whites and people of color (Kefalas 2003; Wilson and Taub 2006; Bettie 2003; McDermott 2006; Rieder 1985). Ethnographers working from the standpoint of vulnerable and excluded populations often privilege their voices (Sprague 2005) while incorporating, both quantitative (census data, surveys) and qualitative data (observations,
interviews) (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Doing so provides a more holistic view of social situations. In addition, ethnographic research enables social scientists to link everyday life to larger social structures (Duneier 1999; Burawoy 1998). For example, in doing research on poor African American book vendors in upscale Greenwich Village, Duneier (1999) concluded that their agency was shaped by social forces outside of their place of work. He found that social constraints, ranging from city ordinances to bathroom access, played a significant role in organizing their lives. In this way, ethnography-based research can make the link between micro, meso, and macro structures. This means expanding beyond the perspectives of residents to observing various public spaces and institutions. It also entails exploring the degree to which intergroup relations are shaped by larger discourses of race and ethnicity as well as ideologies of citizenry and national belonging. In broadening the scope of this research across space and place, I aim to provide a more holistic picture of intergroup relations in Augusta.

B. ABOUT AUGUSTA

The suburban community of Augusta is located 20 miles outside a major U.S. Midwestern city. Founded in 1882, Augusta’s earliest inhabitants were first and second generation German and Swedish Americans. At the beginning of the 20th century, Italian and Lithuanian immigrants began migrating to Augusta. Over the next 30 years the area became home to numerous factories and became known as an “industrial suburb” (Harris 2005). Economic development gave rise to residential settlement and many first and second generation European Americans called Augusta home. By 1930, and due to The 1924 Immigration Act, European migration to the United States came to a trickle. Still, the majority of Augusta’s residents were either first or second generation European Americans. Between 1930 and the early 1970s, Augusta remained a predominately
white, working class community—many of whom were 3rd and 4th generation Italian Americans. Beginning in the late 1970’s, Augusta saw an increase in its Latino population. Numbering only a couple of thousands in the 1980’s, the Latino population grew over the next 30 years. In 1990, Latinos made up a third of Augusta's residents and by 2000, the Latino population surpassed whites (40.5%) and became the largest group in the community (54%). As of 2010, 70% of Augusta’s residents were Latino and 23% were white [See Table 2.1].

[INSERT TABLE 2.1 HERE]

C. WHY AUGUSTA?

I chose to examine intergroup relations in Augusta for a number of reasons. First, Augusta is a representative sample of a re-emerging immigrant destination, post white to Latino neighborhood succession. Moreover, in studying a re-emerging gateway, I wanted to examine the trajectory of white/Latino relations over a large span of time (1970 to 2010). This enabled me to explore a number of venues. For instance, I could examine Latino neighborhood structural integration over time. This meant analyzing the degree to which Latino residents were represented as elected leaders and in municipal positions. Furthermore, Augusta provided an opportunity to explore social contact between white and Latino residents over generations. This afforded the opportunity to examine the types of attitudes and encounters between native-born whites and second generation Latino residents, and whether they changed over time. Essentially, I saw Augusta as an opportunity to speculate about how white/Latino relations may unfold in other types of new immigrant gateways over time, while identifying factors that shaped various group outcomes.

Second, I was already familiar with Augusta because of the previous research projects I conducted at one of the religious institutions, Our Lady of Pompeii Catholic Church. In early
2006, I began examining how white, and mostly Italian American, parishioners experienced and reacted to Latino institutional succession, which served as the basis of my M.A. paper (Martinez Unpublished). It was during this period that I was introduced to many of the research respondents who are a part of the current study. At this time I also began a new research project which examined how Catholic Churches in the area were involved in the immigration rights movement (Davis, Martinez, Warner 2010). Both projects consisted of participant observations of various events and interviews with immigrant rights activists, many whom lived in Augusta and were either lay parishioners or clergy. Hence, my previous research on one of Augusta’s institutions served as my initial entrée into the neighborhood and enabled me to learn more about the area and make research contacts.

Lastly, Augusta was chosen as a research cite because of practicality. The neighborhood is located 13 miles from where I lived. Travel times by car ranged from 30 minutes to an hour, which made it convenient in terms of transportation, accessibility, and costs. This enabled me the ability to visit the community 3-4 times a week over a number of years and commit to volunteering weekly for the church food pantry, arrange and conduct interviews around respondents’ schedule, and observe organizational meetings and events.

D. MY ROLE AS A RESEARCHER

1. Gaining Access
   a. Pre-Dissertation Phase
   My initial entrée into studying Augusta began in 2005 while working on my M.A. degree at the University of Illinois at Chicago. I was interested in ethnic and racial relations in multiracial and multiethnic religious institutions, and particularly, Catholic churches. That spring I was enrolled in a graduate methods seminar on interviewing, taught by Dr. Sharon Collins. The course
required students to conduct interviews and analyze interview data for their thesis or dissertation projects. I identified Augusta’s Our Lady of Pompeii Catholic Church as a research site because it had a significant population of white and Latino parishioners. I contacted the church, informed them of my research project, and asked if it would be possible to arrange interviews with parishioners. I also offered to volunteer at the church, knowing that it would be easier to identify potential interviewees as well as learn more about the site more generally. The head pastor at the time, Father Giancarlo, granted me permission and suggested that I could volunteer at the food pantry and speak to people there, to which I agreed. Upon my first day, I met Grace, who managed the pantry. Grace was a white woman in her sixties and a life-long parishioner and resident of Augusta. She enthusiastically welcomed my help, especially because some of the work was labor intensive and most of the pantry volunteers were senior citizens or middle school children. During the weeks I was there, I helped sort food, bag groceries, and carry them to pantry clients’ cars.

After completing this assignment, I confirmed that I wanted to explore white/Latino relations at Our Lady of Pompeii for my M.A. paper. I was interested in how white, and mostly Italian American parishioners, experienced and responded to Latino succession. After confirming my research interest and obtaining permission from church leaders and UIC’s Office for the Protection of Research Subjects, I began official data collection. I observed various events—religious services, celebrations, and festivals—over the course of the research period, writing fieldnotes, creating research memos, and identifying information relevant to my research questions. In addition, the head pastor of the church (Fr. Lorenzo by this time) provided me a list of parishioners to contact for interviews. It was during this time I met Frank Palucci, a life-long parishioner and resident of Augusta, who would become one of my key informants in the
current study. Frank was a third generation Italian American in his sixties who had worked for the Village of Augusta as a clerical worker. He knew a lot about the church and the neighborhood history and provided me with a wealth of information. Knowing that I sought out opportunities to observe multiple events (and was a willing volunteer), Frank often asked me to help him at events. During the Our Lady of Pompeii Festival in 2006, Frank asked me to assist other parishioners in throwing out trash and to fill bags full of rose petals that would be thrown at the Madonna during the Sunday street procession. The following September I helped sell desserts from his food booth at The Taste of Augusta.

These experiences—both inside and outside the church—gave rise to new questions about white/Latino relations which could not be answered by examining just one site. Despite transitioning to a Latino majority neighborhood, both groups remained relatively isolated in terms of social interaction and proximity. The church was internally segregated in terms of worship services and other religious events. Both groups by in large attended different language (English, Spanish, and Italian) masses and adhered to unique ethno-religious practices and devotions. Group divisions were notable outside the church as well. Whites and Latinos lived in different parts of Augusta and attended different elementary and high schools. In addition, white residents were overrepresented as elected leaders and municipal employees. These group differences peaked my interest as a social investigator and gave rise to new questions about how intergroup relations play out in neighborhoods that have undergone ethnic change and that would be need to be explored further.

b. Dissertation Phase
I officially began my dissertation fieldwork in March of 2009. Initial observations consisted of taking stock of the physical layout and aspects of the neighborhood. I did block-by-block walk-throughs of Augusta, often taking pictures of various sites and writing notes describing the social
geography of the neighborhood. It was during this time I also mapped out the location and types of commercial businesses and residential dwellings, while noting the physical well-being of particular places. Coincidentally, it was the month before the Augusta Village Council elections (April) and lawns were filled with campaign signs of the Augusta Vision Party (the village incumbents who were mostly white) and the Augusta Improvement Party (political challengers, who were mostly Latino). I recorded the number of signs for each party, noting and mapping them out by block, which would potentially enable me to compare whether race or ethnicity (by census track) would overlap with what I assumed would be political support.

During this time, I also contacted Our Lady of Pompeii Catholic Church and the Augusta Village Council and requested permission to observe various functions and organizational meetings that each institution oversaw. Because of my previous work at Our Lady of Pompeii, church officials knew who I was, my research interests were, and welcomed my presence to observe various functions at the church. The church rectory also housed the food pantry, where I ended up volunteering for 18 months. There I met Bobby and Charlie, the managers of the food pantry, who would become two of my key informants for the duration of the research. Both were Italian Americans, life-long residents of the neighborhood, and heavily involved in the church. Bobby was a retired logistics manager in his late sixties who now worked as a church deacon at Our Lady of Pompeii. Besides overseeing the finances and operations of the food pantry, he often conducted church religious services, visited ill parishioners to provide communion, and led funeral masses. His co-manager, Charlie, was an assistant chief on Augusta’s Fire Department in his mid-fifties. Both had “inherited” the food pantry from the previous managers who were senior citizens and who increasingly had difficulty managing weekly operations. Over the course of the next 18 months, both Bobby and Charlie became good sources of information and friends.
We often went to dinner afterwards at a local restaurant where we discussed food pantry logistics, local gossip, and our personal lives. Our conversations were often jovial and collegial and they enthusiastically welcomed my presence. I also contacted the Augusta Village Council to obtain permission to observe bi-monthly meetings. I arranged a time to formally introduce myself and my research interests and intentions to the council. It was during this presentation that I met Sam Raneri (the mayor), Manual Avilas (a Latino village trustee), and Adriana Salinas (the Augusta Latino Liaison and wife to Angel Salinas, another Latino trustee). They also welcomed my presence and offered to help out in any way they could.

Both organizations provided a door to explore various religious and political related functions in Augusta. Along with offering weekly religious services, Our Lady of Pompeii served as a central site for various gatherings, both religious and non-religious. Religious societies, such as the societies of Our Lady of Pompeii and Pardre Biaggio as well the Our Lady of Pompeii History Group, met in the church basement, offices, or former church elementary school. Organizational members consisted of current and former Augusta residents, and overwhelmingly, Italian Americans. Other religious organizations housed at the church consisted of mostly Latino parishioners. These included religious societies devoted to particular saints, bible studies, and church youth groups. In addition to being a host to religious based organizations, Our Lady of Pompeii housed non-religious based organizational meetings. Neighborhoods United, a community group consisting of social service professionals who worked with immigrant, and predominately Latino families in the area, met monthly in the old church rectory building. It was coordinated by Our Lady of Pompeii’s head pastor, Fr. Lorenzo and Victoria Segura, who worked the state health and human services agency. Fr. Lorenzo was a first generation Italian American who was actively involved in immigrant rights issues. He often
worked with religious and secular pro-immigrant advocate organizations lobbying for pro-immigrant immigration reform. Victoria shared in his vision. A second generation Mexicana who grew up in Chicago, she aimed to create “partnerships” across religious, state, and community organizations to work toward improving the quality of life for immigrant families in the area.

Similarly, my routine presence at the bi-monthly Augusta Village Council meetings opened up opportunities to explore other functions by putting me into contact with members of various civic and political organizations. Adriana, the Augusta Latino Liaison, invited me to attend the Augusta Community Relations and Fair Housing meetings, which met monthly at the Augusta Civic Center. The group consisted of a mix of white and Latino residents, most of who worked in village departments. Attending the council meetings also provided an opportunity to speak to candidates about local political issues during Augusta’s mayoral and Village Council elections. In late March, I stood outside the Augusta Civic Center talking with incumbent village trustees (the Augusta Vision Party) and their supporters while they passed out political fliers to residents who were participating in early voting. This also enabled me to meet and speak with candidates of the opposing party (the Augusta Improvement Party) who were present as well.

I also observed events that periodically occurred in neighborhood public spaces. When they arose, I attended health and civic fairs, landmark organizational events, and annual festivals. Augusta’s political, religious, and business leaders often collaborated with social service organizations and residents to hold events geared toward Latinos in Augusta and the surrounding area. These included health fairs geared toward providing information to Latino families as well as expos that aimed to connect U.S. and Mexican political and business leaders to foster transnational relations. Central to this collaboration was the Salvador Solis, a first generation Mexicano who owned a popular chain of Mexican restaurants (one of which was in Augusta),
and Augusta’s mayor, Sam Raneri. Solis also was instrumental in the founding of Casa Morellos, a Mexican Hometown Association (HTA), which opened its doors in Augusta in 2010. Solis kindly gave me a tour of Casa Morellos, which was housed in a former bank building. He later invited me to the official opening of Casa Morellos, which drew hundreds of attendees, including U.S. and Mexican officials and new organizations.

Augusta also hosts three festivals, all of which I observed during the research period. These include The Our Lady of Pompeii Festival, The Taste of Augusta, and Latino Fest. Though each event is organized by different religious, civic, and business organizations, they are open to the public and draw thousands of attendees each year. Festival included food and retail vendors, live entertainment, and carnival rides and games. I attended each of these festivals every year during the research period where I took notes, pictures, and spoke with festival attendees. At various times I volunteered to help some of my research participants sell food (The Taste of Augusta) or to breakdown tables and chairs (Our Lady of Pompeii Festival). In all, these organizations, sites, and events served as, both, my initial entrée into Augusta as well as areas I that would continually revisit and explore. Ultimately they serve as the foundations for my examination of the political, religious, and cultural dimensions of community life.

E. METHODS

1. Field Observations
Over the research period, I conducted numerous observations of various events. This entailed recording field notes, collecting publically available materials, and speaking with people. Field notes were taken either during observations or after they were completed. Organizational meetings afforded me the opportunity to take field notes in real time without standing out. This was because it was assumed that attendees would take notes, as was the case at the monthly Neighborhood United meetings. However, at other times, I chose not write field notes during
certain events. For instance, I did not take field notes during religious services because I did not want to seem disrespectful to other attendees. Other times I wrote down field notes periodically, to focus on observing functions as well as not make participants self-conscious. In situations where I took little or no field notes at all, I often returned to my car to jot down non-recorded observations or to expand on the jottings I wrote. Hand-written field notes were typed up within 24 hours observations. While reviewing hand-written field notes or typing them up, I highlighted some themes to explore. These themes formed the basis of memos which were organized into three memo categories: substantive, theoretical, and methodological. Substantive memos provided rich descriptions of particular observations that either spoke to the research question or offered a potential theme to explore or develop. Theoretical memos were constructed whenever observations could potentially be linked to theoretical perspectives on intergroup relations or threat. Lastly, methodological memos provided me an opportunity to note any matters relevant to collecting data. For instance, I often wrote methodological memos whenever research participants referenced my own position as a researcher, Latino, male, or graduate student. This enabled me to continuously be self-reflective of my positionality and how it influenced the types of data I collected.

Table 2.2 indicates the types of events I attended and observed throughout the research period, indicating various functions, meeting schedules, and ratio of participants by race. As noted earlier, these include observations of religious, village, community, Latino-focused, and pro-immigrant related events. At some of these events, I was a passive observer. This meant listening, writing periodic field notes, and speaking with participants during functions. Other times, I was an active participant observer where organizers enlisted me as volunteer to help organize or contribute to the events. For instance, I worked at the weekly Our Lady of Pompeii
food pantry for nearly two years as well as asked by the food pantry co-managers to set up the Our Lady of Pompeii Festival in July.

[INSERT TABLE 2.2 HERE]

2. Interviews
Formal and informal interviews were conducted with respondents during the course of the research period. Formal, digitally-recorded, semi-structured interviews were done with thirty participants. Formal interview respondents had to meet certain requirements. They had to be an adult (eighteen or older), white or Latino, and had lived or worked in Augusta. Interviewees were recruited using two sampling techniques: purposive and snowball sampling (Singleton and Straits 2005). Purposive sampling depended upon whether respondents fit the sampling criteria. This was confirmed during initial conversations prior to formal interview recruitment. Once confirmed, respondents were then asked to conduct an interview. If they agreed, I exchanged contact information and arranged a tentative time to meet. After formal interviews were conducted, respondents were then asked to refer potential respondents. This reflected the second type of recruitment strategy, snowball sampling. If provided the name of potential respondents, interviewees were given the option to either offer potential respondents’ contact information or refer my contact information to the person they indicated.

Formal interviews lasted between one to four hours. Interviews were conducted in places of respondents’ choosing. These included homes, jobs, village institutions, or in public places. Prior to interviews, respondents were given an IRB-approved information sheet which provided information about the study, potential risks, interviewee rights, and the contact information. Most of the interviews were conducted during one visit. At other times, and due to time constraints, interviews had to be conducted in separate phases, as was the case for those that took place at respondents’ places of employment. During interviews I took notes, indicating the time of day,
the physical environment, respondents’ demeanor, and any non-verbal cues. Interview guides used in the study were designed to elicit particular types of information and were divided into five sections: (I) respondent background and community participation; (II) objective perspectives of neighborhood ethnic change; (III) subjective perspectives of neighborhood ethnic change; (IV) personal relationships with neighborhood residents and; (V) personal social demographic data. Each section contained questions along with probes which were used to guide and clarify responses. After interviews concluded, I typed up interview research memos, based on handwritten and mental notes, detailing respondents’ characteristics and key phrases and themes that emerged. I then uploaded digitized versions of interviews into a computer software system (Olympus) to store and transcribe recordings.

Over the course of the research period, I also conducted hundreds of informal interviews. This was done in lieu of formal interviews for a number of reasons. First, it was difficult at times to arrange a formal interview with respondents. This was due to respondents’ time constraints, difficulty in scheduling follow-up inquiries, feasibility, and proximity. Such was the case for former residents who only returned to Augusta during key events (i.e. annual festivals and church celebrations). Second, at times, some individuals were not interested in being interviewed. If this occurred, I thanked them for the information and informed them to contact me should they change their mind. Third, informal respondents provided information relevant to the research focus but did not fit the criteria for formal interviews. For instance, many representatives from social service agencies were members of the Neighborhoods United (NU) did not live or work in Augusta but could provide information. Still, informal conversations with people provided a wealth of information by providing their various perspectives and relevant information about neighborhood change and white/Latino relations in Augusta.
3. Other Qualitative Sources

In addition to field observations and interviews, I also collected other forms of data from across numerous sites. These included fliers, bulletins, newspapers, and official public documents, and archival materials. Fliers and bulletins were often available at sites and were either handed out by individuals during certain events or placed in areas intended for people to view and take. Fliers and bulletins generally provided information about organizational meetings, events and services. For instance, church bulletins included information about religious services, organizational meetings, and events along with bible verses and prayers in English, Spanish, and Italian. Similarly the Augusta Civic Center provided details about services and recreational programs geared towards certain age groups. I also obtained similar materials from the monthly NU meetings, though most informational handouts were orientated toward social services for first and second generation immigrants, and mostly, Latinos.

Data was also collected from local (2) and regional newspapers (2). Local newspapers included *The Augustan* and *The West Suburban Press*, distributed quarterly and weekly, respectively. *The Augustan* carried stories of Augusta and noted various events and services in the village, while the *West Suburban Press* covered news from eight towns in the area (including Augusta). Unlike the Augustan, the West Suburban Press was available online which made it easier to conduct searches on information on research topics. For instance, I often typed in key words (“Augusta,” “Latino,” “Hispanic,” “Raneri” etc...) in the website search engine to find information about stories and topics that could be used as data. This information was routinely collected and cut and pasted into word documents organized by month to conduct further analysis. In addition to local newspapers, I collected regional periodicals. One was a Spanish language newspaper, *El Suburbia*, and distributed in the metropolitan reading. I would review the newspaper (which was available at numerous sites throughout Augusta and the surrounding
area) for stories of interest. If I found a story of interest, I went to the paper’s website, located the story, and used an online application (Google) to translate documents from English to Spanish. Translated materials were then copied and pasted into a world document and analyzed. The second regional paper was the *Dailey Metropolitan*, which covered numerous towns in the region. However much of the archival data I collected were new stories of Augusta dating back to the late 1890s. This information was accessible through the Richard J. Daley Library website at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

In addition, I also collected two types of official public documents on Augusta. The first were the bi-monthly meeting minutes of the Augusta Village Council. This information detailed council members’ attendance, meeting agendas, public presentations, and votes on building permits, village licenses, and ordinances. I was able to arrange for one of the Village Trustees to bring me the previous meeting minutes at the following council meetings. The second type of official public documents consisted of village ordinances. These documents were available on, and downloaded from, the Village of Augusta’s website. They included information about new and amended ordinances with regard to permits, licensing, zoning, and municipal job positions and duties.

Finally, I drew on archival resources from the Italian-American Collection located in the Department of Special Collections housed in the Richard J. Daley Library at the University of Illinois at Chicago. This entailed scheduling two visits to review the collection with the Department of Special Collection archivists. On the first visit I identified and photocopied relevant materials and stored them into folders to review while analyzing data. I also shared some of this information with the Our Lady of Pompeii Historical Society, some of which they
kept for their own archives. I also arranged a second visit with two members (Frank Palucci and Michael Roberts) of the Our Lady of Pompeii Historical Society to review additional materials.

F. **ANALYSIS**

Data were analyzed while I was in the field as well as after I left. Early data analysis consisted of creating memos and themes emerging from field observations, interviews, and printed materials. These memos addressed substantive, theoretical, and methodological themes and issues as they emerged during fieldwork. Field notes and transcribed interviews were cleaned and organized into folders. Initially, typed up field observations were organized into larger files by month. However, I eventually reorganized them by field site which enabled me to better analyze event and place-based themes over time. These documents were then uploaded into Atlas.Ti, a qualitative data analyses computer software program for alternative storage and analysis.

I analyzed data in two phases. The first phase entailed open-coding. This consisted of a line by line analysis of data materials uploaded into Atlas.Ti and a generation of codes that identified themes. During this phase I generated hundreds of codes. While open-coding, I continued writing memos of emerging and reoccurring themes. Open codes were then reviewed and revised into new codes. These codes were used during the second phase of data analysis: closed-coding. Close coding consisted of re-analyzing data materials and identifying snippets of information with revised codes. Coded information was then retrieved and, along with memos, analyzed for themes which served as the basis of various chapters.
III. AUGUSTA: A HISTORY OF THE SUBURBAN VILLAGE

A. Neighborhood Origins: 1880s-1940s

The Village of Augusta was founded in 1882. Located in what is now a major metropolitan area in the U.S. Midwest, the area was originally mostly open prairie land. Beginning in 1873, the Augusta Land Company began offering “lots to anyone who agreed to build a dwelling for valued at $500 or more” (Harris 2005). By the end of the year 50 people had purchased these lots. The earliest inhabitants were of German and Swedish descent, most of who were farmers or owned store front businesses. Due to its proximity to Chicago and access to railroad transportation, Augusta quickly saw an explosive population growth over the next 20 years. Between 1880 and 1900, the village’s population grew from 200 to nearly 2600 residents. Economic and population growth would continue into the first decade of the 20th century. Residential and commercial districts, along with municipal departments and schools, emerged to meet the demand of population growth. By 1910, the population had reached 4800, transforming it from a rural community to one of the earliest suburbs in the area (Harris 2005).

Driving Augusta’s population growth over the first three decades of the 20th century was European migration. In 1900, over 80% of Augusta’s residents were either foreign born (38.4%) or had foreign-born parents (44.9%). The first wave of immigrants were Lithuanians who were shortly followed by Italians, most of whom who were poor, low-skilled, male laborers. The growing numbers of first and second generation European Americans migrating to the area contributed to Augusta’s steady population growth through World War I. By the mid-1920s, and due to proximity to Chicago and railroads, large scale automotive, construction, and lumber manufacturers emerged in the area which provided blue-collar jobs to first and second generation
low-skilled European Americans. These, along with the introduction of local freight yards, solidified Augusta’s identity as an "industrial suburb" (Harris 2005).

However, U.S. immigration policy would eventually curb European immigration to Augusta by 1930. The Johnson-Reed Act, or Immigration Act of 1924, enacted quotas bringing immigration to a trickle. Still, Augusta remained a predominately immigrant family community. In 1930, nearly over half of the residents were first (27.5%) or second (45.7%) generation Americans. As in urban areas, the large concentration of first and second generation European immigrants would contribute to the rise of ethnic social institutions. The oldest, and perhaps the most visible, are churches. The earliest was St. Martin, a Lutheran Church, founded in 1881 by German Protestants living in the area. European Catholics established their own churches as well. In 1894 German Catholics in the area built St. Gertrude. However, ethnic tensions drove Augusta’s Italian immigrants to lobby the local archdiocese to open another Catholic church staffed by Italian priests who could speak Italian and were familiar Italian Catholic ethno-religious traditions. In turn, Our Lady of Pompeii opened its doors in 1903. Within time, these churches eventually offered new schooling options. German Protestants along with German and Italian Catholics could send their children to parochial schools where they could obtain a quality education while being versed in cultural and ethno-religious traditions. Hence, Augusta became a place where first and second generations and beyond could find economic opportunity, raise a family, obtain a quality education, and retain cultural traditions.

B. POST WWII GROWTH AND STABILITY: 1950s-1960s

Due to immigration restrictions and economic instability, Augusta saw no population growth between 1930 (10,741) and 1940 (10,083) (Harris 2005). However the post-World War II economic boom brought about economic growth and new opportunities in Augusta. The
population increased from 13,366 in 1950 to 22,291 in 1960. Spurned by population growth, suburbanization, and an expanding economy, Augusta again saw a marked increase demand for housing. Prior to the war, many of the dwellings in the area were farm and cottage style homes and, many occupied by working-class families. Other homes were built in the Victorian style. Usually owned by local business owners, these were wooden multi-level dwellings with external stairwells and wrap-around porches. However, new housing construction by 1950s took a new form both in style and space. The Midwest urban bungalow took root in Augusta, resulting in a rapid construction of homes that filled the spaces between these older dwellings and farmland. The demand for housing and abundance of vacant space also gave rise to the emergence of subdivisions and various sorts of cookie-cutter style homes that mirrored the trajectories of suburbanizing area across the United States. In the late 1950s, the northeast area of Augusta which was previously farmland had been transformed into the sub-division of Platter Heights, demarcated by cul-de-sacs of single family homes. Unlike residences in the other areas of the village, these homes were mostly bungalows made of beige bricks with street-facing garages and driveways.

The housing boom, however, could not keep up with demand for housing in Augusta in during this time. Michael Roberts, a white male I often ran into at church functions, told me that his parents tried to purchase a house in Augusta in the late 1950’s but were unable to do so. ‘You couldn’t buy a place [in Augusta]’ he remarked. When asked why he indicated that many of the newly constructed homes were purchased quickly while the older ones were ‘kept in the family.’ Being ‘kept in the family’ referred to tradition of intergenerational transmission of homes, a notable pattern that emerged while doing fieldwork. A number of my respondents in their fifties and sixties still owned the homes in which they were born. The custom of the passing down
homes to children was facilitated by norms associated with life-cycle events and family practices. In Augusta, it was customary for newly-wedded children and their spouses to move in with parents and save funds to purchase a new home. It was also expected that married children would buy a home in neighborhood—and preferably one of the block (and ideally, next door). As parents aged and their adult children become more financially stable many would purchase their parents’ dwellings. In turn, elderly parents became increasingly dependent on their children who would often take care of them in their later years. Today, many homes in Augusta reflect the architectural characteristics of multi-family households. Nearly every block has a home with an external winding metal staircase leading up to a door on a second. Many also have two kitchens: one of the first floor and another in the basement. Thus local social practices facilitated residential stability across generations and discouraged geographic mobility, ultimately creating the conditions for continued social and economic investments in Augusta.

In this sense, the local norms and processes reinforced a sense of family and community among many of Augusta’s “old timers.” Economic and social forces created the conditions for local growth and white residential retention across generations. Augusta’s economic growth and opportunities provided the foundations for European immigrants, their children, and grandchildren to build a life in Augusta over generations. Augusta’s white residents began climbing economic ladders that provided financial stability and gained parity with European Americans. Shared ethnic identities and practices worked against the forces associated with a white Anglo Saxon Protestant ideal of cultural assimilation. Reinforcing peoplehood were institutions such as churches and parochial schools. These institutions reinforced a shared ethnic and territorial identity though the transmission of cultural practices while creating connections among residents. In all, the overlapping nature of family, friends, and faith for many of white
ethnics in Augusta helped to construct a shared sense of community among Augusta's residents for nearly three quarters of a century.

C. **NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGE AND LATINO SUCCESSION: 1970s-2000’s**

Augusta remained a predominately white and mostly Italian American, working and middle class residential community through the 1960s. Whereas the first European settlers, businesses owners, and village officials were German immigrants, by the middle of the 20th century Italian American residents had replaced them as the dominant group in Augusta. Though many of the first Italian settlers had passed away, their children and grandchildren took their place, often remaining in their parents’ homes, working in the area, and investing in neighborhood social institutions. Some also began securing white collar jobs in the education and the public service sector in the surrounding area. Essentially, by the 1960s, Italian Americans of Augusta had been able to take advantage of “the American Dream.”

The winds of change that would eventually give way to demographic transition in Augusta began in the late 1960's. As an industrial suburb, Augusta drew a small number of working class Latino individuals and families to the area. The first Latino settlers in Augusta were Cubans and Puerto Ricans in the late 1960s, which were then followed by Mexicanos in the early 1970s. Some of the earliest Latino residents relocated to Augusta from surrounding cities while others migrated from the Southwestern United States. A few Latino immigrants came directly from their country of origin. A variety of economic and social factors drove Latino migration to and settlement in Augusta. It continued to be home to numerous industries and factories that provided blue collar, low-skilled, jobs with livable wages. Coupled with affordable housing options, the areas was an ideal to work, raise a family and, for some, purchase a home. Social networks also played a significant role in Latino’s migration and settlement. Extended
family members who found jobs in the area would encourage other family members to settle in the area.

Rosalina: [We] kind of travel in droves and you go to the community where your family and your friends are... [and]...mainly I would say for work. [Augusta is] a very blue collar labor type community and that’s where our community works... [It’s] where my father worked at a factory. That’s where my uncles all worked... all down West Avenue. They moved here [also] to get away from the city and the crime that was starting to happen back then.\footnote{7}

As Rosalina states, economic opportunity and social networks drove Mexicano migration to Augusta. Other factors such as safety factored into Latinos families’ decisions to settle in the area. Such was the case for those who previously lived in urban areas with relatively high rates of crime and gang activity. One first generation Mexicana who previously lived in Chicago relayed that her father decided to move to the area to because he was “very worried about having six girls” in a “dangerous neighborhood.” However, a safe neighborhood was also perceived as one in which people knew one another.

Teresa: So you kind of travel where you feel safe and where you know [people]. So that’s kind of what I feel started happening here— you start traveling where you feel safe [...] and you start moving towards where your family is going to have a good life and better schools.

Essentially, Augusta was seen as an affordable, safe, and affable neighborhood for first and second generation Mexicano families during this period.

As the numbers of Latino families grew, the percentage of Augusta’s white population began to decline. White families with school-age children increasingly moved out of the village while those who remained aged and passed away. Because of the tradition of passing down homes to children there was a lack of favorable single-family homes in an already tight housing market. By the 1980s housing expansion and development ceased in Augusta. In turn, many white families with school age children looking for affordable and quality housing turned their
attention outside of the neighborhood. Many white residents who inherited familial homes either rented them or sold them to Latino families. White residents also sought out better schooling options for their children. Many believed the influx of Latino families with school age children negatively impacted the quality of public education. At the elementary school level, white residents were concerned that Latino students from poor and working class families brought down the quality of schooling. In addition, whites were hesitant in sending their children to the Woodbrook East, a high school located in a predominately African American neighborhood, citing concerns of educational quality and racial tensions. White middle class residents with school-age children were then left with three options: send them to low performing public schools with children of color; pay to enroll them in parochial schools outside the neighborhood; or move to other communities with free/affordable, quality, public schools. Many increasingly chose the third option. Lastly, the outmigration of younger white families led to low levels of white resident replenishment. Today, many of Augusta’s white residents are in their 50s or older and less likely to move.

1. Early Encounters

Latino residential settlement eventually gave rise to increased levels of group interaction. Religious and educational institutions were among the first and one of the only places for whites and Latinos to routinely interact. Latino residents were especially drawn to Our Lady of Pompeii because it was one of the few Catholic churches to offer Spanish masses in the area. Some Latino parents who could afford to send their children to church elementary school. There they met white (and mostly, Italian American) children who lived in central Augusta. Though both white and Latino adults I spoke to that had attended Our Lady of Pompeii School noted some ethnic tensions between the groups, over time friendships emerged.
Jeanette: Well, when I was in grade school here there were, there were, Mexican [students]. I think they were mostly Mexicans [and] some Cubans that went to school with me. There [emphasized] was just a little bit of tension at the beginning with the kids, but then we all just played together. It was not big deal. Um, so to me I don’t notice it as, I didn’t notice, “Oh my gosh! There’s Mexicans here!” It was something I was used to.

Latinos, too, indicated that schools were one of the first areas in which they encountered white residents. Valentin Paredes, who was a teenager during the 1970s, reported that he went to school with Augusta’s mayor at Our Lady of Pompeii church, who he remains friends with today. In fact, many Latino respondents indicated that attending parochial schools with white children often led to life-long friendships and were central to traversing neighborhood ethno-spatial boundaries.

Adriana: I went to an […] all girls white school so my friends weren’t from here [Southern Augusta]. Not from the south-side [of] River Street for that matter. They were from the north side of River Street, so um and my best friend, one of my best friends’ it Italian. We’re still friends. We have kids the same age.

Despite the opportunities that parochial schools provided to facilitate positive intergroup interactions, they could not dismantle social and spatial divisions outside. River Street served as an informal residential boundary between central and southern Augusta. Central Augusta has a higher density of white residents, homes, and the majority of Augusta’s churches and public schools. On the other hand, southern Augusta is predominately Latino and has a higher percentage of apartments. It is also home to Augusta’s old business district, which is located on Main Ave. Former and current Latino residents who lived at one time or another in southern Augusta indicated that law officials often targeted Latinos in this area. Valentin Paredes recalled incidences in which U.S. immigration officials drove through southern Augusta harassing Latinos thought to be undocumented immigrants. He jokingly recounted about how he and his cousins taunted immigration officials by running when they drove down his block. In one
incident, immigration officials chased Valentin and his cousin. His cousin, who was enlisted in the U.S. Air Force, eventually got caught. When immigration officials asked his cousin for identification he smilingly produced his U.S. military identification card. However, not all of the interactions between immigration agents and Latino residents were comical. Valentin recounted one incident in which his family heard women screaming outside their apartment late one evening. His father rushed outside to see immigration officials frisking two teenaged Latinas against a fence. The women were returning home from a factory job they worked in Augusta. Valentin’s father chastised the immigration agents and eventually talked them into releasing the women.

Latinos also indicated instances of police targeting Latino youth on Main Street’s business district, located in Southern Augusta. Here, Theresa Durante relays an incident in the 1980s regarding Latino youth congregating around pay phones on Main Street.

_Teresa_: There used to be pay phones [on Main Avenue] and around this payphones there would be [Latino] kids crowding around and the police kept saying that they were dealing drugs. So the kids were being harassed and the parents were complaining about the police harassment and so we organized a community meeting….One of the things that we did is brought the police department and …the citizens together, to find…a solution. [T]he police [were] saying, "Well if your kids are not dealing drugs then they shouldn't have any problems with us removing the phones" and that's what in fact what happened. The phones were removed… and the rest of us were just asking to stop the harassment because they felt harassed by the police department. And then at that time we used that as an opportunity to pretty much tell the police department, "Look. The community is changing. There's a lot of Latinos. How many [emphasis] Latinos, Spanish speaking officers do you have on the force?"

Latino residents also reported concerns about traversing social constructed neighborhood spatial boundaries. River Street served as a residential and racialized boundary between central Augusta, where the majority of white residents lived, and southern Augusta where many Latinos resided. Latino residents saw Central Augusta as the white, or “Italian,” area and were often weary of
crossing north of River Street. Valentin recalled incidents in the 1970s whereby Latinos who went to visit friends were often harassed by white youth ranging from verbal warnings to physical altercations. Younger generations of Latinos relayed the same sentiment. You had to “think twice about crossing River Street” because you were going to get your “ass kicked” or were “getting sent back at the end of a baseball bat.”

Likewise, white youth were also discouraged by their parents to go south River Street to visit Latino schoolmates. As one Mexicano told me

Carlos: Their parents, it was like my Italian friends they couldn’t cross Lake Street… [They] weren’t afraid of you know, me. [It was] the rest of us they were afraid of. They couldn’t come on this side of Lake Street. You’ll get a lot of people [from my generation] that will tell you that.

As Fennelly (2008) writes, “Euro-Americans may have friendly relations with some individual immigrants, while simultaneously harboring resentment and supporting broad negative stereotypes of groups” (174). As these examples show, friendships did form between white and Latino residents-and particularly those who attended the same institutions. Yet, routine interactions were shaped in large part by two factors. The first was joint participation in neighborhood institutions. Parochial schools served as the main foundation of friendships between white and Latino residents. However, given that the majority of white residents send their children to parochial schools and that many of Augusta’s’ Latino families cannot afford tuition; it makes it unlikely that enduring interethnic friendships are likely to form. Second, residential segregation reinforces ethnic stereotypes and decreases the frequency of white/Latino social interaction. Both whites and Latino saw neighborhood residential space as racialized and entering these spaces had dangerous consequences. Yet, unlike Latinos, my white respondents never
indicated experiencing verbal or physical threats. Instead white residents drew on stereotypes to curb neighborhood intergroup interaction.

As this chapter has shown, race, ethnicity, class, and immigration have played a central role in the life of Augustans. Economic forces and social policy drove immigrant and ethnic group settlement. Shared identities and practices buttressed group solidarity and served as shield against hostile discourse and experiences. For Augusta’s white, and mostly Italian American, population, neighborhood integration took place over a few generations. Today the majority of white residents are middle class. A large portion of the residents are senior citizens and plan to live out their lives in the suburban village. Although younger generations are increasingly leaving, a few remain. Those who do acknowledge the challenges associated with demographic change. Rather than moving, many opt to live in central Augusta and send their children to parochial schools. Relative to white residents, Augusta’s Latino population tend to be younger, working class, and be first or second generation Mexicanos. They are more likely to send their children to local schools and live in Southern Augusta. Though many rent apartments, they are increasing buying homes in Augusta or the surrounding area. At this point, white residents have experienced “the American dream,” while Latinos are reaching for it.

Still, neighborhood change is often contentious. Ethnic distinctions are evident in spatial and social boundaries. The largest percentage of Latino residents reside in southern Augusta. Many are working class immigrant families with lower levels of income and educational attainment. Though some come into contact with white residents
in neighborhood institutions such as churches and schools, meaningful intergroup interactions remain segmented and limited nearly 10 years after succession. In what follows, I further explore intergroup relations and Latino integration in political, religious, and cultural spheres in the suburban village.
IV. NAVIGATING ETHNO-POLITICAL CLEAVAGES

A. THE 2009 AUGUSTA MAYORAL AND VILLAGE COUNCIL ELECTIONS

“It’s getting nasty,” Dario Solis tells me as we stand at the rear of Augusta Elementary School. His friend Alexis Salinas, who is running with the incumbent Augusta Vision Party (AVP) for reelection to the Augusta Village Council (AVC), adds that the political opposition distributed fliers alleging Augusta’s long-time mayor, Sam Raneri, recently gave out a 40 million dollar village contract to a company owned by a big political supporter. Salinas went on to note the AVP responded by suing their political opponents for making false allegations. Solis is an avid supporter of his friend, Salinas, as well as the AVP. Both are second generation Mexicanos in their early 30s and have social and economic ties to Augusta. Though Solis no longer lives in the community, he runs a Spanish language newspaper distributed in the area. His father also owns a restaurant in town and both are good friend with the mayor. Salinas, whomove to the community a few years back, was appointed to the AVC by the mayor, between elections. He is married to Adriana Salinas, a second generation Mexicana, and life-long resident of Augusta. She currently works for the village as the community liaison to Augusta’s Latino residents. Along with serving on the AVC, Alexis Salinas is a school district board member and a youth parole officer for the county. Altogether, Dario Solis and the Salinas’ are among the relatively few Mexicanos who serve as formal and informal representatives of Augusta’s Latino residents.

Today is Election Day in Augusta and like many local political elections there are spirited debates, heated discussions, and competing ideas about ways to move the community forward. Though most debates in Augusta were about the best ways to improve residents’ social and economic well-being, I came to find that undergirding political debates were tensions revolving around racial and ethnic group equity and representation. Despite the growing number of Latino
residents over the last 30 years and the neighborhood succession, they are underrepresented as elected officials and as village workers. Only three of the nine of the AVC members were Latino, two of whom were appointed by the mayor prior to 2009 election. Similarly, whites were overrepresented as employees in village administration and municipal departments. At the time, only three Latinos worked in Augusta’s administration offices while I counted only three employed in the fire, police or public works departments. How is it, then, that Latino residents continue to be disproportionately represented as elected leaders and municipal workers in a town in which they are the numerical majority?

The people I spoke to provided different reasons for these group differences. For the incumbent party and its supporters, Latinos were on “their way” to occupying these positions as Augusta’s second and third generation Mexicanos gain upward socioeconomic mobility. This view was even shared by life-long, white residents—many senior citizens—who begrudgingly accept that the community is “changing” and that it was only a matter of time before Augusta had a Latino mayor. Driving whites’ residents’ perception of group threat was a sense that the election of Latino mayor would signify they “lost” Augusta. This is the view the AIP, headed by a Latino mayoral candidate and four Latino council members, held. Martin Jimenez, the Latino mayoral candidate, relayed that many white residents saw the local election as a “zero-sum” game. If a Latino mayor (as well as a Latino dominated village council) were elected, then the majority of white Augustans would have lost the war. Hence, for Jimenez and for many of his supporters, the lack of Latino political integration, inclusion, and representation was a driven by white Augustans’ sense of group threat. Those who opposed the mayor and the AVP attributed the group differences to Augusta’s political machine. The political machine, as they saw it, worked against fair and equal Latino residential and political integration though politically
corruptive practices that perpetuated a system of white patronage and the co-optation. Hence, AVP members saw racial interests overlapping with political interests, which ultimately reproduced white/Latino divisions.

At the end of that April election day the incumbent party won that war with two-thirds of the overall vote. In a packed Augusta Civic Center gym the re-elected mayor and council members were met with applauses and hugs as they made their way to the podium microphone. Only the mayor spoke, thanking voters for their support and campaign workers for their hard work. He talked of his feelings of Augusta and his council’s vision for moving the village forward. Toward the end of this speech, and as is customary in victory speeches, Mayor Raneri acknowledged the hard-fought campaign and efforts of the opposition. But there is only one reference to his challengers, offered in his final remarks: “They can go back to Chicago to where they belong!”

**B. ETHNOPOLITICAL CLEAVES AND LATINO POLITICAL INTEGRATION**

Ask almost any Italian American resident of Augusta and they will tell you that they have deep “roots” in the village. Many lived their entire lives in the village and before them, their parents and grandparents. Though the demographics have changed and the trend of children remaining in Augusta is no longer the norm, they remain deeply attached to their neighbors, elementary school classmates, local businesses, and Catholic churches. Senior citizens recall the names of former neighborhood residents and pinpoint the houses in which they used to live. Middle-aged adults, both current and former residents, often tell stories of revered (as well as feared) mayors, priests, and mobsters who called Augusta their home. Many still talk of and refer to “old-timers,” past and present, as “Mister” or “Misses.”
An example of this affinity is illuminated in their support for their mayor, Sam Raneri, who had served as mayor for twenty years. Raneri is a constant presence in the community both in person and name. He can be seen at any special event in the community, regardless of whether these are conducted in English or Spanish, giving speeches, cutting ribbons, and taking pictures with attendees. The *Augustan*, the quarterly community newspaper, often has a number of pictures of Raneri. His name adorns the signs and water tower welcoming visitors to Augusta. Seniors love him both because of his fun-loving nature and his constant support of senior citizen programs and organizations. Raneri also is warmly regarded by some local Latino residents, especially those who own and operate businesses in Augusta. He attends numerous events in the community geared toward Latino residents such as health fairs, public ceremonies, and more recently, the opening of a Mexican hometown association at the invitation of Salomon Salinas, a prominent first generation Mexican businessman who owns and operates a chain of restaurants in the village. He worked with the mayor to establish a Mexican hometown association in Augusta with hopes of connecting Mexicanos residing in the areas with their home state while fostering transnational business partnerships across national lines. Salinas’s son, Daniel recognized Raneri as the “Man of the Year” in the Spanish language newspaper he owns, *El Suburbria*, for his leadership and partnerships with the Latino community.

In 2009, Raneri ran for reelection to the Augusta Village Council (AVC) with the incumbent Augusta Vision Party (AVP). The AVP included an Italian American woman running for Village Clerk and six others for village trustees. Trustees included three Italian Americans (two men, one woman) and three Mexicanos (two men, one woman). The AVP ran on the platform of moving Augusta “forward” and touted its accomplishments to bring businesses to Augusta and investing in local civic organizations. The challengers, the Augusta Improvement
Party (AIP), consisted of four Latinos and four white candidates. Among Latinos in the AIP, was a Mexicano running for mayor (Martin Jimenez) and a Mexicana running for village clerk. The rest of the AIP candidates ran for trustee’s positions and consisted of four white candidates (two men and two women) and two Latino males. The AIP platform called for improving the quality of public education, better access to public services, and job creation. In a campaign flier they touted their credentials in working with youth and called for local government to improve the quality of Augusta’s public schools. In 2009, only 67% of elementary school students (kindergarten-8th grade) in the district met state academic standards. During that same year Augusta’s school district (which included schools in neighboring predominately African American towns) was cited as the most segregated district in the nation. Part of the reason for these high rates of segregation was that many white parents living in Augusta who could afford to do so sent their children to private, and mostly parochial, schools. In addition to improving the quality of education, the AIP called for equal access to public services and jobs. They cited that most information for residents communicated at community meetings and in fliers were in English while administration officials allocated jobs to white Augustans as well.

In this way, the AIP saw the current white administration as neglecting Latinos. As one AIP Latino candidate running for trustee put it: “I dislike their policies and the effect they have in my opinion on the community. I think their political interests supersede the interest of the community.” Further, AIP candidates were critical of the Latino candidates running on the AVP platform and often questioned their authenticity in representing Latinos. In the previous local election (2005), the Latina candidate who had been married to an Italian American man, ran on her married Italian name. However, in the 2009 election she hyphenated her last name to include her Hispanic maiden name. This drew the ire of one Latina respondent:
**Rosalina**: How are you okay with that [adding her Hispanic maiden name] if that’s now what you’ve used? If you decided on your own accord to honor your husband and take his last name [then] have an Italian last name. But now because you were asked [by the current administration] …you want to be the token of other Hispanics? How are you ok with that?

Others saw AVP Latino trustees as being strategically hand-picked by the current mayor, in order to both, to give off an impression of Latino representation and ensure allegiance. For instance, the two other AVP Latino candidates (both men) had moved to Augusta within in the last 10 years and were appointed to the AVC mid-term which became a point of contention..

**Carlos**: These Hispanic trustees-they’re jokes. They’re here for the Hispanic vote.

**Teresa**: They’ve [the current administration] been very good at giving us puppets who supposedly represent the Latino community. Some [emphasis] of those people are good people… I respect and like [one Latino AVC Trustee] a lot. He's done a lot. He tries really hard to do the right things for this community. Personally, um, he's very sincere. He cares…but no leadership [whisper]. Not a bone of leadership in him. He's there to do what they [the AVP] tell him to [do]. And maybe sometimes I wonder [sincere]. I'm like. "Maybe's he's doing the right thing." Because even though he's under their arm…he has access to a lot of resources. He's been behind the soccer leagues. I mean those are huge [emphasis]. They really keep our kids entertained and busy with the soccer leagues.

As these quotes indicate, some Latino residents questioned the appointment and intentions of Latino AVP trustees to the AVC. On the one hand, they saw Latino AVP trustees as token appointments who served the interests of Augusta’s white administration. They believed the mayor strategically placed them on the AVC to get Latino voter support for future elections. Yet, on the other hand, some saw Latino trustees as having good intentions to help the local Latino community. As Theresa indicates, at least one Latino AVC trustee did distribute resources to Latino community (in this case, a youth soccer league).

In this way, the AVC yielded considerable power in Augusta. It enacted ordinances, gave out permits, hired village workers, and allocated funds to village projects. It was in ones’ best interest to be in the good graces of the mayor and council members should one want to have
access to village resources. This also means being politically supportive (at least publically) of the mayor and council. Hence, political loyalties mattered in Augusta and more so for those whose economic interests were tied to the village. Those who were in the good graces of the AVC were rewarded with access to resources; those who were not were marginalized. The former were insiders; the latter were outsiders.

In this way, the AVC participated in a system of patronage found in machine politics. Machine politics refers to the ways in which political organizations and democratically elected leaders distribute and funnel resources to political supporters in return for political support. This support often comes in the form of votes, organizational endorsements, and political canvassing. In the United States, political machines have historically been tied to securing the immigrant vote in urban areas. For instance, Democratic political machines in cities were largely successful in securing the votes of white working class European immigrants and their children through promises of municipal jobs, contracts, and political appointments (Cornwell 1964; Roediger 1999). In turn, and buttressed largely by their large numbers and anti-immigrant sentiment, these groups threw their political support behind machines. Machine politics then became a way in which formerly marginalized groups gained upward socioeconomic mobility and political power (Merton 1949).

Political machines and bosses depend upon the continued loyalty of groups, lest they lose political elections and their incumbency. Hence political supporters, or insiders, are rewarded, while political opponents, or outsiders, are contained and marginalized. Writing more broadly, Merton (1972) demarcates insiders from outsiders. He writes, “Insiders are the members of specified groups and collectivities or occupants of specified social statuses; Outsiders are non-members (21)”. Whether one is a “member” or a “non-member” depends primarily upon political
allegiance. Yet, membership status as an insider or outsider overlaps with other social characteristics such as residential longevity and ethnic background. Overlapping relationships between politics, neighborhood and ethnicity have been explored in numerous classic works on Italian Americans in Boston (Gans 1962[1982]; Whyte 1942[1981]) as well as Mexicans, Slavs and African Americans in Chicago (Kornblum 1974; see also Huckfeldt 1986). These works find that locally based political systems in (mostly white) ethnic neighborhoods are shaped in part by group identity, community attachment, and neighborhood history. Thus, neighborhood and ethnic politics often overlap and are seen as inextricably intertwined. Essentially, ethnic politics are neighborhood politics and social and residential interests are likely to be understood as synonymous. This perspective of politics is helpful in understanding the emergence, persistence, and dominance of neighborhood-based ethnic politics. As Huckfeldt (1986) writes:

In short, extensive social interaction within the ethnic group encouraged in neighborhoods where group members predominate, creates group cohesiveness and fosters the adoption of political loyalties that correspond to group sentiment (p. 65).

Augusta fits this mold. White, and mostly third and fourth generation Italian American residents, overwhelmingly support the current mayor and the AVC. Despite neighborhood succession, whites are overrepresented in positions of political power and administration over generations. In this sense, they are insiders by ethnic status. Due largely in part to their status as long-time residents who trace their familiar lineage in the neighborhood, they have maintained a strong presence in local governance, village administration, and municipal jobs. These ethnic group interests have been fostered over time and reinforced through overlapping social networks. Latinos, on the other hand, remain disproportionately underrepresented at all political levels and relative to white residents, are outsiders.
For many white Augustans, Ranieri’s reelection represented and symbolized two things. The first was continued privileged access to material resources. By electing a white mayor who was socially accessible, white residents could be guaranteed access to jobs and other benefits. On the other hand, electing a Latino mayor (such as the AIP challenger) would, they believed, redistribute resources to Latino residents. Second, a white mayor symbolized white “ownership” of the community whereas the election of a Latino candidate would be the final process of neighborhood ethnic succession. Martin Jimenez, the Mexicano AIP mayoral candidate acknowledged this sentiment.

**Martin:** It’s like the last dance, you know. All we [white residents] got left is this mayoral seat. We give that up, it’s all going to the Mexicans... but [white residents] don’t see that here’s a capable, competent individual who can better your town.

Martin acknowledged the sentiment behind many of white residents’ decisions to vote for the current mayor. As he saw it, white residents voted for Raneri, the AVP candidate, because of what a Mexicano mayor would signify symbolically. Hence, white residents’ material interests were congruent with symbolic ones.

In this way, neighborhood ethnic politics, and particularly political machines, do not always function to provide access to ethnic minority groups as they have historically been framed (Merton 1949). Rather, Augusta’s political machine worked for a numerical minority group (whites) to maintain political power over the numerical majority (Mexicans). Still white residents and political representatives (including some Latinos) saw the lack of Latino resident political integration as result of political apathy or undocumented immigrant status. These views were echoed by the few Latino representatives who served on the AVC or worked for the village. For them, Latino political integration was something that would increasingly occur over generations. Others, and most notably Latinos who did not work for the village, blamed these
differences on the political corruption inherent in machine politics. Augusta’s political machine made it difficult for Latino residents to participate in politics through corruptive practices of political patronage and intimidation. As they saw it, Latino residents were in no position to benefit from the political machine because they did not know how to navigate it. In the following section, I explore and analyze these explanations through the lens of a select group of Augusta’s formal and informal Latino leaders: Latino middlemen.

C. STRADDLING ETHNO-POLITICAL BOUNDARIES: LATINO MIDDLEMEN

Despite the entrenched ethno-political boundaries and white political dominance in the village, there were a few Latino individuals who were visible and active in Augusta’s politics. What distinguished them from other middle and upper middle class Latinos in Augusta was their involvement in Latino social and economic issues and well-being. They organized fundraisers for scholarships for Latino students, served on community councils and attended meetings, and worked collaboratively with state based social service agencies and private businesses for education and health fairs geared toward local Latino families. These Latinos tended to be college-educated and were employed in middle-class professional positions. They worked as representatives for public and private agencies and organizations or own and operate businesses that generally cater to Latino populations.

These Latino professionals functioned as conduits between Augusta’s Mexicano families and the outside world. What enabled them to do so was the social and cultural capital they wielded. As first and second generation, bilingual, Mexicano professionals, they were familiar with the challenges that working class and poor Latino immigrants encounter in the United States. Instrumentally, they were able to serve as translators and sources of information for both
Spanish speaking residents and the predominately outside English speaking world. White, native, English speakers who represented local and state based organizations utilized them to gather and transmit information regarding events and initiatives geared toward Latino and Spanish speaking populations. They functioned as intermediaries between Latinos residents (many of whom were working class, undocumented, and/or, did not speak English) and Augusta’s English speaking social and political community institutions.

In this way, these representatives of the local Latino community functioned as ethnic brokers. They worked as conduits between a predominately white village administration and Latino residents. Essentially they operated as what Mary Pattillo (2007) has described as middlemen. A middleman, she writes:

… speaks at least two languages in order to translate, has two sets of credentials for legitimacy, and juggles a doublebooked calendar to keep all the relationships cordial, memberships current, and constituencies appeased (p. 113).

Being bilingual, Latino middlemen speak two languages (literally), which enables them to communicate between Latino residents and the dominant white, English-speaking society. Moreover, Latino middlemen must speak and translate the language of culture to ensure against any information that may be misunderstood or misconstrued. Thus, Latino middlemen in Augusta conveyed a personal sense of commitment, both in word and action, to improve the social and economic well-being of Augusta’s Latinos. As first and second generation Mexicanos who achieved upward socioeconomic mobility, they felt a responsibility “to give back to the community.”

Despite this shared commitment, their roles as middlemen could not be disentangled from Augusta’s political structure. Rather, Latino middlemen had to work within a segmented ethnopolitical structure that demarcated political boundaries and loyalties that positioned one as either
an insider or outsider. Latinos who occupied an insider position were aligned with the interests of the current white administration. Those inside the boundaries—supporters of the current administration—were granted access to resources that machine leaders control. They were privy to insider information and were given access to resources controlled by the machine. They usually worked directly for the village as elected officials, administrators, or municipal workers or with local administrators on various health, education, and youth initiatives. Like many insiders, they were openly vocal about their support for the current administration and village initiatives. Further, their status as insiders and the power they yielded positioned them as symbolic leaders of the Latino community who wielded considerable power. Despite the fact that many Latino residents did not know how to play the “political game,” they knew that a political machine was in place. At times, Latino residents contacted Latino insiders who worked with the village to voice concerns over village housing code violations and allegations of anti-Latino discrimination. In this way, Mexicanos residents saw co-ethnics who worked for the village as individuals who were in a position to informally negotiate with the white administrators regarding their concerns.

Outsiders—opponents of the current administration—were located outside the boundaries of the political structure. Latino middlemen located on the outside were publically critical of the current mayoral administration and policies. They saw the current administration as placating the interests of white residents and called into question the intentions of the white administration and unequal representation of Latinos in village jobs and in decision making. What further demarcated Latino insiders and outsiders was their economic relationship with the village. As village employees or local businesses owners, Latino insiders’ economic interests were directly intertwined with the village. On the other hand, Latino outsiders’ material interests were not
directly dependent upon the village. They were employed in professional positions—social service agencies, health institutions, and private businesses. Thus insiders’ material interests were directly linked to Augusta’s economic and political spheres while outsiders were not.

Latino middlemen’s status as either an insider or outsider shaped and constrained how they worked on behalf of Latinos. Latino middlemen who were insiders worked directly with the administration. They walked a fine line between advocating for the social and material needs of Latino residents while making sure they remained aligned with the aims of white elected officials and policies. Essentially, they functioned as brokers between Latino residents and the white administration and worked carefully to navigate ethnic and political allegiances. On the other hand, Latino middlemen who were outsiders had little or no incentive to placate the white administration’s interests. Though constrained as political outsiders with relatively less influence on village policies, they were vocal in their condemnation of government practices they saw as placating white interests and to the detriment of Latino residents’ well-being. Hence, Latino insiders worked as communicators and negotiators while Latino outsiders operated as activists and agitators. In what follows, I examine how Latino insiders and outsiders navigated the village ethno-political structure while advocating on behalf of Augusta’s Latino residents.

1. Latino Insiders: Communicators and Negotiators
   In writing about African American middlemen, Mary Pattillo (2007) identifies black middlemen who are upwardly aligned with white real estate brokers, or “the man.” Upwardly aligned black middlemen, she writes,

   [S]ide with the “man”…their duties toward the littleman are often coercive and exclusive. In the realm of community development the upwardly aligned middleman might be the spokesperson for a city agency charged with communicating to neighborhood residents the city’s plans for, say, a new professional sports arena that will be placed in the neighborhood and cause significant displacement (119).
This characterization fits the mold of Latino insiders in Augusta. They were upwardly aligned in the sense that they publically supported the current administration and aimed to align white administrations interests’ with that with Latinos. They ranged from individuals who were publically supportive of the current mayor to those who were politically active during the campaigns in canvasing. Among Latino insiders were two types that were distinguished by their type of paid work. The first type was those who worked for the village in some capacity. These included village council members, clerical workers, department administrators, and civil servants. The second type of Latino insiders were local business owners, the majority of whom were ethnic entrepreneurs, who owned and operated establishments in the areas that catered exclusively to a Latino or Spanish speaking clientele. Along with political allegiances, what village employees and ethnic entrepreneurs shared was that their economic interests were tied either directly or indirectly to village governance. As village employees, Latino insiders had a vested economic interest in ensuring that they performed in a way that supported and advanced the aims of the current administration. Those who did not could very well find their position in jeopardy—either through termination or election—should they not be seen as aligning themselves with the interests of the current administration as well as fulfilling their duties as village representatives. Hence, their material well-being, in part, was directly related to the current administration. On the other hand, the material interests of ethnic entrepreneurs on the inside were, more or less, indirectly related to the current administration. Their economic livelihood rested largely upon the public consumer, and primarily, a Latino clientele. Still the “free market” upon which ethnic entrepreneurs rested was in part dependent on village policy. For instance, the operation and location of public establishments such as restaurants, grocery stores, and bars in Augusta are largely dependent on business permits which are offered and
voted upon by the village council. Hence, the village council holds much sway over local businesses and ethnic entrepreneurs must engage at some level with the local administration. In all, though Latino insiders are upwardly aligned and granted insider access, they must continue to perform in accordance with aims of the current administration.

I came to find that Latino insiders’ social and cultural capital positioned them as intermediaries between Latino residents and the current administration. As intermediaries, Latino insiders served two functions. The first was as communicators and the second, as negotiators. As communicators, they served as information conduits between English speaking white administrators and Spanish speaking residents. They communicated information about village initiatives, services, events, and expectations regarding local ordinances while relaying important matters of Latino residents’ concerns to village officials. Second, insiders also served as informal brokers between the two entities. Though they were publically aligned with the current administration and local policies, at times their position allotted them an ability to address instances of differential treatment. In turn, having the ear of local officials allowed them at the very least to inform Augusta’s administrators how village policies and practices impacted Latino residential well-being and overall neighborhood stability. In what follows, I highlight the ways that insiders worked as communicators and negotiators regarding Augusta’s local ordinances.

a. Village Ordinances: Residential and Public
It is the middle of the afternoon and I am sitting with Adriana Salinas, as she is juggling holding her baby and talking with her niece who is babysitting her older son. Adriana is a second generation Mexicana in her mid-thirties and life-long resident Augusta. Her parents, who live across the street, previously owned a clothing store on Main Street, Augusta’s central business district. Eventually her father decided to close the business because, in her own words, “He got tired of selling kids clothes.” I first met Adriana at the bi-monthly village council meetings,
where she would attend while her husband, Alexis, served as one of the council members. Adriana, herself juggles double duty, both as a homemaker and working for the village as the Latino Liaison, where she regularly works with Latino businesses in the area. She also attends the Augusta Community Relations meetings and is good friends with the mayor. Despite her formal role and duties, and like other Latino insiders who work for the village, Adriana works informally as a communicator and negotiator between the village administration and Latino residents. She and other Latino insiders are bilingual and are often asked by village administrators and code inspectors to speak with Spanish speaking residents regarding residential code violations including overcrowding, illegal dwellings, and property up-keep. Like other Latinos employed by the village, she works as a communicator of expectations of neighborhood up-keep particularly when communicating with Latino residents who have receive village ordinance violations. Village ordinances are local laws or regulations aimed to ensure public safety and residential up-keep. These laws are enacted to combat instances or signs of neighborhood disorder in order to ensure community well-being. Such laws can be public-based to regulate signs of public disorder: loud music, public urination, or youth curfews. Others are residential-based ordinances aimed to curb overcrowding in housing or the renting out illegal of dwellings such as basements for living purposes.

As a bilingual employee who works in outreach, she is often asked by village administrators and code inspectors to translate between English speaking village workers and Spanish speaking residents. Here, Adriana describes a scenario whereby she is often called upon by village code inspectors to speak with Spanish speaking residents who violated village housing ordinances.
Adriana: [T]he village makes sure you take care of your property because they will violate [ticket] you if they see your grass is too long or if they see something’s hanging and it shouldn’t be. And if you know people [ticketed residents will say], “See that... they’re picking on me”. I get a lot of those complaints as the Latino Liaison-“You know they came here. They inspected. They came unannounced. They gave me a violation and I need to fix it and I don’t have any money. You do what you can with what you have.” But then I tell them all the time, “It’s just for your own self, for your property’s value. You want it to go down [in value]? If it’s affecting you financially, you know, talk to them [code inspectors]. Tell them to give you a longer period of time.” They give you 30 days to fix something. If [money] is the problem they’ll work with you. Not to the point where you’re gonna get this 500 dollar ticket. I mean, they give you a warning you know, sometimes they tape it. I’ve gotten [a] warning before. They tape[d] it to my mailbox--ruined my mailbox--but...they don’t necessarily go out and give you a ticket. They give you a list. This is what we’ve seen on your property.

Latino insiders, like Adriana, employed by the village must communicate to Latino residents numerous things about village ordinances. Though she is highlighting neighborhood codes of up-keep she also has to explain to the resident that the reason for the code violation is to ensure that residents benefit from stable property values. Further, her position as an insider who works for the village enables her to confer information regarding how to navigate financial hardships in light of ordinance violations. If “violated,” they may speak with inspectors to ask for leniency often the form of warnings and time extensions to bring ordinance up to code. Hence, knowing Latino insiders who work for the village may serve as form of social capital of which Latino residents can tap.

Latinos insiders can also work as negotiators between residents and the village administrators. Adriana recalled an incident where a Latino resident had been cited for overcrowding, whereby five men were living in a rented basement of a house. The homeowner, a Latino male, was visibly upset not only because he was ticketed but because he had a rental lease agreement with each of the men. He argued that had it been a “family” (i.e. a heterosexual couple with children) living in the basement he would not be cited. He asked Adriana, “what if the men were gay?” This would be grounds for discrimination. Adriana agreed:
Adriana: He had a point and when we brought it up to the inspectors [he] said, “You know what? You’re right. [We] can’t do that. We would like it to be a family up there- a couple and kids, maybe. But if not, we can’t tell them who can live there.”

In the end, Adriana was able to resolve the situation between code inspectors and the owner by drawing on her social (knowing the mayor) and cultural capital (anti-discrimination laws) to combat potential instances of unequal treatment. Ultimately, and with minor concessions (removing door locks from bedroom doors), the owner was not cited and legally able to rent out his “basement apartment.” In this way, Latino insiders are not constrained when “talking back” to inspectors and officials so long as it is in the overall legal interests in the village.

Latino insiders also work as communicators and negotiators when addressing public ordinances. Like residential ordinances, public ordinances are in place to combat instances of social disorder. These include ordinances on public urination, curfews for children, and loud music. However, unlike residential ordinances, they are geared toward the general public rather than residential dwellings. Hence, public ordinances are space-based, rather than place-based. They implicitly emphasize controlling public rather than private behavior. Still, neighborhood approved forms of behavior in public spaces are informed by cultural norms. Ideas about appropriate actions in the public sphere are influenced by an individual’s evaluation of these actions along with space-based norms.

Often underlying discussions about appropriate acts and activities in Augusta’ public spaces (and public ordinances in general) are ideas about cultural differences. Long-term, white residents are adamant about maintaining an image of neighborhood respectability. This means having garbage-free streets and sidewalks, noise regulations, and painting over graffiti. Though whites maintain that the majority of Latino residents adhere to these public laws, they are also inclined to attribute any signs of disorder to “newcomers.” For instance, one white Augustan I
interviewed indicated that she was irritated with Latino cart vendors who sold corn in the front of a local Catholic parish to church attenders leaving Sunday afternoon Spanish Mass. She indicated that many would throw the corncobs on the surrounding streets. Ultimately, the village passed an ordinance that banned vendors from selling food in front of the church.

Like Latino insiders who were employed for the village, ethnic entrepreneurs also served as brokers between Latino residents and village officials. However, what differentiated them from others is that they operated as informal brokers. What this meant was that they were seen as symbolic Latino leaders who were able to influence elected officials to be more culturally sensitive of the local Latino working class community. Among them was Dario Solis’s father, Salvador Solis, (referred to at the beginning the chapter). Born in Mexico, Salvador had migrated in the late 1970s to the area and by the mid-1980s, began opening restaurant businesses. Over time, Salvador became a popular figure in Augusta and became more active with the Latino community. He founded a philanthropic organization that raised funds for youth in Mexico. In addition, he was instrumental in the annual community festival, The Taste of Augusta, helping to organize the Festiva Latino section of the event that included a stage for Mexican music performances and for the selling of Mexican oriented foods and goods. Moreover he was instrumental in the formation of a Mexican Hometown Association for Mexican state Morelos in Augusta. As a hometown association, the Morelos Hometown Association dually functioned as site for Morelian families to connect with their Mexican home state and to create transnational economic ties between Mexican government officials and local businesses.

During his time in Augusta, he became politically influential through his friendships with the local leaders. He served as an informal representative of both the mayor and local Latino
community. He was vocal in support of the mayor’s candidacy while the mayor often granted material support, often in the form of space, to hold health expos geared toward Latino families. Notwithstanding his visible support of the mayor and efforts to improve the quality of life for Latino families in the area, he also worked behind the scenes to influence local policies that negatively impacted Latinos. One example was in regards to public ordinances, and in one case, public urination. This became apparent during a conversation during an election season whereby Salvador had informed me about how he spoke with the mayor regarding extensive violations against many Latinos by police who ticketed residents (and mostly Latinos) caught urinating in public. In turn, the mayor informed police officers to be more lenient toward those caught urinating in public. Salvador attributed his success to influence this policy to his personal relationship with the mayor. He invited the mayor to his ranch in Morelos numerous times. These trips, according to him, helped the mayor understand that it was culturally acceptable in many of Mexico’s rural areas to urinate in public. In addition, he also noted that Mexicans were more likely to financially invest initially in up-keep within their homes rather than outside of them. In this way, Salvador was hoping to convey that Mexicans’ orientation toward home up-keep was first to invest inside the house, rather than outside it. Hence, his position as insider and respected community member enabled him to be influential behind the scenes by communicating localized understandings of culture and work towards positively integrating local Latino residents.

Ultimately, Latino insiders worked publically and behind the scenes as brokers between village officials and Latino residents. Their position as Latinos and awareness of Latino resident’s economic hardships and cultural insights, coupled with the legitimacy afforded to them by village officials as village employees and ethnic entrepreneurs, enabled them to
address actions that negatively impacted Latino residents. In this way, Latino insiders served as brokers between the Latino residents and village administration and policy. They acknowledge the economic hardships that many Latino residents face and work as informal brokers who negotiate with village officials.

2. Latino Outsiders: Activists and Agitators

“It’s like a mini-Chicago,” Sergio Bonilla tells me. He then asks me for a pen and piece of paper and begins drawing and labeling a series of overlapping concentric circles with the names of Augusta and local educational and civic institutions.

Sergio: There’s a connection in this area that if you study it and the access of opportunities to Latinos. There’s the town of Augusta. There’s the school district 100 [elementary schools]. There’s Memorial park district. There’s a [community college]. There’s even the [local] township. And then there’s 209 [the high school]. The mayor who controls Augusta controls all these other things. And in talking about elections the people say he doesn’t have control of everything. There’s only [a limited amount] of jobs in the village so he can’t possibly control [it all]. But he doesn’t have to give [financially]. It’s legal patronage. That’s how I call it. It doesn’t mean [or that the mayor gives them] village jobs directly through the village. He calls up his buddy Al at the park district. “You know somebody’s- you know “[a] kid needs a job.” He’s not directly giving them so he’s not directly connected and then doesn’t even have to be there just has to be an understanding.

Here, Sergio, a second generation Mexicano and Augustan who works in the financial industry, is explaining what he sees as the influence and over-reaching power of the mayor of Augusta. He likens this influence to strategies associated with machine politics in Chicago, a city popularly referred to employ similar political tactics. A political machine refers to the power yielded by an official or small political group to exert influence over other individuals and organizations to ensure the formers’ social, economic, and political interests are met. At the core of political machines’ intent is to ensure political support.
Sergio is the prototypical Latino outsider in Augusta. He was critical, both, of Augusta’s political structure and adamant about improving the well-being of Latinos in the neighborhood and surrounding areas. As a native Augustan who grew up in the neighborhood, Sergio had personally experienced discrimination at the hands of police officers in the form of surveillance and harassment. Because of his experience and his commitment to improving the quality of life for Latinos, Sergio became involved in local community organizations and often attended meetings. In the 2000’s, Sergio got involved in local politics and decided to run (unsuccessfully) for the Augusta Village Council in 2009 with the AIP. The impetus to run was to dismantle the white ethnic patronage system in Augusta. For him, Augusta was like “a mini-Chicago,” whereby the Augusta political machine systematically rewarded insiders and excluded outsiders. Like other Latino outsiders, Sergio did not have direct economic ties with the village. Hence, his participation in the village was more or less informal: attending local school district board, AVC, and chamber of commerce meetings and volunteering in local events geared toward improving the quality of Latino families in the areas. At these meetings he, as well as other outsiders, were often vocal about local council elections, policies, village administrative intentions and how they impacted Augusta’s Latino residents.

For him, as well as other outsiders, local politics could not be disentangled from ethnicity. During my time in Augusta, talk about local politics often brought up discussions of ethnic group conflict. Latino outsiders saw the mayor and village administration’s actions as prioritizing the interest of white Augustans over that of Latino residents. For these critics, Augusta’s political machine operated in a way to ensure white political and social dominance over Latinos. They saw unequal power relationships emanating from local practices of corruption and patronage that redistributed resources along ethno-racial lines. In the following
sections, I examine how Latino outsiders saw various political corruptive practices—patronage, favoritism, cronyism, and intimidation—as reproducing Latino marginalization in three areas: access to village jobs, monetary resource allocation, and unchecked anti-Latino discrimination

a. Access to Village Jobs
According to insiders, politically corruptive practices perpetuated white/Latino residential differences in a variety of ways. One of the most discussed ways was long-embedded practices of a patronage system that allocated village jobs disproportionately to long-term white residents. These differences were supported by my observations: Latinos were disproportionately underrepresented in the fire, police, and streets and sanitation departments as well as in village administration. Most employees in these departments were white, and overwhelmingly, Italian American. Whereas both Latino outsiders and insiders (the latter, being less so) were critical of these differences, many whites did not discuss these differences.

In the mind of some whites residents obtaining employment in Augusta had little to do with one’s political allegiance or ethnic background. To get a job with the village all one has to do is “stay out of trouble and grow up,” Dana Peligrini said jokingly to me on election-day while we stood in front of the elementary school that was doubling as a voter station. Dana, an Italian American woman in her early 30s who grew up in Augusta and teaches North Augusta Elementary School is referring to her brother, Danny, who is an Augusta fire fighter. As she saw it, getting a job with the village had more to do with being a long-term resident rather than being politically connected.

However, not all whites felt the same way. During The Taste of Augusta that year I ran into a Paul Jennings, a white male in his late 20s who had attended the festival with his wife and infant daughter. Paul, who grew up in an adjacent town, had just completed his fire fighter training at a local community college and had been searching for jobs in the area. When asked if
he had applied to the Augusta fire department, he remarked, “You have to have a vowel at the end of your last name” [implying “Italian”] to get a job as a municipal worker in the community. Here, both Dana and Paul highlight the significance of particular social characteristics one must have in order to work for the village of Augusta. Dana stresses, staying out of “trouble” which implicitly indicates one’s residential status as an important criterion for village employment.

Paul, on the other hand, explicitly indicates the role of one’s name (as ethnically Italian) in even being considered for employment for in village departments. Both characterizations support outsiders’ claims of local ethnic patronage practices: that residential history and embeddedness along with ethnic background superseded that of equal access and opportunity.

Whereas whites’ explanation about access to city jobs ranged from benign assumptions to acknowledging the role of ethnic names in securing a job, Latino outsiders were more critical of these differences. When asked about the relative lack of Latinos in municipal jobs, Rosalina attributed the lack of Latino representation to the white ethnic political patronage system.

Rosalina: It’s all about elections—all about patronists. There’s not one Hispanic [on the fire department], and that’s the part that’s frustrating. How do you have a community of 72% Hispanic and not have one Hispanic on the fire department? Not one. How do you have a community at 72% Hispanic [and] there’s [only] four bilingual police officers—one is working as a community (inaudible), the other one is part time? So that leaves two, and one of those two is a soldier who goes back to Iraq. So how do you have one really full time police officer for a Hispanic community?

Outsiders felt that there should be more Latinos employed in village municipal departments. Their rationale was that the ethnic demographics of the population should be equally reflected in village workers. Further, these demands were not only about issues of equity but practical ones for the “Hispanic community.” It was important to have English/Spanish bilingual village workers, particularly on the police and fire departments to work as language translators with Spanish speakers in light of emergencies. In part, as Rosalina and others shared, getting a job
was influenced by one’s political allegiance to the current mayor and administration. Though there were clearly some Latino residents who support and voted for the current mayor, their lack of social and cultural capital within the context Augusta’s political patronage system put Latino residents at a disadvantage.

Rosalina: It’s because they don’t know the right people and I’m witness, witness, I mean with my own ears and eyes, when people have applied and they’ve asked me to help them get on to whatever. And then [potential applicants] say “Well, you have to talk to so and so council, you have to talk, make sure this trustee, you have to make sure this trustee recommends [me].” And I don’t do that so they don’t get [considered for the position]. I’m like, “Oh I’m not going to do that. I can help you. I can tell you who I was told to ask to make sure you get on to the police department, but you probably won’t get on,” [laughs]. So that’s the type of thing people don’t really know. I think that’s why we [Latinos] lose.

For many outsiders like Rosalina, Latinos who apply for municipal jobs are put at a disadvantage because they do not know the process of getting hired. Latinos not only have to know someone, but they also have to know how to play the game. Their lack of social (knowing someone) and cultural (knowing the hidden the process) capital puts them at a relative disadvantage to those who know how the system operates. Yet, Latino insiders who know how to play the game of getting hired in Augusta’s political patronage system may pass along helpful information to get hired but may not be willing to participate in it. Rosalina indicates she did not want compromise her morals by participating in the very same corruptive practices she contests. Hence, because of the lack of specific forms of social and cultural capital that Latinos have and insiders’ unwillingness to compromise their ideals, Latino applicants ultimately “lose.”

b. Monetary Resource Allocation
A second way outsiders saw Augusta’s white patronage system reinforcing Latino marginalization was by the misappropriation of funds away from neighborhood institutions and services that Latino residents used. Outsiders believed that administrators directed resources toward individuals and organizations who were political allies. The most cited allegation
revolved around the allocation of funds to local elementary schools. Augusta is home to three local elementary schools (Kindergarten to 8th grade), two of which were predominately Latino.\(^{ix}\) One of them was Augusta Elementary, a predominately Latino school located near the southern part of Augusta. Compared to the other two schools, Augusta Elementary was over-populated and described as having 40 students in a classroom (30 was seen as the cut-off point). As a result of overcrowding some classes had to be held in the basement. However, outsiders attributed school overcrowding to the mismanagement of funds rather than over enrollment, claiming that the village had the same budget as neighboring communities with higher performing schools. They believed funds were wrongly misdirected toward political supporters rather than toward hiring teachers.

**Martin:** You fired 20 teachers and you didn’t fire one janitor so where’s your priority? Your political army is janitors. I understand that. Can’t touch ‘em. But you fired 20 teachers; you’re telling me teachers are not as valuable as those janitors. Not only that, you hire one political operative to be the supervisor of all those janitors, paying ‘em $80,000 a year. That speaks volumes for decisions are made and what’s going on. And that’s just one example.

For Martin and other Latino outsiders, Augusta’s patronage system directed economic resources into employees to salaries who supported the current administration over teacher salaries and building improvements. In doing so, the village administration ensures support among their “political army”.

c. **Unchecked Anti-Latino Discrimination**

A third way outsiders saw the political patronage system as adversely affecting Latino residents was that it perpetuated corruption and let criminal activity go unchecked. Augusta has been known to have a history of corruption among the area dating back to the first half of the 20th century and links to Chicago’s notorious gangster, Alfonse Capone—something that overshadows the village today. Since the late 1990s, federal investigations have led to the
conviction of ten of Augusta’s employees—including village attorneys, police officers, and a former mayor—on various charges including income tax evasion, bribery, extortion, and witness-tampering (Sterret et al. 2012). Outsiders believed the legacy of corruption (and its remnants) negatively impacted Latino residents.

Outsiders saw the mayor and village administration as turning a blind-eye to corrupt village departmental employees who were intentionally targeting Latino businesses and homeowners through racketeering, extortion, and bribery schemes. One instance of corruption involved Augusta’s chief of police, Steve Veroni, who was convicted in 2009 of intimidating local businesses to hire his private security firm. He, along with two other village employees were convicted of strong-arming local businesses into hiring a private security firm, of which the chief of police owned and was staffed by off-duty Augusta police officers. Shortly prior to the investigation the village passed an ordinance requiring all bar owners to hire security to curb underage drinking and drug activity. A federal investigation found that the Augusta’s Chief of police forced bar owners to hire his security firm and staff off-duty Augusta police officers. Carlos Espinosa, a second generation Mexicano male who grew up in Augusta and whose father owned a bar in Augusta catering to a mostly Latino clientele, indicated that his father was approached by the chief of police asking him to hire his security firm. When his father refused to hire the firm, opting to hire his own bouncers at a cheaper rate, he alleged the chief of police tried to intimidate him into hiring his security firm. On-duty Augusta police officers would come in the bar unannounced and conduct random identification card checks. Ultimately, his father decided to close the bar due to new license liquor laws. Along with the negative impact corruption had on Latino businesses, there was also a concern of the impact on Latino customers. Carlos indicated that because many Latinos were undocumented, “the last thing you want is a
cop over your shoulder in full uniform while you’re doing it [drinking]. You don’t feel safe. You feel threatened.”

Further, Latino outsiders were not immune to being targets. Being publicly critical of the current administration or throwing ones’ support behind the wrong candidate in local elections could lead to repercussions. In fact, I came to find that over the years opposing candidates reported numerous instances of vandalism to their private property. During election periods, opposing candidates reported having political signs being stolen from their property, having their garages vandalized, getting their car windows broken, and in one instance, having their living room windows shot at with a pellet gun. Though police reports were filed and suspects never found, they believed these acts were politically motivated and carried out by supporters of the current administration. Moreover, such acts of overt intimidation can bear negatively upon amicable relationships between Latino outsiders and the white administration. One Mexicana respondent, Teresa Duarante, who provided legal services in the community, counted the mayor and a Latino village council member as personal friends. During one election year, she openly supported a friend who was running opposition to the mayor. She displayed the opposing candidate’s sign in her office window at the front of the building. A few days later somebody removed the signs and put them in her alley garbage can. The mayoral administration also alleged she illegally obtained signatures for her friend to be on the ballot. When asked about the incident, Teresa indicated it had soured her relationships with the mayor and council members who she considered to be friends:

Teresa: They [mayor and a council member] both stopped talking to me. And then… the [opposing candidate] signs disappeared. Every night, we'd put new ones and they would disappear. The day before the [mayoral] election I get to my office and I find a sign in my door. One of my signs, my friend's signs and then another one about five feet away and I look down the hallway and another at five feet, and another, another one, you know, all the way to the back where my garbage can for my business is at which is next door to his
business. And guess what I find in my garbage can? […] All of the signs that have been disappearing for a month. They came and dumped them in my garbage can. [Pause]. That's what they did.

As Teresa saw it, her social capital—as someone who had a good relations with village administrators and operated a business in close proximity to the mayor’s insurance business—was not enough to protect her from being a political target. Complicating her experience was that she had eventually decided to work with a health organization that was based in Augusta which relied partly upon economic resources from the village. Concerned about funding and future acts of intimidation, Teresa decided it was in her and her employer’s best interest to remain silent about her political support for opposing candidates. Yet, the experience has led her to be, both more cynical of political participation in local politics and more self-conscious about how she navigates political boundaries.

**Teresa:** For me it was a learning experience because I realized how dirty they were. I don't care so much about it but I used to care a lot for my name, you know, I'm a person of honesty and integrity, and to put my name on a complaint accusing me of fraud, collection of signatures that really bothered me. So I realized how dirty they were and then, these little things with the signs and coming and dumping them in my garbage can. What kind—why are you doing this? What kind of message. And so I was like, ok I have to be really careful about how I do things in this town.

As Latino outsiders saw it, political intimidation not only decreased their willingness to voice their political opinion but had social-psychological consequences as well. Outsiders were more than willing to engage on various levels with Augusta’s political machine to dismantle it to create what they saw as a more fair and equitable experience for all residents. Yet, at times, there were left demoralized.

**D. CONCLUSION**

Latino political integration the suburban neighborhood of Augusta continues to lag after nearly a decade after community succession. Despite relatively large and increasing numbers in the
suburban village, they remain underrepresented in village governance and jobs. There are two explanations for this difference. On one hand, some see the Latino political integration as a process that occurs over time and generations. This is the view held by many long-term white residents, elected community leaders, and administrators. It also a view held by of Mexicanos who work for the village and operate as ethnic brokers. They espouse as assimilationist view of political integration whereby Mexican immigrants—and mostly their U.S. born children—are following the same patterns as other U.S. immigrant groups. For them, power, representation, and structural integration will occur over time and not overnight. Others see a neighborhood political system in place that works to counteract Latino political integration. Though they acknowledge some barriers (i.e. being undocumented), they are more apt to cite political corruption as the most significant factor in continual Latino exclusion. The political system does this, as they see it, by systematically funneling resources along ethnic and political lines while putting up formal and informal barriers that make it hard for political integration. Such political systems are difficult to dismantle, especially when people do not want to do so. Many white residents may put up with what may be seen by some as corrupt, so long as they see their own interests as met [i.e., being able to call in a favor or get a job with the village]. However, there is also a perception that the election of a Latino mayor or Latino dominated council would symbolize they “lost” Augusta. Hence, a sense of group threat keeps white residents politically active in Augusta and able to organize around group interests, despite neighborhood succession.
V. THIS IS AN ITALIAN CHURCH WITH A LARGE HISPANIC POPULATION*: WHITE ETHNO-RELIGIOUS PLACEMAKING

In June of 2009, a contingent of third and fourth generation Italian Americans successfully lobbied to have Augusta’s Our Lady of Pompeii Catholic Church become one of the few Marian shrines in the United States. The church served as the center of religious and social life for many Italian American Catholics in the area since it officially opened its doors in 1903. Though Augusta became a Latino majority community in 2000 and most parishioners are now Mexicanos, white ethnics maintain a strong visible and symbolic presence in the church. In 2007, the front page of the trilingual (English, Spanish, and Italian) church bulletin began identifying Our Lady of Pompeii as the “The Only Italian American Parish” in the local archdiocese. The bulletin is often filled with announcements inviting its readers to join The Our Lady of Pompeii and Holy Name Societies, long-time parish based religious organizations that died out a generation ago but have seen a notable reemergence over the recent years. There has been also a noticeable effort to reach out to former and new Italian American Catholic parishioners. Parishioners are encouraged to contact their friends and families who have since left Augusta to come back to celebrate church milestones and attend religious events such as the annual The Good Friday Procession or Our Lady of Pompeii Festival while Italian American Catholic religious societies in the surrounding areas are urged to make the parish “their home.”

The Annual Our Lady of Pompeii Festival (henceforth, the “Feast”), held every July, functions as the central event for Italian American parishioners, serving dually as a public demonstration of spiritual devotion to the church patroness and namesake as well as a reunion between former and current Italian parishioners and residents. During the Feast week, current and former residents reunite at the nightly church services to participate in the nine day Novena where they will recite the Rosary in Italian and stare adoringly at the statue of the Blessed Mother brought
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from Italy to Augusta over a century ago. The streets surrounding the church are turned into a festival ground. Though it is marketed as a religious event, the Feast combines elements of secular Italian and American culture. Italian and American flags fly along light poles while food vendors sell traditional Italian food and monogrammed red, green, and white shirts. Food vendors lean over their booths to embrace friends, many who are parishioners and residents and return every year to the event. In this sense, Our Lady of Pompeii Church functions as a social hub to link people and place across time, and despite changing neighborhood demographics.

The recent re-emergence of Italian Catholic ethno-religious identity and Italian parishioners’ revitalization efforts over the last 10 years have occurred at the peak of institutional and neighborhood demographic change. As older generations of Italian Americans pass away and their children move out of the neighborhood, they are being replaced by Latinos, and mostly Mexican immigrants and their American born children. These changes are reflected inside the church. Since the 1980’s, church leaders made changes to accommodate Latino newcomers by hiring Spanish speaking priests, adding Spanish masses, and integrating Mexican ethno-religious cultural symbols and traditions into the church. Today, Sunday morning English and Italian masses fill less than a quarter of church and the number of Italian Catholic religious societies have dwindled. On the other hand, Sunday afternoon Spanish masses are filled to capacity and are often standing room only. Though they are a numerical minority, Italian American parishioners still maintain a strong symbolic presence in the church.

This chapter explores how a numerical minority of white ethnics collectively organize to ascribe an Italian American ethno-religious identity to a predominately Latino church. Specifically, I examine the driving forces behind, and strategies of, place making. “[t]he process of organizing or re-organizing the key elements of place” (Aguilar-San Juan 2000:43). In doing
so, I endeavor to answer two questions. First, what factors drive white ethnics to make place? Second, what branding strategies do white ethnics use to ascribe ethno-religious identity to place? My findings reveal that strong levels of place attachment and group threat serve as the impetus behind collective efforts of place making. In turn, white ethnics brand place through concurrent strategies of place making, marking, and marketing the church as a distinctively Italian Catholic ethno-religious site. Essentially, these factors and processes enable white ethnics to successfully construct and inscribe an ethno-religious identity to an organization despite being a numerical minority.

A. **HISTORY OF OUR LADY OF POMPEII CATHOLIC CHURCH**

Our Lady of Pompeii Catholic Church opened its doors in 1903. However, the origins of the church stretch back a decade prior and are attributed to a lone Italian immigrant woman, Mrs. Anna Marie Emilio, who brought with her from Italy a strong religious devotion to Our Lady of Pompeii. According to life-long parishioners, Mrs. Emilio's husband had fallen gravely ill and she had called upon Our Lady of Pompeii to intercede on his behalf. Should his life be spared, Mrs. Emilio promised to hold a yearly festival in honor of the Blessed Mother. Her husband recovered, and that following year, Mrs. Emilio raised $5,000 to purchase a statue of Our Lady of Pompeii from Italy and held the first festival on her farm in Augusta. The same statue still stands today, encased in glass, at the back of Our Lady of Pompeii’s chapel.

Our Lady of Pompeii, though not formally recognized as a national parish by its local Roman Catholic archdiocese, drew a large contingent of Italian and Italian Americans from Augusta and the surrounding area when it opened. Catholic archdiocese officials assigned Italian speaking priests from a Catholic religious order dedicated to ministering to migrant
communities. These Italian priests could identify and communicate with the local population and were well versed in Italian Catholic religious traditions and devotions. In turn, Italian Catholic immigrants who were not often well-received in Irish and German Catholic parishes found a church where they could worship in their native language and practice ethnically distinctive forms of Catholicism.

The biggest draw was (and continues to be) the annual Our Lady of Pompeii Feast held during the first week in July. The Feast, though a local affair, eventually grew in terms of participants and activities. Thousands of devoted Italian Catholics from the surrounding areas often traveled in caravans of horse-drawn carts when it first began. The focal point of The Feast was the Sunday Procession whereby the statue of the Madonna was carried on the shoulders of men throughout the streets of Augusta. A 1905 newspaper article noted the fervor and sacrifices of the devoted at the event:

“Ah, the blessed Virgin!” whispered the crowd as the snow white image, surrounded by sparkling tapers, was brought forth. With the passionate light of devotions in their eyes, the women who knew well what a dollar meant, elbowed each other to pin paper money to the statue's vestments. The saint seemed to smile down at them, and to bless them for their sacrifice.

Climbing the stairways on their knees, the people laid their offspring upon the glittering altar of the church. Many a baby who had come to the fiesta in its finest dresses, departed with its old clothes on. Mothers who could give nothing else, kneeling among the candles and the incense, stripped their little ones of their fine garments and laid the bright clothes before the Virgins' feet. These garments will be sold some day to purchase a fine robe for Maria.

[…]Some of the trinkets were cheap little things but treasures, nevertheless. One woman, having nothing else to give, laid down her wedding ring. These souvenirs are to be melted so that the lady of Pompeii next year may wear a golden crown.

The Feast became one of the most popular religious events for area Italian American Catholics throughout the first three quarters of the twentieth century. Local area newspapers estimated that between 2,000 and 15,000 people attended The Feast each
year—a significant number during an era of relatively limited transportation options. Still, devoted Italian Catholics made the trip, some as far away as the Little Italy neighborhood located in a city twenty miles away. One 67 year old Italian American Feast organizer remembered "the people used to come out with the horse and wagon....and walked here [from the city]" (Area newspaper, July 16, 1983). This man, who named his daughter after the church patroness, went on to say that forty people applied to carry the statue that year. To carry the statue in the procession was seen both as an honor and a sign of penance. Men had to be invited by church leaders to carry the statue. Though some were chosen because of their participation in church organizations, it was not uncommon to auction off an opportunity to carry the statue. In 1904, one man paid $68 (a hefty sum at the time) to carry the statue in the mid-July summer heat (Area newspaper, July 25, 1904). According to one of my respondents, in the 1970’s another man paid over $15,000 to church leaders to have the procession re-routed to pass in front of his ailing mother's home. Though men were only allowed to carry the statue in the annual procession, women were in charge of the Madonna's upkeep and often jockeyed with each other for the honor to wash her vestments. The financial and social investment in the patroness throughout the history of the church by the devoted reveals the depth of her spiritual significance in the lives of the faithful.

Parishioners’ long-standing devotions were expressed during key Feast anniversaries and church milestones. For the 75th anniversary of The Feast in 1968, the church included information about its history, congratulatory messages from local businesses, and over one hundred pictures of parishioner families in a parish booklet. To mark the parish’s 100th anniversary in 1993, the congregation raised thousands of dollars
to erect a Centennial Bell "in honor of her many past and present followers." Milestones extended beyond anniversaries. To mark its dedication as a Shrine, the parish purchased a bronze commemorative book to be housed at the church indefinitely. For a donation of $100, people could leave a personalized message or inscribe their family name in the book. The persistent communal spiritual and material investment of Italian parishioners relays a deep spiritual connection between themselves and their patroness, as well as deep connections to others.

Up through the mid-1970s, Augusta remained a predominately white ethnic, and mostly, Italian neighborhood. Though most of the original white ethnic immigrants had passed on, children and grandchildren took their place often remaining in the neighborhood, inheriting their parents' homes, and maintaining local ethnic and cultural traditions. Many second and third generation Italian Americans often worked local industrial and manufacturing jobs while a few increasingly entered into white collar employment. Whereas white ethnics of German and Irish descent (the original settlers in the area) were overrepresented in local government and civic jobs for the first 50 years of the twentieth century, Italians had by then replaced them in positions such as mayors, fireman, police officers, and village works departments. Beginning in the late 1970’s, Latinos, many from Mexico, settled in Augusta. Though their numbers were small, their presence was felt at Our Lady of Pompeii. By the early 1980’s, the church offered weekly services in Spanish and was one of the few Catholic institutions in the immediate area to do so. The number of Latinos living in the community grew along with those attending the parish. Church leaders worked to integrate Latinos in parish and community life by attending to both their spiritual and material needs. The archdiocese assigned bilingual priests who were fluent in English and Spanish while clergy leaders incorporated Mexican ethno-religious devotions and
traditions. Inside, the church displayed a portrait of Our Lady of Guadalupe, a popular Mexican Catholic portrayal of the Jesus Christ’s Mother, along the back wall. In front of the portrait are electric candles and a bench where her devotees can kneel and pray. During Spanish services her portrait is often brought up to the front of the church where passersby often stop and give the sign of the cross after receiving communion. Mexican Catholic religious devotions at Our Lady of Pompeii are often portrayed in the form of religio-cultural practices. The church often holds Mexican Catholic religio-cultural events such as the Dias De Los Muertos (Day of the Dead) and presentation of infants. Likewise, the church serves as a site for public religious processions such as The Posadas and Via Crucis (Good Friday), which are often adapted to address social and economic barriers that Latino immigrant families face in the United States.

B. PLACE MAKING MOBILIZING FACTORS: PLACE ATTACHMENT AND GROUP THREAT

1. Place Attachment
One primary mobilizing factor behind white ethnic place making was high levels of place attachment. Place attachment refers to “an affective relationship between people and the landscape that goes beyond cognition, preference, and judgment” (Riley 1992: 13). A number of community studies, and to varying degrees, have examined residential attachments to their neighborhoods (Gans [1962] 1982; Hunter 1974; Kefalas 2003; Pattillo-McCoy 1999; Rieder 1985). Though not explicitly examining place attachment (for an exception, see Hunter 1974), there is a general consensus that long-term residents have an affinity to settlements in which they reside. Stronger levels of neighborhood attachment are often associated with greater degrees of neighborhood social organization, “the extent to which the residents of a neighborhood are able to maintain effective social control and realize their collective goals” (Wilson and Taub 2006: 88).
The degree of resident attachment is influenced by various factors such as length of residence, the extent of in-neighborhood social ties, and participation in neighborhood voluntary institutions (Hunter 1974). On this last point, those invested in local voluntary institutions, such as civic and religious organizations, are more likely to have stronger ties to the local area. Though the intensity of attachment varies by institutional type (Flippen 2001), this suggests that long-time residents with multiple social ties are more likely to participate in neighborhood social institutions than those who do not exhibit the same characteristics.

Although scholars have identified the role of place attachment in social life (cf. Altman and Low 1992), there is a dearth of research examining how voluntary organizations such as religious sites foster place attachment. Sacred places and religious rituals connect people to place (Mazumdar and Mazumdar 1993). Group narratives passed down through generations, the social and material investment in sacred place-based artifacts, and routine pilgrimages foster a stronger sense of religious place attachment (Mazumdar and Mazumdar 2004). Other factors, such as (long) length of residence, participation in neighborhood institutions, and strong social ties strengthen connections to places (Hunter 1974). Previous studies on urban Catholic churches, suggest that many parishioners maintain a strong affinity to these sites, evidenced by repeated participation in religious events across generations (McGreevy 1998; McMahon 1996; Orsi 1985; Sciorra 1999; Stanger-Ross 2010). This suggests that U.S. urban Catholic churches are unique in two ways. First, and unlike most Protestant churches, early urban Catholic churches were established by their local archdiocese to be territorial parishes intended to administer to parishioners within defined geographical boundaries. For instance, increased migration of white ethnics between the mid19th and early 20th century to U.S. cities led to an
explosive construction of Catholic churches. Buttressed by increasing rates of ethnic and racial segregation, neighborhoods often became ethnically and racially homogenous resulting in the creation of national (or ethnic) churches. Second, neighborhood, ethnic, and religious identities often overlapped. For example, Eileen McMahon’s (1994) work (aptly titled, *What Parish Are You From*?), described how Chicago’s Irish Catholics’ religious and neighborhood identities were often conflated. Hence, for many white ethnic groups, neighborhood attachment and religious place affiliation was inextricably intertwined and ultimately fostered a parish identity for generations to come. As Charlie Gulianni, an Our Lady of Pompeii parishioner indicated:

Charlie: [T]he church is a big part of this community. I always said Pompeii is the heart and soul of Augusta whether people belong here or not. The Feast in this church and the parish kind of run[s] […] the lives of the people that live here. Everything kind of revolves around this [the church].

As Charlie infers, church life encompassed neighborhood life, linking parish and place. This relationship was solidified through spiritual and social aspects of organizational life. Many have a profound love of the Blessed Mother and it was not unusual for respondents to become visibly emotional when they mentioned her in interviews. During The Feast Day one year, I stood with a group of white residents in front of their home while waiting for the procession and statue to pass. I struck up a conversation with one of them, a woman who looked to be in her early 60s and who lived down the street from the church. As do many long time parishioners, she explained her deep devotion to the Blessed Mother. Through teary eyes, she discussed how the church patroness helped her cope with the death of her son. Such deep spiritual connections and devotions were visible in parishioners’ material investments. Women compete with each other to clean the statues’ vestments while men have been said to pay a considerable price to carry the Madonna on The Feast Day. In fact, in one instance one parishioner paid church leaders to have the procession rerouted to pass by his ailing mother’s home. In 2010, The Feast Day service in
the church was televised on a Catholic cable station. The event prompted one viewer in another state with a strong devotion to the Blessed Mother to donate $2000 to the parish.

Strengthening the bonds between people, place, and parish were the social relationships maintained over (and between) generations. Of places, Orum and Chen (2003) write:

Just as individuals come to have a sense of themselves through their connections to places in their lives, so, too, social groups, ranging from families and friends to neighborhoods and communities, develop a powerful sense of affiliation and common identity based upon their connections to places. (p. 12)

The church served as a hub of ritual social activity over the past century for many Italian American residents. It was a place where grandparents first met, children were baptized, and where many planned to hold their funeral. Parishioners from the baby boomer generation reminisced of parish sponsored retreats and dances they attended during their teenage years. Such nostalgia was often reflected in collective efforts to recreate events (a 1950’s Sock Hop Dance) or hold all class reunions for the Our Lady of Pompeii Elementary School which closed its doors in the late 1990s. As Gieryn (2002) writes, “Buildings stabilize social life. They give structure to social institutions, durability to social networks, persistence to behavior patterns. What we build solidifies society against time and its’ incessant forces for change” (35). White ethnics saw the church as a physical structure that housed personally significant elements of material cultural. For a century it housed the statue that they, as well as their ancestors, prayed to during their times of need and paraded annually through Augusta’s streets every Feast Day. In housing religious artifacts it created the conditions for ritual social interactions by operating as a social hub and social link. As a social hub, the church facilitated the maintenance of social relationships between members through routine religious and social gatherings. As a social link, it connected current and former Italian parishioners to each other and to a shared past. These
conditions fostered the context for the creation of strong social ties and dense social networks that gave rise to a shared group identity and strong affinity to place.

In this way, Our Lady of Pompeii Catholic Church fosters what Randall Collins (2004) described as interaction ritual chains. Drawing on Collins, Deener (2010) describes interactional ritual chains as:

[T]he historical web of social situations in which individuals present ‘solidarity and symbols of group membership’, connect a population with local institutions and symbols over time, creating moments of visible cohesion that reinforce public perceptions of the groups’ collective presence. (47)

Our Lady of Pompeii church serves as part of white ethnic parishioner’s interaction ritual chain. As one of the longest standing voluntary institutions in Augusta, it held and continues to hold, special meaning for current and former parishioners and residents. Despite the fact that Italian American parishioners are no longer the majority group at Our Lady of Pompeii, it is still described by church members, as well as non-members, as an Italian American church. In this way, Italian American parishioners maintain a visible presence in this now Latino-majority church. Andrew Deener (2010) labels this as collective visibility, or “the construction of internal place attributes” (47). He goes on to write: “A group that achieves collective visibility becomes intertwined with the identity of the neighborhood, often overshadowing the presence of other groups” (47). Although Augusta’s ethnic and racial demographics have changed over the years, it is still collectively seen by residents and nonresidents as an Italian American settlement. Italian flags fly on resident’s porches while non-residents routinely refer to the Our Lady of Pompeii Feast as the “Italian” Feast. In part, Italian American residents’ collective visibility can be attributed to negative ethnic stereotypes and a history of political corruption and organized crime—something non-residents would bring up in conversations of Augusta (and a sensitive topic among life-long residents). Yet, multiple popular online social networking with web pages
entitled “Augustans,” “I once lived in Augusta,” and “Fans of the Italian Feast” are filled with pictures of residents who have since passed and jovial posts from former residents living in other states who miss the authentic Italian food sold at neighborhood festivals. Such sites serve as a forum for current, former, and non-residents to connect over shared history and sentiment. To this end, place attachment creates the condition for which people to connect and shore up shared identities.

2. Group Threat
A second factor that drove white ethnic place making was group threat. Demographic changes in Augusta over the last 30 years, driven by white flight, attrition, and a growing Latino population have heightened some white residents’ concerns about neighborhood stability and well-being. Others held more progressive views and were less pessimistic about neighborhood change. Still, nearly every white resident I interviewed acknowledged the challenges or “growing pains” of a changing community. Within the church, white ethnics perceived that the growing number of Latinos posed a threat in two ways: the first was a threat to long-established ethno-religious practices and, the second, to the church’s ethno-religious identity. The former refers to the long-established ethno-religious practices and primarily regarding the content of various functions and specifically revolved around accommodations that altered the content of various functions. One example of this revolved around the integration of Mexican culture into the Sunday Feast procession. Here, Frank Palucci relays an incident regarding one Latina parishioner’s attempt to include a mariachi band in The Feast Day procession:

**Frank:** About 15 years ago a woman paid for a mariachi band to be in The Feast procession. Well they [got] no further than the field mass. And the people [white ethnic parishioners] complained to the priest. They said, “What is this?” I mean the woman paid 2500 dollars for it [the mariachi band]. So they put her at the end of the procession. They put the mariachis behind [a float at the end of the parade] because that’s not part of our culture.
In this case, the infusion of Mexican culture into The Feast Day procession incensed Frank as well as other white ethnics because, as he put it, it was “not part of our culture.” Thus, though many white ethnics often characterized the church as ‘open’ to everyone, actual attempts to infuse Mexican culture into longstanding church traditions were often met with resistance. For Frank, the issue was resolved when the Mariachi band was put at the end of the procession.

Further, white ethnics interpreted such attempts to include Latinos into Italian ethno-religious festival traditions as a usurpation of Italians’ symbolic ownership. Here, Jeanette describes the tensions between groups.

Jeanette: [S]o there was, “Well we [Mexicano parishioners] need to take more part in The Feast.” And it’s like, “Hey, now everybody’s welcome. Come!” But it was kind of like: “Well we [Mexicanos] want The Feast to be done this way.” See that was where the hard feelings came in. We’ve [Italians] been here for one hundred and fifteen years, I think it is now. So let’s say, a good hundred years before the Hispanic community got to be very involved. And now it’s, “Well we [Mexicanos] want this and we want that, and we want this.” And it’s like, “Wait a minute here.” It’s like being thrown out of your own house. When this December comes along and it’s [the] our Lady of Guadalupe [devotion day], we would never presume to tell them [Mexicanos] how [her] The Feast should go. It’s not our party. If you came to my house, [interviewer], I wouldn’t serve you anything I knew you wouldn’t want. But if you’re coming to my house for dinner, you’re probably gonna get lasagna. So it was kind of like, we’ve tried to make the point, “It’s our party. You’re invited. We just want to throw the party.” But then again, when Our Lady of Guadalupe comes around, I guess everyone’s invited but nothing is done in English so we don’t understand.

Group threat theory posits that feelings of threat emerge when a one group interprets themselves to be in direct competition with another group over resources social, economic, and, or political resources (Blalock 1967; Dixon 2006). In his classic work, “Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position,” Blumer (1958) posited that individual prejudice is linked to group membership. He argued that prejudice arises when members of one group perceive members of another as encroaching upon the former’s proprietary claims. Though group ownership claims may be material (i.e. economic), others claims can be non-tangible (symbolic). In the case of Our Lady
of Pompeii, white ethnic parishioners actively involved in place-making were adamant that the church maintain its Italian American ethno-religious identity and practices. That is not to say that white ethnics were hostile to sharing the church with Latino parishioners. Many did acknowledge the importance of holding Spanish masses, incorporating Mexican ethno-religious traditions, and recruiting Spanish speaking priests. Yet they were more vocally critical about situations in which accommodations bled over into historically white ethnic social spaces as was the case for multilingual masses. Many white ethnic parishioners adamantly opposed church leaders’ attempts to conduct bilingual (English/Spanish) and trilingual (English/Spanish/Italian) masses for Easter and Christmas holiday services. For them, the celebratory masses should always be in English.

The growing number of Latino parishioners also posed a threat to white ethnics’ perception of church’s ethnic identity. This became evident during a meeting I stumbled upon one evening with Frank Palucci and three other white ethnic parishioners. Seeing me through the church rectory office window one evening, Frank waved and beckoned me to come inside. The impromptu meeting was set up by him and Michael, a parishioner who was also a member of the Our Lady of Pompeii Historical Group, and was joined by two other men. They were discussing potential church renovation plans, one of which included adding another chapel on the building. The chapel, they explained, would be a replica of the original structure built in 1903 and would house the Our Lady of Pompeii statue. When discussing ways to raise funds for the project, Frank mentioned a story of a priest from a neighboring parish who recently visited Our Lady of Pompeii. Given the large Latino population, the priest indicated that he was unaware that parish had a long-standing Italian American population. This disturbed Frank and he informed us that, "This is not a Hispanic church. This is an Italian church with a large Hispanic population."
Such concerns extended beyond the mere perception of a growing number of Latino parishioners and were more so about how their large numbers would alter the religious identity of the church. In large part, this issue revolved around concerns about the church patroness. One white parishioner indicated that rumors circulated within the church that church leaders were going to change the name of the parish to Our Lady of Guadalupe, a Catholic Mexican ethno-religious depiction of Jesus’s mother. Though he dismissed these rumors, others echoed these concerns in interviews.

**Gina:** I can understand the Hispanics being for Our Lady of Guadalupe,[but] what [we are] saying is this is Our Lady of Pompeii. This is not Our Lady of Guadalupe. People were afraid that they were going to make it more [like Our Lady of Guadalupe]. Our Lady is called so many things. You know, Our Lady of Sorrows? It’s the same person with a different name to it. But you know, people feel like this is Our Lady of Pompeii and we want to keep it Our Lady of Pompeii because the blood sweat and tears for those statues in this church going up were pennies, nickels, and dimes from our ancestors.

Here, Gina verifies some of the concerns of white ethnic parishioners: that Latino parishioners harbored intentions to reconstitute the church as a religious place dedicated to Our Lady of Guadalupe. Latino parishioners acknowledged and were understanding of these concerns. Yet their interpretations of the situation varied. On the one hand, Latino parishioners rejected any attempts to modify events to be more inclusive. One example occurred one year where festival organizers changed The Feast’s name, “The Italian Feast Our Lady of Pompeii” by dropping the “Italian” from the title to be more inclusive of non-Italian attenders (and especially Latino parishioners). As one Latino parishioner, Carlos, remarked:

**Carlos:** [Because of] the influence of the Hispanics [on] The Feast, they changed it [the name] for a while. They would just call it The Feast. The Our Lady of Pompeii Feast you know, when in all actuality it was the Italian Feast. It was the Italian Feast.

**Interviewer:** Who changed it [the name]?

**Carlos:** The [Feast] committee […] they stopped calling it [The] Italian Feast for a while. And that was like you know, whatever, that’s bullshit. Well, let em
[Italians] has their shit, you know? As a kid I remember, I was a teenager, I was like ‘Who gives a shit?’ And I remember[ed] […] like if you walk around the PA [sound system] they call[ed] it The Italian Feast… someone made a beef about it. “Hey. You know what? This was The Italian Feast. Why the fuck do we have to change? Why can’t it be The Italian Feast?”…which they’re [Italians] all in their right for that […]. So like, you know the residents all call it The Italian fast. [On] the loudspeaker they call it something else. It’s the Italian Feast, that’s what it was. I mean like, you know, really, is it The Italian feast, with 70% of your population [being Latino]? I mean you walk up and down The Feast you tell me how many Italians compared to how many Mexicans you see.

Here, Carlos is rationalizing why it should be called The “Italian” Feast. He echoes some Italian parishioners’ resentment over changing the name of The Feast and justifies their claims. Most telling though is that he is also acknowledging that the Italians have a valid symbolic claim to label this religious event as a distinctively Italian Catholic ethno-religious function despite the fact they are now the numerical minority group not only in the church and neighborhood, but at the festival. My observations of The Feast during the research period confirmed his assertion: the majority of those attending the outside festival were overwhelming Latino, and mostly couples with young children and teenagers. Yet, other Latinos were more sensitive how Latinos felt about Italians’ ubiquitous claims of symbolic ownership over the church.

**Guadalupe:** I think the Latino community in the church does not feel like this is their church […]. We’re [Latinos] here and this is a church that, that provides services. We come here but I think it’s hard to say this is my church. It’s very marked.

Though Guadalupe and Carlos differ in how they viewed the relevance of place identity inscription for Latino festival attenders and parishioners, they both indicated that Italians laid a symbolic claim over the church and a major religious function. As Guadalupe indicated, Latino parishioners did see the church as “marked” as Italian.
These findings further point to the importance of identifying and delineating between the particular forces behind place-making. On the one hand, and in line with the classical urban sociological perspective, place-making is often framed as process that naturally evolves through residential settlement (San Juan-Aguilar 2005). Places emerge anachronistically and are then continuously reconstituted to reflect the social, material, and specific practices of its users, consumers, and stewards. Place making is then often framed as an unintentional and natural process. On the other hand, and in line with the political economy perspectives, places are intentionally made, and particularly so by place elites and shaped by powerful economic interests (Logan and Molotch 2007). Hence, places are intentionally constructed by people and strategically made. To varying degrees, in their responses both Carlos and Guadalupe employ various elements of the classical urban sociological (Latinos are the majority of the church population) and political economy perspectives (Italians parishioners intentionally make ethno-religious place) to discuss place identity and ownership. Yet despite Latino neighborhood and organizational succession, white ethnics maintain a sense of ownership of the church. Further, the impetus to make place and reaffirm place identity are not driven by group economic interests but by place attachment and threat.

C. PLACE MAKING STRATEGIES: MARKING, MARKING, AND MARKETING

1. **Place Making**

Since 2000, there has been a concerted effort by Our Lady of Pompeii’s white ethnic parishioners in place-making. One way white ethnic parishioners went about making place was to codify the church’s institutional identity. Beginning in 2006, parishioners organized to have the church become a Marian shrine. The local archdiocese defines a shrine as "[a] church or other sacred
space used by the faithful for pilgrimages." The decision to make the church a Marian Shrine was announced by an auxiliary Bishop during The Our Lady of Pompeii Feast in 2006. The decision was met with excitement and gained much support and fanfare by many white ethnic parishioners. Organizers petitioned people to donate gold—many which came in the form of family heirlooms and at least two parents' wedding rings—to be melted into gold crowns for the statue of the Madonna and baby Jesus whom she held in her arms. Meanwhile, parishioners sent letters to the local archdiocese asking the Cardinal and Bishop’s permission for a papal blessing of the crowns. Their efforts paid off, and in May of 2009, a contingent of 35 parishioners travelled to Rome to watch the Pope bless the statues' crowns. After their return, the church held a coronation ceremony that June where the statue was carried on the shoulders of women (the first time in church history that women carried the statue in a procession) to the original church location and the surrounding streets. The culmination of the event was when a packed church saw the crowns placed on the Madonna and Child. It is now one of five Marian Shrines in the United States.

Religious organizations inside the church were seen as central to the social preservation of ethno-religious identities and practices. Over the years, dwindling numbers of participation in religious organizations—The Society of Our Lady of Pompeii, The Holy Name Society, the Woman's Sodality along with others—were seen as one of the reasons why traditional Italian ethno-religious practices fell to the wayside. Though some of the reason respondents gave for the demise of these organizations was because of a general decrease in religious devotion among parishioners, much of this was attributed toward changing demographics. Old members died off and their children left the church and the neighborhood. Others blamed it on Mexican parishioner's lack of interest to participate in these religious organizations.
Frank: We had a lot more parish societies before the Mexicans came here. They are not joiners. They don’t join societies. [Mexican’s] devotion to the Blessed Mother was either not as deep or their commitment to [Our Lady of Pompeii] is not as strong as other people [who] have left […] and so, we’ve lost [these religious organizations].

For Frank, Mexican parishioners did not “join” these religious organizations, either because they were not devoted to the church patroness or were unwilling to become members. However, in recent years there have been efforts to resurrect these organizations. One example has been the reorganization of The Society of Our Lady of Pompeii (henceforth, “The Society”). The Society was formed in the early years of the church to manage the religious aspects of The Feast. However, over time, parishioner membership in the Society waned and eventually ceased to exist. Beginning in 2001, white ethnic parishioners reformed the Society and its membership eventually grew. Though the Society was directed toward maintaining religious traditions, it was also seen as way to consolidate the jobs of other religious organizations that no longer existed, ultimately functioning as an umbrella organization. The designation of the church as ethnically Italian, the codification of it as a shrine, and efforts to revive old religious organizations reflect the ways Italian parishioners went about place-making.

2. Place Marking
In making place, Italian parishioners symbolically marked its identity and practices as well. Beginning in 2009, the front page of the church bulletin indicated that it was, “The Only Italian American Church” in the area. Though I did not initially notice this insertion, the statement was missing from all the church bulletins I collected prior stretching back to 2006. Yet the church’s ethno-religious identity and origins extend beyond the symbolic to the material. Four Italian flags fly above the main entrance of the church year round. The maroon patio legacy bricks are etched with (mostly Italian) surnames of individuals and families who purchased them through a church fundraiser after the building entrance was remodeled in 2000. Like the legacy bricks, bronze
plaques attached to the Centennial Bell marble, benches, and the church wall bear the names of patrons and long-time parishioners. Outside the church near the west side entrance, stands a bronze statue of Padre Biaggio, an Italian monk and saint who lived in the nineteenth century. Dangling from his hands are dozens of Rosaries, put there by the throngs of mostly Italian Americans and other white ethnics who kneel and pray in front of him on any given day. To the casual observer, it is not hard to see the Italian origins of Our Lady of Pompeii Church.

3. Place Marketing

As a voluntary organization, Our Lady of Pompeii's livelihood is dependent on member participation and contributions. Many of Our Lady of Pompeii's Italian parishioners acknowledged this and sought ways to "reach out" to others to increase the number of Italian Catholics within the church's ranks. They believed that by restoring and cultivating an Italian Catholic ethno-religious identity and cultural practices they would attract former and new devotees. One way to accomplish this was to "bring back" former parishioners and to invite them to participate in the collective process of place-making. For instance, the Our Lady of Pompeii Historical Society began soliciting current and former parishioners to contribute pictures and memorabilia from the old church (leveled in 1967) which were to be included in the church historical display the following year. During the weeks leading up to the 2009 Feast, lime green fliers were placed at the back of the church soliciting parishioners for "historical memorabilia of the church, feast, or any parish organizations (past and present)." Announcements were also made after each Novena, asking those in attendance to "rummage through parents’ basements" for pictures, newspaper clippings, and banners related to the church. The initial drive was seen as a success and culminated in the creation of the 2010 church historical display. The display consisted of 15 bulletin boards bearing photographs, newspaper clippings, and stories related to
parish history. Most bulletins were arranged by time period while others were devoted to people, monumental events, and candle houses. Accompanying each board were three poster cards, describing the contents of bulletin boards in English, Italian and Spanish. However, donated memorabilia extended beyond photographs and clippings. At the end of one Novena, Charlie Giuliani walked me over to the shrinery to show me what he brought: a railing from the old church altar he found in his mother's basement.

White ethnic parishioners actively worked to recruit new parishioners they saw as enhancing an Italian Catholic ethno-religious identity. Noting the large Italian American Catholic population and religious organizations and societies in the area, there was an effort to reach out to them. These included societies devoted to various Italian Catholic saints, such as Padre Lorenzo and St. Anthony. Over the years, these societies and organizations increasingly participated in special religious services and processions. For example, in 2009 I attended a service in honor of San Beniamino, a saint revered by many Italian Catholics. The service, performed in Italian, was organized by a religious society housed outside the church and consisted of Italian immigrants from outside the parish. The service featured a statue of San Beniamino which was brought from Italy weeks prior. At the end of the service, half a dozen men carried the statue ceremoniously down the center aisle, toward the rear of the church, and to its official new home: The Our Lady of Pompeii baptistery. Other Italian Catholic religious organizations were also sought out and invited to participate in the church's processions. Like many Our Lady of Pompeii parishioners, they constructed their own candle houses and banners and marched alongside other Italian religious organizations during the Good Friday and Feast neighborhood processions. Extending the invitation to other Italian oriented contingents increased event participation while cultivating Italian ethno-religious place traditions.
The tools used by Italian parishioners to codify an Italian American church identity and preserve Italian ritual practices—making, marking, and marketing—revealed a concerted effort to construct a distinctively white ethno-religious place. Boyd's (2008) work on the neighborhood revitalization in Bronzeville, a historically Black community in Chicago, reveals how heritage and racial tourism work in overlapping ways to make, mark, and market place (cf. Van den Berghe and Keyes, 1984). In place of racial tourism, Italian parishioners actively worked to make place by encouraging *ethno-religious tourism*. Like religious pilgrims, ethno-religious tourists seek out sacred spaces to connect spiritually with a place. Yet not all who attend pilgrimage sites are faithful adherents or “believers.” One year at The Feast, I spoke with a former resident who informed me that despite being the only non-Italian, Protestant, kid on his block and never attending a service at Our Lady of Pompeii, he returns to The Feast every year to watch the procession.

My findings reveal how a group claims and inscribes symbolic ownership to a place in light of social demographic changes. Place attachment and external threats create the conditions for which people attached to these places successfully organize to counteract changes. They do so by employing a repertoire of place making strategies aimed at justifying and reinforcing claims to place. However, such claims are not necessarily about who has the right to use a place. White ethnic parishioners understand that Our Lady of Pompeii is a religious institution that is (and should be) open to other groups, and in this case, Latino “newcomers.” Yet there is a prevailing sentiment that place identity needs to be constantly cultivated, place practices saved, and place ownership reiterated. As one Italian American parishioner (Theresa) remarked earlier: “It’s our party. You’re invited. We just want to throw the party.”
The findings have implications for understanding the relationship between people and place. “Starting from a place, then [emphasis original] moving outwards can yield important findings” (Borer, 2006: 181). This means putting place at the center of analysis. Urban culturalists such as Michael Ian Borer (2006), argue that urban sociologists’ overemphasis on urbanization shifts focus away from urbanism and coincidently, the analysis of local people, place, and culture. Borer, as well as others (Firey 1945), call for us to examine “culturally significant” spaces in urban areas through understanding the relationship between place and peoples’ collective memories, sentiment, ritual interactions, and practices.

However, in doing so, we must acknowledge the unique characteristics of places. For urban sociologists, this means understanding the shared core aspects of all places while differentiating between them. Though places—schools, department stores, museums, as well as churches—share some of the same characteristics, they hold different meanings for people. “Places drenched in religious and historic symbolic meanings,” Rabinowitz (2001) writes, “tend to invoke emotions the intensity which far exceeds those generated by sites and territories of economic, demographic or strategic values” (93). With regards to place making, this suggests that scholars need to consider how various actors make place. It is not only place elites or place professionals that make place—so do ordinary place people. Gieryn (2000) writes:

Places are endlessly made, not just when the powerful pursue their ambitions though brick and mortar, not just when design professional give them form to function, but also when ordinary people extract from continuous and abstract space a bounded, identified, meaningful, named and significant place. (p. 471)

Central to this critique are the types of place makers, “the people, industries, or social formations engaged in place making” (Aguilar-San Juan 2005: 43). Whereas the urban ecological perspective omits the role of powerful external forces and interest in making place, the political economic model overemphasizes the role of elites, or “upstream forces that drive the creation of
place with power and wealth” (Gieryn 2000: 468) who also may work in tandem with place professionals such as policy makers, developers and architects, among others. Ordinary people, along with political elites and professionals, can be active in making place (Gieryn, 2000).

Race, ethnicity, and religion scholars, too, should address the unique characteristics of place for institutions and groups they study. Though many studies examine the significance of race, ethnicity and religion in collective action (Morris 1984; Davis, Martinez, and Warner, 2010), racial attitudes (Emerson and Smith 2000), institutional diversity (Christerson, Emerson, and Edwards 2005), and immigrant adaptation and incorporation (Ebaugh and Chafetz 2000; Warner and Wittner 1998) there is relatively little research examining these relationships in the context of place. Those that do (Mazumdar and Mazumdar 1993; 2004; 2009) find that some ethnic religious minorities construct sacred spaces in non-congregational places such as homes and gardens. Yet, considering growing diversity in the United States, scholars of race, ethnicity, religion, and immigration, should see how place shapes relations within religious congregations.
VI. ETHNIC PLACES, RACIALIZED SPACES: FESTIVALS IN THE SUBURBAN VILLAGE

It is a warm and sunny September day at The Taste of Augusta as I help Frank Palucci unpack boxes of frozen tiramisu behind a wooden booth underneath a white canopy. Though he (like many of the other Italian American vendors at this festival) no longer owns a restaurant, he continues to rent a booth and sell the same food every year. Above the booth is a sign that reads "Delicious Don's," the name of Frank's family restaurant that was located in Augusta that was 10 years ago. According to Frank the space was then rented to Cubans who sold "coke" and catered exclusively to "drag queens."

This year Frank asked me to help him at his booth at The Taste of Augusta over the Labor Day Weekend. We both dressed casually for the warm weather: he in a white shirt and beige pants and I in jeans, t-shirt, and backwards White Sox baseball hat. His booth is adjoined by dozens of other food vendors who sell a variety of traditional Italian American style food. Like Delicious Don's, most of the food vendor signs consist of individual names followed by the foods they are selling: Johnny's gnocchi, Carmela's spaghetti, and Lucia's pasta con fagioli. Judging by the many ceremonial hugs, kisses, and polite inquiries about family members, it is clear that almost everyone knows each other.

Over the next four hours, we spend our time peddling tiramisu. Throngs of senior citizens accompanied by friends, young couples with small children, police officers smoking cigars, and groups of boisterous teenagers with backward baseball caps, stroll down the food vendor aisles stopping to contemplate their potential purchases. Frank knows many of the customers that stop at our booth and cheerfully Anglicizes my name and introduces me as "John" (I do not correct him), though I introduced by myself as Juan. All shake my hand, and though I do not know any of them, a few kind women lean over and plant a kiss on my cheek, a customary tradition among
many of Augusta’s long-time residents. Four hours later at 9:30 PM, Frank cuts me loose from my duties and hands me a crisp twenty dollar bill for helping. I initially refuse it, reminding Frank that “I volunteered”; he will have none of that. I take the money, thank him, and leave the booth to explore the rest of what The Taste of Augusta has to offer.

Having spent most of the day in the central portion of The Taste of Augusta (where all the food vendors are located) I head toward the western end of the festival to the Festiva Latino section, a designated area within the festival where many Latino entertainers perform throughout the weekend. As I near, I can see scores of people in front of the stage, swaying and dancing to the sounds coming from the Mexican band performing. I enter underneath a large arch with the words "Festiva Latino." As I pass through, I see an Augusta police officer walking toward me, swirling his index finger in a circular motion, and mouthing something. As he gets closer, he mouths his words again: “Turn your hat around." Surprised, I quickly remark, “Oh! I’m sorry.” I rotate the bill of my baseball hat from back to front. His eyes widen, as if surprised by my response, and he quickly retorts: “Oh, that’s ok.” I smile and then walk into the Festiva Latino section where I spend the rest of the evening watching people dance to the sounds of Mexican music being played on the stage.

The preceding vignette reveals some of the ways in which race and place, inform social meanings and interactions in shared public spaces. In this chapter I explore how broader ethnic and racial power dynamics in Augusta are reflected in shared public spaces, and in this case, three of Augusta’s community festivals: The Our Lady of Pompeii Festival, The Taste of Augusta, and Latino Fest. Though I did not set out to study Augusta’s festivals, attending these annual events provided a key opportunity to examine white/Latino interactions in shared public
spaces. Essentially, I came to find Latinos often perceived or experienced different forms of treatment in these spaces, and most notably, in the form of exclusion and policing. Exclusion was reflected in the underrepresentation of Augusta’s local Latino business community as vendors at each of the festivals. The majority of businesses participating as vendors at these festivals were either operated by current or former white ethnic residents or organizations based outside of Augusta. The second form of marginalization was that of policing. Latinos experienced two types of policing. The first type was the policing of space, reflected in organizers and law officials’ evaluation of what was understood as acceptable an activity in various festival settings.

The second type of policing came in the form of surveillance of non-whites by law officials. The findings reveal that despite community leaders and festival organizers' attempts to create a culturally inclusive environment, Latinos experience differential treatment and discrimination and encounter barriers to full participation in festivals.

A. FESTIVALS AND PUBLIC SPACES

Festivals are “formal periods or programs of pleasurable activities, entertainment, or events having a festive character and publicly celebrating some concept, happening or fact” (Janiskee 1980: 97, as cited in De Bres and Davis 2001). They are generally organized and intended to celebrate the significance of a people, place and, or, event. Community festivals foster and maintain local culture and history (Frisby and Getz 1989; See also Des Bres and Davis 2001). Cultural and historical artifacts are often on display at these events and can take the form of the types of food, entertainment, and events offered. Festivals often mark what organizers interpret as significant about a population and geographic place. Community festivals thus reveal two social aspects. The first is a sense of shared identity among a people in a particular place, and
second, a concerted effort to convey this identity to a broader public. From this view, community festivals can be viewed as a celebration and public display of collective identity connected to peoplehood and place. Festivals are, essentially and in Goffmanian terms, a community’s presentation of self. However, community festivals do not only operate as a celebration and projection of a collective identity. They also serve an economic purpose for its organizers. Previous studies on festivals posit that these events present an opportunity to commodify local culture and identity (Des Bres and Davis 2001; Esman 1982). From a community standpoint, festivals provide an opportunity to showcase the local culture and economy, which increase a potential customer base for area businesses vendors who rent booths from festival organizers to sell food, goods, and various services. In turn, organizers benefit financially from renting space.

In essence, festivals are public spaces: “all areas that are open and accessible to all members of the public in a society, in principle though not necessarily in practice” (Neal 2010: 1). Public spaces include cafes, restaurants, parks, retail stores, plazas, street, and schools, among others. They differ from private spaces where entre is regulated and membership a prerequisite. Public spaces are often one of the few areas where people of different ethnic and racial backgrounds interact (Anderson 2011; Duneier 1999; Lee 2002; McDermott 2006). Yet, as Neal (2010) indicates, not all public spaces are open to all in “practice.” In the United States, space has always been raced, often through formal and informal policing and exclusion. For instance, the racial history of the U.S. shows how white institutions and actors have worked to control the movement of black bodies through public spaces by enacting anti-black legislation (i.e. Jim Crowe laws, black codes, and restrictive covenants) as well as through overt acts of violence (Massey and Denton 1994: Sugrue 1996). Though overt racist laws have been dismantled and anti-black targeting and violence is seen as unacceptable, African Americans still experience
discrimination in public places (Feagin 1991). In this way, events such as festivals in public spaces allot an opportunity to examine intergroup interactions and local social relationships.

The community of Augusta is home to three annual festivals: The Our Lady of Pompeii Feast, The Taste of Augusta, and The Latino Fest [See Table 6.1]. Each is held annually and includes food, live entertainment, and a carnival. The longest running in the community is The Our Lady of Pompeii Feast (henceforward, The “Feast”) which began in 1894. It is held every July and organized by the church’s Feast Committee. Augusta’s two other festivals—The Taste of Augusta and Latino Fest—occur the first and second weekends in September, respectively, and are held in the parking lot of the Augusta Community Center. The Taste of Augusta (henceforward, the “Taste”) is the second longest running festival in the community and began in 1981. The Taste, like The Feast, largely celebrates local Italian identity and culture reflected in the abundance of Italian American music, performers, and food. Over the years and as the Latino population grew, by the early 2000s festival organizers designated a section of the parking lot for Latino entertainment and retailers and labeled it Festiva Latino. The section is located furthest to the west end of The Taste entrance and includes a stage for Latino performers, a few retail vendors, and informational booths rented by area social service agencies who work with Latinos and immigrants. In essence, the Festiva Latino section is geared toward Latino social cultural interests and functions as a Latino space within an otherwise Italian focused event.

The third yearly festival in Augusta is The Latino Fest which began in 1989. It was originally organized by Augusta’s Latino business community and held on Main Ave and, one of the community’s main shopping districts where most of Augusta’s Latino businesses are located. These businesses include convenient and grocery stores, clothing boutiques, and medical services. However, due to the growing number of attendees and subsequent safety concerns,
Latino Fest was eventually relocated to its current home in the Augusta Community Center parking lot. Though each festival conveys a particular social and cultural identity—religious, neighborhood, and pan ethnic—aspects of each can be found across all of Augusta's yearly events. Italian food is served at The Feast, Mexican culture is on display at the Taste, and Augusta’s Latino business community organizes The Latino Fest. Hence, Augusta’s yearly festivals function in a way to showcase local religious, neighborhood, and ethnic identities.

[INSERT TABLE 6.1 HERE]

Augusta’s festivals, like many public events, are settings in which people are likely to encounter others who are different than themselves. Community festivals attract a wide range of people from various racial, ethnic, economic, and residential backgrounds. However, the wide draw and general appeal of festivals does not ensure equal participation or a uniform experience. Public social events, like a community festival, occur within particular social contexts and are structured around the interests of an organizing group. Organizers yield various amount of control, or power, over the contents and activities within a space. For instance, the majority of Feast and Taste committee members consist of white residents. Committee members ultimately make the decisions regarding the types of entertainment, activities, and the selection of vendors. At both the Taste and The Feast, Italian ethnic culture is clearly evident and reflected in the types of food, refreshments, and entertainment. On the other hand, the types of Mexican ethnic culture amenities are proportionately small despite the fact that Augusta is a Latino-majority town. The disproportionate ethnic cultural representations within ethnically and racially diverse social paces—reflected in the overrepresentation of Italian ethnic culture and underrepresentation of Mexican ethnic culture—serve to heighten the visibility of a numerical minority over that of a numerical majority group. Essentially, festival organizers maintain and perpetuate a white ethnic
place identity despite Latino neighborhood succession. In this way, The Feast and The Taste, as shared social spaces, are a microcosm of broader neighborhood dynamics that reflect the unequal distribution of power. Bourdieu (1985) identifies a link between social space and power:

To speak of a social space means that one cannot group just anyone with anyone while ignoring the fundamental differences, particularly economic and cultural ones. But this never entirely excludes the possibility of organizing agents in accordance with other principles of division—ethnic or national ones, for example—though it has to be remembered that these are generally linked to the fundamental principles, with ethnic groups themselves being at least roughly hierarchized in the social space... (p. 726).

Here, Bourdieu discusses the mirroring of broader “fundamental differences” and social hierarchies in social spaces. Thus, the construction, organization, and elements of social spaces are informed and shaped by external forces. Social structures such as gender (Gardner 1995; Sennet 1977) and race (Massey and Denton 1994; McMahon 1996) inform how women and people of color experience and are constrained in many public social spaces. Public social space can be gendered as well as racialized. In writing about U.S. Latinos’ experience with whites in social settings, Cobas and Feagin (2006) discuss what they call white social space. They write:

White social space rests on the assumption that oppression and the racialization of physical space are inextricably intertwined. Social space obtains its color when Whites appropriate it and racialize each group of color, as they have done with every indigenous or immigrant group since 1607. (p. 4).

White social spaces historically were constructed and maintained by racist policies and overt acts of violence, reflected in high rates of racial segregation in neighborhoods and schools between whites and racial minorities. However, the passage of anti-discrimination laws and increasing liberalizing racial attitudes among Whites reveal that racist attitudes and discriminatory behavior is socially unacceptable among the general public. Yet shifts in policy and racial attitudes have not led to the full and equal participation of minorities in American
social life. People of color still report incidences of differential treatment by whites based on race. As a result, Blacks (Feagin 1991), Asians, (Tuan 1998) and Latinos (Sharaievska, Stodolska, Shinew, and Kim 2010) still encounter different forms of racial discrimination within public social settings in the Post-Civil Rights era.

In what follows, I describe how Augusta’s neighborhood-based festivals, as diverse ethno-racial settings, reflect power differentials between white and Latino residents and festival attenders. I examine the findings that emerged while attending these events over the research period. I found that Latino experienced differential forms of treatment. These differential forms of treatment came in the form of social exclusion and the policing. Such experiences, I find, result from existing power differentials whereby white ethnic interests are privileged over that of local Latino residents. Though Mexican cultural elements are on display and Latinos frequent these festivals, their presence, both as vendors and attenders, are mediated and under surveillance by festival committees and local law officials.

1. Social Exclusion

The longest running annual festival in Augusta is The Feast. Although it is a religious-based event, The Feast contains non-religious components. These include food booths, rides, and carnival games that function as a church fundraiser. The Feast has a clear visible Italian ethnic flavor noticeable in the prevalence of red, white and green colors and Italian flags displayed on booths, street poles, shirts, and hats. Although The Feast is in focus and flavor oriented toward Italian Catholic ethno-religious culture, the majority of those partaking in the non-religious amenities offered at the event are Latinos. As the population of Latinos in Augusta grew over the years, so did their participation in parish activities. By the mid-1990s, Latinos outnumbered the white parishioner population of Our Lady of Pompeii. Their increasing presence prompted some
parish leaders to begin to make a concerted effort to incorporate some aspects of Mexican culture in The Feast. One way was to recruit local Mexican restaurants to rent booths at the event. A few Mexican restaurant owners (all Latino) rented booths sporadically over the years and sold traditional Mexican food. However, over time, Latino food vendors disappeared from The Feast. Apparently, those Latino businesses who had first rented a food booth at The Feast were not asked back by The Feast Committee while requests by new vendors were left unanswered. When I asked Rosalina, a Mexicana in her mid-thirties about why there were no Mexican food vendors she laughingly noted that many have tried but, “there’s been a lot of backlash and that’s why nobody attempts anymore.” Rosalina knew of at least two Latinos who owned and operated Mexican restaurants in Augusta and previously rented vendor space at The Feast but were not asked back. She goes on to discuss their reactions:

Rosalina: So there’s been many [who] feel [cheated] by the church. They feel like, "You know what? We’re going backwards. How is it that? I want to promote my business, too. You know what? I want to promote what I’m doing [but] no, it won’t happen [laughter].

The Feast committee was in charge of vendor booth rental and consisted of mostly Italian parishioners.xvi Though The Feast committee consisted of volunteers, formal acceptance to the Committee was contingent upon the approval of its current president, Mike Enzo, who, according to one Italian American male ran the committee like a "fiefdom." This became clear to me while I was volunteering one day at the Our Lady of Pompeii food pantry. The pantry was run by Bobby Di Giovani and Charlie Giuliani, life-long residents of Augusta who were actively involved in parish life. During one conversation, Bob commented to Charlie that I should join the committee and that it would be good for my research. Charlie replied that he would look into but that any new members had to be “approved” by Mike Enzo.
Although some resented the exclusion of Latino vendors at The Feast, others rationalized their absence. Respondents implied that this was, after all, “The Italian Feast” and not just a religious event. Carlos Espinosa, a Mexicano in his mid-twenties noted church leaders’ attempts to be more inclusive of Latinos by branding The Feast as a religious event (the Our Lady of Pompeii Madonna Feast) rather than an ethnic one (The Italian Feast).

Carlos: [Because of] the influence of the Hispanics [on] The Feast they changed [the name] for a while. They [called it] the “Our Lady of Pompeii Madonna Feast”, you know, when in all actuality, it was the Italian Feast. It was the Italian Feast.

Juan: Who changed [the name]?

Carlos: The [Feast] committee, whoever, it was just changed…they stopped calling it [the] Italian Feast for a while and [some people were] like, whatever, that’s bullshit. Well, let [the Italians] have their shit, you know. As a kid I remember, I was a teenager, I was like who gives a shit and I remember it got back to uh, to like if you walk around the PA [the speaker system] they call it "The Italian Feast," .... someone made a beef about it like-"Hey. You know what? This was The Italian Feast. Why the fuck do we have to change it? You know? Why can’t it be The Italian Feast,” and which they're all in their right for that.

As Carlos noted, the majority of Latinos conveyed to me that The Feast was marked symbolically as an Italian event. Yet, some of the Italians felt that The Feast should be seen as a religious event rather than an ethno-cultural one. During a casino night fundraiser at the church, Jeanette, an Italian American woman in her forties and active member of the parish, told me that she did not like that many people characterized The Feast as an Italian event. For her, The Feast was a celebration of religious faith and devotion to the church patroness. Later that evening, Frank, who had overheard our conversation, also conveyed the same sentiment. He explained to me The Feast was not just for the Italians but for everyone, including the Hispanics. For him, it was not an "Italian pride parade" and that those who characterized The Our Lady of Pompeii Festival as “The Italian Feast" were from outside the neighborhood xvii. Yet, conflicting ideas
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about the meaning of The Feast as either a religious or ethnic festival were evident among both Latinos and white.

Whereas The Feast was a church based event that was culturally Italian and religiously Catholic, The Taste was a community event organized by the village and local chamber of commerce and presided over by The Taste Committee, whose members were white. The Taste, like The Feast, included food, live entertainment, as well as carnival rides and games. In addition to food vendors, The Taste also rented booths to a number of retail and service based businesses. According a 2006 Taste flier, the village valued partnerships between the "business community" and "corporate leaders and small businesses owners for years" for "offering a variety of affordable community events for the public." Also, like The Feast, The Taste is used as a fundraiser. Since its inception in 1981, the Taste had donated hundreds of thousands of dollars of proceeds to local schools, charities, youth groups, and senior citizen organizations. The Taste was also marketed as a multicultural event. According to a 2006 Taste flier:

Augusta is as unique a community as you will ever hope to find in the…area. Our residents are a vibrant blend of many ethnic and racial cultures that are not usually found in your typical suburban community [...]. Today, our various cultures are united in practicing the very same principles of family, community, church and volunteerism that were established Augusta’s “Founding Fathers and Mothers” over 124 years ago [...]. Augusta is renowned for its long-time tradition of hosting festive celebrations that recognize our multi-cultural community [...]. The Taste normally draws around 200,000 visitors, but this year we anticipate nearly 300,000 festival goers because, the top-notch entertainment offerings, and of course, the best mix of ethnic and American cuisine you will find anywhere [...].

The Taste organizers marketed it as a community event that acknowledges, values, and incorporates various aspects of local and cultural diversity represented in the number of "ethnic" displays of entertainment and food. Yet, like The Feast, Latino food vendors were disproportionately underrepresented. A review of the 2009 and 2010 Taste fliers indicate that while nearly half of the 70 food vendors sold traditional Italian style foods no more than four
sold traditional Latino food while only two sold traditional Mexican style foods (pork tamales) and beverages (horchata, a Mexican drink made with milk, rice, and cinnamon) [See Table 6.2].

When I asked one respondent about the lack of traditional Mexican food options at the Taste, she noted that there were in fact only two Mexican food vendors. One belonged to a prominent Latino business man, Salvador Solis, who I referred to earlier. Solis’s cousin ran the other. Sanchez was a close friend of a local elected official, and had been instrumental in establishing a Mexican hometown association. He also was influential in the formation of the Festiva Latino section of The Taste.

[INSERT TABLE 6.2 HERE]

Another remarkable aspect of The Taste, like The Feast, was that many vendors who sold Italian food did not currently own restaurants in the area. For instance, during the research period, I only counted three Italian restaurants that sold food in Augusta, and according to the vendor signs, only one had a booth at The Taste. Most of the food vendors selling Italian food had signs with a vendors’ name and the type of food they were selling. Frank, as I had mentioned, routinely rented a stand under the name of his family’s former restaurant (Delicious Don’s) which had closed over 10 years prior. The non-food vendors often operated small businesses (i.e., go-kart tracks, jewelry stores, private medical practices) in the surrounding communities or were representatives of regional or nation-wide corporations (i.e., banks, insurance companies). One of the vendors, a dentist who owned a private practice and passed out free cups of beer to those who signed up for their email alerts, told me that he was able to rent a booth because he knew the head of The Taste Committee.

The underrepresentation of Mexican and overrepresentation of Italian food vendors reveal the ways in which social ties mediate access to festivals. White residents, as a group, have a long
history of participation in Augusta’s social functions and are overrepresented in positions of leadership within them. As a result, those who are long term residents—regardless of whether they own a business—were more likely to be approved as a vendor at The Taste. In fact, many of The Taste vendors also had booths at The Feast. The few Latino vendors who sold traditional Mexican food at the Taste exhibited the same social ties to elected officials in Augusta, who came to know village administration through owning businesses in the area and who often supported the current administration. However, the development of these social ties differed along ethnic lines. White long-time residents were able to form these ties over the years and generations. They grew up with town administrators and officials, and many either worked or had a family employed at one time or another in the village. On the other hand, the small number of Latino vendors at the Taste owned businesses in Augusta and were openly supportive of the current white administration during village elections.

Whereas there was a feeling that Mexican vendors from the local area were excluded from The Feast and The Taste, all my respondents indicated that there was a large presence of Latino oriented businesses at The Latino Fest. Yet, unlike The Feast and The Taste, most of the food and retail vendors were nationally based corporations with franchises (insurance offices and banks) in Augusta or Spanish language media outlets, local colleges and neighboring village agencies in the region. Their sponsorships enabled The Latino Fest organizers to bring in over 50 musical performers (many from Latin America) to play at the three-day event. Attendance at The Latino Fest draws thousands from Augusta and the surrounding area. Though marketed as "Hispanic" and including traditional food and music from various Latin American countries, most of attendees are of Mexican background (which makes up two-thirds to three-quarters of the population in the area).
Although Mexican respondents were satisfied with the representation of Latino culture at The Latino Fest, some were critical about the physical relocation of the event from its original location in the main business corridor to the Augusta Community Center parking lot. Originally, the festival was held on Main Street where many Latino-owned businesses were located. According to village officials and organizers, the motivation behind moving the festival was to accommodate the larger number of people in attendance. For instance, one year so many people had attended Latino Fest that the stage had been pushed back a couple of feet by the audience watching the musical performers. According to village officials I interviewed (white and Latino) the festival was moved because of safety issues. Yet, many still held the sentiment that the change negatively impacted local businesses because they had to rent vendor booths to sell items rather than sell them freely out of their stores. In turn, this was interpreted as an opportunity for the village to make money off The Latino Fest. For some, the Augusta Community Center was "not in the center of the [Latino] community.” Hence, the relocation of The Latino Fest was seen as moving it away from the "heart" of Augusta's Latino community and excluding many of Augusta's local Latino businesses from profiting from the festival.

2. Policing
Along with noting the underrepresentation of vendors, Latinos also reported instances of aggressive policing at the festivals. Overly aggressive policing occurred in two ways. The first took the form of policing of the kinds of activities within festival spaces. For example, during one year at the Taste in 2009, one of the community board members, Pauline Molina, who was running for a county office, had attended the festival and was soliciting patrons for signatures to get on the ballot. Food vendors who supported her candidacy also solicited patrons to sign the clip boards stationed at their booths. By the end of the day a long line of people waiting to sign Molina’s petition had formed in front of her in the middle of the food vendor section. Hence, The
Taste functioned as an open public space for individuals to disseminate information about political activities and for candidates to solicit support for their candidacy without contestation.

Yet, I came to find that festival organizers differentiated between the types of appropriate political activities in this space. A month after The Taste, I conducted an interview with Miguel, a Latino male in his early twenties and a member of the Youth in Action Committee (YAC), a community-based organization geared toward youth empowerment and advocacy for undocumented immigrants. The organization consisted primarily of Latino youth from the surrounding area. The YAC was very active in increasing civic engagement among residents in Augusta and neighboring towns: going door-to-door to encourage people to fill out the 2010 census, holding voter registration drives, and conducting exit polling at congressional elections. That same year, Miguel and two other YAC members arranged for a booth in Festiva Latino area to register patrons to vote. Miguel indicated that it was difficult to get peoples’ attention. The music was too loud which made it difficult to speak with people while those he did talk with were uninterested. Miguel and the two other YAC members eventually decided to leave the Festiva Latino section and register people in the Taste’s food vendor area. When they did they were approached by police officers informing them that they were not allowed to register people to vote in this section. When Miguel asked why, the police officer replied that “partisan” activities were not allowed at the Taste. Miguel also indicated that he saw one of The Taste organizers inform the police of the YAC’s activities prior to the incident. When probed further for why Taste organizers asked them to stop, Miguel remarked that there was a sense they were not wanted:

**Miguel:** They just didn’t want us to be there. So that’s the reason why there were just kind of blocking the way….I don’t even understand why…they wouldn’t [want us there] because those votes go for Augusta and that’s what they us want
us to do or that’s why it should be done, you know. That’s how you get community involvement.

These two episodes highlight the contradiction of what is seen as acceptable within the same public space. Whereas the village official was allowed to petition festival attendees for signatures to get on a ballot (a partisan activity), Latinos were not allowed to register people to vote (a non-partisan activity). Neal (2010) acknowledges these contradictions of public spaces. As he notes public spaces “are open and accessible to all members in a society, in principle though not necessarily in practice” (2010: 1). In this case, both actors saw The Taste as an appropriate public event to solicit attendees’ participation in the political process. However, festival organizers distinguished between acceptable and unacceptable types of practices, which, in themselves, were inconsistent.

The second form of policing at the festivals came in the form of racial targeting. A number of Latino respondents noted that non-white festival patrons often received differential treatment. These types of encounters were often relayed by Latinos who grew up in Augusta during the 1990s when there had been notable gang activity. Though none of my Latino respondents indicated that they were part of a gang, they had strong feelings regarding the ways that police officers monitored these events. As Carlos remarked:

Carlos: You don’t see gangbangers at The Feast. They’re [police officers] good at breaking shit up real quick and they’re really rough on you. If you’re fucking fighting at The Feast, you’re getting the shit kicked out of you.

Though Carlos was talking about The Feast, police are generally on the look-out for any sign of potential gang activity often triggered by a backwards baseball hat (as I experienced) or minority youth congregating in groups. One year I saw a police officer searching the pockets of a Latino teenage male at The Latino Fest. Both seemed to know each other, as the conversation was civil and even somewhat humorous. The police officer eventually let him go on his way where he
rejoined his group of friends. For many of Augusta’s residents, gang activity is a growing concern for both whites and Latinos. Though not explicitly indicating that all gang members were Latino, discussions about the rise of gang activity in Augusta implicitly attributed ethnic demographic changes and the lack of activities for “youth”. Further, in recent years the village created a gang task-force and a position for a youth correctional officer, which as staffed by a Latino male. Residents see gang activity as a precedent to criminal activity such as vandalism, burglary, and drug trafficking. Criminal activity poses an affront to conceptions of what a safe community is: safe and familiar. “Good” and safe” communities are ones which have social order and crime disrupts this order. Residents acknowledge that neighborhood crime resulting from gang activity needs to be dealt with swiftly (for instance, there is a local gang task force and all graffiti is removed as soon as possible) and there is little tolerance for indicators of potential criminal elements or activities.

Augusta’s police officers are highly visible at all three festivals. They often can be seen standing in groups of three or more at street intersections, smoking cigars, chatting with festival attendees (many of them they know), and consistently eyeing the surroundings. This scene is replicated at the city civic worker booth where other city workers, such as fireman and emergency medical technicians EMT’s, sit and watch patrons as they walk pass. Though many Latinos share the same concern regarding criminal activity as their fellow white residents, some also feel that they are wrongly singled out by police because they are Latino. Sergio Bonilla, a second generation Mexicano in his thirties, who works in the finance industry and is active in politics, recounted a negative experience he had with a police officer at The Feast in the 1990s. Sergio had attended The Feast with two other Latino males and was approached by a police officer.
**Sergio:** One of the cops was like, "Hey, you guys got to leave. You can't be gangbanging here" and I'm like, "What are you talking about? I'm not a gangbanger." He's like, "Well I don't want to see you young kids in, you know, like a group of three or more, you know." And I'm like, you know, "Why not?"...I told him those kids [pointing two other teenagers at The Feast] over there have been walking around the whole festival and he's like, "Yeah, but I know them. They live right down the street...They're ok. And I'm like, I'm talking back this cop. and he got fed up with me with everything I was saying. I kept asking "Why? Why? Why? And my friends are like, "Let's go. You know, don't worry about it. Let's just walk away." And I'm like, "No. And [the police officer] is like, "You know what kid? I had enough with your bullshit. You know, if you have a problem with what I'm saying, I can take off my badge and me and you can walk down to the alley and see who's the tough guy here"....and me being the tough guy that I was, "So you're going to take off you badge? And he's like, "Yeah." And then I read his number out loud and I'm like, "Ok. Take it [the badge] off. I already know your badge number so I can report you."

As Sergio notes, the police officer believed him and his friends to be members of a local gang. When the police officer confronted Sergio, he responded by questioning the officer’s motive which potentially could have escalated into a physical altercation. Sergio went on to tell me that he felt he was targeted because the police officer believed them to be “some dumb Mexicans.” His noted his knowledge of his right to peacefully assemble and sense of indignation was informed by his middle class status and his right as a U.S. Citizen. Sergio went on to indicate that unlike many of his Latino friends growing up, he attended a highly regarded Catholic parochial high school a few towns west of Augusta. The majority of Latino adults who lived in Augusta during this time had relatively lower levels of education compared to white residents. Most were working class and foreign-born, and some, undocumented. As a result, and unlike Sergio, Latino residents of Augusta may be less willing to openly challenge overt acts of discrimination by local law officials out of a lack of knowledge of their rights and out of fear.

Racial targeting was not only limited to interactions between police and Latino festival attenders. While Latinos attended these festivals, African Americans rarely did. Augusta borders two towns that are predominately African American. Yet I rarely saw African Americans at any
of these fests. Among the three, black patrons were mostly noticeably absent from The Feast. Those I did see at The Feast were usually adult couples (mostly Haitian Catholics who marched in the Sunday religious procession) and occasionally a teenage male who was often accompanied by Latino or white festival attenders. The lack of African Americans at The Feast came up in various conversations. Guadalupe Nunez, a second generation Mexicana in her thirties and former Augusta resident, indicated that black festival attenders were not welcomed at The Feast.

Guadalupe: Well, growing up, if they [African Americans] tried to come to The Feast, they were kicked out………made them run and stuff like that
Juan: By who—residents or cops?
Guadalupe: It was probably a combination of both but I do remember that happening. They were not welcome.

In this way, The Feast, though marketed as religious event, came to be constructed as place that was socially and spatially marked as ethnically Italian and racially white. Latinos and African Americans were seen as out of place and were under constant surveillance. Both local law officials and white festival attenders, and presumingly residents, participated in policing brown and black bodies. Yet, the repercussions were relatively more severe for black festival attenders and in the form of overt intimidation and violence. Informing this view of space was the perception of legitimate ethnic groups’ claims of who “owned” The Feast. As Carlos emphatically stated, “This is The Italian Feast,” a sentiment implicitly inferred by the exclusion of Latino vendors and instances of policing non-white patrons. Though the majority of overt policing of non-whites was reportedly higher at The Feast, similar instances did occur at The Taste and Latino Fest. Festival fliers marketed both as inclusive and multicultural that infused the ethnic “tastes” of the residents. Yet, non-white bodies experienced differential types of treatment in the form of representation and policing.
Geiryn (2000) argues that places emplace difference and hierarchy "by routinizing daily rounds in ways that exclude and segregate categories of people...by embodying in visible and tangible ways the cultural meanings variously ascribed by them" (474). At Augusta's annual festivals, difference and hierarchy are reflected through the routine marginalization of Latino festival attenders through by systematic formal exclusion and informal monitoring processes of formal exclusion and policing. Despite Latino neighborhood succession, these events are organized more or less by, and in the interests of, white residents and festival organizers. Ensuring these power differentials are the social and political locations of whites vies-a-vis Latinos. Socially, whites’ social attachment to the neighborhood and overlapping social ties ensure that festivals are organized in a way that does not infringe on their interests. White vendors (especially those who do not own local businesses) can be assured that they can continue selling food and goods at The Feast and The Taste. Activities, goods, food, and refreshments geared toward Latinos are incorporated only to the extent that their visibility remains low, regulated, and occur in particular spaces. Whether Latinos vendors were allotted vendor space depended largely on their social and economic utility to white administration officials. Characteristics of vendors who were Latino or offered Latino oriented services, were either influential in local politics or had the propensity to bring economic incentives to the community. Given that the majority of local politicians are white and are likely open to heightening the visibility of local economy, it may come to no surprise that the vast majority of Latino-owned businesses find it difficult to participate in these social events.

However, these festival spaces not only reflect the political and economic interests of a white minority population. They are also about maintaining community power differentials and social boundaries reflected in the policing of non-white bodies and activities. Karen Glover
(2007: 239), writing on racial profiling, states that, “Social space figures prominently in the profiling process, with minority space viewed as a marker of criminality. Conversely, white social space is viewed as something to be protected and defended.” The presence of a white social space at these festivals became visible at moments whereby Latinos (and at times, African Americans) were seen by whites as “being out of place.” Being out of place meant that Latino Feast patrons overstepped the boundaries of what was considered to be socially acceptable practices by festival organizers and law officials. White social space also became evident whenever non-whites were singled out by police officers. In some cases, Augusta’s law officials interpreted the congregation of Latino teenage males in these spaces, as “gang activity” resulting increased surveillance.

Hence, Augusta's three annual festivals can be seen as white social spaces reflected in ethno-racial power differentials. White festival organizers at The Feast and The Taste serve as gatekeepers. They choose the types of vendors and activities in these spaces. Latinos, and Mexican culture, are welcomed but regulated and contained. Further, Latino male youth are under constant surveillance at each by festival officials and police officers. These spaces reflect the ethno-racial hierarchy of the neighborhood and the broader racial social system in the United States. White Augustans see themselves as stewards of festivals and Latinos are increasingly welcomed so much as they are not perceived as a threat. That is not to infer that Latinos cannot claim ownership of particular festival spaces (as vendors) or a festival event (as The Latino Fest). Yet, their presence and movement within these spaces are contained through selective exclusion and policing practices. Thus, social spaces and activities organized around the interests of the dominant group are instances in which to explore racial and ethnic power dynamics diverse community. Examining the social and spatial boundaries enable us to make white social space
visible in multicultural settings and its’ connection to larger racial dynamics. Doing so, we are better able to understand the paradox of celebrating localized and ethnic identities and its duel effect of solidifying group boundaries.
VII: CONCLUSION

Unlike, earlier waves of immigration, today’s newcomers are more likely to be non-white, geographically dispersed, and settle outside traditional urban immigrant receiving gateways. Driving these changes are globalization, advances in technology, and a growing service sector economy in the United States. Often underlying contemporary discussions of immigration today are whether, and to what extent, newcomers and their U.S. born children will follow the same trajectory of European immigrants who arrived on American shores over the last 150 years and the extent they will be integrated into the nation’s social fabric. The recent explosion in studies examining the impact of a growing Latino populations through the realm of assimilation (Alba and Nee 2003; Portes and Rumbault 2001), institutional integration (Marrow 2005; Millard, Chapa and McConnell 2004), and local ethnic racial relations (Fennelly 2008; Marrow 2008; Shutika 2008) speak to the urgency of such an exploration.

How intergroup relations unfold in historically white settlements, post Latino succession, is the focus of this dissertation. It aims to contribute to larger debates about how increasing rates of ethnic and racial diversity will play out U.S. neighborhoods by filling in a gap in the literature through examining white/Latino relations in a re-emerging destination. Not all Latinos today reside in old destinations where they are the numerical majority, nor do all settle in new destinations where they are the numerical minority. Immigration ebbs and flows in the United States. Migration, settlement, and integration differ across region, place, and time. Yet, the lack of sociological investigation examining the forces that shape intergroup relations across a variety of social contexts limits our understandings of increasing diversity impacts life in new destinations. Neighborhoods that have undergone white to Latino succession at the turn of 21st century in United States provide a glimpse into that future. How do white residents react to
Latino neighborhood succession? How does group conflict play out in various dimensions of neighborhood life? How do neighborhood-based social structures, organizations, and practices facilitate or impede Latino residents’ integration? What do the findings reveal about the future of white/Latino relations in new destinations? How do they expand our knowledge of ethnic and racial relations more broadly?

This study answers these questions by examining how neighborhood transition plays out in political, religious, cultural dimensions of community life. My findings reveal that despite Latino neighborhood succession, white residents continue to occupy maintain a privileged social status. This is reflected in white residents continued access to political power, ability to claim symbolic ownership over shared places, and regulate local Latino residential representation in, and movement through, community public spaces. Latinos respond and navigate unequal power relations through a variety of ways: acquiescence, learning how to “play the game,” or by contesting systematic exclusion.

This study points to the significance of social context for studying intergroup relations in new destinations. As others have found (Marrow 2008), population size, socioeconomic status, and politics—along with regional based understandings of race—shape relations in new destinations. The findings of this study lend support to this claim and reinforce at call for us to identify local dimensions of stratification across social contexts and dimensions of community life. Interrogating and deconstructing local social structures that “naturally” reproduce group privilege, advantages, and differences along ethno-racial lines offers a window to see how ethnic and racial relations will play out a racially colorblind era (Bonilla-Silva 2001; Lewis 2004). However, this also means “going beyond race,” not by omitting it in analysis, but rather by exploring how other factors shape the types of relationships that emerge. The findings show that
class, immigration status, political identities, and residential length (along with others) shape intergroup relations, which group interests’ are met, and how newcomers’ experience and navigate neighborhood life. Some Mexicano residents do draw on various forms of social and cultural capital. They do so both as a means to combat discrimination as well as to bridge cultural gaps, both their own advantage as well as co-ethnics. Thus, acknowledging how neighborhood social structures, institutional practices, and shared worldviews are linked to particular places provides a basis examine intergroup relations within, and across, social contexts.

A. CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of this study contribute to our understanding of intergroup relations in new immigrant destinations in a number of ways. First, ethnic and racial neighborhood succession does not ensure transition of group power. Despite the growing numbers of Latinos, and neighborhood succession in 2000, white Augustans still retain a considerable amount of power. Power is reflected in white resident’s heightened collective visibility (Deener 2010) and an ability to achieve desirable outcomes despite demographic change and resistance. It is maintained by the forms of social and cultural capital that many white Augustans yield. White resident social capital comes from dense social networks that provide access to power holders (such as elected officials and institutional leaders) while cultural capital is reflected in their knowledge of social practices and local processes (i.e. patronage). Both forms of capital ensure the numerical minority group’s concerns are heard and their interests met. Long-term white residents often have insider knowledge regarding how to navigate local ordinances, where to obtain insider information about village jobs, and what informal requirements are needed to secure one. On the other hand, Latinos are less likely to have social ties to influential leaders, let
alone, knowledge on how to “work the system” on their own behalf. In large part, Latinos (and especially first generation) are continually excluded because they do not yield the necessary forms of place-based social and cultural capital as do their white counterparts. However, even second generation Latino Augustans who are life-long residents and have knowledge of the system indicate that neighborhood social structures privilege white residents’ interests. In turn, and despite Latino neighborhood succession, they are excluded and remain “outsiders” in Augusta.

Second, a perception of group threat plays a significant role in perpetuating group segmentation along ethnic and racial lines. As Aguirre and Turner (2001) write:

If a subordinate ethnic group is perceived as threatening the political power, the economic well-being, the cultural symbols (language, customs, values, and beliefs), the social structures (community organization, social clubs, rituals, and holidays), and/or the basic institutions (economy, politics, family, church, school, and medicine) of a dominant ethnic group, this perception will translate into hostility, fueling the fires of discrimination (34).

In part, some white residents’ reasons for voting for a predominately white village council, branding a white ethno-religious identity to a religious institution, and regulating the types of activities during neighborhood events are reactions to neighborhood change. Thus, Latino neighborhood succession not only threatens white residential privilege and power, but also what they understand as “a distinctive sense of place” (Kefalas 2003: 154). Long-term white Augustans have a strong connection to their town fostered over generations and through connections with neighbors and institutions. As Kefalas (2003) writes, “places achieve significance because they can be the source of intense emotion” (154). Therefore it is not necessary economic or political threat driving white residents’ fears but concerns of community loss and alienation. As relative newcomers, Latino residents do not exhibit the same fears of
group threat as do their white counterparts. Rather their concerns revolve around issues of equal access, fair representation, and meaningful inclusion. These findings suggest it is important for social investigators to acknowledge the role of symbolic threats, along with material ones, in shaping ethnic and racial intergroup relations in new destinations.

Third, the types of relations between groups are shaped by social contexts. Social scientists acknowledge that ethnic and racial intergroup relations are influenced by socio-historical structures and forces which can lead to divergent outcomes. Historically, race has been understood as the driving factor in shaping relations between whites and non-whites in the United States. This has clearly been the case for whites and blacks, whereby racial structures and racist policies regulated the types of interactions and relationships between them. Yet Latinos complicate traditional understandings of theories of ethnic and race relations based upon a white/black binary. This suggests that intergroup relations may differ between groups differ in old, new, and re-emerging destinations because of the diversity of the characteristics that non-white immigrants yield. My research findings support this claim: multiple factors such as class, political allegiance, length of residence, fluency in English, along with immigration and citizenship status influence perceptions, encounters, and relationships. These factors color white residents’ attitudes of their Latino counterparts and shape Latino agency.

**B. HOW CAN THIS STUDY BE IMPROVED?**

There are a number of ways this study could be improved. The first is to expand analysis to other types of neighborhood institutions. While I have chosen to sacrifice breadth in order to obtain depth, looking at intergroup relations in schools (Lewis 2003: Royster 2003) and local businesses (McDermott; Lee 2002) can provide important insights into relations in new destinations. Perspectives about the quality of local public schools did arise in discussions with white and
Latino residents. Both were concerned about what they perceived as a decreasing quality of
education in local elementary schools but they often differed on the solutions to remedy it.
Whites believed that too much money was being spent on programs (such as bilingual education)
directed disproportionately toward Latino students. Latinos, on the other hand believed that
financial resources were misappropriated to white administrative supporters. Further, the
attrition of long-time area businesses (many owned by Italian Americans) often surfaced in
interviews with white residents. Many lamented the loss of these businesses and attributed their
demise to demographic changes. Thus, examinations of these institutions can yield a number of
important findings that can fill in a gap in this work.

Second, this study can be improved by exploring more in depth how ethnicity and race
intersect with other variables that aid or inhibit social agency. Studies on migrant workers
(Guevarra 2010) underscore the importance of paying attention to factors such as class shape
newcomers’ experiences. Writing on Filipina migrant workers, Guevarra (2010) writes that it is
important to acknowledge stories of class struggle to “show the simultaneity of… experiences”
to examine how one “can be oppressed and at the same time empowered” (207). Analyzing how
gender, citizenship status, along with class, intersects in ways that privilege or oppress groups
can provide a more nuanced view of social agency.

Third, whereas this study fills a gap in a body of literature by applying qualitative
methods to examine relations on the ground, survey research can continue to provide important
insights about relations in new destinations. One way to achieve this is to shift focus from
regional analyses of new destinations to specific places. This entails two things. The first is to
identify and collect data of on specific types of new immigrant gateways (emerging, pre-
emerging, and re-emerging). Theories of intergroup relations (Allport 1958; Blalock 1968
Pettigrew year) and empirical studies (Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Marrow 2008) call for us to acknowledge how social context shapes the trajectory of relations. This means taking into account population numbers, along with ethnicity and race. Second, these quantitative studies need identify and create valid quantifiable measures that measure the quality of intergroup relations and that can be applied across destination types. This calls for social scientists to examine how race, ethnicity, class, gender, citizenship and immigration status, along with others, shape attitudes and integration. Doing so can provide a more holistic view of intergroup relations in new destinations while identifying the specific variables that differentiate them.

C. FINAL THOUGHTS

The first decade of the twenty-first century in the United States will be remembered by social analysts as “an era when a suburban immigrant nation first emerged” (Hardwick 2008: 31). The task for social scientists is now to explore how this (re)shapes life in new immigrant gateways over time. This calls for examinations of whether place-based social structures facilitate or impede newcomers’ integration and social well-being. The demographics of the United States is changing and increasingly being felt in towns across the nation. Neighborhood residents and community leaders—both white and non-white—in new destinations that are invested in fostering neighborhood social and economic stability then must contend with these changes. This means acknowledging “growing pains,” identifying areas of conflict, and actively working towards solutions that foster neighborhood well-being. Institutions such as churches and schools are often the first areas where change first takes place. Thus, institutional leaders are often at the front lines in facilitating newcomers’ integration and addressing the concerns of old timers. Elected officials, too, must understand the long-term consequences of social structures and policies that negatively impact newcomers. Enacting legislation that disproportionately targets
Latinos immigrant families only breeds tension and mistrust. Rather, these leaders must continually look at ways to welcome and incorporate Latino newcomers into community life and at the same time, acknowledge the concern of long-term white residents. Not all whites who are resistant to ethnic and racial change are driven by white racist ideologies nor do all hold anti-Latino stereotypes. Rather, many are concerned about the loss of a way of life in which they have become accustomed. To this end, community leaders must serve as role models and communicators by acknowledging the value of residential diversity while acknowledging the challenges associated with social change.
TABLES

**TABLE 2.1: White (Non-Latino) and Latino Demographics of Augusta**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Latino)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Observations</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Participants*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Pompeii Related Events</td>
<td>Spanish Masses</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Masses</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>White/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian Mass</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Pantry</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Latino/White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Lady of Pompeii History Society</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society of Our Lady of Pompeii</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Lady of Pompeii Festival (The Feast)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>White/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Lady of Pompeii Festival Fundraising Dinner</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Village Departmental Organizations and Events</td>
<td>Augusta Village Council</td>
<td>Bi-Monthly</td>
<td>White/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta Fair Housing and Community Relations</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>White/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Community Events</td>
<td>The Taste of Augusta</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>White/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino Fest</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Council Elections</td>
<td>April 2009; 2013</td>
<td>White/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Focused Community Organization and Events</td>
<td>Neighborhoods United</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Latino/Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Fair</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morellos Home Town Association Opening</td>
<td>Sept 2010</td>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhoods United Youth Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhoods United Annual Celebration</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Latino/Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Immigration Rights Meetings and Events (inside and outside Augusta)</td>
<td>Marches/Rallies</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Latino/Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posadas</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Latino/Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call You Senator</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Immigrant Rights Coalition</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Latino/Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midway Detention Center</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Latino/Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* White=Predominately white; Latino=Predominately Latino; White/Latino= Mostly white, some Latino; Latino/white= Mostly Latino, some white; Mixed=Multiethnic/multi-racial; Latino/Mixed= Mostly Latino, but some non-Latinos
Table 6.1: Augusta's Festivals: Founding Year, Organizers, and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Festival</th>
<th>Founding Year</th>
<th>Organizers</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Feast</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>The Feast Committee</td>
<td>Church and adjacent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Taste</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>The Taste Committee</td>
<td>Community Center parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Fest</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>The Latino Fest Committe</td>
<td>Community Center parking lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Taste of Augusta Food Vendors, 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taste of Augusta</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Mexican</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Traditional Carnival Food</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FOOTNOTES

1 I extend the term “Mexicano” to include both Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants who reside in the United States. When indicating the gender of individuals, I use male (Mexicano) and female (Mexicana) pronouns. I use the term “Latino” to refer to those groups from Latin America, including Mexicanos. “White” refers to non-Latino, whites. “Italian” and “Italian American” is used whenever referring to white residents with Italian ancestry. At particular times I employ the term “white ethnic” (see the chapter 5) to signal the connection between white residents’ ethnic, religious, and cultural identities and practices. The researcher acknowledges the many debates regarding the usage of particular terms with regards to issues of power. The researcher also looks forward to revising this paper with identifiers that promote fair representation and visibility that counteract sexist and racist language while acknowledging the unique experiences of individuals and groups.

ii All names of places, institutions, organization, and individuals, have been changed.

iii For instance, Park’s (1950) race relation cycle parallels processes of assimilation with intergroup relations.

iv One interview was conducted at my residence because the respondent worked nearby.

v The sheet also served as an assent form which did not require them to sign their name. I choose this option over requiring written consent to ensure further against risks associated with breach of confidentiality.

vi Neighborhoods United was a group consisting of representatives from social service representatives that worked with primarily with Latino families in the surrounding area. They met monthly at Our Lady of Pompeii in the old rectory, which was a building attached to the church.

vii Information about formal interview respondents’ backgrounds can be found in table 2.3 in the appendices.

viii In line with previous research on race and brokering (Pattillo 2007), I use the term “middlemen” to refer to both men and women.

ix According to the state board of education report cards, Augusta’s school district was identified as one of the most segregated suburban school district in the metropolitan area.

x In this chapter I use the term “white ethnic” to highlight the significance and connection between white, and mostly Italian American, ethnic, cultural, and religious identities.

xi I have omitted the citation to not reveal the identity of the church and neighborhood.

xii One year, a religious leader had invited me to take the place of his son to carry the statue in the annual procession.

xiii See Pattillo-McCoy (1999) for a critique of the neighborhood social organization thesis.

xiv Interestingly, this sentiment was often directed toward the infusion of Spanish in these events. No respondent explicitly indicated that they disliked it when Italian was infused into English dominant settings.

xv This is a room at Our Lady of Pompeii where baptisms were performed and statues stored.

xvi I only identified one Latino male who was a member of the Feast committee.

xvii Many former residents and their children often returned every year to participate in the religious and secular activities of the Feast.

xviii Information on food vendors at the Feast and Latino Fest could not be obtained.
These proportions are subjective and based upon the researcher’s interpretation of participants racial background and the proportional ratio.
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