What’s the Matter With Park Slope?

The Geography of Interests, Issues, and Identities in 2013 NY Mayoral Election
The Politics of Diversity

• Political order in rapidly changing places in “Blue” America
  – Gentrification
  – Immigration
• Potential for intergroup conflict
  – Incommensurable preferences
  – Competition over resources
  – General downward pressure on state action
• Countervailing forces/spatial processes
  – Cross-group organization
  – Sorted Places?
  – Luxurious exceptionalism?
• Chicago 2015...
Today

- Election Narrative
- Analysis of “Interests” on “Key” Issue: SQF
- Organizational Account: WFP turnout analysis
- Park Slope Paradox
- Institutional Caveat
- Implications and Theoretical connections
  - Prospects for durability/generalizability
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“The Migrating Median”: Continuity and Change
“The Migrating Median”, 1989-2013
Major campaign dynamics

• Increasing negatives for Quinn
  – Linked to Bloomberg’s 3rd term
  – Early “Big money” candidate
Major campaign dynamics

- Increasing negatives for Quinn
- 7/23: Weiner’s 2\textsuperscript{nd}...implosion
  - Frees up front-runner’s constituency
Late July

NEW YORK CITY MAYOR – DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

*RCP POLL AVERAGE*

- de Blasio: +16.4
- Thompson: 21.3
- Quinn: 17.0
- Weiner: 7.6
- Liu: 4.7
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REAL CLEAR POLITICS
Major campaign dynamics

• Increasing negatives for Quinn
• 7/23: Weiner’s 2\textsuperscript{nd}...implosion
  – Frees up front-runner’s constituency
• 8/12: SQF Court ruling
  – (re)Raises salience of issue; stalled in courts
  – DeBlasio and Liu strongest against SQF
  – Provides liberal orthodox position
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“Suspects”

• Issues given narrative salience in media
  – Stop, Question, Frisk: Did it matter?
  – Central Park Horses?
  – “Bloomberg”
  – Inequality: Paid Leave, Affordable Housing, Univ. Pre-K

• Interests
  – Public Safety/Civil Rights
  – Distributional and material goods
  – Property values

• Organization
  – Working Families Party
SQF as a decider?

• “...the issue that most contributed to De Blasio’s victory was stop and frisk.”

Michael Greenberg, NYRoB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do You Think ‘Stop and Frisk’ Is:</th>
<th>De Blasio</th>
<th>Liu</th>
<th>Quinn</th>
<th>Thompson</th>
<th>Weiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excessive and results in innocent people being harassed</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An acceptable way to make New York City safer</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NYTimes
SQF as a decider?

- “...the issue that most contributed to De Blasio’s victory was stop and frisk.”

  Michael Greenberg, NYRoB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afam</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1/13</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>8/19</td>
<td>7/9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SQF as a decider?

• “...the issue that most contributed to De Blasio’s victory was stop and frisk.”
  
  Michael Greenberg, NYRoB

• Should see some relationship between SQF policy and results
  – Support for DB where SQF most intense?
  – Support for Quinn, Lhota, Weiner where crime drops biggest?
  – Higher turnout where SQF most intense
SQF

- One of suite of police innovations used by NYPD
- Large intensification during Bloomberg
- "Developmental" public safety
- ~500,000/year
- ~10% white, 50% black
- Court injunction 2013, overturned
Crime continued to decrease in NYC

7 Major Felonies

Change in number of reported major felonies since 2000, by precinct
SQF Targets the *Young*, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Med</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agen</td>
<td>531479</td>
<td>28.06883</td>
<td>11.74634</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SQF implemented unevenly

Cumulative Stops Per Resident, 2003-2012

PrecinctData2012B
custcab
0.00 - 0.25
0.26 - 0.50
0.51 - 1.00
1.01 - 2.00
2.01 - 4.42
SQF implemented unevenly

SQF: Stops per Felony
PrecinctData2012B
stpcr

- 0.00 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 3.50
- 3.51 - 5.00
- 5.01 - 7.00
- 7.01 - 9.60
SQF implemented unevenly (AD, 2012)
No relationship between SQF and election results: primary turnout
No relationship between SQF and election results: general turnout
No relationship between SQF and election results: primary turnout “boost”
No relationship between SQF and election results:

general turnout “boost”

![Graph showing no relationship between SQF and election results with a general turnout "boost".]
Maybe weak relationship between SQF and election results: primary vote choice
SQF Platform: Signal to Jump center?

- New commissioner, Police IG, eliminated racial profile and reduce minor drug arrests
- Strengthen NYPD, no oversight
Organizational Alternative: Working Families Party

- Fusion-driven party, since mid-1990s
- Grassroots
- City Council-oriented
- Class-based platform
  - Paid Sick Leave
  - Affordable Housing
  - Education: Free Pre-K and Higher Ed, School equity
Working Families Party in ‘13 Mayoral Race

• All Dem Candidates had been nominated by WFP; none formally until after primary
• De Blasio adopts full platform in primary
• Persuade? Signal liberal pole, articulate agenda
De Blasio Support and WFP

![Graph showing De Blasio Support and WFP relationship]
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Working Families Party

- All Dem Candidates had been nominated by WFP; none formally until after primary
- De Blasio adopts full platform in primary
- Persuade? Signal liberal pole, provide platform
- Mobilize? Especially in local race (low turnout)
Mobilization and WFP

• **City Council**: Seek a majority with Democratic caucus
• Smaller constituencies help
• Groom and develop candidates
WFP Mobilization:
Turnout in ’13 Higher where WFP active in ‘09
WHERE is WFP?
Mobilization and WFP

- **City Council:** Seek a majority with Democratic caucus (Achieved)
- Smaller constituencies help
- Groom and develop candidates
Mobilization and WFP

City Council Races, and WFP Nominees

CouncilAssemPieces
nomchall
- Green: No nominee
- Teal: Co-nominee
- Purple: Challenge
Mobilization and WFP

• **City Council:** Seek a majority with Democratic caucus (Achieved)

• Smaller constituencies help

• Groom and develop candidates

• **Turnout boost (vs. no WFP Nom), in general:**
  – 4-5%, Where WFP nominates candidate
  – 13%, When challenge Democratic nominee
WFP Mobilization Test: CD/AD Fragments
WFP Mobilization Test: CD/AD Fragments
WFP Mobilization Test: CD/AD Fragments
WFP Mobilization Test: CD/AD Fragments
WFP Mobilization Test: CD/AD Fragments

• Compare turnout in adjacent fragments
• Where WFP nominates councilmember:
  – Average increase of 2% in primary (p<.1)
  – Average increase of 3% in general (p<.05)
Working Families Boost

• City Council
  – Turnout: 5-12% association
  – Turnout: 3% “Treatment” in WFP CDADs
  – Mayoral: Clearing the bar?

• DB choice: Primary and General
• WFP support and activity citywide, but strongest in affluent Brooklyn
• Increasing over time
WFP Increases
WHERE is WFP?

WFP Share for For De Blasio, '13g

TEDDemogVoteHousing DBWF_ED
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WFP Votes

TEDDemogVoteHousing WFSHARE
- 0.0 - 0.025
- 0.026 - 0.050
- 0.051 - 0.10
- 0.11 - 0.15
- 0.16 - 1.0
What’s the Matter with Park Slope?
Park Slopers aren’t particularly likely to face too-high rents
But WFP-areas HAVE seen very high rent increases.
New Salient Identities?
Variant changes, ‘09–’13
Valence, or Shift?

Bloomberg v. Thompson, 2009

De Blasio v. Lhota, 2013
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Race and vote choice: the gentry-cloud
Summing up

• Little “interest-based” effect of SQF
• Redistributive shift driven by affluent liberal constituency
• Evidence for WFP turnout boost
  – Indirect ideological effect of SQF?
• “Amateur” Democrats?
Methodological caveat: aggregation

• It could be that the least affluent 20% of Park Slope are “over-participating”
Institutional Caveat: Partisan Primary

Caveat:
Primary
WFP, Park Slope, and the Future of Big-City Politics

“Democratic Tension” of Big-city politics
• Inequality ➔ Pressure for Redistribution (Meltzer-Richards)
• Intercity competition ➔ Pro-development policy (Peterson)
• Diversity as basis of rivalry

New Realities
• Political sorting and ideological polarization
  – Diversity as basis of coalition
• Global city exceptionalism?
Thank you