MILWAUKEE COMMISSION ON
HUMAN RIGHTS
CITY HALL
MILWAUKEE 2, WISCONSIN

File Copy

Rm 52-240

G403M6
+IN

THE HOUSING OF NEGROES IN MILWAUKEE: 1955

".. many members of minority groups, regardless of their income or their economic status, have had the least opportunity of all our citizens to acquire good homes."

President D. D. Eisenhower
Message to Congress, January 1954

Irwin D. Rinder

The Intercollegiate Council on Intergroup Relations, Milwaukee

$1.00 per copy

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
816 STATE STREET
MADISON 6, WISCONSIN

NOV 20 1952

Rm 57-2402

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	FORWARD	1
II.	THE PROBLEM OF HOUSING	3
	A. Some Perspectives	3
	B. Race Relations in General	4
	C. Housing Problems in Particular	7
III.	THE CITY AND THE SAMPLING	11
IV.	RESEARCH FINDINGS	17
	A. Method of Presentation	17
	B. Type of Structure and Number of Occupants	18
	C. Maintenance	23
	D. Facilities	24
	1. Plumbing	24
	2. Lighting	26
	3. Heating	26
	4. Cooking	28
	5. Perishable Food Storage	29
	6. Laundry	30
	7. Living Room Furnishings	31
	E. Recreation	32
	F. Some Attitudes and Experiences re Housing	35
	G. Age: Length of Occupancy: Provenience	38
	H. Socio-Economic Status	39
	I. Tenure and Home Ownership	42
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	46
VI.	APPENDIXES	50
	A. Letter of Introduction from Urban League	
	B. Instruction Sheet	
	C. Questionnaire	
VII.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	57

I. FORWARD

The Intercollegiate Council on Intergroup Relations is the coordinating group for the Human Relations Committee at the colleges and universities of the Milwaukee area. It makes it possible for these committees to come to grips with human relations problems which transcend the campus and are community-wide in scope. The Council having conducted several projects since its inception in 1952, was exploring what might be done for 1955 when its attention was focused by a request from Mr. William Kelly of the Urban League for a study of the housing of Negroes in Milwaukee. Such other members of the community who serve the Council in a consultive capacity as Mr. Corneff Taylor of the Milwaukee Commission on Human Rights, and Mr. Maurice Terry of the National Conference of Christians and Jews agreed that such a project would constitute a contribution toward community self-knowledge and potentially toward its betterment.

At a general meeting, the Intercollegiate Council decided that a study of the housing of Negroes should be undertaken, not only for its civic value but also for its legitimate expansion of the education and human relations experiences of participating students. The subcommittee listed below was then gathered as the continuing group to conduct such a study. Numerous meetings were held in order to clarify objectives; develop a questionnaire, the major research instrument; draw up sampling lists of households, etc. This subcommittee wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the interest and aid which the individuals and agencies mentioned above generously tendered; financial support

from the National Conference of Christians and Jews for secretarial and duplicating expenses; and the encouragement of Professor Rudolph Morris of the Sociology Department, Marquette University, who is the moving spirit of the Council.

Sister M. Rebecca, OSF, Alverno College
Dr. Joseph W. McGee, Marquette University
Dr. Fred Kaufmann, Milwaukee School of Engineering
Chairman: Dr. Irwin D. Rinder, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee

II. THE PROBLEM OF HOUSING

A. Some Perspectives

In this decade attention in intergroup relations has been increasingly directed toward the housing of minority, particularly racial groups in our population. Restrictive practices, designed to hamper the settlement of "undesirable" citizens except in the areas hitherto reserved for them, have resulted in the confinement of large numbers of Americans into racial, ethnic, and cultural enclaves, usually in the most physically deteriorated portions of our cities. Originally attracted to the low rental housing in these areas, members of racial minorities in particular find that, once within them, it is difficult if not impossible to find housing elsewhere in the city. Arbitrary barriers hamper their spatial mobility and residential location.

The construction so frequently placed upon the race relations problems in the United States are frequently gloomy or pessimistic over man's inhumanity toward man. Granting that homo sapiens is somewhat lower than the angels, may we not find in these very problems some small reason for optimism. For example, there are no problems in human relations where these relations are static. Where the relationships between racial groups are unambiguously and unchallangeably ordered by slavery or a caste system, individual but not social problems of adjustment may occur. It is only when the older structurings of relationships have broken down and are in the process of flux that problems arise, signifying that people are perplexed by new situations for which there does not exist any traditional or pat answer. In a democracy,

especially one as dynamic as our own, there shall always be problems. Minority problems are those we happen to inherit from the breakdown of the group and status definitions of preceeding eras.

Negro-white relations in the contemporary United States are perhaps in a greater state of change and transition than at any time since the period immediately following the Civil War. At that time, a status quo of white super - and Negro subordination was soon reestablished in the post-bellum period, in the South most firmly but throughout the nation generally. Whites regained the reins of economic and political control; in this they were supported by the Plessy vs. Ferguson decision of the Supreme Court which established the doctrine of "separate but equal," thus life was resumed and polarized into segregated racial spheres under the sanction of law.

In this century, the shifts in Negro population attendant upon the reduction of immigration, the industrial demands of two world wars, the enhanced economic and political position of a Negro population increasingly urbanized and educated, and the spotlight glare of world interest in the domestic affairs of the nation spokesman for democracy, have all contributed to the disruption of many long established patterns of inequality inherited from the past. Our awareness of many problems and our many national efforts toward working out adjustments and readjustments signify that new equilibriums of accommodation on higher planes of equality are developing between races.

B. Race Relations in General

In An American Dilemma, the definitive study of Negro-white

relations in the U. S., Myrdal found it conceptually valuable to organize systematically the discriminations which whites maintained as the "rank order of discriminations." This ranking was headed by those activities which whites generally felt were most personal and intimate like marriage and sociability; ranged through less personal activities like the use of public facilities, protection by courts, police, etc., political participation; and finally concluded with discrimination against economic participation. For the white population, this rank order states the order of intensity of feeling and strength of resistance toward equal Negro participation in these areas of life activity. Myrdal and his associates felt that the rank order of importance for Negroes was reversed, i.e., that they felt most strongly about those discriminations which were at the bottom of the white list and were least concerned about those to which whites assigned priority.

If these "rank order of discriminations" hypotheses are correct, (they have received some validation in empirical studies) they lead to a prognosis of easier accommodation between Negroes and whites over the short haul, since the points of greatest immediacy and pressure for equal rights for Negroes coincide with the points of least resistance from whites. However, as yesterday's aspirations become today's accomplishments the order of priorities moves upward and the resistance stiffens. Our strides in improving vocational opportunities, access to the ballot, and participation in government, and most recently in improving education have brought us to the place where we must face the demand for a free housing market - the right of the individual citizen to live

wherever he can afford to locate and wherever vacancies exist.

For the member of the dominant group, housing is perhaps, the topic where the claim for equality of treatment by the subordinate group becomes less a matter of abstract principle (principles which Myrdal called the higher values of the "American Creed"), remote in its consequences, and becomes something closer to home with all the implications of both urgency and intimacy which this term connotes. As one leading textbook flatly states in its section on housing, "The major and most dangerously explosive area of conflict between groups in the United States is over living space."[1]

This explosiveness need not eventuate in violent mob outbursts, even though this has sometimes been the case. We have learned that proper utilization of such community representatives as employers, educators, clergy, and police acting in full awareness of their responsibilities can make for peaceful accommodation despite the violent gestures and utterances of extremists. The overwhelming majority of Americans respect individual civil and property rights when these have been explained to them and where the authorities clearly indicate their intention to guarantee those rights.

In summary, the existence of minority problems should not distress or depress us - indeed, they are evidence of vitality - but the providing of appropriate arenas in which these problems may be worked out, and the perpetuation of those institutionalized

---

[1] Brown and Roucek, One America, N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. (3rd edition), Chapter 17, "The Bases of Conflict: Housing," p. 460.

procedures and safeguards which maximize democracy, these must be the renewed concern of each generation. Among the techniques which aid our realization of the potential for rational action is research. Differences in values and points of view will continue but, insofar as research findings replace speculation and myth, there will be some common frame of discourse.

C. Housing Problems in Particular

While slavery continued in the United States, status relations between whites and Negroes were (with the exception of the small number of Freemen) unambiguously relations between superiors and subordinates. Paradoxically, this system produced greater physical proximity between these groups than was to be the case in the post-emancipation period. Where the social system does not structure relationships, man must improvise informal or non-legal techniques to do this job for him so long as he chooses to perpetuate these invidious physical (racial) distinctions of status.

If social distance - the keeping of others at arm's length - was to be maintained both literally and figuratively, then the maintenance of physical distance through segregation was the most convenient technique available. Segregated housing has been among the most important techniques employed in perpetuating status differences between races in the United States. Housing is ordinarily stratified socio-economically by the market so that most residential areas have a clear character as "upper class," "middle class," and the like. With regard to race, the market mechanism was not deemed sufficient to ensure the maintenance of

the character of an area so various other methods have been resorted to. Negroes, even when they can afford to, do not find it easy to move out of the racial ghetto. The syllogism of social distance which provides the rationale of this restrictive policy is approximately as follows. Since all Negroes, according to racist dogma, are categorically defined as members of a group of lower status; and since one's own status depends in part upon where one lives and who one's neighbors are; and since residential propinquity implies equality (except where the proximate individual is clearly subordinate as a menial or domestic, when their presence paradoxically heightens status); then Negro residents lower the social prestige of a community and the status of its white residents. Hence Negroes must be kept out or they jeopardize one's social standing: much else is rationalization of this basic proposition.

Segregation by municipal ordinance (regulated by legislative fiat, not unlike present day South Africa's policy of apartheid) seems to have been a hastily conceived stopgap response to the large scale Negro migration to northern cities which received impetus with the first world war. After a Supreme Court decision in 1917 declaring this manuever unconstitutional, the line on segregation was held through the makeshift of race restrictive covenants. These individual commitments, made contractually, limited the resale of real estate purchases to specified groups only, usually identified as caucasian. Restrictive covenants were not able to contain the Negro population within prescribed bounds, but they did delay and hinder movement.

In 1948 the Supreme Court again destroyed the foundation under practices which denied equality of opportunity in housing by declaring the race restrictive covenant unenforceable in the courts of the land. The removal of this last remaining legal prop of segregation denotes an important accomplishment, but it does not close the story. So long as individuals harbor antipathies toward other individuals because of their group identify; so long as racial stereotypes and myths are perpetuated, e.g., those concerning cleanliness, honesty, morality, and other personal traits and the effect of certain residents upon property values; that long will man's ingenuity be misguided in the perpetration of barriers against democracy in housing. It is unfortunate that the quasi-military terminology of ecology is so descriptive of minority housing phenomena; minority movement into an area is characterized as "invasion" and the concommitant movement of old residents out of that area is labelled "flight." The ghetto expands, its frontiers shift, and it becomes more commodious; but residential segregation continues with a new set of boundaries.

So frequently has the above description of movement and countermovement been the pattern, it is hardly surprising that the layman has often concluded that racial isolation is a necessary response of human nature. That this pattern is neither inevitable nor salutory is evidenced by the increasing number of instances of racially integrated housing which have appeared this past decade. Municipal housing projects in many locales testify to the possibility and realization of the peaceful integration

of diverse peoples into communities. This is not entirely voluntary since it is, in these municipalities, a policy-based, inseparable condition of public low-rent housing; it is, nonetheless, encouraging. The paradoxical import of this development in racially integrated housing - and it should be sobering to the rest of the population - is that the best progress is being made among the lowest socio-economic segments of the population. This most poorly educated and traditionally most prejudiced portion of the nation has become a surprisingly successful laboratory in human relations. On the middle class scene, recent developments (like the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference on Chicago's southeast side and its counterparts in other cities) testify that men of good will can maintain their property, maintain and even improve community esprit de corps regardless of the skin color of neighbors, providing they apply their diligence, their reason, and the democratic and religious principles which they profess.

III. THE CITY AND THE SAMPLING

At the time of the 1950 decennial census, the city of Milwaukee consisted of 222 census tracts and 587,472 inhabitants. The nonwhites in the city were 22,742 in number and of these, the largest part by far, 21,772 were Negro. While this is not a large Negro population in either an absolute or proportional sense, it does represent a considerable increase over the previous census figure of 8,821; an increase of 145% in the ten year interval between censuses. While this population increase was taking place, the non-white occupied dwellings tabulated by the census increased only 79%, intensifying an already crowded condition.

That the Negro population is residentially segregated in Milwaukee is very apparent, for the same census of 1950 shows that 11,961 of the Negroes in Milwaukee reside within four census tracts (20, 21, 29, and 30). In other words, 55% of Milwaukee's Negroes are located within less than 2% of its census tracts. It hardly requires the computation of a chi square statistic to prove that this degree of concentration is not random, i.e. the result of chance or accidental residential location. Furthermore, as Table 3 shows, the number of census tracts in all which contain as little as 1% or over Negro residents total only 29: all but a negligible number of Milwaukee's Negroes are to be found within 13% of the city's tracts.

In Chapter II, Section 3 it was asserted that the degree of residential segregation has been even greater since emancipation than it was during slavery; and since the north was able to create this pattern from the beginning of interracial contact in

significant numbers, segregation is more complete in parts of the north than it is in the south. The following table shows one of the ways this segregation can be quantitatively determined along with some representative findings. Although the data treated below is now outdated, there is no reason to believe that the indicated trend has undergone any change. In fact, with the increasing number of Negroes leaving the rural south for the urban north there is some basis for feeling that the concentration and segregation may have become even more intensified.

TABLE 1. DEGREE OF SEGREGATION IN CITIES*

Cities	% of Nonwhite in total Population 1934	% Distribution of Nonwhite Population in City Blocks			
		less than 10% nonwhite	10-49% nonwhite	50-99% nonwhite	100% nonwhite
Birmingham, Ala.	40.2%	10.8%	12.7%	28.8%	47.7%
Atlanta, Ga.	35.2	17.0	12.8	22.9	47.3
Washington, D.C.	27.8	2.5	31.1	66.4	
Indianapolis, Ind.	11.8	24.9	23.1	26.1	25.9
Cleveland, Ohio	8.4	40.0	17.2	40.4	2.4
Chicago, Ill.	6.7	4.9	4.7	90.4	
Seattle, Wash.	2.3	37.1	42.1	18.1	2.7
Providence, R. I.	2.3	41.8	47.3	10.3	.6
MILWAUKEE, WIS.	1.6	1.4	23.3	75.3	
Minneapolis, Minn.	.7	60.3	22.6	16.0	1.1

* from Homer Hoyt, "The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities," 1939, pp. 66-67.

Milwaukee did not appear in the original of this table but its inclusion resulted from the computations made by the Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau of Milwaukee, based on the 1940 census. This agency also found that a 1945 census taken by the Milwaukee Health Department in tracts 20 and 21 indicated segregation was more

concentrated than it had been five years earlier, i.e. an increase from 75.4 to 80.4% of the nonwhite population living in blocks of three-fourths or more nonwhite occupancy.[1]

In view of this extraordinary pattern of distribution (or rather lack of distribution) of Negroes in Milwaukee, the research staff of the present project was confronted with a number of perplexities which had to be resolved. From the very outset it was agreed that scientific sampling was to be the only method of securing cases rather than any less objective method which might allow bias to influence the selection of cases and diminish the validity of the findings. Since Milwaukee is fortunate in having its census data tabulated by census tracts[2] and the further convenience of a census tract street index,[3] area sampling through the selection of random house numbers in any particular tract was not only feasible but routine.[4] The major problem was to allocate the available resources most efficiently. Since the Council was depending upon volunteer student help for the field work, an early estimate of the number of interviews likely to be collected was set at 400, different amounts being assigned as quotas to the several schools in line with their size and facilities.

---

1 Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau, Milwaukee's Negro Community, Milwaukee, rexographed, 1946.

2 Census tracts are small areas, having a population usually between 3,000 and 6,000, into which certain large cities have been subdivided for statistical and administrative purposes. An attempt is made to get them fairly uniform in size and in population composition.

3 The census tract street index tells the names of the streets and the house numbers which fall within each of the tracts of the city.

4 The randomly chosen house numbers did not always represent a dwelling occupied by Negroes. The interviewers were instructed to use the house number as a starting point from which to proceed to the next higher number until a Negro respondent was found.

How best distribute the anticipated 400 cases? Simple random sampling over the city would neglect the single most salient fact that the Negro population is not uniformly distributed over the city. On the other hand a weighted sample, in terms of the actual proportion of the Negro population found in different tracts, would be heavily weighted with cases from the small number of tracts of greatest concentration. This would result in only a minute sampling of those Negroes who reside in areas of sparser Negro settlement, e.g. 1 or 2% of our 400 cases would be so few as to present a formidable potential sampling error. Since it was deemed important to gain adequate information about these latter areas some compromise in sampling technique was necessary.

The procedure finally adopted was that of weighting the sample so that the tracts of heaviest Negro occupancy received the greatest amount of investigation but not the entire amount indicated by a literal arithmetic weighting. This would give some emphasis to size but would also ensure a modest rather than infinitesimal representation for areas of small Negro inhabitance. The city's Negro population was divided into four groups on the basis of the proportion of Negro to white residents. Those census tracts with 50% or over Negro population constitute zone 1; tracts with 25-50% Negro residents became zone 2; from 10-25% Negro in population composition became zone 3; and from 1-10%, zone 4. The tracts comprising each zone and the percentage of its population recorded as Negro in the 1950 census are described in Table 3.

The number of cases arbitrarily allocated to each zone, the

number actually realized through the field work, and the division of responsibility among the cooperating schools will be found in Table 2.

TABLE 2. THE EXPECTED AND ACTUAL DISTRIBUTION OF CASES

Zone	Cases Expected	Cases Obtained	School
1	200	138	Marquette University
2	120	108	Wisconsin State College
3	50	16	Milw. School of Engineering
4	30	29	Alverno College
TOTAL	400	291	

The research tool, a questionnaire, is included in this report as Appendix 1. The student interviewers met at Marquette University one evening where the purposes of the study and the general sampling procedure were explained. The questionnaire was reviewed by holding a mock interview between student and householder and an attempt was made to clear up any questions and to anticipate and provide for problems which might arise. Some of these students had participated in the early phases of research formulation but for the most participation was limited to the collection of data.

TABLE 3. PERCENTAGE OF NEGRO POPULATION IN MILWAUKEE CENSUS TRACTS AND THE GROUPING OF TRACTS INTO ZONES FOR STUDY

More than 50% - Zone 1		25-50% - Zone 2		10-25% - Zone 3		1-10% - Zone 4	
Census Tract	Percentage	Census Tract	Percentage	Census Tract	Percentage	Census Tract	Percentage
20	79%	35	41%	19	18%	1	1%
21	68%	36	47%	31	21%	2*	2%
29	76%			52	18%	7*	2%
30	80%					16*	1½%
						17	2%
						18	1%
						22*	7%
						23*	1%
						28	2%
						33*	3%
						34*	7%
						43	1%
						53	9%
						62*	1%
						73	8%
						108	3%
						113	2%
						115	1%
						219	2%
						220	1%

* Tracts actually sampled in Zone 4. All tracts were sampled in Zones 1, 2, and 3.

IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Method of Presentation

This chapter contains the substance of the study and an endeavor has been made to present it as meaningfully as possible. In all cases, unless otherwise noted, the data has been organized by our scheme of four zones (see Table 3) to enable comparisons and contrasts to be made between the characteristics of Negroes living in areas of differing racial concentration. Furthermore, where it has been possible to get comparative data on whites and Negroes from the census, these have been included. This census material helps us establish the base line for those trends in social phenomena which may be observed to vary with location in the city and it helps us compare the material on Negroes with that derived from the tracts in general. The following cautions must however be borne in mind.

(1) The census data was collected five years earlier than that for the present study and this may introduce some variation in results, e.g. changes in income, education, rent, etc. However, this difference between studies will be constant in its effect from zone to zone.

(2) The data for this study is sample data rather than complete enumeration and was collected by relatively inexperienced staff. Error may be introduced through inadequacies here.

(3) Where comparisons between the population of the tract as a whole and the nonwhite sample within the tract is made, the extent of difference between the two is reduced by the fact that the data for the former (tract as a whole) includes nonwhites as well as whites. The larger the concentration of nonwhites, the more is the differentiation obscured.

Since the census material on nonwhite housing was obtained through a sampling of selected census tracts, and since this

sampling was made only in those tracts with an appreciable nonwhite population, census data was not forthcoming from all tracts in which we are interested. This is particularly true of Zone 4 where we had to employ data from certain tracts other than the ones in which our own survey material was actually collected. We must assume in this instance that these other tracts are comparable to our own. The actual tracts contained in the zonal scheme employed for consolidating census data is as follows: Zone 1 - 20, 21, 29, 30; Zone 2 - 35, 36; Zone 3 - 19, 31, 52; Zone 4 - 22, 53, 73.

B. Type of Structure and Number of Occupants

From the census we learn that the distribution of white and Negro residents is as follows.

TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF WHITES AND NEGROES IN CITY AND SELECTED TRACTS

Population	City of Milwaukee		Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
White	565,700	96%	3,804	24%	6,573	55%	9,345	82%	11,938	91%
Negro	21,772	4	11,961	76	5,298	45	2,086	18	1,047	9

This table gives a clear portrayal of the extent of Negro concentration in certain census tracts near the central portion of the city. It also shows how this concentration, both in absolute numbers and in proportion of the population, diminishes steadily as one moves outward from the center.

TABLE 5. CENSUS REPORT ON AGE OF STRUCTURES BY YEAR IN WHICH BUILT

Year Built	Milwaukee		Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Total Reporting	184,926		3,690		2,930		2,850		3,715	
1940-1949	16,700	9%	45	1%	-		25	1%	-	
1930-1939	12,165	7	235	7	80	3%	5	-	25	1%
1920-1929	41,250	22	290	8	300	10	240	8	425	11
1919 or earlier	114,250	62	3,120	84	2,550	87	2,580	90	3,265	88

The evidence of this table points to the fact that housing in each of the four zones is about equally archaic from the point of view of date constructed, and each shows about the same amount of aged structures and the same paucity of new construction percentagewise. In both instances, there is an appreciable departure from the norm for the city as a whole.

TABLE 6.[1]

Question 1. Nature of Structure	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Single Family	17	13%	34	33%	6	40%	7	27%
Single Family Subdivided	13	10	9	9	2	13	2	8
Duplex	49	38	42	40	3	20	13	50
Duplex Subdivided	21	16	9	9	3	20	2	8
Apartment House	26	20	8	8	1	7	2	8
Rooming House	3	3	2	1	-		-	

[1] The numbering of the questions in this and following tables follows the numbering in the questionnaire, not the order in which they now occur.

TABLE 6 (continued)

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Question 2. Type of Construction				
Brick	31 24%	13 13%	15 100%	4 14%
Frame	84 64	70 65	-	20 69
Composition	16 12	24 22	-	5 17
Question 3. Number of Rooms per Family				
1	3	1	—	2
2	12	1	1	4
3	25	10	4	5
4	33	30	6	4
5	23	28	2	3
6	11	18	2	5
7	7	13	1	3
8	3	2	-	2
9	3	2	-	-
10	2	1	-	-
Over 10	11	2	-	-
Median	4.3	5.4	4.5	4.7

TABLE 7.

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Question 49. How many persons live in this unit?				
1	7	3	-	-
2	22	10	6	4
3	24	28	-	4

TABLE 7. (continued)

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Question 49. How many persons live in this unit? (continued)				
4	19	15	3	5
5	16	17	2	3
6	14	13	2	3
7	15	6	1	5
8	8	5	2	2
9	2	3	-	1
10	2	-	-	-
Over 10	5	3	-	-
Median	3.7	3.3	4.3	4.0
Question 50. How many families live in this structure?				
1	27	30	4	10
2	49	45	9	10
3	20	11	3	1
4	14	11	-	1
5	3	1	-	-
6	4	2	-	1
7	-	-	-	1
8	2	-	-	1
9	1	-	-	-
10	3	2	-	-
Over 10	4	2	-	2
Median	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.3
Question 51. How many individuals including roomer & boarders, etc., live in this building?				
1-4	16	17	5	6
5-9	47	42	4	11

TABLE 7. (continued)

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Question	How many individuals including roomer & boarders, etc., live in this building?			
10-14	23	18	5	5
15-19	9	5	-	1
Over 20	2	2	-	6
Median	7.6	7.0	7.0	7.8

TABLE 8. CENSUS DATA ON HOUSEHOLDS AND CROWDING

Measure	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Population per household	3.27	3.78	3.72	3.43	3.35
Persons per Room (entire tract)					
Number reporting	183,773	3,593	2,985	2,800	3,725
1.01 or more	18,713 10%	905 25%	536 18%	449 16%	556 15%
(Negro only)					
Number reporting		2,558	1,090	374	220
1.01 or more		722 28	265 25	89 24	63 29

Table 8 shows that each of the four zones contains more persons per household than the city average and that this crowding is greatest in Zone 1 and decreases as we move out through the other zones. The "persons per room" measure which is the census formula for measuring crowding, i.e. over 1 person per room is crowding, shows approximately the same picture except that the crowding figure jumps for zone 4 and is even slightly above the measure for zone 1.

In other words, although zone 4 averages a smaller population per household than the others, this household is crowded into even fewer rooms.

C. Maintenance

The census does not inquire into maintenance although it is interested in the state of repair or disrepair of structures. Our study did obtain some information about the responsibility for maintenance, recency of decorating, etc. and this will be described in the tables which follow. The general import of these data is to document a great deal of similarity between zones. The exception to this is the somewhat longer time required in zone 3 for the making of repairs after a complaint has been lodged.

TABLE 9.

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Question 4. Who is supposed to be responsible for maintenance and repairs?								
Owner	122	92	101	94	15	94	29	100
Tenant	11	8	6	6	1	6	-	
Question 5. Who actually takes care of maintenance and repairs?								
Owner	108	86	97	91	14	94	28	96
Tenant	14	11	9	8	1	6	1	4
Jointly	3	3	1	1	-		-	
Question 6. Estimated time to get repairs made after a complaint.								
Less then a week	53	62	38	69	4	29	14	74
Week to a month	23	27	15	27	9	64	1	5
1-2 months	3	4	2	4	-		1	5
Over 2 months	6	8	-		1	7	3	15

TABLE 9, (continued)

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Question 7. Who is responsible for decorating? (paint, paper, etc.)								
Owner	80	72	75	80	12	80	18	69
Tenant	21	19	19	20	3	20	8	31
Jointly	10	10	-		-		-	
Question 8. When was decorating last done in your living quarters?								
Within last month	5	5	6	7	-		1	5
Over a month to a year	41	39	47	58	7	54	13	65
Over a year	58	56	28	35	6	46	6	30

D. Facilities: (1) Plumbing

The census provides us with the following information about plumbing facilities.

TABLE 10. CENSUS DATA ON PLUMBING FACILITIES BY CITY AND SELECTED TRACTS

Condition	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Total Reporting	185,103	3,582	2,988	2,801	3,712
Negro Reporting		2,513 70%	1,703 36%	367 13%	218 6%
No Private Bath or Dilapidated					
Entire tract	30,311 16%	1,638 46%	953 32%	679 24%	965 26%
Negro only		1,225 75%	386 41%	147 22%	72 7%
No Running Water or Dilapidated					
Entire Tract	7,969 4%	950 27%	493 16%	175 6%	209 6%
		761 80%	230 47%	72 41%	18 9%

These data continue to point up what has been found previously; that zones 1, 2, 3, and 4 show a greater incidence of blight,

deterioration, or less adequate facilities than is found over the rest of the city. Furthermore, this table shows that within these zones, Negroes possess a greater share of these undesirable facilities than they constitute a percentage of the population, e.g. Negroes are 70% of the population in zone 1 and they report 75% and 80% of the dilapidated or absent plumbing facilities in that zone. If the Negro population was not such a large percentage of the total population in zone 1, the Negro disproportion of blight might be shown to be even larger. The following data from our own study finds that Negro residents, regardless of their tract and zone location have quite similar plumbing facilities.

TABLE 11.

Question 9. Bathroom facilities.	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Private bathroom	111	86	97	91	16	100	25	86
Shared toilet	17	14	10	9	-		4	14
Question 10. Water								
Both hot and Cold	96	79	98	91	15	94	26	90
Cold only	39	21	10	9	1	6	3	10
Question 11. Bathing facilities.								
Private bath/shower	65	64	90	89	10	91	23	82
Shared bath/shower	19	19	8	8	-		4	14
No bath/shower	18	17	3	3	1	9	1	4

(2) Lighting

TABLE 12.

Question 12. Type of Lighting?	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Electric	135	108	16	28
Lamps	-	-	-	1
Question 13. How many outlets per room?				
0	3	-	-	3
1	70	32	4	8
2	41	51	5	11
3	5	8	2	2
4	2	8	3	-
5	1	2	-	-
Median	.8	1.4	1.6	1.1
Question 14. How frequently are fuses blown?				
Seldom	85 68	81 79	12 80	8 40
About once a year	10 8	3 3	-	1 5
More than once a year	30 24	18 18	3 20	11 55

(3) Heating

TABLE 13. CENSUS REPORT ON HEATING FOR CITY AND SELECTED TRACTS

Condition	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Number Reporting	185,055	3,560	3,005	2,890	3,730
Central Heating	153,335 83%	1,935 54%	1,965 65%	2,145 74%	2,925 78%

TABLE 13. CENSUS REPORT ON HEATING FOR CITY AND SELECTED TRACTS (continued)

Condition	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Non-central Heating	32,235 17%	1,610 45%	1,040 35%	730 25%	795 21%
Not heated	485 -	15 -	- -	15 -	10 -

Before discussing anything else about the table above, we must give a priority to the category "Not Heated." Although the unheated homes are a negligible percentage of total homes in Milwaukee, or within each tract for that matter, they nevertheless total 40 cases for these four zones composed of 12 census tracts. These 40 cases are nearly 10% of the total number in the city, and they were garnered, as were all of the housing data, through a 20% sample of Milwaukee households. Since this 20% sample was randomly procured, we may with some safety project this finding and conclude that 10% of all cases of unheated dwellings are located in the four zones containing the bulk of the Negro population.

The remainder of the table recapitulates the same trend present in all other census findings, that the four zones have a greater incidence of non-centrally heated structures than the city average and that this rate decreases as we move out from the center. Our own survey findings presented below fail to show any consistent trend or differentiation between zones for Negro respondents with the exception of the greater frequency of central heating and of coal as a fuel in zone 3.

TABLE 14.

Question 15. Type of heating facility.	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Central heating	69	51	87	80	15	94	21	72
Space heating	50	37	17	16	-		7	24
Spot heating	17	12	4	4	1	6	1	4
Question 16. Type of fuel.								
Oil	51	38	39	36	1	6	7	25
Gas	16	12	18	16	1	6	6	21
Coal	68	50	51	47	14	88	15	54
Electricity	-		1	1	-		-	
Question 17a. Occupant's estimate of adequacy of heating.								
Adequate	110	87	77	88	12	75	22	91
Inadequate	16	13	10	12	4	25	2	9
Question 17b. Interviewer's estimate of adequacy of heating.								
Adequate	86	82	72	82	13	87	18	90
Inadequate	19	18	15	18	2	13	2	10

(4) Cooking

TABLE 15.

Question 18. Cooking facility.	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Stove	132	96	94	94	16	100	28	96
Hot plate	4	3	1	1	-	-	-	
Facility shared	2	1	5	5	-		1	4
Question 19. Is the above stove - ?								
Electric	10	7	18	17	-		-	
Gas	126	93	89	83	16	100	29	100

TABLE 15. (continued)

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Question 20. Number of cooking burners available, counting a stove's oven as 1?				
1	2	-	-	-
2	1	1	-	-
3	1	1	1	-
4	45	18	1	8
5	83	84	14	20
6	3	4	-	1

The modal number of burners is 5 and the median between 4 and 5 in every zone.

(5) Perishable Food Storage

The census again provides us with some material based upon its 20% sampling of households.

TABLE 16. CENSUS REPORT OF REFRIGERATION FACILITIES FOR CITY AND SELECTED TRACTS

Condition	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Number Reporting	184,060	3,545	3,005	2,755	3,730
Mechanical	160,565 87%	2,395 68%	2,360 78%	2,015 73%	3,000 80%
Ice	17,985 10	995 28	555 19	620 22	565 15
Other or None	5,710 3	155 4	90 3	120 5	165 5

The same two trends noted repeatedly appear here: less adequate facilities are found in greater proportions in these census tracts than in the city generally; these conditions show alleviation

the further from the zone we move. And once more, our survey statistics fail to uncover any consistent significant differences between the Negro residents of these tracts.

TABLE 17.

Question 21. Food storage facility.	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Refrigerator	116	87	102	95	16	100	25	86
Ice-box	16	12	4	4	-		3	10
Window box	1	1	-		-		-	
None	1		1	1	-		1	4
Question 22. Is facility checked above -?								
Private	119	89	100	94	13	100	26	93
Shared	14	11	6	6	-		2	7
Question 23. Is there a freezer?								
Yes	23	18	26	24	8	61	9	31
No	107	82	81	76	5	39	20	69

(6) Laundry

TABLE 18.

Question 24. Type of laundry facility.	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Automatic washer	15	11	19	18	1	6	7	24
Semi-automatic	69	51	61	57	8	50	10	34
Tub and board	19	14	18	17	6	38	6	21
None	33	24	8	8	1	6	6	21

TABLE 18. (continued)

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Question 25. Is facility checked above - ?								
Private	91	91	80	88	13	93	21	81
Shared	9	9	11	12	1	7	5	19
Question 26. Do you use a private, shared or no dryer?								
Private	2	2	5	17	-		2	10
Shared	-		1	3	1	13	-	
None	96	98	24	80	7	87	18	90

(7) Living Room Furnishings

TABLE 19.

Question 28. Floor covering								
	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Carpeting	24	18	29	27	4	40	1	4
Rugs	25	19	33	30	2	20	10	42
Linoleum	85	63	41	38	2	20	13	54
Bare floor	1	-	6	5	2	20	-	
Question 29. Window covering								
Drapes	34	27	43	41	-		14	50
Curtains	68	54	34	32	9	90	11	39
Blinds	13	10	12	12	-		1	4
Shades	10	8	16	15	1	10	2	7
Question 30. Estimate of Furniture								
Inadequate	20	16	16	16	1	7	4	15
Adequate but worn	62	50	35	34	5	36	10	39
Adequate and new or in good repair	33	27	40	39	7	50	11	42
Comfortable or luxurious	8	7	11	11	1	7	1	4

E. Recreation

Recreation is a useful measure, not only of available leisure and of the varieties of resources one can employ, but of socio-economic status as well. Generally, participation in voluntary organizations and recreational resources are positively correlated with income and education. This study employed a rather crude method of developing some index of recreation through the simple unit quantification and summing of activities and facilities which might be considered recreational.

TABLE 20.

Question 27. Which of the following do you own or employ? radio, phonograph, television, piano, other musical instrument, telephone, game equipment (ping-pong, billiards, scrabble, etc.), library, hobbies (list), automobile (make and year).

No. Possessed	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
1	25	7	-	4
2	21	11	1	5
3	26	20	2	6
4	28	27	9	4
5	23	21	2	7
6	5	18	3	1
7	-	2	-	-
8	1	-	-	-
9	-	1	-	-
Median	2.7	3.6	3.6	2.8

As can be seen from Question 27, we sought information not only as to the presence of an automobile but as to its make and year as well. There exists as part of the stereotype of minority characteristics (also applied to the inhabitants of slums in general) that

they are improvident, childlike, etc. and given to conspicuous luxury purchases. It was felt that we might find some evidence as to the validity of this belief. Our findings are as follows.

TABLE 21. DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION ON AUTOMOBILES ELICITED BY QUESTION 27

Price Range	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Low Priced Cars[1]	10	30	16	37	3	60	3	33
Medium Priced Cars	20	60	20	46	2	40	6	66
High Priced Cars	3	10	7	17	0		0	
Median Age of Above Automobiles								
Price Range								
Low Priced Cars	1950-51		1950		1950		1954	
Medium Priced Cars	1951		1951		1949		1950	
High Priced Cars	1950		1951		-		-	

We learn from the above that there is a marked similarity in the distribution of makes of cars (classified by price range) and the age of these cars from zone to zone. The exceptions are the greater concentration on low priced cars in zone 3 and the greater recency of low priced models in zone 4. Neither the age nor the number of cars

---

[1] The following is a simplified classification adapted from Consumer Reports (Annual Automobile Issue), May, 1955, p. 221.
Low Priced Cars: Chevrolet 6 and 8, Dodge 6, Ford 6 and 8, Plymouth 6 and 8, Rambler, Studebacker 6 and 8, Willys.
Medium Priced Cars: Buick, DeSoto, Hudson, Mercury, Nash, Oldsmobile, Pontiac, Chrysler.
High Priced Cars: Cadillac, Chrysler New Yorker, Imperial, Lincoln, Packard.

represented by these data lend much credance to the popular image of the racial slum as swarming with spanking new, pastel-tinted cadillac convertibles.[2]

One final datum to conclude this discussion of recreation. The 1950 census, in its 20% housing sample, inquired about television with the following results.

TABLE 22. CENSUS FINDINGS CONCERNING DISTRIBUTION OF TELEVISION SETS

Condition	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Number Reporting	183,210	3,650	2,970	2,740	3,770
With Television	43,765 24%	505 14%	610 21%	500 18%	785 21%

In every one of our zones, the ownership of television sets is at a rate below that for the city as a whole. This finding, along with the prior one on automobiles does belie the stereotype which would lead one to expect large numbers of these possessions in the slums.

---

[2] According to the 35th Edition (1955) of Automobile Facts and Figures, published by the Automobile Manufacturers Association, there are 3.3 persons per passenger car registered in the U.S. Since this includes commercial, government, and multiple-car families, this works out to 71% of families owning cars rather than 1 per family as the figure 3.3 seems to indicate.

Zone 1 with 138 respondents reported 33 cars, zone 2 with 108 reported 43, 16 respondents in zone 3 totalled 5 cars, and 29 in zone 4 possessed in all 9 cars. Even on a per person basis this just equals the 1 car for 3.3 persons national average and when we further consider that these respondents represent larger units it seems certain that car ownership for Negroes is considerably below the national rate.

There are many interesting and plausible explanations and rationalizations which would enable one to account for a certain amount of luxury spending by slum dwellers or the residents of segregated areas. These point out that the very incongruity of the new and the shiny amidst the bleakness of these dilapidated structures makes them stand out in a fashion which perhaps exaggerates them in human perception. Or that new cars (a) are purchased on time, or (b) are jointly purchased by several spending units pooling their resources, or (c) belong to wealthier individuals who purchase cars with the money they are not permitted to spend for new housing elsewhere, or (d) are a compensation mechanism for realizing status in a social milieu where many other avenues of status are shut off, or (e) just seem to be present in large numbers because of the population density of the dwellings in these areas, i.e. cars are crowded in the streets because their owners are even more crowded in the dwellings flanking that street, etc. While eminently reasonable, perhaps recourse to such explanations should not be made until it has been established by the facts that an explanation is needed.

F. Some Attitudes and Experiences re Housing

TABLE 23.

Question 38. Have you tried to live elsewhere in the city unsuccessfully? that is, have you tried to own or rent and been turned down because of discrimination?

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Yes	14	11	8	10	2	13	5	19
No	110	89	75	90	14	87	22	81

TABLE 23. (continued)

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Question 39. Are you satisfied with this present home?								
Yes	92	68	88	67	4	27	19	68
No	43	32	43	33	11	73	9	32
Where would you prefer to live if you could move?								
Don't know	33	36	22	29	4	33	7	37
Another part of city	54	59	48	62	7	58	9	47
Suburbs	4	5	7	9	1	9	3	16
Question 40. Have you ever considered building your own home rather than renting or buying?								
Yes	32	25	43	41	6	40	7	24
No	95	75	61	59	9	60	22	76
Question 41. If answer (to question 40) is Yes and you did not build, why?								
Financial	24		29		3		5	
Discrimination	-		2		-		-	

The data above and those which follow on neighboring are advanced more tentatively than any other in the study. Inquiry concerning attitudes is a useful and legitimate function of social science but requires greater methodological nicety by way of wording, interviewer training, response and nonresponse bias, verification and validation et al. than this study could marshall. However, our findings are presented as interesting and perhaps suggestive. The implication of the responses found above seems to be a slight tendency for the desire to live elsewhere in the city to be associated with the fact of living beyond zone 1, i.e. the farther from

the core of the segregated area, the greater the desire to leave it. Of those who have considered building their own home and been unable to, financial reasons rather than discrimination were almost exclusively given. This might reflect the fact that many of these persons were not in any financial condition to have actually attempted home building and so had not yet been confronted with discrimination.

TABLE 24.

Question 42. Do you have much contact with the neighbors?	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Yes	61	48	43	41	8	50	9	31
No	67	52	63	59	8	50	20	69
Question 43. How do you get along with them (sic. neighbors)?								
Very well	64	62	69	77	6	38	13	59
All right	39	38	17	19	9	56	6	27
Not well	-		3	4	1	6	3	14
Question 44. Are you friendly with other than your Negro neighbors?								
Yes	82	75	85	91	14	93	25	96
No	28	25	8	9	1	7	1	4

The answers to these loosely formulated questions on neighboring seem to indicate that contact with neighbors tends to decrease, moving outward from zone 1 but that friendliness with white neighbors tends to increase. The mathematical possibilities of having white neighbors of course increases along this gradient and whether the tendency toward friendly contacts increases accordingly or was simply verballized concommitantly is a question we cannot answer.

G. Age: Length of Occupancy: Provenience

TABLE 25.

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Question 45. What is the age of the head of the family?				
Under 21	0	0	6	-
21-29	20	24	6	7
30-39	44	31	-	7
40-49	24	21	2	11
Over 50	39	26	2	3
Median age -	39	39	24	39
Question 35a. How long have you lived in this building?				
Less than a year	39	30	8	9
1-4 years	42	39	7	12
5-9 years	27	28	1	7
Over 10 years	23	10	-	-
Median number of years	3+	2+	1	2+
How long have you lived in Milwaukee?				
Less than a year	6	5	-	-
1-4 years	21	20	1	6
5-9	42	28	6	11
Over 10 years	62	54	9	12
Median	9	9	10+	7+

Question 36. Where did you live just previous to coming to Milwaukee?								
South Atlantic States	19	14	10	10	-		1	3
East South Central States	49	36	30	29	7	50	10	34
West South Central States	24	18	25	24	-		8	28
East North Central States	32	23	25	24	6	43	8	28
Middle Atlantic States	2	1	1	1	1	7	-	
West North Central States	9	7	13	12	-		2	7
Pacific Coast	2	1	1	1	-		-	

TABLE 25. (continued)

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Question 37. Where were you born?								
South Atlantic States	25	18	9	9	-		2	7
East South Central States	63	46	45	42	8	57	12	41
West South Central States	31	22	27	25	1	7	7	24
East North Central States	16	12	16	15	5	36	5	17
Middle Atlantic States	1	-	2	2	-		-	
West North Central States	2	2	7	7	-		3	10
Pacific Coast	-		-		-		-	

Once again, when comparing the subjects in the four zones we fail to find any consistent trend and are impressed by the frequent similarities which occur.

H. Socio-Economic Status

As our baseline, it is again possible to make use of census findings on a number of phenomena which are usually considered indicia of socio-economic status.

TABLE 26. CENSUS DATA - MEASURES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Median years of school completed:					
Entire Tract	9.1	8.1	8.7	8.7	9.1
Negroes only	-	8.1	8.7	8.3	-
Median Income:					
Entire Tract	3,340	2,192	2,766	2,553	3,118
Negroes only	-	2,185	2,569	2,249*	2,749*

TABLE 26. CENSUS DATA - MEASURES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
(continued)

	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Median Rent:					
Entire Tract	43.49	34.06	35.49	36.72	39.95
Negroes only	37.53	34.31	38.40	38.80*	41.33*
Median Value of one-dwelling-unit structures:					
Entire Tract	$11,086	$6,066*	$6,709	$7,779	$6,510* (8,201 omitting Tract 22)
Negroes only	6,014**	5,945*	6,083*	-	-

These data show the expected gradient between zones in education, income, rent, and median value of dwellings. We continue to find that these zones are substandard compared to the norms or averages which prevail for the city generally. And interestingly, although the median rent paid by Negroes in the city is lower than that paid by whites, nevertheless the evidence points to the fact that in comparable areas, Negroes are paying higher rents than whites for what we may assume are similar or inferior accommodations.

---

* Where the census did not compute the median because of fewer than 100 cases, we computed it from the figures which are presented in the census.

** Estimate, based upon unofficial computations explained above.

TABLE 27.

Question 46. What is the highest grade of school completed by head of family?

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Under 8 grades	32	28	22	27	4	25	6	25
8 grades	31	27	15	18	3	19	8	33
9-12 grades	48	41	33	40	6	38	7	29
College	5	4	13	15	3	19	3	13
Question 47. Occupation?								
Professional and Semi-professional	4	4	6	6	-		2	8
Entrepreneurial Managerial	3	3	7	7	2	14	-	
Clerical - Sales	2	2	4	4	1	7	1	4
Agriculture	-		-		1	7	-	
Skilled	17	16	19	19	4	29	3	13
Semi-Skilled	32	30	33	34	2	14	10	42
Unskilled	33	31	17	17	3	21	5	21
Service	16	15	12	12	1	7	3	13
Question 48. Income?								
Under $500	0		1		1		-	
500-999	4		3		-		-	
1000-1499	3		4		1		-	
1500-1999	2		1		1		-	
2000-2499	16		-		-		6	
2500-2999	9		4		-		2	
3000-3499	21		7		3		3	
3500-3999	17		22		2		7	
4000-4499	13		13		4		3	
4500-4999	8		10		-		1	
Over 5000	10		17		4		3	
Median	$3,417		$3,977		$3,999		$3,606	

TABLE 27. (continued)

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Question 32. If you rent or pay mortgage what is your monthly payment?				
Under $25,	2	1	-	3
25-34	7	2	-	-
35-44	12	5	-	-
45-54	24	6	-	3
55-64	17	15	1	4
65-74	18	25	6	5
75-84	10	13	5	6
Over 85	14	17	3	3
Median	$58	$69	$75	$71

We are confronted once more with findings in our own survey which give a picture contrary to that derived from the census data. Whereas the census figures show consistent and continuous change toward improvement (socio-economically speaking) as distance increases from the center of the city, our inspection of the Negro residents of these tracts and zones does not yield such clear trends. The data above on education, income, and rent show only a slightly higher tendency toward higher status for zones 2 and 3 as compared to zones 1 and 4; this is different from the usual gradient relationship which obtains between white occupied residential areas.

I. Tenure and Home Ownership

In 1950, the census found the rates of home owning and renting for whites and nonwhites to be as follows:

TABLE 28. CENSUS RATES OF HOME RENTING AND OWNING BY WHITES AND NONWHITES

Condition	Milwaukee	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
All Dwelling Units	188,926	3,763	3,071	2,868	3,809
Owner Occupied	79,945 42	557 15	875 29	835 29	1,134 30
Nonwhite Owners	1,195 1.5	393 71	436 50	125 5	103 9
Renter Occupied	105,789 56	3,150 84	2,153 70	1,988 69	2,632 69
Nonwhite Renters	3,550 3.4	2,249 71	677 32	252 13	117 5

These four zones show a rate of home ownership lower than that for the city and a rate of renting higher than the city average. Both of these rates show change from zone to zone, with the former increasing and the latter decreasing as one moves out from zone 1 to zone 4. The change is from lesser standards toward a closer approximation of the citywide norm. Read horizontally, the two rows on nonwhite tenure show a progressive diminution from zones 1 to 4 which simply reflects the decreasing numbers of nonwhites in census tracts the further one moves from the tracts of densest concentration. If we refer back to Table 4, we can recall that Negroes comprised 76%, 45%, 18%, and 9% of Tracts 1 through 4 and they also compose close to these figures of the owner and renters of their respective tracts, even exceeding the anticipated ownership figure in zone 2. Only in zone 3 does the ownership rate slump far below the actual proportion of Negroes present.

TABLE 29.

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Question 31. Do you own, rent or sublet?								
Own	41	32	49	46	2	13	8	28
Rent	88	68	58	54	14	87	21	72
Sublet	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Question 34. What is the race of the person from whom you rent or from whom you purchased this building?								
Negro	46	40	39	41	4	25	10	39
White	68	60	56	59	12	75	16	61

TABLE 30.

Question 53. If you own the home what was the purchase price?	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4
Under $2,499	2	1	-	3
2,500-4,999	10	5	-	1
5,000-7,499	6	15	-	3
7,500-9,999	8	9	-	-
10,000-12,499	7	5	1	-
12,500-14,999	1	3	-	2
Over 15,000	2	2	1	-
Median Value	$7,499	$7,333	$13,750	$6,666

Question 53. Have you ever owned a home before this present one?								
Yes	10	24	12	27	-		4	50
No	32	76	32	73	2	100	4	50

TABLE 30. (continued)

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3		Zone 4	
Question 56. How many mortgages are there?								
0	6	21	3	6	-		-	
1	21	72	24	49	1	100	3	50
2	2	7	22	45	-		3	50
Question 57. Who holds these mortgages?								
Bank	3	19	7	21	1	100	1	16
Bldg. & Loan Assoc.	5	31	19	58	-		4	67
Individuals	3	19	5	15	-		1	16
Real Estate Co.	5	31	2		-		-	
Question 58. How many of these creditors are Negro and how many are white?								
Negro	2	11	2	8	-		1	20
White	16	89	22	92	1	100	4	80
Question 59. Did you buy this house from the owner or his agent, or from a real estate broker or company?								
Owner	5	14	18	34	-		4	50
Real Estate Company	32	86	35	66	2	100	4	50

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The reader who has worked his way carefully through the body of this report may have remarked that much has been left unsaid. It is true that certain material was organized and presented without any attempt at analysis. This is not to deny the intrinsic interest or possible relevance of these data. However, in this present context it was thought best not to attempt too much: if we have sketched a general map of the social terrain it will be sufficient, and others with more particular interests can perform the requisite intensive reworking and exhaustive analysis of those features which most concern them.

The simple descriptive statistics which are the heart of this study have conveyed two impressions which were pointed out time and again. These impressions - as profound as they are unoriginal - help sum up a complex and dynamic situation. The first is that census tracts, singly or organized into zones, evidence the ecological distribution of social phenomena. This has become a sociological commonplace. Such ecological distributions are measured and typified by the gradient, i.e., a line drawn outward from the center of the city would show along its length a progressive increase in the measures of socio-economic status and a concommitant progressive decline in the incidence of rates of social disorganization. The second impression, derived from the evidence collected by our own project, is that the similarities in the socio-economic composition of the Negro population, regardless of location within the four zones studied, is more impressive than any differences found between them.

In short, white persons within the city have distributed themselves residentially in a manner expressed by the gradients while no such patterning is clearly discernible among the Negroes studied.

What I am trying to convey is that the Negro population is residentially homogenized.[1] The free choice of residence in the open housing market which ecologically stratifies most of our population in terms of income, education, and occupation, is not operative in the case of Negroes. All those restricted within the arbitrary confines of the racial ghetto must find shelter as best they can within its circumscribed bounds. The Negro middle and upper classes, regardless of their education, skills, professional accomplishments - if their skin is dark - must reside in the slum. The fact that they dislike the disorganizing and predatory features of the slum as greatly as do their white social status counterparts avails them naught.

A democratic society is not "classless;" it is stratified as is any other form of human social organization. Democracy does, however, maximize the individual's opportunity to develop and realize whatever potential he may possess, hence to occupy the social stratum of which he is most deserving. The free enterprise market, in its

---

[1] Many of the student interviewers volunteered as one of their impressions the marked contrasts between the homes they visited. On the same block, sometimes next door to each other, would be comfortable, decorous homes on the one hand and quite mean and impoverished ones on the other.

Students were nearly unanimous in feeling that the interviewing contact and home visits with Negroes were highly satisfactory educationally and beneficial democratically. If this was not so patently true, it would be almost pathetic that so little contact should bulk so large as "interracial" experience.

ideal operation, supports the democratic society in that it is rational in its calculations, i.e. the market functions in terms of supply and demand rather than in terms of the personality, name, traditional status, etc. of the participants in the economy. Such an economic system is a democratizing influence not only because it enables individuals to profit solely on the basis of ability but it also permits them to enjoy their success subject only to their ability to pay. Theoretically, all can participate in the competitive process and all can enjoy its fruits without reference to such irrelevant considerations as sex, race, religion, and national origin. This is not only theory - it is a right guaranteed by the Constitution.

Although Negroes increasingly are enjoying greater opportunities to participate freely in the economy, our data suggests they are not receiving similar opportunities to participate in the "social" aspects of society. There is a lag between the rights to produce which have been won and the rights to consume (as equals) which are still denied. Although there are undoubtedly some Negroes, among the small number living outside the 29 census tracts in the oldest part of the city which comprised our four zones, who have been able to secure housing and community commensurate with their social status and standard of values, they are an almost negligible percentage. At the present time, most Negroes must locate within the portions of the city already opened and available to "nonwhites." This means that the movement of Negroes and other racial minorities into an area coincides with the withdrawal of white persons out of it. These areas invariably are the oldest and most deteriorated parts of the city, and although some homes may be purchased and

maintained by wealthier individuals moving in, other structures will be subdivided and rented to the less well-to-do by entrepreneurs who specialize in that sort of operation. It becomes exceedingly difficult under these circumstances for a community to develop a consistent character which may be identified with some particular social status, e.g. middle-class. The Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference made an important contribution to our understanding of these housing dynamics by its demonstration of community maintenance through the enforcement of housing standards rather than racial barriers.

The homogeneity of social composition of the Negro population in the four zones - and the inferior condition of housing in those zones - indicates that the old and unfortunate process of gradual expansion along with lack of status differentiation of "nonwhite sections" of the city is continuing. The crowning irony is to be found in the intellectual baggage of the prejudiced individual who insists that Negroes be kept segregated, i.e. he denies Negroes the possibility to differentiate themselves through free selective settlement, and then insists that the homogenized slum which results is because "they're all alike." This is the self-confirming prophecy with a vengeance.

A P P E N D I X E S

Affiliated with
NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE
1133 Broadway
New York City

Milwaukee Urban League

FOR EQUAL ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Telephone: COncord 4-1970
WILLIAM V. KELLEY
Executive Secretary

March 3, 1955

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OFFICERS
Mrs. Perry Anderson
President
Roy Wilson
First Vice-President
Mrs. Wallace Lomoe
Second Vice-President
Mrs. James Dorsey
Secretary
Dr. L. L. Allen
Treasurer

MEMBERS
Albert Houghton
Hollis B. Kinner, Sr.
Mrs. Wallace Lomoe
Mrs. Fred Madison
Willett S. Main
Rev. W. J. G. McLin
Clifford F. Messinger, Jr.
Mrs. Joseph Pryor
Rev. Emsworth Reisner
Theodore Rosenak
Robert Sparms
Maurice H. Terry
John J. Williams
Webster Woodmansee

HONORARY MEMBER
Miss Mable Rainey

Dear Citizen of Milwaukee:

This letter will serve to introduce _____, a student at _____ who is participating in a study of housing and housing conditions in the near northside community of Milwaukee.

The housing study is under the sponsorship of the Intercollegiate Council on Intergroup Relations, and is being undertaken at the request of the Milwaukee Urban League. The Intercollegiate Council has four membership schools: Wisconsin State College, Alverno College, Marquette University and the Milwaukee School of Engineering. In addition, the Council has cooperating members representing three local intergroup relations agencies: Milwaukee Urban League, National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Milwaukee Commission on Human Rights.

Approximately 400 other homesites are being visited in an effort to obtain significant housing data. It is hoped to collect sufficient information to make statistical comparisons between housing occupied by white and Negro families, relative to percentage of home ownership, kind and type of facilities available, cost, number of residents, etc.

It is not necessary for you to give the interviewer your name, and you may rest assured that any information received will be considered entirely confidential.

We thank you greatly for your cooperation. Should you desire, we will be glad to furnish you a summary of the results of this research.

Sincerely yours,

INTERCOLLEGIATE COUNCIL
OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Fred Kaufman/w

Fred Kaufman
President

MILWAUKEE URBAN LEAGUE

William V. Kelley
Executive Secretary

RED FEATHER SERVICE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERVIEWERS

You are acting in a professional capacity as representatives of your respective schools and of the city of Milwaukee. Please dress and act accordingly. Remember to be courteous and mature at all times.

Read the interview form over carefully in advance so that you may ask the person supervising your interviews for information to clear up any difficulty of interpretation that may arise.

The addresses on the sampling list were drawn randomly and will not always correctly indicate Negro occupancy. Since this is a study of Negro occupied dwellings in Milwaukee, do not interview where the occupying family is white or part-white (mixed marriage). Inquire of them where the closest Negro occupied dwellings is located and proceed to it as the interview best corresponding to the original sample address.

Where the interview stimulates conversation and extended discussion from the respondents, the interviewer should record as much of this as he can recall as soon after the close of each interview as possible. Do this either on the back of the questionnaire or on a separate sheet of paper which should be attached to the correct interview.

After completing the interview and leaving the premises, record on the top of the interview the address of the home studied.

MILWAUKEE INTERCOLLEGIATE COUNCIL
QUESTIONNAIRE ON HOUSING

A. STRUCTURE

1. (a) single family, (b) single family subdivided, (c) duplex, (d) duplex subdivided, (e) apartment house, (f) rooming house.

   (Note or inquire about the possibility of there being more than one structure on this lot, usually this will take the form of one house built right behind another and identified by the same numeral address with an a, b, or c tacked on to it. If there is such a building, select it as your next stop for interviewing.)

2. (a) brick, (b) frame, (c) composition, (d) other _____

3. Rooms (indicate the number of each found in the structure) (a) bedrooms _____, (b) living rooms ___, (c) bathrooms ___ (d) kitchens ___, (e) closets ___, (f) others, such as basement, attic or porch rooms _____.

4. Who is supposed to be financially responsible for maintenance and repairs, (a) owner, (b) tenant.

5. Who actually takes care of maintenance and repairs, (a) owner, (b) tenant.

6. Estimated time to get repairs made after a complaint _____ (day, week, month, etc.)

7. Who is responsible for decorating (paint, paper, etc.) _____ (a) owner, (b) tenant.

8. When was decorating last done in your living quarters _____ (in months, years, etc.)

B. FACILITIES

I. Plumbing

9. (a) private bath, (b) shared hall toilet, (c) outdoors, (d) other.

10. (a) hot-cold running water, (b) cold only, (c) no running water, (d) must fetch from shared tap.

11. (a) private bath-shower, (b) shared bath, (c) no bath.

II. Lighting

12. (a) electric lighting, (b) lamps, (c) candles, (d) other _____

13. How many outlets per room _____

14. How frequently are fuses blown _____

III. Heating

15. (a) central heating, (b) space heating, (c) spot heating, (d) other _____

16. Fuel: (a) oil, (b) gas, (c) coal, (d) electricity, (e) wood, (f) other _____.

17. Estimate of adequacy of heating: (a) occupant _____; (b) interviewer _____

IV. Cooking

18. (a) stove, (b) hot-plate, (c) facility shared with others, (d) no facility _____

19. Is the above stove (a) electric, (b) gas, (c) coal, (d) wood, (e) other _____.

20. Number of cooking burners available, counting a stove's oven as 1 (one) _____

V. Perishable Food Storage

21. (a) refrigerator, (b) ice-box, (c) window box, (d) none (e) other _____

22. Is facility checked above (a) private, or (b) shared.

23. Is there a freezer, (a) yes, (b) no.

VI. Laundry

24. (a) automatic washer, (b) semi-automatic, (c) tub and board, (d) none.

25. Is facility checked above (a) private, or (b) shared.

26. Do you use a dryer, (a) private, or (b) shared.

VII. Recreation

27. (a) radio, (b) phonograph, (c) TV, (d) piano, (e) other musical instrument _____, (f) telephone, (g) game equipment (ping-pong, billiards, scrabble, etc.) _____, (h) library, (i) hobbies (list) _____,(j) automobile (make and year) _____

VIII. Living Room Furnishings

28. (a) carpeting, (b) rugs, (c) linoleum, (d) bare floor, (e) other _____.

29. (a) drapes, (b) curtains, (c) blinds, (d) shades, (e) bare windows, (f) other _____.

30. estimate of furniture: (a) inadequate, (b) adequate but worn, (c) adequate and new or in good repair, (d) comfortable or luxurious.

C. OCCUPANCY - TENURE - SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

31. Do you (a) own, (b) rent, or (c) sublet.

32. If you rent or pay mortgage, what is your monthly payment $_____

33. What does this payment include (heat, light, linen, furnished, etc. _____

34. What is the race of the person from whom you rent or from whom you purchased this building, (a) Negro, (b) white.

35. How long have you lived in this building _____? in Milwaukee ____?

36. Where did you live just previous to coming to Milwaukee (city and state) _____

37. Where were you born (city and state)_____

38. Have you tried to live elsewhere in the city unsuccessfully? that is have you tried to own or rent and been turned down because of discrimination _____

39. Are you satisfied with this present home ____? Where would you prefer to live if you could move _____?

40. Have you ever considered building your own home rather than renting or buying? (a) Yes, (b) No.

41. If answer is Yes and you did not build, why? _____

42. Do you have much contact with the neighbors, (a) Yes, (b) No ____

43. How do you get along with them? _____

44. Are you friendly with other than your Negro neighbors? _____

45. What is the age of the head of the family? _____

46. What is the highest grade of school completed of head of family _____?

47. Occupation _____

48. Income _____

49. How many persons live in this unit _____

50. How many families live in this structure _____

51. How many individuals, including roomers and boarders, etc. live in this building _____

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS APPLY ONLY TO HOME OWNERS:

52. If you own the home, what was the purchase price _____

53. Have you ever owned a home before this present one, (a) Yes, (b) No.

54. Have you now a relation with the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) _____

55. Have you had experiences with the FHA? what sort _____

56. How many mortgages are there _____

57. Who holds these mortgages (banks, insurance co., individuals, etc.) _____

58. How many of these creditors are Negroes and how many white? _____

59. Did you buy this house from (a) the owner or his agent, or (b) from a real estate broker or company? _____

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Charles. Forbidden Neighbors: A Study of Prejudice in Housing. N.Y.: Harpers, 1955.

Citizens' Governmental Research Bureau. Milwaukee's Negro Community. Milwaukee: 125 E. Wells St., (multigraphed), 1946.

Marquette University College of Business Administration. Census Tract Street Index for Milwaukee County. Marquette Studies in Business and Economics, Series II, No. 1, 1950.

U.S. Census of Housing. Block Statistics, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1950.

U.S. Census of Population. Census Tract Statistics, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and adjacent area. Selected Population and Housing Characteristics, 1950.