While the buildings housed more people than before, it was much healthier. But the dwellings were inhabited by the better-class workmen and artisans. The slum people had simply drifted on to crowd other slums or to form new slums.¹

Rowntree’s study of town life in York

The previous chapter closed with an overview of Charles Booth’s impact on legislation regarding poverty and housing in the years following his inquiry. Although his study had been widely acclaimed, it had its critics. The Liberal Party politician, Charles Masterman, was one of these. He had spent time himself living in the London slums, and wrote an impressionistic account of his time there in articles published collectively as From the Abyss. Rosemary O’Day quotes his sniffy description of Booth’s ‘maps of picturesque bewilderment of colour, infinite detail of streets and houses and family lives. And at the end of it all the general impression left was of something monstrous, grotesque, inane, something beyond the power of individual synthesis: a chaos resisting all attempts to reduce it to orderly law.’ Masterman also compared Booth’s work unfavourably with Benjamin Seebohm Rowntree’s York study, which Masterman found to be better connected and ‘more helpful’.²

Putting aside how reasonable it is to diminish the importance of Booth’s maps, let alone the majesty and scope of his published study, the longer view of history normally brackets Booth and Rowntree together, given their collective influence on changing attitudes towards poverty as well as their impact on new legislation in this area.
Rowntree’s York enquiry was conducted with a team of assistants during 1899–1900 and then published in 1901 under the title *Poverty, a Study of Town Life*. His study was inspired by Booth, but whereas Booth’s work was extensive and used multiple sources, Rowntree chose to conduct an intensive study of a single town, much smaller than Booth’s London.\(^3\)

Despite the differences in scope, the York study found very similar results to those of Booth: large families crammed into small rooms without sanitation or ventilation, and disease rife in poverty areas. Rowntree’s team found that a quarter of all the children living in York’s slums died before the age of one and that, overall, the poverty rate of the town was at least as bad as that found by Booth in London. Even if a child survived poverty in childhood, they were likely to remain poor, whether due to the casualisation of labour or to sickness or injury from work. If one survived working life, old age was likely again to return a person to poverty; just as Booth had found, old age was closely correlated with poverty. Unsurprisingly, both Booth and Rowntree became campaigners for old age pensions.

Rowntree’s report is full of tables of statistics regarding factors such as household income and the cost of the diet and cooking fuel required to feed a manual labourer (he contrasts manual labourers with ‘brain workers’). By aiming to determine the nature of living in poverty, Rowntree was in effect investigating whether it was due to ‘wasteful expenditure’, or ‘insufficient means’. Rowntree’s report did much to reiterate Booth’s findings that poverty was not, as was typically thought, a matter of fault; critically, his determination of a poverty line based on income was set at the point at which income was only enough for the ‘maintenance of merely physical efficiency’, as opposed to access to enough to allow for ‘expenditure necessary for the development of the mental, moral and social sides of nature’.\(^4\) Rowntree showed that poverty distress was caused principally by low wages or irregular work. Nevertheless, his report’s map of licensed houses (which he refers to in the text as the ‘drink map’, see Figure 4.1) emphasised the problematic relationship between drink and poverty, which we will see more of in Chapter 6, where a lack of sobriety was commonly associated with crime as well as poverty. Here, the association is more nuanced. While Rowntree was critical about the poorest of the poor wasting their money on drink, he was also aware that consumption of alcohol in York was no greater than elsewhere in the country.\(^5\)

Rowntree strove to emphasise how precariously the poor sat on a finely balanced point between just getting by and destitution. His compassion
Figure 4.1  Map of York Showing the Position of the Licensed Houses, 1901. The map is shaded in four colours denoting the principal classes from lilac ‘The poorest districts’ to green ‘Districts inhabited by the servant-keeping class’.

Inset showing space syntax map of city-wide accessibility in York. Benjamin Seebohm Rowntree, 1901. Image of map of York courtesy Chris Mullen; space syntax map by Kayvan Karimi.
shines through his descriptions, for example, of what ‘merely physical efficiency’ constitutes in reality:

And let us clearly understand what “merely physical efficiency” means. A family living upon the scale allowed for in this estimate must never spend a penny on railway fare or omnibus. They must never go into the country unless they walk. They must never purchase a halfpenny newspaper or spend a penny to buy a ticket for a popular concert. They must write no letters to absent children, for they cannot afford to pay the postage. They must never contribute anything to their church or chapel, or give any help to a neighbour which costs them money. They cannot save, nor can they join sick club or Trade Union, because they cannot pay the necessary subscriptions. The children must have no pocket money for dolls, marbles, or sweets. The father must smoke no tobacco, and must drink no beer. The mother must never buy any pretty clothes for herself or for her children, the character of the family wardrobe as for the family diet being governed by the regulation, “Nothing must be bought but that which is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of physical health, and what is bought must be of the plainest and most economical description.” Should a child fall ill, it must be attended by the parish doctor; should it die, it must be buried by the parish. Finally, the wage-earner must never be absent from his work for a single day.6

Rowntree’s comments on the drink map are incisive. He notes that the highest concentration of pubs is in the oldest section of the town, within and around the walls. This may, he surmised, be due to the town having served as a coaching centre, but the historical explanation did not solve in his mind the problem of there being an excess of drinking establishments in the poorest area of the centre. In fact, he devotes considerable space to analysis of the number of drinking establishments per population in his ‘public houses’ section of the book’s supplementary chapter. The character of many of the poverty area’s pubs, as being exclusively for drinking, are, he states, one of the causes of the prevalence of ‘vertical drinkers’, who are more likely to be heavy drinkers. The lower density of pubs outside of the centre, he argues, is mostly to do with the reluctance of magistrates to grant licenses to new establishments. Lastly, the change in the practice of organisations such as Trade Unions and Friendly Societies to meet in coffee houses instead of pubs (meaning a reduction in the use of pubs as community meeting places, which was a common feature earlier in the
nineteenth century) had led to a narrowing of activities within the public house, although music and games, he reported, remained commonplace.

The spatial distribution of pubs in the poorer, central district is in fact a typical pattern in slum areas of the country at the time. Several factors would have been at play, such as the pub providing warm, dry premises when the home was anything but, and the pub serving as a place for socialising outside of the home. It is evidently not a coincidence that pubs proliferated more on poor streets, while York’s ‘best’ central streets, Monkgate, Clifton and Bootham, had hardly any.

Interestingly, space syntax analysis of York by Kayvan Karimi confirms the historical descriptions of these latter streets as being inhabited by the city’s prosperous classes (which in the nineteenth century would typically have lived on the main avenues of towns and cities). Karimi’s study investigated the character of six naturally evolved historic cities – York, Bristol, Norwich, Canterbury, Hereford and Winchester – in the few decades before Rowntree’s study. It found there to be a spatial structure common to all the cases examined; all had a compact network of streets at the centre, forming a core of connected streets which were the meeting point of linear routes from the outside of the town (see Figure 4.1 inset, which colours city-wide accessibility from red to blue, integrated to segregated). This core, marked in the white circle in the illustration, was always highly integrated spatially (namely, most accessible from everywhere to everywhere else and more likely to be busy with pedestrian and vehicular activity). The central cores of the six towns contained the most important urban functions, such as the market or the cathedral.

Karimi also found that the main roads into the town were highly accessible to principal routes within the city. The main roads into town were also the ones with the fewest pubs on Rowntree’s map. Looking at their spatial structure, they only turned into local streets – typically lined with shops and other businesses – as they narrowed down at the town’s heart; transforming themselves from routes into the town to routes within the town. The Clifton/Bootham alignment, for example, continued straight into High Petergate and, with a small kink that would have slowed traffic down, into Low Petergate, at which point the higher density of pubs was scattered amongst a much tighter mesh of shorter streets constituting the ‘live centre’ of the town, its commercial heartland (see Figure 4.2). In contrast, Walmgate, running into York from the south-east, had a much lower space syntax integration value and, unlike the other main arteries, it had a large number of pubs on its last stretch into town.
This analysis tells us something interesting about how the nineteenth century city was formed: to shape and to be shaped by the pattern of social and economic activities within it. Clearly, the two were intertwined. The working class urban street in this period was much more active than in the past, resulting in the street becoming a place for informal collective life. As Brian Harrison has stated in his classic chapter on Victorian pubs,

all but the busiest streets at that time united rather than divided the community: in working-class areas the emphasis is not so much on the individual home, prized as this is, as on the informal collective life outside it in the extended family, the street, the pub and the open-air market . . . the pavements were alive with pedestrians many of whom felt obliged to subscribe to drinking customs on the way. Many people earned their living on the pavement – the beggars, stallholders, acrobats, organ-grinders, pedlars.  

Harrison explains how the pub had a special role to play in the public sphere, in that it offered a place whose interior was masked by its frosted glass, a refuge from the street. It is no wonder that the temperance reformers, battling against the nineteenth-century drink culture
struggled to compete with this enticing prospect, as we will see in Chapter 5.

Rowntree’s team made close observations of activities in and around York’s pubs. In one, he notes how the publican provides entertainment in a typically ‘brilliantly lit, and often gaudily’ decorated room, kept ‘temptingly warm’ in winter:

> At intervals one of the company is called on for a song, and if there is a chorus, everyone who can will join in it. Many of the songs are characterised by maudlin sentimentality; others again are unrestrainedly vulgar. Throughout the whole assembly there is an air of jollity and an absence of irksome restraint which must prove very attractive after a day’s confinement in factory or shop.

Yet Rowntree’s report shows him to have been well aware of the harm of excess drink, not only to the working man’s pocket and his family’s bellies. The way in which young children were exposed to the seedier aspects of life by being sent to fetch jugs of beer, let alone the use of pubs for prostitution, were also part of his first-hand accounts of life in York.¹⁰

Rowntree’s report was celebrated as one of the most important empirical social studies of its time. By confirming Booth’s findings as being true just as much for a small town as for a large city, he helped steer national legislation towards improving the lot of the poor. His definition of a poverty line, along with statistically founded calculations of the cost of basic nutrition needs, were taken up by the burgeoning Liberal Party, ultimately leading to legislation (picking up where Booth left off) on old age pensions and national insurance.

**Hull-House and the wage map of Chicago, 1899**

Meanwhile in the United States, following a visit by the social reformer Jane Addams to Toynbee Hall in London, a settlement house called Hull-House was founded in Chicago in 1889 by Addams and her colleagues, including Ellen Gates Starr. The house was located on the western edge of a densely settled multi-ethnic immigrant neighbourhood, at the intersection of Halstead and Polk Streets (immediately to the west of the map in Figure 4.3). It aimed to provide a variety of social services, education and guidance, to local families.¹¹ Its philanthropic activities also comprised research, including a nearly unique study into the daily lives and living patterns of Hull-House’s neighbours.
Figure 4.3 Hull-House wages maps 1–4, 1895.
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This was a period during which Chicago had grown at speed, with a much more dispersed pattern than we saw in New York in Chapter 2. There was little purpose-built housing, partly because it was expected that it would be wasteful to construct housing when factories and railroad terminals would soon take their place. Instead of Jacob Riis’ New York setting of six- or seven-storey walk-up apartment blocks, the typical housing form in Chicago’s poorest districts was made up of shoddily built dwellings, creating highly unsanitary housing that became increasingly overcrowded with the mass influx of immigrants into the city from the 1880s onwards. Districts such as the one studied here would typically have subdivided dwellings as well as stand-alone ‘rear houses’ constructed cheaply on the back of lots, accessible only through narrow passageways, forming totally inadequate, poorly lit and ventilated housing:

Although poor buildings bring in such high rents that there is no business profit in destroying them to build new ones, the character of many of the houses is such that they literally rot away and fall apart while occupied. New brick tenement houses constantly going up replace wooden ramshackle ones fallen into an uninhabitable state. The long, low house on the northeast corner of Taylor and Jefferson cannot last long. No. 305 Ewing is in a desperate condition, and No. 958 Polk is disintegrating day by day and has been abandoned. . .

Where temporary shanties of one or two stories are replaced by substantial blocks of three or four, the gain in solidity is too often accompanied by a loss in air and light which makes the very permanence of the houses an evil. The advantages of indifferent plumbing over none at all, and of the temporary cleanliness of new buildings over old, seem doubtful compensation for the increased crowding, the more stifling atmosphere, and the denser darkness in the later tenements.¹²

Within a few years of its founding, the residents of the settlement collectively produced the Hull-House Maps and Papers, which comprised a set of essays alongside a spectacular pair of maps (each a series of four sheets; see Figures 4.3 to 4.5 in this chapter and Figures 5.6 and 5.7 in Chapter 5), one on wages and the other on nationalities, which constitute an important visual record of the district at the time.¹³ We will see more of the nationalities maps in the next chapter, but it is worth noting that they capture data in the same way as the wages maps, using the building lot as the unit of analysis, rather than the street or the street segment as in the case of Booth’s maps.
The study area covered Halsted Street on the west, State on the east, Polk on the north and Twelfth on the south, which is essentially the district running immediately east of the address of Hull-House itself. While the streets closest to Hull-House were ‘the poorest and probably the most crowded section of Chicago’, the study area also included ‘east of the river
a criminal district which ranks as one of the most openly and flagrantly vicious in the civilized world’.\textsuperscript{14}

The data for the maps were compiled by agents working for Florence Kelley in the spring of 1893, visiting every house, tenement, and room in the Nineteenth Ward, collecting data about tenement inhabitants by interviewing them personally. Kelley conducted the investigation on behalf of the federal government, a \textit{Special Investigation of the Slums of Great Cities}, living throughout its duration at Hull-House. Part of the reasoning behind the study was to capture an area in its transitional state, before it descended into the squalor seen in older cities in the US:

> In such a transitional stage as the present, there is surely great reason to suppose that Chicago will take warning from the experience of older cities whose crowded quarters have become a menace to the public health and security. The possibility of helping toward an improvement in the sanitation of the neighbourhood, and toward an introduction of some degree of comfort, has given purpose and confidence to this undertaking. It is also hoped that the setting forth of some of the conditions shown in the maps and papers may be of value, not only to the people of Chicago who desire correct and accurate information concerning the foreign and populous parts of the town, but to the constantly increasing body of sociological students more widely scattered.\textsuperscript{15}

The area of study was chosen as it was deemed to be the most representative of ‘slum . . . conditions of life’ in the city.\textsuperscript{16} The data were then transferred onto the maps, capturing in graphic form the physical dimension of the distribution of weekly wages as well as the range and distribution of ethnic groups. The legacy of Charles Booth is obvious in the use of colour coded maps, instead of relying on narrative reports or statistical tables, to provide an omniscient perspective of the perceived problem of the urban slum. This allowed for visual analysis of the socio-spatial dynamics of the city at the time. Notably, the Hull-House researchers followed his method in cross-checking the house-to-house survey with statements by workers in the various trades and occupations, although the eyes of the world do not centre upon this third of a square mile in the heart of Chicago as upon East London when looking for the very essence of misery, and although the ground examined here is very circumscribed compared with the vast area covered by Mr. Booth’s incomparable studies, the two works have much in common.\textsuperscript{17}
The map’s colour code indicated the weekly wages of the residents in one of five separate classes, from under $5 per week to over $20 per week (a category ‘largely composed of land and property owners, saloon and shop keepers, and those in business for themselves’), although information on income would not necessarily have captured irregularity of employment. As well as the five wages classes, the map also recorded the location of brothels. Their location east of the river is quite an unusual feature, given that it points to an area physically separated from the immigrant quarter, with some of the poorest housing (Figure 4.4).

The level of detail on the maps, as well as their size (the four sheets together were 36 x 112cm), would have made an imposing sight. The way in which the maps distinguished between more prosperous housing on the front of lots and the crowded ‘rear houses’ at the back allowed the observer to get to grips with the scale of the problem of housing as well as its spatial juxtaposition.

Even without undertaking detailed space syntax analysis, a study of the spatial distribution of poverty in just one of the sheets, Wage Map No. 2 – Polk Street to Twelfth, Jefferson Street to Beach, Chicago, is illuminating. By calculating the proportion of each class present on all the street alignments, it is possible to compare the distribution of the poorer classes on the main streets as opposed to the alleys (see detail of map in Figure 4.5). The results show that while the lowest two wage classes, black and blue, are present in less than 11 per cent of all street-facing buildings (0.76 and 10.13, respectively), they constitute nearly 71 per cent (21.7 and 49.06 per cent, respectively) of all buildings.

Figure 4.5 Detail of wage map no. 2, Hull-House wages maps, 1895.
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situated on alleys. The figures for the top two classes, green and yellow, are the mirror image of these results, with 70 per cent of street-facing buildings sitting in the top two classes (15.44 and 54.68, respectively) and only 12 per cent of alley buildings (8.96 and 2.83, respectively) classified as such. This spatial disposition of poverty and prosperity is not too distant from the marginal separation found in the previous chapter’s analysis of London from the same period and shows how – at least west of the river – there was a diversity of class situated in what was viewed to be a poverty area. Given the descriptions of the quality of the buildings in the alleys, it is likely the differences between front and back were quite dramatic. Notably, the few buildings classified in the top classes that are present in alleys are situated on corners, so could in fact be reasonably assigned to the main road. Indeed, the notes on the map emphasise how the smart frontages on some of the main roads on this sheet were masking a ‘hideousness shut up in the inside rooms of the larger, higher, and to the casual eye the better tenements of more pretentious aspect’.19

It is worth also bearing in mind the notation on the map regarding the alleys: they are ‘opened by ordinance’. There was evidently a desire by the city to open up the most problematic of the densely built-up lots in a period prior to the drawing of the map. This is confirmed by the notes on the map, which describe how the rear tenements and alleys of the district contain ‘the densest crowds of the most wretched and destitute . . .’ (note the association of bad smells with disease in the following):

Little idea can be given of the filthy and rotten tenements, the dingy courts and tumble-down sheds, the foul stables and dilapidated outhouses, the broken sewer-pipes, the piles of garbage fairly alive with diseased odours, and of the numbers of children filling every nook, working and playing in every room, eating and sleeping in every window-sill, pouring in and out of every door, and seeming literally to pave every scrap of yard . . .20

The decrepit state of the yards was quite shocking, and can be seen in the photographic collection of the Hull-House study, while a 1905 missionary tract attested to the miserable state of children in the ‘slum district’ of Chicago (see image from this missionary book in Figure 4.6),

Look at that little weazened, half-starved girl of ten or a dozen summers down there at the foot of the stairway. This is a typical back yard in the slum district of Chicago . . . Her hair is dishevelled, her clothing is tattered and torn, her worn-out shoes but partially
protect her feet from the stone pavement, her hands and face are grimy with the dust of the street.\textsuperscript{22}

Overall, the Hull-House maps were intended to serve several purposes, to illustrate a method that could be used elsewhere, to present conditions to the public. The point was to stimulate inquiry and action, rather than offer solutions.\textsuperscript{23} Together with the activities of the Settlement’s residents, the impact of the maps continued well into the opening decade of the twentieth century.

\textbf{Towards an academic sociology: Du Bois’ map of the Seventh Ward of Philadelphia}

A less-known successor to Booth’s project was the map of the Seventh Ward of Philadelphia, drawn up by William Edward Burghardt (known as W.E.B.) Du Bois for his book, \textit{The Philadelphia Negro}.\textsuperscript{24} The study was
commissioned by the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania in order to know ‘precisely how this class of people live; what occupations they follow; from what occupations they are excluded; how many of their children go to school; and to ascertain every fact which will throw light on this social problem’.  

Du Bois’ legacy as an urban sociologist is frequently omitted in the narrative arc that starts with Booth and continues with Hull-House and through the work of the Chicago School from the early twentieth century onwards. His pioneering study, although not novel in its conceptualisation of poverty (in effect, it built on the work of Booth and Rowntree), nor in its relatively limited coverage of a single district, was entirely original in its comprehensive and systematic empirical analysis of an area of Philadelphia’s black population that until that time had not been considered worthy of analysis. Moreover, as Bulmer has argued, Du Bois’ formal analysis constitutes one of the first sociological urban studies, which led him to develop original thinking about the influences of the social environment on poverty life in general and of minority groups in particular that were well ahead of their time. The study was also the first step in a lifetime of scholarly work in sociology. Du Bois’ innovation both as a sociologist and as a social theorist has frequently been marginalised, despite his being a pioneer in empirical sociological study methods that combine surveys, interviews and participant observation along with secondary data. The knowledge of statistics that he brought with him from his studies in Berlin is also frequently forgotten. In the case of his pioneering participant-observational study of Philadelphia, Du Bois made the most of his situation as a black American, to enter the ‘Negro’ area of Philadelphia, to live amongst the poor and to report on their life, providing a much closer insider’s view than would otherwise be possible. There have been writers who have cavilled at this assessment, stating that as someone highly educated, Du Bois could not entirely have understood the realities of life in poverty. Nevertheless, he and his wife lived for a year in the area and experienced first-hand life in a run-down street at that time.

Du Bois had been born into a free black family in 1868 in a mixed area of Massachusetts, although he was amongst the few black people living there. After attending Fisk University in Nashville (funded by several worthies of his local community), he obtained a place at Harvard, which he funded through scholarships and his own savings from work. After completing his degree in record time, Du Bois went to pursue his PhD at the University of Berlin, taking courses in economic history and sociology.
for a thesis on the African slave trade. Martin Bulmer has written about the importance of Du Bois’ time in Berlin, where he worked with Gustav Schmoller, whose research into plantation economics showed Du Bois how careful ‘inductive analysis’ using social scientific facts ‘could produce systematic causal explanations of social phenomena’. After the funding to support his PhD studies in Berlin ran out, Du Bois returned to the United States to complete his PhD at Harvard, although he never managed to get a post at an ‘integrated’ university and indeed his biography shows him to have lived quite an isolated life at Harvard, as one of the few black students there. In contrast with the examples of Booth, Rowntree and even the investigators at Hull-House – who all had independent means, or at least access to them – Du Bois lacked any external resources for his work. His scholarship relied on his own abilities to raise funds and the invitation to conduct the research in Philadelphia came at a time where he was teaching at an African Methodist church school in Ohio.

Du Bois wrote about how the study was instigated by one of the periodic attempts at political reform in the city, which wished to get to grips with what was seen as a corrupted vote emanating from the ‘Negro Seventh Ward’. While commissioned by the University of Pennsylvania, his contribution to the study was never properly recognised by that institution, nor was it well supported financially. He writes:

I was offered a salary of $800 for a limited period of one year. I was given no real academic standing, no office at the University, no official recognition of any kind; my name was even eventually omitted from the catalogue; I had no contact with students, and very little with members of the faculty, even in my department. With my bride of three months, I settled in one room over a cafeteria run by a College Settlement, in the worst part of the Seventh Ward. We lived there a year, in the midst of an atmosphere of dirt, drunkenness, poverty and crime. Murder sat on our doorsteps, police were our government, and philanthropy dropped in with periodic advice.

The inquiry aimed to investigate the geographical distribution of the ‘Negro’ inhabitants of Philadelphia, their occupations and daily life, their home, their organisations, and above all, their relation to their million white fellow-citizens. Du Bois dedicated a whole chapter to describing ‘The Problem’, the ‘peculiar social problems affecting the Negro people’. He describes this in terms of the lack of assimilation which, compared
even with other unassimilated groups such as Jews or Italians is more entrenched due to its being bound up in problems of poverty, ignorance, crime and labour. For Du Bois, life in the ‘Negro ghetto’ was ‘a city within a city;’ its inhabitants did not ‘form an integral part of the larger social group.’ In effect, Du Bois was arguing that black segregation was exceptional because it was comprised of multiple factors – social exclusion, as well as racial prejudice, as well as entrenched poverty – and all this coupled with immobility, a lack of opportunities to move out of the area. In conceiving of segregation as a spatial problem as well as a multivariate problem Du Bois’ research predated spatial concepts of segregation laid out much later in the twentieth century.

Du Bois was at pains to emphasise also the composition of the community: its stratification, with prosperous well-educated people as well as those at the other end of the spectrum living in relatively close quarters. Part of the purpose of his study was to add detail to existing knowledge of what was frequently seen as a homogeneous mass, with the majority blamed for the misdeeds of the small minority. His sample area was a particularly impoverished district of Philadelphia, but there was a black presence in many districts across the city. The study itself used schedules to ensure a consistency in data-gathering, which involved a house-to-house gathering of data over the course of a 15-month period. Du Bois distinguished between four groups:

Grade 1. Families of undoubted respectability earning sufficient income to live well; not engaged in menial service of any kind; the wife engaged in no occupation save that of house-wife, except in a few cases where she had special employment at home. The children not compelled to be bread-winners, but found in school; the family living in a well-kept home. These were estimated to be eleven per cent of the Ward’s black population.

Grade 2. The respectable working-class; in comfortable circumstances, with a good home, and having steady remunerative work. The younger children in school. These were estimated to be 56 per cent of the Ward’s black population.

Grade 3. The poor; persons not earning enough to keep them at all times above want; honest, although not always energetic or thrifty, and with no touch of gross immorality or crime. Including the very poor, and the poor. These were estimated to be a little over thirty per cent of the Ward’s black population.
Grade 4. The lowest class of criminals, prostitutes and loafers; the ‘submerged tenth.’ These were around six percent of the Ward’s black population.

Du Bois’ map, which coloured up the Ward based on these four social/income classes, did so by selecting only those lots with a black presence, leaving the rest blank (see Figures 4.7 and 4.8). The influence of Booth, both in the colour codes and in the labelling of the bottom class (as vicious and criminal) is obvious (and Booth is cited several times in his book), although the use of the lot as the unit of analysis follows Hull-House. By mapping his data, Du Bois was able to show the spatial patterning of the various strata of what might simplistically have been seen as the ‘ghetto’. The very fact that the (at least potential) servant keepers were living alongside the servants themselves was a matter worthy of comment. Indeed, the nature of working in service is one of several topics discussed at length in the report. But this is not a simple matter: as Du Bois argued, the forces that kept the top class ‘in the slums’ – ‘intermingled with . . . a dangerous criminal class’ did not stem from a desire to retain proximity between the classes. Rather, it was factors such as discrimination (in employment, wages and housing) that led to cross-class proximity within the black population of the city, despite the fact that the ‘Negro’ population was relatively ‘more scattered than ever before’.31 Despite needing to live close to their place of employment, the city’s black population was barred from doing so due to discrimination. Du Bois reports that if a black person wished to move out of an area, even if they were willing to rent the property, the putative landlord would charge a higher rent to make up for the possible loss of rental income from existing tenants moving out.

Aldon Morris has pointed out how Du Bois’ view of the racial configuration of the black community in Philadelphia was as a planned, intentional programme, and not a ‘natural ecological process’.32 Yet is it also important to note Du Bois’ careful reading of segregation being occasionally a matter of choice – he points out how black institutions, especially churches, served an important role within the community, which meant that they would act as a magnet for their congregants to remain close by; they would also serve as a refuge away from racial harassment. This aspect of racial and religious segregation will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Other matters are also worth further reflection. The lowest of the four classes is present in small specks of black throughout the area, but there
Figure 4.7  The Seventh Ward of Philadelphia: The Distribution of Negro Inhabitants Throughout the Ward, and Their Social Condition, 1896.

is a tight cluster of the criminal classes on the eastern edge of the ward, the site of the original black settlement in the city from 50 to 60 years earlier. Another aspect of the spatial distribution is the almost complete absence of the black population on the north–south wider avenues. They are clearly relegated to the relatively spatially segregated interstices of the district, with the lowest class located in the ‘mostly crowded narrow courts and alleys’, as Du Bois puts it. The local health inspector is quoted by Du Bois as assessing one of these areas (near Fifth and adjoining parts of Seventh):

Few of the houses are underdrained, and if the closets have sewer connections the people are too careless to keep them in order. The streets and alleys are strewn with garbage, excepting immediately after the visit of the street cleaner. Penetrate into one of these houses and beyond into the back yard, if there is one (frequently there is not), and there will be found a pile of ashes, garbage and filth, the accumulation of the winter, perhaps of the whole year. In such heaps of refuse what disease germ may be breeding?33

In fact another spatial characteristic of the black households’ distribution is apparent from analysis carried out by Amy Hillier in a recent GIS (Geographical Information Science) project on the Du Bois map, which
mapped data from the 1900 census (the closest match to Du Bois’ data period) on social class, race and national origin, household size, occupation of the head of household, presence of children, servants and boarders, and owner/renter status, as well as information about births and deaths from health registries. The study confirmed empirically Du Bois’ observation regarding a shift in demographics in the preceding 20 years since 15,000 migrants had arrived in the county from Maryland, Virginia and Carolina; Hillier shows that the black population can be considered as two separate groups from the point of view of their settlement patterns: those born in the city and those who had migrated into it from the southern states.

Du Bois commented of the rural incomers that, unlike the established population, they were untrained and much poorer, less habituated to urban living. They frequently ended up in the worse slums, living alongside the criminal minority. This is a feature of slum life about which Du Bois did not mince his words:

The new immigrants usually settle in pretty well-defined localities in or near the slums . . . where there is a dangerous intermingling of good and bad elements fatal to growing children and unwholesome for adults. Such streets may be found in the Seventh Ward, between Tenth and Juniper streets, in parts of the Third and Fourth wards and in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth wards. This mingling swells the apparent size of many slum districts, and at the same time screens the real criminals. Investigators are often surprised in the worst districts to see red-handed criminals and good-hearted, hard-working, honest people living side by side in apparent harmony. Even when the new immigrants seek better districts, their low standard of living and careless appearance make them unwelcome to the better class of blacks and to the great mass of whites. Thus, they find themselves hemmed in between the slums and the decent sections, and they easily drift into the happy-go-lucky life of the lowest classes and rear young criminals for our jails.

In a further indication of his subtle reading of social space, Du Bois found that the poorest districts in which the migrant black population settled also largely contained ‘foreigners’, recent immigrants from Russia and Poland – mostly Jewish. Du Bois’ historical review of the ebbing and flowing of migration into the city points out that the latter tended to move in where the black population was moving out.
The subject of migration continued to interest Du Bois, who analysed it not only in *The Philadelphia Negro*, but in subsequent studies he conducted at the University of Atlanta, where he went on to work. The pioneering infographic on the shift in population from rural counties to the cities (see Figure 4.9) as well as their relative proportion in those cities is one of many such statistical graphics created by Du Bois for his later studies.

**Figure 4.9** City and Rural Population, c.1890.
Soon after its publication, Du Bois’ work in Philadelphia received high praise in a number of journals, which commended his painstaking methods and objective interpretation. However, they were less convinced by Du Bois’ predictions regarding the potential for the future assimilation of the ‘Negro’ population. While there has been a transformation in the levels of prejudice reported by Du Bois, its long-term impact, its direct impact in shaping patterns of settlement in many cities in the United States, can be still seen today. Despite the excellence of Du Bois’ work, he himself suffered prejudice such that, despite his Harvard PhD, the only post open to him was at the segregated University of Atlanta.

Du Bois’ work is a landmark in social analysis: not only for his graphic innovation, but also for his achievement in setting a standard for a scientific approach to studying society that was taken up by scholars such as Robert Park and colleagues at the Chicago School of Sociology. Following the Philadelphia study, with the exception of the New Survey of London Life and Labour of 1929–31, thematic mapping became a rare form of graphic representation. Instead, there was a shift towards the contemporary method of sampling the population, which had the advantage of providing for national coverage of social analysis, despite the consequential loss in detail.

Revisiting Booth: Llewellyn Smith and the New Survey of London

By the 1930s, London had undergone something of a transformation from the period of Booth’s survey. A Labour government had brought in many changes to improve living standards. At the same time, its economic geography had changed, with a massive growth at the urban periphery. New land uses, new technologies such as street lighting, new systems of sanitation, together with widespread slum clearances and new housing, all meant that the city was starting to be reconfigured, with migration to the suburbs both by the working classes and the more prosperous classes. At the same time, alongside new factories in the suburban districts, small-scale production became prevalent:

... the [New Survey of London] discovered “a high demand on skill” and innovation among the new occupation of “machine operator”
in small engineering workshops, among “specialised labourers” in wood-working, hand-cutters and designers in tailoring and leather work, printing, jewellery making and scientific and musical instruments. Apprenticeships were declining, but 23,000 were enrolled in Technical Schools within the County, and piece-workers could earn high wages for “steadiness and care” if not skill.  

Many jobs, especially in light industries, shifted outside of the city’s original boundaries. A large increase in social housing, constructed by the London County Council, meant that much of the poverty found in Booth’s time was starting to be diffused or eliminated. In parallel the country’s economic recession in the late 1920s and early 1930s led to migration into London for work. Within the heart of the city, the older pattern of poor and rich living in a “‘pre-modern’, front street-back street’ arrangement continued, due to the ongoing demands from industry for manual labourers as well as the ‘army of service workers’ who continued to serve London’s wealthy population (Figure 4.10).  

**Figure 4.10** View from a rooftop of the corner of Ocean Street and Masters Street, Stepney, London. Rows of houses, a shop and pedestrians are visible. 1937.
Copyright London Metropolitan Archives, City of London (Collage: the London Picture Archive, ref 119415).
The New Survey of London Life and Labour came at this juncture as a follow-up to Booth’s study by a team at the London School of Economics.39 Its director was Hubert Llewellyn Smith (a former assistant on Booth’s Inquiry), who aimed to repeat Booth’s methods with a street survey. He was joined by a team that included Arthur Lyon Bowley: Bowley not only designed the research, he also personally led an additional study of the poorest eastern boroughs, which comprised a house-to-house study of a sample of 12,000 working-class households.40 Llewellyn Smith summarised his study’s findings as follows:

It is satisfactory to find that the level of poverty in East London is now only about one-third as high as in Charles Booth’s time. It is much less satisfactory to learn that, in spite of this shrinkage, there are still more than a quarter of a million persons below the poverty line. When we consider how low and bare is the minimum of subsistence of the Booth poverty line, it is impossible to rest content with a condition of things under which one in ten in the Eastern Survey Area are living below this level. If the great progress towards extinction of poverty is matter [sic] for sincere congratulation and encouragement, the magnitude and gravity of what still remains give no ground for facile complacence, but rather for disquiet and searching of heart.41

Indeed, the study was well received – for its scope, but particularly for its attempt to revisit Booth’s study to examine the impact of several decades of urban change, and specifically to address the question of whether poverty in London was increasing or decreasing. Sally Alexander describes how it showed a general rise in income, with a shorter working day and improved literacy.42 The additional free time meant that people had more time to spend on leisure activities, which included the very popular cinema-going, as well as music – and gambling. She shows that access to more cash made for an easier life, but still there were a large number of people living in a state either close to or in poverty.

The nine volumes of Llewelyn Smith’s report constituted a comprehensive follow-up to Booth’s study 40 years earlier, with detailed studies on various aspects beyond the basic enquiry into poverty. Its accompanying set of six maps covered a wide area of London on a four-inch map of the County of London, coloured in a scale that reflected Booth’s methods, though while black was retained for the ‘lowest class of degraded or semi-criminal population’, Booth’s two other poverty classes were combined...
into blue, denoting ‘those who are living below Charles Booth’s poverty line’ (see Figure 4.11).

The report’s definition of the poverty line has drawn some criticism. First, the street survey aimed to replicate Booth’s methods, using school attendance officers, supposedly in the same vein as the School Visitors of Booth’s study. However, the officers were unlikely to have any detailed knowledge of families with children, let alone those without (as E.P. Hennock puts it rather less politely, the survey and maps were ‘conducted in the mental equivalent of historical fancy dress’).

Similarly, Colin and Christine Linsley claim that the New Survey’s poverty line failed to replicate Booth’s survey as it included Class E, ‘which was never a poverty class under Booth’. They maintain that a more precise definition of poverty would have found that only 6 per cent of the population of London was in poverty, less than the 9.8 per cent calculated by Llewelyn Smith (and in contrast with Booth’s 30 per cent). Despite this criticism, it is clear that Bowley’s research design was undertaken with great care and based on a substantial amount of prior research and testing of methods in his own work.

The survey avoided defining a poverty line; rather, it defined a minimal standard of living. Bearing all this in mind, the survey maps are an important snapshot in time that provides a rare opportunity to look at aspects of spatial/social continuity and change. Nevertheless, for the purposes of reading them, it helps to be aware that the light blue may cover cases where people were living a degree above the poverty line defined by the survey.

One example useful in studying continuity and change is Portland Road in west London. Looking at it on the 1898–9 Booth map of poverty, one finds that the street bisects two districts situated to its east and west. This is due to the fact that the relatively smart Ladbroke Estate (to the west) was
constructed alongside the much more downmarket Norland Estate, home at the time of its construction to piggeries and potteries, alongside a gypsy encampment (to the east). The Booth map also illustrates a dramatic drop from the more prosperous southern section to the northern section, coloured light blue (poor) and darker shades of dark blue and black (vicious, semi-criminal) in the back streets beyond. By the time of the New Survey of 1929, the north end had become ‘Degraded and Semi-Criminal’ – coloured black for the lowest class (Figure 4.12, with inset showing the New Survey). Shortly afterwards the tenement housing was demolished and replaced by social housing: Notting Wood and Winterbourne House. Whilst the southern section slipped down the poverty scale into multiple occupancy, the council-owned housing locked in place a class situation, which essentially has not shifted to this day. The situation in the prosperous south has been dramatically different. It would probably be classed in the top grade if Booth were to repeat his survey today.

In a similar fashion, a study of the south-eastern sections of the New Survey maps shows that despite a general uplifting in poverty levels since Booth’s time, the area around the docks is one of several instances
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**Figure 4.12**  
Copyright London School of Economics Charles Booth Archive.  
LSE reference no. BOOTH/E/1/8
of continuing problems with deep poverty, as can be seen in Figure 4.13, which has an inset of the same area as it was coloured up in the 1898–9 survey. So, while poverty has become more dispersed, it remained entrenched in some areas. This is confirmed by Brinley Thomas, who wrote soon after the survey’s publication that while only one fifth of the ‘Eastern Area’ population were classed as poor in the New Survey, as opposed to over three-fifths in Booth’s time, spatially, the segmentation of areas by industrial or transport infrastructure remained a problem:

The corresponding proportion in Charles Booth’s day was over three-fifths. The ugly pockets of chronic poverty still remaining are due chiefly to physical obstacles to freedom of movement. For example, “bounded by Limehouse Cut to the south, the gasworks to the west and a maze of railway lines to the east is the notoriously poor and degraded area formerly known as the ‘Fenian Barracks’” which was the subject of a vivid description by Charles Booth and still maintains something of its old reputation.47

Figure 4.13 illustrates the area as it was assessed in both periods (with the main map showing the 1898–9 map coloured up following the above quoted remarks). It is clear how some of the streets within it remained impoverished well into the New Survey’s period.

Figure 4.13 Detail of Map Descriptive of London Poverty, 1898–9, sheet 1, with inset of same area from New Survey of London Life and Labour, 1929–31.

LSE reference no. BOOTH/E/1/1.
In fact, George Duckworth’s report on ‘Fenian Barracks’ (Fenian Barracks was the local name for Furze Street) was telling, not just because it revealed how the police viewed it as troublesome, an area where people they were pursuing could disappear from view with the collusion of their neighbours; but also from the point of view of the proposed solution to the problem, namely to reconnect one of the internal streets into Bow Common Lane so that there would be more through-traffic coming down it:

> This district has many bad spots and a great many very poor streets. From the police point of view the “Barracks” is the worst. This is a spot, which . . . is consistently bad, and from its size very difficult to deal with. Small streets may be bad in themselves but they can be tackled. A large block is another thing altogether. 48

The spatial structure of poverty and – in this instance, crime – is a topic that will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6. Meanwhile, it is important to note that the spatial patterning of poverty continues to be a current topic of interest. Recent work by Oliver O’Brien has an interesting angle on this, where he proposes to construct a new way of visualising poverty that harks back to Charles Booth’s methods, by overlaying UK national statistics on a map, showing demographic data according to census areas. Taking on board the limitations of choropleth maps, which tend to hide the detail of the street layout, he has created a visualisation which colours the streets across several major UK cities according to the demographic data of the area in which they are situated (Figure 4.14). Nevertheless (as O’Brien himself is at pains to point out), despite the graphic power and sophistication of the maps, they cannot replace the ability of the historical maps to distinguish between single houses (or even streets); the colour coding on an individual house is not necessarily strictly accurate. 49 This is one of many similar attempts to visualise the complexity of poverty in contemporary times. Other studies have used data on house sales to plot detailed data on housing economics, or land use patterns. 50

**The persistence of poverty – the continuing puzzle**

The demise of poverty maps since the New Survey of the early 1930s was mirrored by the demise of the social survey during the inter-war years. Such surveys were seen as problematically detailed with too many facts
and figures, often delaying reform. Instead, the rise of ethnographic studies of communities meant that qualitative studies grew in popularity, while the development of sampling techniques, especially after the Second World War and the rise in professional marketing, led to an increase in the use of sample studies in urban sociology.

In many cities across the world the deterioration of inner-city dwellings continued to leave such areas stigmatised as slums, with many areas being written off for mortgage purposes. Entire tenements started to be torn down to be replaced by ‘projects’ – the new morphology featuring tall blocks of apartments, which in some instances replaced entire districts. In New York, for example, the mayor Fiorello La Guardia famously urged the clearance of slum areas with the slogan ‘tear down the old, build up the new . . . Down with rotten antiquated rat holes . . . Let in the sun.’ The projects solution was seen as entirely positive to
start with, yet a combination of bad design, a lack of investment, and a concentration of social problems in a single area brought about rapid deterioration in many of these schemes. In the case of the Pruitt-Igoe project, for example, Mark David Major has shown that the scheme (constructed in 1954 in a predominantly black neighbourhood in north St. Louis) replaced a sophisticated grid layout comprising street-facing dwellings with a new, Modernist scheme that reoriented public space inwards, creating a chaotic layout with little spatial logic and dramatically lessened connections to the wider street grid. Although poor design did not determine the project’s social deterioration directly, it is clear from Major’s analysis how a combination of a spatial layout that made the project vulnerable to crime, the socially vulnerable population placed within it and its subsequent neglect by the authorities led collectively to a downward spiral of social malaise, and ultimately – though it should not have been inevitably – to the demolition of the buildings.  

There were similar cycles of deterioration in large-scale experimental projects elsewhere. In the UK, developments such as Sheffield’s Park Hill Estate became symbolic of many of the subsequent social problems with inner city housing. This belied the fact that the widespread problems with the country’s great Modernist programme of social housing can be blamed both on architectural and urban design defects and on a lack of investment, maintenance and social support. As in the case of Pruitt-Igoe, detailed analysis of the spatial configuration of a number of these projects (or ‘estates’ as they are termed in the UK) shows that the spatial segregation of many of these schemes from the wider street network was an important factor in their decline: their external isolation and their internal over-articulation together created very low rates of internal pedestrian movement, meaning there was little natural interface between locals and strangers passing through the estates. This meant there was also little mixing between younger and older people and – importantly – between poorer and richer people, resulting in a vicious circle of social decline that was exacerbated by other factors, including stigma, physical decline and so on.

This analysis points to the complexity of poverty. Social disadvantages can include the spatial concentration of inadequate housing, bad health and other cycles of areal economic deprivation, which can affect factors such as access to open space for recreation or for walking, increased vulnerability to crime and unequal access to jobs due to poor public transport, making it harder to hold down a job or to obtain training.
This analysis also points to the need to consider spatial patterns alongside the social problems of individuals: an area which is isolated is more likely to have a concentration of people living in poverty, as we saw in both the Booth maps and the New Survey maps. Yet this concentration is not only due to the area being hemmed in or cut off by the railway lines, it is not only a matter of physical segregation: a lack of social integration may be to do with prejudice, as we saw in the case of the Philadelphia map. This argument works also in reverse: an area that has become labelled as not worthy of investment (such as the case of late nineteenth-century Chicago) will create situations where existing dwellings deteriorate to such an extent that only those with the least choice, such as immigrants or the jobless, will end up living there. In addition, as Ruth Lupton has argued, the physical concentration of multiple forms of disadvantage, such as the lack of social ties, alongside population mix, reputation and so on, will shape area characteristics: ‘For example, disadvantaged individuals in an isolated area will form one set of social relations, while disadvantaged individuals in a well-connected area may form another.’

An additional element at play has been the unforeseen outcome of state-sponsored housing, which leads to the concentration of poverty as an outcome of the better housing having been sold to the private sector, leaving clusters of people who are the least well-off in the worse areas of the city.

While there are those who argue that patterns of behaviour, or a ‘culture of poverty’, are the main reasons for the sustenance of poverty over time, this seems unlikely, given that the population in such areas tends to be highly mobile – in fact, too mobile, experiencing what is termed ‘churn’, to create a stable community. The spatial argument holds stronger still once we consider the study by Danny Dorling and colleagues on the persistence of poverty in London. His study has concluded that given that the city’s population is likely to have been almost completely replaced over such a long period, the spatial structure of the area itself must be a contributory factor in the continuity of poverty in certain areas from the 1880s to this day. In fact, the correlation between poverty and spatial segregation mentioned above points to there being two spatial processes involved: the area effect, alongside the effect of the finest-scale constitution of an area’s streets. It could be said that a combination of the two effects together contributes to the worst problems of poverty.

Contemporary research has shown that the poorer population sectors are marginalised due to perceived or actual social barriers. In fact, a recent
large-scale study of the configuration of poverty in the US has found that there are two models for this: the first describes cities where the affluent are relatively concentrated and centralised, but also have higher than average interaction with the poor – examples include Boulder, Charleston, Portland, Seattle and Tampa. The second model applies in cities where there is a sharp divide between affluent and poverty populations, the latter of which are much more likely to be ethnic minorities – examples include Chicago, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Philadelphia and Tucson. In the UK, housing inequality can reinforce racial divides, especially amongst new immigrants from the developing world. Ultimately, the spatial patterning of poverty is frequently intertwined with racial segregation, about which more in the next chapter.
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