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Especially at week-ends, coloured men come there from other parts of London for African-style food, for girls, and for relaxation in a neighbourhood where their different appearance does not make them objects of particular attention.¹

The ghetto and the ethnic enclave

The German sociologist Georg Simmel wrote in 1903 about how the city functions as an alienating environment that is strikingly different from the village or the town: in the city the individual has to adjust to the ‘metropolitan rhythm of events’.² This shift from the individuality of life in the village or town to the complexity of social life in the city was something with which the urbanists at the University of Chicago were deeply concerned; specifically, the way in which the urban environment reshapes social relations as well as patterns of interaction. In this context Louis Wirth, whose book The Ghetto was written at the university, examined the history of Jewish settlement patterns in Europe as well as their manifestation after migration to cities such as Chicago.³ Wirth went to work alongside the leading sociologists Park and Burgess at the university, and his explanation of the nature of urbanism ‘as a way of life’ has shaped thinking about how cities allow for the segmentation of interests, groups and communities:

Characteristically, urbanites meet one another in highly segmental roles. They are, to be sure, dependent upon more people for the satisfactions of their life-needs than are rural people and thus are associated with a greater number of organized groups, but they are less dependent upon particular persons, and their dependence
upon others is confined to a highly fractionalized aspect of the other’s round of activity. This is essentially what is meant by saying that the city is characterized by secondary rather than primary contacts. The contacts of the city may indeed be face to face, but they are nevertheless impersonal, superficial, transitory, and segmental. The reserve, the indifference, and the blasé outlook which urbanites manifest in their relationships may thus be regarded as devices for immunizing themselves against the personal claims and expectations of others.\textsuperscript{4}

This argument was part of Wirth’s theory of how the city can be an instrument for integrating minority populations (although Wirth was also critical of the way in which the city can cause the fragmentation of family life). Nevertheless, this role that the city can play in distancing individual behaviour, in allowing for multiple identities to coexist, serves as a counterpoint to the typical framing of social segmentation as problematical. Self-segregation by choice is in fact a common feature in cities; arguably it stems from a natural preference to mix with people like oneself. It does not preclude social integration, given the fact that individuals can have many different social connections across the city.

However, due partly to the challenges in understanding the complexity of segregation, and partly to the problematic possibilities of its extreme manifestations, the subject continues to attract debate over its causes, structure and outcomes. Much of the discussion stems from a disciplinary divide between the social and the spatial sciences. There is limited engagement in the social sciences with the role of space in shaping segregation, while the role of mobility in overcoming segregation and the role of time in dissolving patterns of urban segregation are also frequently overlooked. Similarly, the spatial sciences tend to be more focused on patterns of settlement than the individual and societal motivations for those patterns.

One of the more debated concepts within urban segregation literature is the contemporary use of the term ‘ghetto’.\textsuperscript{5} Historically speaking, its first documented use was in sixteenth-century Venice. As we saw in this book’s introduction, the Venice Ghetto has become the touchstone of discussions on segregation due to its historical importance as the first documented instance of forced enclosure. In addition to its centrality to the history of segregation in Europe, the Venice Ghetto serves as an ideal starting point for discussions regarding the spatial complexity of segregation.
The term ‘ghetto’ continued to be most commonly used to describe Jewish quarters until the twentieth century, although in the United States the legacy of African-American segregation has more recently given the term an exceptional resonance in both academic and popular literature, shifting away from its association with Jewish quarters (whether enforced or voluntary, and whether situated on the urban periphery or at its heart), towards the most extreme examples of racial and social divide in the United States in modern times.\(^6\) Given that fact, it is surprising to find that areas labelled as ‘ghettos’ today are sometimes confusingly simply describing residential clusters of homogeneous groups or ethnic enclaves. The need for a clearer distinction between spatial descriptors such as *ghetto* and *ethnic enclave* is crucial and there are several scholars who emphasise this point: ‘The ghetto is negative, the enclave is benign; the ghetto is forced, the enclave is voluntary; the ghetto is real, the enclave is symbolic; the ghetto is threatening, the enclave is touristic’.\(^7\)

As with the term ‘ghetto’, one of the difficulties in the use of the term ‘segregation’ is its multiplicity of meaning. It can variously be used to describe exclusion due to poverty, to ethnic group membership, to physical separation, to economic deprivation or to occupational segmentation, among others. When used to describe one of these states, the other potential meanings are strung along as well. So, for example, the ethnic cluster is assumed also to be cut off physically from its surroundings. Reading the vast literature on the subject, one would conclude that the ideal urban formation would be a perfect mix of class or ethnic groups, but there is little evidence for determining exactly at what point separation by social group becomes problematic. Nor is it clear how one would arrive at the platonic ideal of social mixing. Although examples of more successful cases of spatial organisation by class or age exist, it is striking how much they are the result of specific social situations at a given point in history. So, for example, the apartments of nineteenth-century Paris organised class differentiation according to distance from the street (with the poorest living at the top), while in Berlin organisation was more likely to be by the depth of the urban block, and in London it would proceed turn by turn from main street to back street: marginal separation by linear integration.\(^8\)

Segregation as a specifically urban phenomenon has been documented and researched for well over a century, stemming from a general concern with mass migration which coincided with the emergence of the new science of sociology. This chapter will show that cities are settlements
unlike any other, not only in their scale, but also because they bring together the widest possible variety of people. Indeed, one could argue that the essential role of cities is to bring together and to organise diversity.

This chapter looks at a series of maps that are in effect touchstones in the history of segregation, from late nineteenth-century San Francisco to Chicago, London and onwards. By doing so it aims to illustrate how the elusive concept of segregation can be defined with considerable precision, once its spatial aspects are measured. We will also see that examples of enforced division have occurred throughout history, from colonial enclosures across Asia to apartheid in South Africa. Many historical examples still endure, such as in the United States, where the racialised assessment of financial risk in the past continues to be etched on the ground in many of the country’s major cities.

**Moral panic in nineteenth-century Chinatown**

This book’s introductory chapter showed how the latter half of the nineteenth century featured an increase in international migration, leading to a proliferation of newspaper articles on the apparent ‘foreignness’ of urban slums in places such as Britain, the United States and Australia. In the case of San Francisco, Nayan Shah shows how from the 1850s onwards the hostility of the popular press was matched by the concern of politicians and health officials, for whom the sanitary conditions in the then largest Chinese quarter in the world were a matter of serious public health concern. He writes of salacious ‘press coverage of public health inspections’ in which ‘reporters described the Chinatown labyrinth as hundreds of underground passageways connecting the filthy cellars and cramped “garrets” where Chinese men lived.’ The situation was not helped by a longstanding animosity between the city’s indigenous population and its Chinese residents, who had initially arrived during the Gold Rush, but whose subsequent presence during the 1860s depression led to tensions between the city’s white and Chinese population – and in particular, incoming migrants, who were seen by local labourers as direct competition for jobs. In addition, the high density of Chinese living patterns, with many living in dormitories in beds used in rotation, led to assertions that their actual way of life caused disease to proliferate. Eyewitness accounts cast the Chinese quarter’s ‘serpentine and subterranean passageways’ as a veritable labyrinth, one seen by the police as
a severe challenge to public order in much the same way that Booth's policemen viewed parts of London a decade later (and with similarly intolerant language).

By the 1880s, a committee was established by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors ‘on the Condition of the Chinese Quarter’, which aimed to uncover the effects of Chinese immigration on the locality. The committee’s report, describing the Chinese presence in almost biblical language as ‘pestilent’, included a folding map (see Figure 5.1), which appeared both in the San Francisco Municipal Report of 1884–85 and in Farwell’s inflammatory text ‘The Chinese at Home and Abroad’.12 The map aims to cover the principal area of San Francisco’s Chinatown, a total of 12 blocks bordered by California, Stockton, Broadway and Kearny Streets.

The emphasis of the map graphically is on vice, with a colour coding that illustrates the spatial patterning of the various activities that were of concern to the authorities. It shows ‘General Chinese Occupancy’ (tan), ‘Gambling Houses’ (pink), ‘Chinese Prostitution’ (green), ‘Chinese Opium Resorts’ (yellow), ‘Chinese Joss Houses’ (red) and ‘White Prostitution’ (blue).13

Closer study of the variously coloured land uses on the map sustains the impression of vice being concealed from view. It shows that ‘Gambling’ is consistently located either hidden from the street in rear yards or in buildings off alleyways. In fact, the report has an appendix listing all the ‘Barricaded Gambling Dens’, which shows how the study took care to capture the precise configuration of Chinatown’s putative labyrinth, the better for ascertaining how to tidy it up and rid it of disease (see Figure 5.2).14 The same is the case for the few ‘Chinese Opium Resorts’, which are uniformly hidden away from the street (Figure 5.3). The two are described vividly as a ‘twin problem’, the writer not holding back on his criticism in a passage rife with racist language and replete with terms intended to emphasise his revulsion at the manner of living in the quarter:

The twin vices of gambling in its most defiant form, and the opium habit, they have not only firmly planted here for their own delectation and the gratification of the grosser passions, but they have succeeded in so spreading these vitiating evils as to have added thousands of proselytes to the practice of these vices from our own blood and race. The lowest possible form of prostitution – partaking
Figure 5.1
Official Map of Chinatown, San Francisco, 1885.
of both slavery and prostitution – they have planted and fostered
to a lusty growth among us, and have inoculated our youth not
only with the virus of immorality in its most hideous form but
have, through the same sources, physically poisoned the blood of
thousands by the inoculation with diseases the most frightful that flesh is heir to, and furnishing posterity with a line of scrofulous and leprous victims that might better never have been born than to curse themselves and mankind at large with their contagious presence.\textsuperscript{15}

‘Chinese Prostitution’ is located in more prominent thoroughfares and tightly clustered in certain areas: this may be due to the need to attract a certain amount of passing traffic. ‘White Prostitution’ (an especial horror from the point of view of the report, which stated that many of the women involved were opium addicts) is similarly patterned, but centred on the widest (and presumably most accessible) streets of the area. The map features a small quantity of buildings without colour, denoting ‘White’ businesses or dwellings (with the occasional ‘Coloured’ dwelling too). These are consistently located on the edges of the area.\textsuperscript{16}

The report’s text indicates how the mapping of Chinese ‘Joss Houses’ – namely Shen temples – was motivated by a highly negative reading of Chinese communal activity. The report’s authors believed that the only solution to the problem of the Joss House was to convert the ‘heathen’ Chinese to Christianity (although ultimately the report recommends complete cessation of Chinese immigration).\textsuperscript{17}

. . . the ‘Joss House’ is, proportioned to population, even more common in Chinatown than are the edifices of the Christian church in other portions of the city. Idols of the most hideous form and feature squat upon their altars, from which license, in the belief of the Chinaman, sufficient to justify crime or vice of any degree may be had for the asking . . . Even the ‘Goddess of Prostitution’ sits enthroned upon her altar in more than one Joss House in San Francisco, and licenses her votaries to the practice of nameless indulgences and the most bestial gratification of their sensuous lusts. Let the sceptic who views this statement as an exaggeration or misrepresentation of fact visit the Joss Houses of San Francisco and he will no longer doubt; for it is the truth.\textsuperscript{18}

Notably, of the thirteen Joss Houses identified on the map only three were on main roads. Eight were at least one turning off a main road, with an additional two either completely hidden or sharing accommodation with a business (in Duncome Alley and Stockton Place, respectively). The map provides a hint at the various spatial realisations of this
minority community, with many of its places of worship being located in tucked-away corners of the district, similar to the location of the chapels constructed by London’s immigrant French Huguenot immigrants who arrived predominantly in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries or the synagogues built by Jewish immigrants in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The Chinatown map’s use of colour intentionally emphasises the most problematic aspects of the area’s community in the eyes of the authorities. What is less obvious until one reads the map closely is how the uniform mass of buildings coloured in tan are actually comprised of an intricate mesh of businesses. Taking just one sample street (see Figure 5.4), while the first block of Sacramento Street leading south of Stockton Street is full of buildings labelled ‘White Prostitution’ (coloured blue), Dupont Street to its south is aligned with an array of retail

![Figure 5.4](image-url)
and wholesale units: a meat market, a pawn and drugstore, a tea ware-
house, shoe factory and many general shops selling merchandise. All are
labelled Chinese. If we look at Figure 5.5, covering an area further east,
and consider the businesses there, they are even more varied, with laun-
dries, factories, shops, pawn brokers, bakery, restaurants and dining
rooms; they present thus an entirely benign face to the main road,
Washington Street.

This prompts a question about whether Chinatown was truly a place
apart, or in fact formed part of the wider economy of the city. While the
alleys were undoubtedly full of vice, and the Chinese community had
its own commercial associations, it is clear that a certain degree of eco-


Figure 5.5  Detail of Fig. 5.1, *Official Map of Chinatown*, San Francisco, 1885.

номic exchange must have occurred, despite the fact that overall the
inhabitants of Chinatown were socially segregated from and politically
marginalised by the city at large.

The map itself served its purpose. It captured in forensic detail the deg-

radation of Chinatown’s buildings along with its inhabitants. It played no
small part in fuelling the continuation of racist challenges to the status quo of its pattern of living and, ultimately, helped support the authorities in bringing in the necessary public health regulations to tidy up its streets and alleys.

The spatial complexity of segregation: multiculturalism, nineteenth-century style

While Chinatown was being mapped in California, a more benign mapping of an immigrant quarter was taking place in Chicago. We saw in the previous chapter how the residents of the Hull-House settlement assisted in compiling the wage maps from data gathered, under the guidance of Florence Kelley, for a report commissioned by the United States Department of Labour, by order of the US Congress. The 1895 nationalities maps compiled at the same time constitute some of the most important maps of immigration in the United States (see Figure 5.6, showing maps 1–4). Through their level of detail, capturing the spatial patterning of nationality at the street-lot scale, they provided both for their time and for scholars of segregation today an astonishing picture of the way in which spatial clustering is formed locally within a district that might be otherwise simply considered as an ‘immigrant quarter’, or even a ‘ghetto’.21 They also reflect a sophistication in sociological method that preceded the scholarship for which Chicago became famous a decade or so later.

It should be noted that in her introduction to the 2007 edition of the papers, Rima Lunin Schultz criticises the almost uniformly bleak picture portrayed in the papers and maps, stating that if the boundary had been drawn so as to include the western side of Halsted, and some of the block beyond, it would have encompassed a more prosperous district containing a large French population.22 This is undoubtedly true, and an important lesson can be learned from this on how the way in which areas are sampled can distort how they are evaluated. Nevertheless, putting aside the fact that the streets beyond were probably excluded due to the omission of those areas from the underlying maps, there is still much to be learned from these maps, which provide an unprecedented level of detail on the area at the time.

The maps’ data were gathered at the same time as the wages information, between April and July 1893. The nationality of adults was recorded according to place of birth, while children under 10 took the nationality
Figure 5.6  Hull-House nationalities maps 1–4, Chicago, 1895.
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of their parents. The map records 18 nationalities, using a colour code that ranges from black for ‘coloured’ to white for English-speaking. They show the percentage (not the sum) of each nationality residing on an individual city lot. The Irish are so distinct and important, state the map notes, that they are accorded their own colour: in line with the use of graphic stereotypes, it is green. Interestingly we have a distinction between ‘Arabian’ and ‘Syrian’, the latter which would include contemporary Lebanon. The notes inform the reader that the Russians and Poles are in fact ‘uniformly Jewish’.

The resulting tapestry of colours shows the tendencies for nationalities to cluster, despite the overarching impression (at least in maps 1 and 2; see Figure 5.7) of a general intermingling of the nations into a single immigrant quarter. Further investigation finds the Italians (dark blue) solidly packed on Ewing and Polk Streets (in fact they are the most numerous in the district), while the Russian and Polish Jewish cluster is situated around Polk and Twelfth Streets. In fact, there was a much larger Jewish settlement that extended south from Twelfth Street, off the map. The maps notes inform us that a significant reason for the general pattern of localised clustering is the manner of sub-letting to boarders or lodgers to the rear of tenements, which frequently set in tow the ‘prompt departure of all tenants of other nationalities who can manage to get quarters elsewhere’.

This disposition for members of the same nationality to cluster together is a common feature of immigrant quarters that is frequently at the heart of what is negatively labelled as ‘ghettoisation’. The same has been found in a study of Manchester and Leeds in the late nineteenth century, which found that between 60 and 80 per cent (respectively) of boarders and lodgers were living with families from the same country of origin; more still if only counting the Jewish quarter, rather than the city overall. Cultural differences between immigrant groups would also cause them to choose to live in households of a common country of origin.

The same applies as well in patterns of settlement in contemporary cities. Pablo Mateos, for example, has found that in the neighbourhood of Kreuzberg in Berlin neighbours from different ethnic backgrounds mix successfully within the public realm as well as at school, yet at the scale of the apartment block, analysis of names on doorbells reveals a clear demarcation between blocks with a dominant Turkish (or other ethnic background) and those with a German-origin name. This strong cultural reinforcement of place of origin can play a part in strengthening
communal ties and shows something important about how the scale of analysis can affect the way we read segregation on the ground. Taking Chicago as a whole, the area covered by the Hull-House maps would be seen as an immigrant quarter (with the tighter cluster of Jewish settlement that was known, as mentioned above, as the ‘ghetto’), but within

Figure 5.7  Detail of Hull-House nationalities maps 1–4, Chicago, 1895.
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the area there is spatial segregation at building level. In effect, the map illustrates how geographical scales are socially constructed. They are the product of social relations, actions, and institutions. Separation at the apartment-block scale may be a completely benign outcome of patterns of ownership and housing economics.

The maps taken as a pair – wages and nationalities – allow the reader to cross-reference between levels of income and ethnicity. Even without detailed analysis, it is clear that poverty and nationality are intertwined, with a greater proportion of Bohemian and Polish immigrants located in the rear sections of lots and in alleys, while the eastern edge of the district had a disproportionate amount of black, poorer blocks (as discussed in the previous chapter).

The decade following the publication of the Hull-House maps yielded many other maps of nationality, whether directly influenced by its methods or as separate creations in their own right. In Boston a map ‘Illustrating the Distribution of the Predominant Race Factors in the West End, Boston’ showed the results of a study conducted by the Boston settlement headed by Robert Wood. Wood’s study of 1903 resulted in two maps of the industrial character of the population and its racial composition. The map, which colours up street segments according to ‘Americans; Irish [in green]; Jews; British & Provincials; Negroes [sic, in black]; Italians and Mixed’ are said to be ‘accurate as to the prevailing condition in each block’. While no nationality is in a majority in the city, it is clear that there were localised clusters, though these were less obvious than in Chicago, both because of the use of the street as the unit of analysis and because the area studied was much smaller.

A decade or so later a much less precise approach to mapping nationalities was used for *A Map of Newark with Areas Where Different Nationalities Predominate*, illustrating the principal location of nationalities in Newark (Figure 5.8). The map, which was the frontispiece of a directory issued by the Bureau of Associated Charities, is mentioned only in passing in the directory. It does however feature alongside a detailed record of how cities such as Newark, with a population of 350,000 at the time, had formed a programme of private and public philanthropy to create a system of social services or agencies following rapid growth in the preceding years.

With the Newark map, the mapping of race and nationalities in the United States arrived at a hiatus, as the focus shifted towards crime – although arguably crime mapping too was bound up in issues of race
and nationalities, as we will see in the next chapter. In this regard, the story of the racialised assessment of mortgage risk, what is known as redlining, will be considered later in this chapter, but meanwhile we need to return to London to consider one of the most important legacies of Charles Booth’s project, a map of Jewish East London from the turn of the twentieth century.

**Out of the ghetto? Jewish East London**

Following a series of pogroms in the Russian Pale of Settlement from 1881 onwards, and the consequent loss of security concerning both life and livelihoods (whether directly or indirectly shaped by the ongoing reduction in circumstances for an already impoverished population), a large influx of refugee Jewish immigrants started to arrive in London and other major English ports. Some were en route to the Americas while others remained in England. The consequence was that the Jewish population of major English cities grew rapidly in the latter two decades of the nineteenth century, with London’s swelling to around 135,000.

The map of Jewish East London (Figure 5.9) appeared in *The Jew in London*, published in 1901 in response to widespread concern about...
Figure 5.9  *Jewish East London, 1899.*
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the incoming migration of the preceding decade and a half. The book, produced under the auspices of Toynbee Hall, contained two essays: one by Charles Russell, who wrote as an outsider; the other by Harry Samuel Lewis, a member of the Jewish community.  

Numerous Jewish organisations had by this point been set up by the established Jewish community to provide charitable support, but also with the aim of integrating the arrivals socially and economically into the existing population (partly out of pure charitable instinct, but also to avert anti-Semitic responses). Despite this aid, the problems of high-density settlement included crises concerning unsanitary conditions and overcrowding alongside rent inflation. Jerry White describes how ‘it was said that rents in the Jewish quarter had nearly doubled – at a time when wage rates were rising only slowly’. Immigrant living conditions were frequently worse than those of the other inhabitants of the poverty areas, but this did not help the impression that the newcomers were the cause of a general deterioration in living conditions in the area. Booth states that, putting aside the generally bad conditions in some areas of the East End of London, the Jewish quarter was distinctive in featuring ‘overcrowding in all its forms, whether in the close packing of human beings within four walls, or in the filling up of every available building space with dwellings and workshops . . .’. Housing density was higher in this area than anywhere else in the East End. The book’s writing, reasonably measured (for its time), recommends that instead of restricting immigration the focus of legislation should be on remedying the worst evils: the ‘sweating system’, which could be deterred by encouraging larger factories; and domestic overcrowding, which could be mitigated by encouraging dispersal farther afield, to cheaper accommodation. It also argues that English-born Jews should join local clubs and show that they were willing to join in with the ‘great nation’ to which they now belonged.

The map of Jewish East London was drawn up by George Arkell, one of Booth’s investigators. Arkell obtained data from the London School Board as well as Tower Hamlets and Hackney’s school visitors. As in the Booth study itself, Arkell used the visitors’ schedules, which contained information on all families with children of school age (that is, under 14). Data on every street in the area provided information on which families were Jewish and which were non-Jewish, identifying Jewish families by name, the school attended and whether Jewish holidays were observed. As in the Booth study, the School Board Visitors’ data were extrapolated, with the assumption that in any given street the proportion of Jewish
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and non-Jewish families without children under 14 would match that for families with school-age children. The map was then coloured up, with the street as the unit except in cases of very long streets, which were instead dealt with in sections (see key to map in Figure 5.10). Close study of the map reveals that in fact there was widespread intermingling of Jewish and other residents on the streets of the area, with most streets in the middling range of mixing. The pattern of settlement is reflected in the book’s map notes, which give a hint at how the street’s spatial configuration interacts with the way in which incoming migrants had settled in the area over time:

The gradual spread of the Jews . . . has followed . . . the path of least resistance. From Whitechapel the flow has moved along the great highways, especially Whitechapel Road and Commercial Road, and into the streets immediately off these thoroughfares. In streets not directly connected with the main roads, and not readily reached, the influx has been slow and is comparatively recent. In some long streets directly connected with a main road, a distinct difference may be noted between the near and remote ends of the street. . . The same tendency to spread along the main thoroughfares is seen in the outlying portions. . .
Historical evidence indicates as well that in addition to work, it was the availability of cheap housing that made the East End attractive to impoverished incomers. However, this was not the only factor in the spatial distribution of Jewish immigrants. As we saw in Chapter 3, ‘the poor were not a homogeneous class’. The fact that some streets were more accessible than others was not unknown to the incomers to the area. While the newest arrivals had no choice but to lodge in whatever cheap and inaccessible accommodation was available, those that managed to improve their economic situation, although this might take years, made the most of the spatial logic of the area to move into the streets with greater accessibility and, concomitantly, a greater intermingling of Jewish and non-Jewish people.

Opportunities for spatial integration were of benefit to the economic activities of the incoming migrants. Indeed, there were Jewish traders who regularly travelled beyond the reaches of the East End. Booth describes, in one of many examples, the area around Chalton Street, situated perpendicular to the busy thoroughfare of the Euston
Road: ‘Jews come from Whitechapel, selling draperies for the most part’ at a daily market, which was busiest on the Friday (the eve of the Jewish Sabbath).\textsuperscript{38}

Even at the finest scale, small shifts in the street geometry can interrelate with the social situation: this can be seen in Figure 5.11, which zooms in on the same area as featured on the 1898–9 Booth map and the Jewish East London map in Figure 5.12. The corresponding area is described in the following passage from Booth’s police interview notebooks:

West along Brushfield Street, north up Gun Street very rough. Mixture of dwelling houses and factories. Three storey and attic houses. A Jewish common lodging at the north-west end. Where the Jew thieves congregate. It is called “the poor Jews home” [sic] on the board outside. South of Brushfield Street Gun Lane is rougher than the north end. Street narrow. Loft across from wall to wall. Old boots and mess in street. 4.5 storied houses, a lodging house

\textbf{Figure 5.12}  
\textit{Detail from Map of Jewish East London,} 1899. Streets with a Jewish majority are shown in blues and streets with a Jewish minority in reds.

George Arkell, 1901. Copyright Cornell University – PJ Mode Collection of Persuasive Cartography.
at south east end. Dilapidated looking: ticket-of-leave men living here. . . But “it is not a street particularly noted for prostitutes!” At the north end is Fort Street. Fairly well to do. Pink rather than purple of map: “Jew middlemen live here”. . . Steward Street 4 storied. Windows dirty but pink - in map purple. Duke Street has houses on east side. The west side is all factories and warehouses. Character dark blue to light blue. In map purple. “The coster flower & fruit sellers in Liverpool Street come from here!” Inhabitants are a mixture of Jews and Irish. South into Artillery Lane. Three storied synagogue on west side. Dwelling houses on east side only. Purple to pink. West along Artillery Passage all Jews. Rather narrow passage with shops on either side. Pink as map. On the north side of it is a passage leading to Artillery Lane called Artillery Court not coloured on map, ragged children, fish curers, rough, dark blue. East along Artillery Lane past the Roman Catholic dormitory at the corner of Bell Lane. The hour was only 1PM but there was already a crowd of 30 men and 2 women waiting to be taken in, though the doors do not open till 4. French [the policeman] said there were a set of scoundrels but they did not look as if they belonged to the worst class, all fairly clothed, one or two old cripples.39

The notebook extract details how Artillery Passage is lined with shops and is relatively prosperous (indeed it is of the same character today). It is likely that it benefits from connecting directly to Bishopsgate, the main artery – an ancient road – that runs north–south immediately to the west of the district. The notebook description also shows that, while the different class and religious groups might be separated at the residential scale (in the back streets), once in the busy main roads they were not only ‘co-present’ – the basic ingredient of community – but also had the potential for social interaction with the host society, at the very least through trade and industry, but also through a network of social interdependence and support, with a large number of communal charitable and religious organisations set around the area.

The map of Jewish East London is in fact a reminder to read maps with caution. On the face of it, the map is a neutral record of the statistical picture of Jewish immigrant settlement at the time, showing this population’s spread along the main roads and the streets adjacent to these, with certain areas remaining completely empty of the newcomers. Yet, the choice of the colder colour, blue, to denote streets with a majority presence, in contrast with red for streets where Jewish inhabitation was
in a minority, gives the impression that the Jewish presence in the area was much greater – and much more problematic – than it was in reality. The map also excluded pockets of Jewish settlement in the more prosperous districts of Dalston and Hackney. Nevertheless, the map stands as an important record of the heart of Jewish working-class settlement in London at this point in time.

In contrast, the Booth police interview notebooks attest to the intermingling in the same street of Jewish and non-Jewish inhabitants, the latter in reality largely Irish, many of them children of migrants from a previous generation. There is other historical evidence for mixing across the classes and indeed across supposed ethnic and spatial divisions, where work for members of the Irish community was found more easily amongst the Jewish new immigrants than from the community at large. In effect, as Bronwen Walter has written, the lives of the two communities ‘intersected at three nested scales – the household, the street and the wider sector of the East End’.

It should be noted though that other sources report on tensions between the communities: ‘in those districts on the edge of the foreign quarter, where street supremacy had not been settled, resistance to Jewish encroachment was most intense . . . [and] led to the formation of Jewish exclusion zones’. However, whether it was the case that people moved to seek amenable neighbours or for the simple reason of cost, there may equally be instances, here as elsewhere, where immigrants chose to cluster for cultural or religious reasons.

Strong rules against intermarriage have historically created clusters of Jewish settlement beyond the initial stages of migration, and south-east Asian immigrants to the UK have upheld similar rules in order to maintain cultural cohesion and occasionally to avoid contact with ‘what they see as a prejudiced host society’. The need for a group to have a sufficient presence to maintain its religious institutions frequently explains immigrant communities’ remaining in an area beyond the first stages of settlement. Russell and Lewis found this to be the case in Jewish East London, where individuals seemed ‘often to remain in the district, out of regard to the feelings of their parents, who are perhaps dependent on them for support’, or because of the presence of Jewish institutions, especially synagogues, in the district.

The synagogues were one of the prominent land uses in the area. They tended to be located on secondary streets, not facing the main public streets, but taking advantage of local routes used by the community.
Indeed, in a study where over a hundred Jewish institutions were plotted on a map of the area, it was found that other than the synagogues, all other Jewish community institutions, including clubs, schools, theatres, soup kitchens and colleges, were located on streets which were spatially integrated in relation to the local street network. Of these, the streets with educational institutions and streets with more than one institution type had average local integration values which were significantly higher than the average for the whole area.

More recent analysis compared the visibility of synagogues and churches in a section of the East End at the turn of the twentieth century. One of the cases studied was Chevrah Shass Synagogue, an image of which can be seen in Figure 5.13. If we look at its location on the section of the Goad Plan in Figure 5.14 (where it is marked as ‘Old Montague Street Synagogue’), we see that although its entrance was visible to the street, the synagogue itself was almost entirely hidden from view, tucked away

![Image of Chevrah Shass Synagogue, Old Montague Street, East London c.1950. The synagogue entrance was marked by a sign in Hebrew and English c.1946–59.](image-url)

*Figure 5.13* Chevrah Shass Synagogue, Old Montague Street, East London c.1950. The synagogue entrance was marked by a sign in Hebrew and English c.1946–59.

Artist: John Gay; copyright Heritage Image Partnership Ltd/Alamy.
at the end of a passageway between two shops and behind factory stores. It was one of 14 synagogues within a small area of Whitechapel. Overall the study found that the Jewish inhabitants of the district had a variety of prayer spaces, ranging from ad hoc prayers that took place in workshops through more formalised (typically back-yard) buildings to a cohort of synagogues that were conversions from chapels, with only a couple of purpose-built structures. The analysis found that while most of the synagogues were either completely hidden, or only visible to their immediate surroundings, the two most visible synagogues were situated on streets serving the more longstanding Jewish residents of Whitechapel.46

At the same time, Jewish communal institutions were placed in prime positions within the principal streets local to the neighbourhood, leaving the most outward-looking economic activities to take place on those streets that could best benefit from London’s natural flows of movement. The study concluded that the incomers were able to take advantage of the fine-grain street system of London’s East End to construct several complementary networks – economic, social and cultural – to sustain their community during their first stages of acculturation into wider society.

Redlining, Apartheid and the persistence of segregation

The maps of nationalities, race and religion shown so far have varied in the explicitness of their discussions of race, with the San Francisco map
being the most extreme in tone. Nevertheless, all three have in common the fact that they were recording cases where a minority was settling in a cluster more or less by choice (if one puts aside restrictions due to poverty, or localised racism). In contrast, the maps discussed in the following section are a sample of the many cases worldwide where there has been explicit seclusion of a minority group due to government-inspired racial laws.

Carl Nightingale has revealed how as early as 1711 the city of Madras was divided into a ‘White Town’ and ‘Black Town’, while J.A. Schalk’s *Plan of the City of Calcutta, 1823* shows the Black Town to the north standing in contrast with the widely spaced compounds of the White Town to the east of the city’s fort, ‘carved out of the jungles of Chowringhee’. Although segregation by race was never completely successful, it remained a constant feature of twentieth-century colonial planning. It can be seen too in many cities across Africa, such as Asmara, for which a ‘racial zoning map’ (see Figure 5.15) was drawn when the country was under Italian rule. The map is an overlay on the first town plan for the city, which was drafted in 1913. We can see how in drawing up the plan, its architects anticipated a future European-style layout of boulevards, squares and public gardens set within radial roads.

![Figure 5.15  Racial Zoning Map of the City of Asmara, 1916.](image)

*Courtesy Dr Edward Denison and the Asmara Heritage Project.*
The map was based on a new building code that had been issued to form the basis of future zoning that required a racial separation – that is, segregation – of the city into ‘four distinct urban quarters’. The zones comprised one for Europeans only, a second in which Europeans and other foreigners (Jewish, Greek and Arab merchants) would mix with Eritreans working in the market, a third for natives, located in the area surrounding the Orthodox Church, and a fourth reserved for industry. Belula Tecle-Misghina points out that unlike many other colonial cities, Asmara’s plan took account of pre-existing physical elements in the landscape as well as social conditions, and that these together helped to shape the allocation of the areas in question. She states that ‘in effect, Asmara’s development was founded on a curious amalgamation of pre-existing social and physical realities overlaid by a racially predisposed socio-economic policy of development’. Similarly, Denison and colleagues have stated how the plan reflects the tensions between ‘ethnic and religious diversity’ that were ‘characteristic of many modern colonial encounters’. What seems evident from reading the map is that the drive to shape inter-racial encounters (or, more precisely, to avoid them), took primacy in deciding on the zoning: almost from its inception the ‘native’ zone was disconnected from the European zone, situated beyond the industrial zone and linked with just two boulevards. It is interesting however to note that as the city grew, the zoning took secondary position to the overarching urban design characteristics of the city, namely its ‘picturesque, grid, and radial elements’. At least in this instance, Modernist planning principles were stronger than social structures, a phenomenon possibly assisted by the many phases of political change that the city experienced throughout the twentieth century.

Following his study of black Philadelphia (which we saw in Chapter 4), W.E.B. Du Bois prophesied that ‘the greatest problem of the twentieth century would be the problem of the colour-line’. He maintained that this barrier to integration would persist so long as there was a lack of contact across the racial divide. This would stem from a variety of factors, including a lack of physical proximity (due to the way neighbourhoods are organised); a lack of economic opportunity; a lack of political power; and less tangible contact, either through an absence of opportunity for the intellectual exchange of ideas or an absence of daily social contact or religious teaching:

First, as to physical dwelling. It is usually possible to draw in nearly every Southern community a physical colour-line on the map,
on the one side of which whites dwell and on the other Negroes. The winding and intricacy of the geographical colour-line varies, of course, in different communities. I know some towns where a straight line drawn through the middle of the main street separates nine-tenths of the whites from nine-tenths of the blacks. In other towns the older settlement of whites has been encircled by a broad band of blacks; in still other cases little settlements or nuclei of blacks have sprung up amid surrounding whites. Usually in cities each street has its distinctive colour, and only now and then do the colours meet in close proximity. Even in the country something of this segregation is manifest in the smaller areas, and of course in the larger phenomena of the Black Belt.\textsuperscript{54}

In this context, the ‘redline’ maps drawn in United States in the 1930s provide an ideal historical record of the spatial division Du Bois alludes to. The practice of redlining started when the Federal Home Owners’ Loan Corporation, a national source of credit for companies, set out in 1933 to demarcate the relative risk of loans for mortgages in different areas of cities across the United States. The corporation’s local assessors ranked neighbourhoods according to four grades: A to D, colour coded as green, blue, yellow and red, respectively. They considered factors such as intensity of the sale and rental demand; percentage of home ownership; age and type of building; economic stability of area; social status of the population; sufficiency of public utilities, accessibility of schools, churches and business centres; transportation methods; topography of the area; and the restrictions set up to protect the neighbourhood.\textsuperscript{55}

In reality, almost all black neighbourhoods were classified as grade D, red – hence the term redlining (in fact, red shading would be more precise). Notably some of the maps had formal categories typed in, while others, such as that of Birmingham, Atlanta, cut to the chase, with the categories green to red labelled ‘Best, Still Desirable, Definitely Redlining, Hazardous’ respectively, with an additional grey shade for ‘Negro Concentrations’ (see \textit{Figures 5.16} and \textit{5.17}).

The financial implications of a bad grading were severe, as most loan companies and insurers would refuse to lend money in redlined areas. In addition, by condemning entire areas as being at high risk for defaulting, the maps became self-fulfilling prophesies on the future of such districts
as poverty areas – a phenomenon that, as we saw in the previous chapter, had group effects, such as a lack of access to resources, to training and to work.

There is evidence that in the mid-twentieth century there were cases of racial discrimination in the United States from estate agents as well as from potential neighbours of African Americans wishing to move into

new neighbourhoods, including both intimidation and violence. The impact of redlining on discrimination was different; it had the effect of areal discrimination, rather than prejudice against individuals or families. As Paul Bennett has argued, one of the reasons that the spatiality of redlining is so abhorrent is because people were: ‘assumed to be poor risk and excluded because of their location of residence (and the racial composition of that area)’, even if as individuals they did not at all represent a financial risk.

The spatiality of redlining is even more problematic if we consider how it had the effect of setting in stone what might previously have been more fluid boundaries. A study by Amy Hillier shows the long-term outcome of such area-based discrimination in the case of Philadelphia. Her study involved a random sampling of mortgage loans, mapped according to types of lender (federal, non-federal, commercial banks and so on). The study found that overall while people living in the central core of the city – where there was a predominance of poorer neighbourhoods with greater concentrations of blacks – had access to mortgages, they had fewer choices of lenders and had to pay a higher interest rate than people living elsewhere in the city. Although some middle-class blacks moved out of the city’s core (due to their having greater opportunities to obtain cheap mortgages to do so), poorer people remained stuck in inner-city areas. Thus, inner-city districts where large numbers of people struggled economically in the past continue to struggle today, remaining the most marginal both economically and racially. Hillier discusses whether the persistence of poverty in

Figure 5.17 Key to Miami redline map.
Home Owners’ Loan Corporation, 1933–1 July 1939.
the inner city can be explained by a simple rational response of lenders ‘to the increased cost of doing business in a particular area’, yet she shows evidence that racial targeting remains a problem today in certain districts, even after controlling for the income of the applicant and the underwriter’s evaluation of risks. Either way, the outcome is the ongoing concentration of poverty areas that suffer from a lack of ethnic mixing – a pattern that can be found in many other US cities besides Philadelphia, such as San Francisco.

There are even starker patterns of spatial inequality in the case of South Africa in the post-Apartheid era, following what was arguably the most extreme form of geographical confinement in the twentieth century. While many racial barriers to residential moves within the country have been removed via government legislation, there is plenty of evidence that longstanding problems of poverty in the country have created a situation in which many moves towards area integration are stymied by entrenched problems of poverty and racism that will be difficult to shift in the short term.

In his masterly study of Chicago, *Great American City*, Robert J. Sampson found that the persistence of segregation in particular areas of the city was the result of three principal factors: low economic status, ethnic heterogeneity and residential instability. Sources of ‘compromised wellbeing’ such as poverty and unemployment, which would normally be viewed as problems relating to individuals (that is, not as influenced by their environment), are shown to be consistently clustered. Sampson repeatedly shows how the multiple factors that comprise deprivation are interrelated socially and endure spatially. He finds that housing inequalities and racial stratification are ‘etched in space’ and proposes that the neighbourhood effect has a structural logic comprising social problems, exacerbated by racial segregation and the ‘poverty trap’, that together explain the spatial inscription of inequality. Evidently, without understanding the spatiality of segregation, such problems are likely to remain entrenched.

### The complexity of segregation

One of the most important lessons to be learned from maps of segregation is the complexity of segregation as a socio-spatial phenomenon. While maps will typically capture a single aspect, such as race or nationality, it is clear that economics, politics and – fundamentally – urban space itself will all have a role to play in shaping how an individual, as
part of a group, will be able to overcome their place in the city. As soon as we start to consider also the racial segregation of areas, especially when it is shaped by external factors (such as governmental restrictions), the many possible interactions between the various factors that make up the concept of segregation become complicated even further in a process that has been termed ‘wicked’.63

This is one of the reasons that segregation is such an enduring phenomenon. While there are scholars who have produced mathematical models that claim to forecast patterns of segregation, they have to contend with the almost impossible challenge in predicting societal behaviour. After all, we cannot extrapolate from the actions of individuals to the likelihood that a group will behave in a particular way.

Another aspect of the challenge of capturing patterns of segregation are the issues of scale and space, highlighted above in the discussion around the spatial patterning of nationalities in Chicago. Whether the city was at that time segregated or not seems to be a question of scale, just as much as of space. Families congregated in certain areas of the district as the result of a sequence of individual decisions that collectively resulted in the patchwork of group clustering seen on the map.

The many ways in which maps can reveal spatial patterns means that their interpretation is going to depend on how a map maker chooses to represent the data they had gathered. We have seen how in the case of the studies of Chicago and Philadelphia the building or the lot were chosen as the unit of analysis. The result tended to correspond to this unit size: most solutions proposed in these cases were more likely to be social than spatial, quite possibly as a result of the spatial pattern being less obvious to the untrained eye. In London, on the other hand, Booth chose to use the street as his unit of analysis (other than the initial house-to-house survey). While this was primarily a pragmatic decision that stemmed from the vast scale of his project, nevertheless, although his maps were incredibly detailed, and successfully demonstrated the tractability of the poverty problem in London, they still gave the impression that poverty might be prevalent across a whole street, when it may in fact have been more localised. The proposed solutions were consequently primarily spatial, such as slum clearance or dispersal to the suburbs.

This chapter has also demonstrated that the complexity of segregation as a concept means that what is frequently termed a ‘ghetto’ is not necessarily
a place hosting a single ethnic group. Richard Sennett describes in *The Uses of Disorder* how a walk down Halstead Street, Chicago, at the time of Hull-House would take the individual past a vast range of people from many different countries, carrying out many different activities. This diversity of uses belies the perception of the ‘ghetto’ as being an enclosed, spatially contained area.

Indeed, the spatial analysis of nineteenth-century London revealed that despite the label of ‘ghetto’, the separation between poor and more prosperous streets in the East End of the city was not as sharp as perceived. Although there were pockets of severe deprivation, other poverty streets were located in close proximity to more affluent areas and there were distinct advantages to this mixing of classes, especially for commerce. Taking Middlesex Street (also known as Petticoat Lane) as an example, it is evident that the street’s market, which had become predominantly Jewish at the time of Booth’s study, benefited from its proximity to more prosperous streets in its vicinity. It managed to serve simultaneously as a place of work for the poorer inhabitants and a place of leisure and exchange for the more prosperous people of the neighbourhood; similarly, this was a place where immigrants and more established inhabitants were able to co-exist in the public realm:

The neighbourhood of old Petticoat Lane on Sunday is one of the wonders of London, a medley of strange sights, strange sounds, and strange smells. Streets crowded so as to be thoroughfares no longer, and lined with a double or treble row of hand-barrows, set fast with empty cases, so as to assume the guise of market stalls. . . Those who have something showy, noisily push their trade, while the modest merit of the utterly cheap makes its silent appeal from the lower stalls, on which are to be found a heterogeneous collection of such things as cotton sheeting, American cloth for furniture covers, old clothes, worn-out boots, damaged lamps, chipped china shepherdesses, rusty locks, and rubbish indescribable. . . Other stalls supply daily wants – fish is sold in large quantities– vegetables and fruit – queer cakes and outlandish bread. In nearly all cases the Jew is the seller, and the Gentile the buyer; Petticoat Lane is the exchange of the Jew, but the lounge of the Christian.

The mapping of diversity clearly has its ambiguities, but of course so can the underlying data. It is important to bear in mind, for example, that conceptions of foreignness, ethnicity and race are not fixed,
but subject to the social or political context within which they were created. For example, the status of people born in Ireland was very much a social matter in the nineteenth century. Ireland had become part of the United Kingdom in 1801, but people of Irish origin were still considered outsiders by many people well into the twentieth century.\footnote{57} This dichotomy between official political status and everyday reality was even more complicated in the nineteenth-century USA, where stratification by ‘colour’ started as early as the 1870 census, ‘which distinguished between “white,” “mulatto,” “Chinese” and “Indian”; by 1890 additional categories included “quadroon,” “octoroon” and “Japanese”.\footnote{68} These difficulties of definition have not gone away. In France, collecting statistics on an individual’s race or ethnic identity is illegal, while in Sweden, there is a lack of detailed ethnic and racial statistics.\footnote{69} Although such policies have good intentions, the result is that policy-makers find it harder to check if there is discrimination in employment recruitment, or to tailor their social assistance to the specific needs of individual groups; nor can they easily unpick social problems stemming from poverty from problems relating to minority status (assuming the two differ).\footnote{69}

Other problems with classifying the children of immigrants can raise thorny questions around what makes for a native – whether language, culture or even diet. Anne Kershon, for one, has written about how new arrivals to London’s East End (whether eighteenth-century French Huguenots, nineteenth-century Russian Jews or twentieth-century Bangladesh),

used their mother tongue (or dialect) as a verbal building brick in the construction of a spatial location away from a previous home, a dwelling place where they could set down roots and accommodate change in an alien society. At the same time, they sought to create a fortress within which they could exclude all that was strange and threatening.\footnote{70}

Further down the line of acculturation, food may be the aspect of immigrant culture that people hold on to longest, even if they have abandoned traditional dress, language or music.\footnote{71}

Spatial integration is therefore much more complex than a simple map can capture. A group can start to disperse across a city’s area, yet still maintain its core religious or cultural activities in the original place of arrival. Integration is also an aspect of time. People can have a residence
in one place, but their workplace in another. A map of the same people at the same point in history will reveal strikingly different patterns depending on whether it is recording the former or the latter. Similarly, the spatial pattern of an immigrant quarter can shift across the day and the week. For example, in a study of London’s contemporary Chinatown, Simone Chung shows that its streets mix different people together at certain times, but also separate the various groups using the street at other times. On the face of it, a land use map of the area will show the area to be dominated by Chinese-owned or at least Chinese culturally related businesses, restaurants and other services, but a map of people’s presence on the street reveals a different, more complicated picture. At some points during the week the map will reveal only small clusters of ethnic Chinese present in the area, primarily in the back streets, in local housing; at other times of the week it shifts to becoming a predominantly Chinese district; with a peak presence during the Sunday lunch hour, when London’s Chinese community converges on the area. (Of course, to refer to a ‘Chinese community’, when this population in fact encompasses people from myriad ethnic Chinese backgrounds, is itself mistaken). Clearly, in a context such as this, in which no single group predominates, shifts in spatial, temporal and ethnic mix will change the spatial pattern quite subtly over the course of time.

Jonathan Raban has written about how in London urban neighbourhoods known as ‘Italian’ or ‘Jewish’ have no clear boundaries, nor are they inhabited exclusively by people of those backgrounds. This is an essential aspect of successful urbanity:

They are more or less arbitrary patches of city space on which several communities are in a constant state of collision. A colourful and closely-knit minority can give an area its “character”, while its real life lies in the rub of subtle conflicts between all sorts of groups of different people, many of whom are visible only to the denizen.

In fact, a strong cultural community can exist independently of any geographical boundaries. As we saw above, London’s Chinatown mostly functions as a locus for a transpatial community, but periodically the area takes on clear ethnic spatial boundaries. The same is even more the case with dispersed minority religious communities, who come together once a week for prayers. While London likes to consider itself as a city of villages, the reality is that even though it may bear the spatial signature of its village past, from a cultural point of view it is anything but a set of atomised communities.
Maps of nationality and race refute the simplistic notion that segregation is bad, integration is good. The fact is that in many cities immigrants and minorities choose to live in localised clusters, yet at the same time maintain a variety of social ties outside of their immediate neighbourhood. There are critical differences between voluntary segregation, such as that typified by contemporary European cities, and the involuntary segregation that has taken place elsewhere in the world.
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