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Introduction

The purpose of this report is twofold: first, to analyze racial and ethnolinguistic disparities in socioeconomic status in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and their relationship to the likely impact of voter ID legislation in the state; and second, to examine whether racial issues have historically been injected into politics in Milwaukee and Wisconsin. Specifically, the plaintiffs in *Frank v. Walker*, Civil Action No. 2:11-cv-01128(LA) retained me to analyze issues surrounding voter ID in Wisconsin that pertain to Senate Factors Five and Six of the Voting Rights Act. Section I of the report examines the degree to which the Milwaukee metropolitan area exhibits entrenched, persistent, and profound racial and ethnic inequality and socioeconomic disparities – across a wide range of indicators, and to a degree virtually unrivaled in the United States. The section also analyzes the extent to which these disparities and this distress would likely produce differential and deleterious racial impacts of Wisconsin’s voter identification statute, Wisconsin Act 23, enacted in May 2011, and thus hinder the ability of minorities to equally participate in the electoral process. Section II analyzes the history of racialized politics in Milwaukee and in Wisconsin, and places the politics of voter fraud and voter ID in this larger historical context.

I am a Professor of History, Economic Development, and Urban Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM), where I have been on the faculty since 1984. I am also a Senior Fellow at the university’s Center for Economic Development, where I was the founder and director from 1990-2007. I also direct the university’s Center for Canadian-American Policy Studies and Consortium for Economic Opportunity, and am past director of UWM’s graduate programs in Urban Studies. A copy of my curriculum vitae is attached. I am being compensated $150 per hour for my work on this project, including any deposition or testimony in court. I have not testified in court nor been deposed during the past four years.

My academic expertise lies generally in two main areas: urban economic development, with particular emphasis on labor market issues and the political economy of urban redevelopment; and on the politics and economics of ethnic and cultural diversity in cities. I teach courses on these subjects at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. I am the author or co-author of four books and forty book chapters and peer-reviewed articles on these and other scholarly subjects. In addition, I have written 35 working papers and research reports, under the aegis of the UWM Center for Economic Development, on various aspects of economic development in Milwaukee, including in particular social and economic conditions in Milwaukee’s inner city neighborhoods and racial disparities in the region’s labor markets. I have also written numerous newspaper columns, in The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, The Baltimore Sun, The Montreal Gazette, La Presse (Montreal), and Le Devoir (Montreal), on issues of inequality, economic development, and racial and ethnolinguistic disparities. I am frequently sought by journalists to comment on social and economic conditions in Milwaukee (and in
cities generally), and have been a source and commentator for local media outlets such as *The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, *The Milwaukee Business Journal*, WUWM-Milwaukee Public Radio, and *Wisconsin Public Radio*, as well as for all four Milwaukee television stations. I have also been an expert source for national journalists writing about Milwaukee and Wisconsin (or on urban issues generally), such as *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Baltimore Sun*, *The Chicago Tribune*, *The Washington Post*, and *The Los Angeles Times*, and for international outlets such as *Le Monde* (France), *La Presse* (Canada), *Le Devoir* (Canada), *The Globe and Mail* (Canada), and *Radio-Canada* and the *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*. 
Section I: Racial Disparities and Socioeconomic Status

Senate Factor Five of the VRA calls for an assessment of “the extent to which members of the minority group bear the effects of discrimination in such areas as education, employment, and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process.”

Overview: Metropolitan Milwaukee\(^1\), to a degree virtually unrivaled in the United States, exhibits entrenched, persistent, and profound racial and ethnic inequality and socioeconomic disparities. On indicator after indicator, for blacks and Hispanics, metro Milwaukee ranks among the most distressed—if not the most distressed—metropolis in the country, and disparities between whites and minority communities on a broad array of socioeconomic indicators are generally wider than in most U.S. metropolitan areas. Minority communities in Greater Milwaukee generally live in neighborhoods described by sociologists such as Harvard University’s William Julius Wilson and Robert J. Sampson as experiencing “concentrated disadvantage,” where an accumulation of inequalities and resource deficiencies reinforce one another and create conditions for the perpetuation of inequality and distress.

Many of these disparities are also apparent at the state level. Political science research makes clear that such disparities significantly hinder equal participation in the political process. By adding to the “costs” of voting, especially in view of racial and ethnic disparities in the ability to secure valid identification or documentation, Wisconsin Act 23 will disproportionately and deleteriously affect minority communities in Wisconsin for whom effective participation in the electoral process is already hindered by the effects of historical and contemporary discrimination.

The following reviews key evidence on the socioeconomic status of minority communities in Wisconsin and on racial disparities.

Segregation

Milwaukee’s racial geography has been marked by a long-standing historical pattern of extreme segregation, which continues through today. Milwaukee has ranked among the nation’s four or five most racially segregated cities and metropolitan areas since the 1950s, when black migration to the city accelerated dramatically. Mass black migration to Milwaukee occurred later than for most northern cities, but between 1950 and 1980, the black population in metro Milwaukee grew from just under 22,000 to almost 150,000, the fastest rate of

\(^1\) Throughout this report, the Milwaukee metropolitan area refers to the four-county region encompassing Milwaukee, Waukesha, Washington, and Ozaukee Counties, as defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
increase in the country (it is over 255,000 today). Almost all Milwaukee’s black population concentrated in so-called Inner Core neighborhoods on the city’s near north side, and by 1970, according to the most authoritative study of racial segregation in American cities, Milwaukee posted the fifth highest level of segregation among the 30 U.S. metropolises containing large black populations.\(^2\) The standard measure of segregation used by sociologists is the “index of dissimilarity,”\(^3\) and a measure of 60 is considered “high” segregation; 80 is considered “extreme” segregation. By 1970, the black-white index of dissimilarity in Milwaukee was 90.5,\(^4\) and it has never dipped below 80 since.

Moreover, by 1980, using five different indicators of segregation (dissimilarity, isolation, clustering, centralization, and concentration), researchers identified Milwaukee as one of the nation’s most hypersegregated large metropolitan areas, ranking in the top five on each of these indicators.\(^5\) As Douglas S. Massey points out: “A high level of segregation on any single dimension is problematic because it isolates a minority group from amenities, opportunities, and resources that affect socioeconomic well-being. As high levels of segregation accumulate across dimensions, however, the deleterious effects of segregation multiply.”\(^6\)

Between 1980-2010, although segregation rates remained very high in 39 of the nation’s 102 largest metropolitan areas,\(^7\) several metropolises showed signs of modest African American residential desegregation. For example, even as these cities remained highly segregated, over the past thirty years the “black-white” index of dissimilarity declined in Atlanta by 14.7 points; in Boston by 12.3; in Detroit by 12.2; in Chicago by 11.4; and in Cleveland by 11.3. By contrast, in Milwaukee, the black-white segregation index declined by a scant 2.4 points between 1980-2010, the lowest rate of “desegregation” of any large metropolitan area in the country.\(^8\)


\(^3\) The index of dissimilarity measures the degree to which racial groups are evenly spread among neighborhoods in a metro area or city, with respect to the racial composition of the city or region as a whole. Thus, as Massey and Denton note: “The index of dissimilarity gives the percentage of blacks who would have to move to achieve an ‘even’ residential pattern – one where every neighborhood replicates the racial composition of the city.” (p. 20).

\(^4\) Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*, p. 64.

\(^5\) Ibid. p. 76.


\(^7\) These 39 “high segregation” metros are the ones with dissimilarity index scores over 60.

In short, even as major metro areas across the U.S. have modestly desegregated since the 1980s, Milwaukee’s rate of black-white segregation has barely budged. Not only has Milwaukee persistently ranked among the nation’s most racially segregated metropolitan areas since 1970, but in contrast to many of the country’s historically most segregated regions, the residential segregation of African Americans has barely diminished in Milwaukee over the past thirty years.

Three studies based on 2010 U.S. census data confirm Milwaukee’s status as America’s most racially segregated metropolitan area. William Frey of the University of Michigan and the Brookings Institution examined segregation rates in the nation’s 102 largest metropolitan areas, using the index of dissimilarity: Milwaukee posted the highest rate of black-white segregation in the country (the region ranked 2nd in 2000 and 5th in 1990). Frey also examined “Hispanic-white” segregation and found that Milwaukee ranked 9th highest in the rate of Hispanic-white segregation in 2010 (compared to 11th highest in 2000 and 14th highest in 1990). Although the segregation of Milwaukee’s Hispanic population is less intense than for blacks – the Hispanic-white segregation rate in 2010 (57.0) was substantially lower than the black-white rate (81.5)-- Hispanic segregation in Milwaukee nevertheless ranks among the worst in the nation.9

A second study, produced by Brown University segregation expert John Logan, replicated Frey’s dissimilarity measures as well as calculated another measure of segregation – the level of racial isolation (i.e. the percentage minority in the neighborhood where the average minority group member lives). Milwaukee’s black-white isolation index of 65.5 placed it as the 5th most segregated among the 50 metropolitan areas in the U.S. with the largest black populations in 2010; by contrast, Milwaukee ranked 9th in 2000 and 8th in 1990.

Finally, a study by Edward Glaeser of Harvard and Jacob Vigdor of Duke, using a slightly different methodology that measured “black-nonblack” segregation (instead of the more conventional “black-white” or “Hispanic-white”) found, like Frey and Logan, that using the dissimilarity index, Milwaukee was the most segregated metropolitan area in the country in 2010. Using their version of the isolation index, they ranked Milwaukee as the most segregated by that indicator as well. The findings are especially striking since the Glaeser-Vigdor study received substantial national publicity for trumpeting a “pervasive decline” in residential segregation in the U.S. between 1970 and 2010. Among the nation’s most segregated metropolitan

---

9 This finding is consistent with data on linguistic isolation in Milwaukee. A linguistically isolated household is one in which no member 14 years old and over speaks English well. Linguistic isolation presents serious barriers to socioeconomic advancement in employment, education, and other areas. Milwaukee ranked 60th of the 100 largest metro areas in a 2000 study of linguistic isolation, with a rate of 2.3% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census, Summary File 4; data accessed at Harvard School of Public Health, http://diversitydata-archive.org). However, in a broad swath of 46 census block groups on Milwaukee’s heavily Hispanic near south side, between 16-40% of the households were linguistically isolated in 2000. See Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council, City of Milwaukee Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (August 2005), pp. 25-26.
areas, however, Milwaukee's desegregation was the smallest and slowest – a
tenacious holdout to the general pattern.¹⁰

The residential hypersegregation of metropolitan Milwaukee also underpins
segregation in institutions, such as public schools. Data from the National Center on
Education Statistics for 2009-2010 shows that for public primary school students,
Milwaukee has the 2nd most segregated schools among the nation’s 100 largest
metropolitan areas, measured by the black-white dissimilarity index. Milwaukee
ranked 8th most segregated among the 100 in Hispanic-white school segregation.¹¹
As eminent education researcher Gary Orfield of UCLA has noted, the state of
Wisconsin as a whole has witnessed a dramatic increase in “resegregated” schools
“due largely to the spread of segregation in the Milwaukee area which has long had
one of the nation’s most intensely segregated housing markets.”¹² In 2006, over 72
percent of black students in Wisconsin attended schools in which over 50% of the
students were minorities (Wisconsin ranked as the 16th most segregated state by
this measure); over 41 percent of Wisconsin black students attended schools that
were over 90% minority in composition (Wisconsin ranked as the 11th most
segregated state by this measure).¹³

At the heart of metropolitan Milwaukee's hypersegregation is this fact:
Milwaukee has the lowest rate of black suburbanization of any large metropolitan
area in the country.¹⁴ As Table 1 shows, among the nation’s most segregated
metropolises in 2010--the seven metros posting the highest dissimilarity scores in
the Frey study—Milwaukee had, by far, the lowest percentage of blacks and
Hispanics living in the region’s suburbs. Only 8.8 percent of metro Milwaukee’s
blacks lived in the region’s suburbs in 2010. By contrast, in metro areas such as
Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit, with overall levels of segregation comparable to
Milwaukee’s as measured by the dissimilarity index, black suburbanization rates
range between 40 and 50 percent. The racial “suburbanization gap” in Milwaukee—
the difference in the percentages of blacks and whites living in the suburbs—is far
greater, at over 70 percentage points, than any other metropolis in the country.

---

¹⁰ Edward Glaeser and Jacob Vigdor, The End of the Segregated Century: Racial Separation in
America’s Neighborhoods, 1890-2010, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, Civic Report, January 2012. Critics have pointed out that the Glaeser-Vigdor methodology of measuring “black-nonblack” segregation instead of the more traditional “black-white” segregation overstates the degree of desegregation that has occurred in cities. But given that their methodology exaggerates the extent of desegregation in cities, it is remarkable how persistently segregated Milwaukee has remained, even in their analysis.


¹³ Ibid. p. 29.

including, as Table 1 shows, even the nation’s most segregated metropolitan areas. The Hispanic level of suburbanization in Milwaukee, though much higher than the black rate, still lags significantly behind other highly segregated metropolises. In short, to a greater extent than any large region in the country, Milwaukee’s minorities are concentrated in the urban core, in neighborhoods, as I will examine shortly, marked by concentrated poverty, joblessness, and other measures of socioeconomic distress.

Table 1:

Suburbanization, Race, and Ethnicity

Percentage of metro area population living in suburbs, by race and ethnicity
Nation’s Seven Most Segregated Metro Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black-White Gap</th>
<th>Hispanic-White Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Summary File 2, 2010

Several factors contribute to Milwaukee’s exceptionally low rate of black suburbanization. Two deserve particular mention. First, the private housing industry, especially the mortgage lending market, “has played a pivotal role in determining residential patterns” in metro Milwaukee.\(^{15}\) In 1988, a highly publicized, Pulitzer prize winning series in *The Atlanta Journal Constitution* revealed that Milwaukee had the biggest gap in mortgage denial rates between whites and nonwhites in the country.\(^{16}\) Subsequent government reports and academic studies confirmed that these racial disparities persisted into the 2000s; a 2008 study, for example, found that metropolitan Milwaukee still had the greatest racial disparity in home loan denial rates of the 50 largest metropolitan areas in the United States.\(^{17}\) Moreover, the data paradoxically showed that the racial denial rates disparity for

---


residential loans generally increased as incomes rose. "In the Milwaukee Metro Area, the racial denial disparity between non-white and white applicants rises from 1.6 for applicants with incomes under 50% of metro area median income to 2.7 for applicants with incomes over 120% of metro area median income."\textsuperscript{18} What’s more, relatively affluent non-whites (income more than 120% of metro area median) incurred 50% higher loan denial rates than did relatively lower-income whites (income between 50-79% of metro median), and about the same denial rate as very low income whites (income less than 50% of metro area median).\textsuperscript{19} Unsurprisingly, therefore, the overwhelming majority of home purchase loans made in the Milwaukee suburbs in the 1990s (over 98%) were extended to white, non-Hispanic applicants—a pattern that insured the reproduction of residential segregation in metro Milwaukee.\textsuperscript{20}

Second, the political climate of Milwaukee’s suburbs has also played a role in maintaining this entrenched pattern of racial segregation. The historical legacy of housing discrimination and resistance to desegregation in Milwaukee and its environs has been well established in the literature.\textsuperscript{21} A vivid and more recent example of this climate came in May 2010 when, after years of pressure from fair housing groups, the City of New Berlin (in suburban Waukesha County) narrowly approved an affordable housing project for the community. Initially supported by the mayor, the New Berlin plan nevertheless generated intense and racially tinged community opposition. As one lawsuit put it: “Mayor Chiovatero was fully aware that opposition from members of the public to MSP’s development had a very substantial racial component...He was berated and vilified both publicly and privately for having supported the development. The racial underpinnings of much of the opposition was indicated by, among other things, a sign left facing his home, calling the mayor a ‘nigger lover.’ Opponents of the development, knowing that Mayor Chiovatero had been adopted as a child, even took the step of sending someone to check public records to see if he had any ‘African-American blood.'”\textsuperscript{22}

In June 2011 the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) sued New Berlin for violations of the federal Fair Housing Act, arguing that the suburban community killed the affordable housing project “because of race and because of community opposition

---

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid. p. 12. In this regard, Milwaukee varies considerably from the national norm: “Nationally, the loan disparity rate changes little from lowest to highest income applicants.”

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{20} Squires, Closing the Racial Gap, p. 6.


that city officials understood to be based on the race and on racial stereotypes of the prospective tenants of affordable housing.”  

The DOJ suit described the political climate in New Berlin this way:

Some of the opposition was based in part on fear that prospective tenants would be African American or minority. The Mayor, Aldermen, Plan Commissioners and staff at DCD were aware that community opposition was based in part on race. The communications they received over several weeks contained express and implied racial terms that were derogatory and based on stereotypes of African American residents. These communications references “niggers,” “white flight,” “crime,” “drugs,” “gangs,” “families with 10 or 15 kids,” of “slums,” of not wanting New Berlin to turn into “Milwaukee,” of moving to New Berlin “to get away from the poor people…”

Consequently, Mayor Chiovatero withdrew his support for the project, stating: “I am a prisoner in my own home...Our City is filled with prejudice and bigoted people who with very few facts are marking this project into something evil and degrading...New Berlin is not ready, nor may never be, for a project like this.”

The DOJ and New Berlin settled the case in April 2012, clearing the way for the affordable housing project, as well as requiring “that the city take affirmative steps to provide for future affordable housing, communicate its commitment to fair housing and establish a mechanism to ensure open and fair housing in New Berlin.” But the New Berlin episode provided a vivid illustration of the social and political forces maintaining the hypersegregation of metro Milwaukee’s suburbs.

Poverty, Income, and Education

Metropolitan Milwaukee is marked by deep racial and ethnic disparities in poverty and income. As Table 2 shows, median black household income in Milwaukee is less than half that of median white household income; and median

---

24 Ibid. p. 6.
25 Ibid.
27 As an aftermath to the project, a recall campaign was launched against Chiovatero and a New Berlin alderman, targeted because “they aren’t working for the will of the people” – even though, by this time, Chiovatero was firmly opposed to the affordable housing project. The recall eventually fizzled. See Mike Johnson, “Citizens group to target New Berlin mayor, alderman for recall,” The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, June 24, 2010.
Hispanic income is just 60 percent that of white household income. The black percentage of white household income (46%) places Milwaukee 39th among the nation’s 40 largest metropolitan areas.28 The Hispanic percentage of white household income (61%) ranks Milwaukee 26th among the nation’s 40 largest metropolitan areas. Milwaukee is clearly a region with among the deepest levels of racial and ethnic income inequality in the country.

Table 2:

Racial and Ethnicity Disparities in Income in Metropolitan Milwaukee: 2008-2010

Median household income, by race and ethnicity, 2008-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Median HH Income</th>
<th>As % of White HH income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>$60,302</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$27,802</td>
<td>46.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>$36,623</td>
<td>60.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Metro Milwaukee is also characterized by exceptionally high rates of minority group poverty, and huge disparities in white-minority poverty rates, a phenomenon intimately linked to the entrenched hypersegregation noted earlier. According to the 2008-10 *American Community Survey*, Milwaukee reported a black poverty rate of 36.5 percent: this is the highest black rate of poverty among the nation’s 40 largest metropolitan areas. The Hispanic poverty rate was 25.5 percent: this placed Milwaukee 15th highest among the nation’s 40 largest metropolitan areas.

The white (non-Hispanic) poverty rate in metro Milwaukee in 2008-10 was only 7.1 percent. Thus, the black poverty rate in Milwaukee was over 5 times the white rate, the second worst disparity of among the 40 largest metro areas in the nation. The ratio of Hispanic poverty to white poverty was 3.6 in Milwaukee; this was the ninth worst disparity among the large metropolitan areas.

Not only do metro Milwaukee’s minority communities report high levels of poverty and wide racial disparities in poverty rates, but as a consequence of hypersegregation here, a high proportion of Milwaukee’s minorities live in conditions of *concentrated* or *extreme* poverty – defined by urban sociologists as

---

neighborhoods in which the poverty rate is over 40 percent. Scholars such as William Julius Wilson, Douglas Massey, Robert Sampson, and Paul Jargowsky have all noted the especially deleterious socioeconomic, cultural, and political consequences of extreme, concentrated poverty. As a recent Brookings Institution study put it: "Why does concentrated poverty matter? Being poor in a very poor neighborhood subjects residents to costs and limitations above and beyond the burdens of individual poverty." As Jargowsky puts it: "In these poorest neighborhoods the poverty rate exceeds 40 percent, and opportunities for successful social and economic contacts are few. The problem is exacerbated as families and businesses with better prospects relocate out of impoverished inner-city neighborhoods, leaving many cities with abandoned and decaying cores."

Jargowsky’s research found that by 1990 Milwaukee led the nation in the percentage of the region’s black population living in extreme poverty neighborhoods: 47.0 percent. 64.3 percent of poor blacks lived in extreme poverty neighborhoods. Those rates have come down over the past twenty years: in 2010, 33 percent of all Milwaukee blacks lived in extreme poverty neighborhoods, while 45 percent of poor blacks lived in such neighborhoods. But the rates remain high, among the highest in the country, and, in fact, increased during the economically difficult decade of 2000-2010.

Moreover, the disparity between whites and blacks in metro Milwaukee living in extreme poverty is enormous. While 32.9 percent of Milwaukee blacks live in concentrated poverty neighborhoods, only 1.6 percent of whites do – a staggering 20 to 1 ratio. 13.7 percent of Milwaukee Hispanics live in extreme poverty neighborhoods, over eight times the white rate.

Put another way, although blacks and Hispanics make up 23 percent of metro Milwaukee’s population, they comprise 86.1 percent of all Milwaukeeans living in extreme poverty neighborhoods.


31 Jargowsky, Poverty and Place, p. 1

32 Jargowsky, Poverty and Place, pp. 49-57.

33 Data from American Community Survey 5-year data (2006-10). If we look at the percentage of minorities living in very high poverty census tracts (30% poverty or higher in the tract), over half of metro Milwaukee’s black population (53.2%) and over one-third of the Hispanic population (36.0%) lived in neighborhoods of extreme poverty and those just under the threshold for “extreme” poverty. By contrast, only 4.2% of Milwaukee’s white population lived in census tracts in which the poverty rate was 30% or higher.
Concentrated poverty, hypersegregation, and racial disparities in poverty rates have also combined to produce conditions of intense poverty for minorities in public schools in metro Milwaukee. As UWM researchers have documented, “what makes Milwaukee unique in the state of Wisconsin...is its concentration of poverty in the schools. Where suburban schools –even those with open enrollment and Chapter 220 transfer students—typically have less than 25% of their students from impoverished families...the city most typically has schools where a substantial majority of students are impoverished (and have been so for long periods of time).” 92 percent of MPS students attend a school where over half the children are poor, compared to only 4 percent of children in suburban schools in the four-county Milwaukee metro area enrolled in such high poverty schools.34

Thus, in 2009-2010, the average black primary school student in metro Milwaukee attended a school in which 78.1 percent of the students were poor, the 10th highest poverty rate for black students among the nation’s 100 largest metropolitan areas. The average Hispanic student attended a school in which 70.5 percent of the students were poor, the 29th highest rate among the 100 metros. By contrast, the average white primary school student in metro Milwaukee attended a school in which 24.2 percent of the students were poor – this is the 9th lowest rate of the 100 largest metropolitan areas in the country. Consequently, the minority-white disparity in school poverty in Milwaukee ranks among the widest in the country.35

In light of these racial and ethnic disparities in overall poverty rates and income inequality as well as school poverty, it is small wonder that metro Milwaukee’s minority-white school achievement gaps are among the largest in the nation. A deep vein of academic research has documented the primordial connection between poverty and educational outcomes.36 Thus, a recent Brookings Institution study documents that Milwaukee registered in 2010 the second widest black-white school test score gap among the nation’s 100 largest metropolitan areas (only Buffalo was worse). The Latino-white test score gap in Milwaukee ranked 14th among the 100 metro areas.37 In an average high-performing school in metro Milwaukee –those in the top quintile of standardized test scores—the student body was only 5 percent black and 3 percent Latino. In an average “bottom quintile” school, the student body was 76 percent black and 15 percent Latino – a percentage four times greater than

---

the minority share of metro Milwaukee’s population. In short, hypersegregation and concentrated neighborhood poverty in Milwaukee have combined to produce segregated schools marked by extreme poverty and wide racial disparities in educational achievement.

Metro Milwaukee is also marked by massive racial and ethnolinguistic disparities in educational attainment. Almost 44 percent of non-Hispanic whites over the age of 25 in the region held an associate’s or college degree in 2010; by contrast, only 19.4 percent of blacks and 16.2 percent of Hispanics held such post-secondary degrees.

Employment Disparities

A series of studies over the past decade have documented the magnitude of joblessness among Milwaukee’s minorities, especially for African American males, as well as racial disparities in employment that have grown wider than in any metropolis in the nation.

No metro area has witnessed more precipitous erosion in the labor market for black males over the past 40 years than has Milwaukee. Once a region posting black male employment rates above the national average, by the turn of the 20th century Milwaukee’s black male employment rate had plummeted to among the lowest in the country. According to 2010 census data, only 44.7 percent of metro Milwaukee’s working-age black males (those between the ages of 16-64) were employed in 2010, the lowest rate ever recorded for black males in the region. Only two of 40 large benchmark metropolitan areas analyzed – Buffalo and Detroit—reported lower black male employment rates in 2010 than did Milwaukee. Moreover, with a white male employment rate of 77.4 percent in 2010, Milwaukee also registered, by several percentage points, the largest racial disparity in employment rates for males (32.7 percentage points) of any metropolitan area in the country.

Table 3 shows vividly the black-white male employment disparity in Milwaukee. This table shows the percentage of prime working age men (ages 25-54) who were employed in 2010. It reveals that: 1) only 52.7 percent of prime working age black

38 Ibid.
39 American Community Survey 2008-2010 3-Year Estimates, Table B 150021
Table 3:
Racial Disparities in Male Employment Rates in Selected Metropolitan Areas
Males in Prime Working Years, By Race: 2010

Percentage of working-age (25-54) males employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO AREA</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>PCT. GAP IN BLACK/WHITE RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Levine, Race and Male Employment in the Wake of the Great Recession, p. 15
males were employed in Milwaukee in 2010, the lowest employment rate among black males in their prime working years of any metropolitan area in the country; and 2) the black-white disparity in employment rates for prime working age males in Milwaukee is over 32 percentage points, the widest gap in the nation and a disparity that is more than triple the rather modest 10 point racial employment gap in metro Milwaukee in 1970. Perhaps no statistic better epitomizes the severity of Milwaukee’s black male employment crisis: by 2010, barely more than half of African American males in their prime working years were employed, compared to 85 percent almost forty years ago.41

The employment rate for prime working age Hispanic males in Milwaukee in 2010 stood at 72.6 percent – substantially higher than the black rate, but a rate that nevertheless placed Milwaukee only 28th (fourth worst) in Hispanic male employment rates among the 32 large benchmark metropolitan areas for which data were available in 2010. Moreover, the Hispanic-white disparity in male employment rates of 12.5 percentage points in 2010, although considerably smaller than the black-white gap, nevertheless was the third largest of the 32 large metro areas for which data was available.

Several factors explain these patterns in male employment: hypersegregation and differential access to labor market opportunities; the geography of regional economic growth (all job growth occurring in suburbs and exurbs inaccessible from inner city neighborhoods where most Milwaukee minorities live); and racial and ethnic disparities in educational attainment (variations in human capital).42

The legacy of historical labor market discrimination, and the “path dependency” that has flowed from those initial conditions, has also undoubtedly shaped these disparities.43 But persistent patterns of labor market discrimination in Milwaukee also remain part of the equation. For example, in a study of the New York City labor market, using an “experimental audit” methodology, in which testers of different races but with identical qualifications apply for jobs, Princeton sociologist Devah Pager and colleagues found strong bias against black men for service sector jobs. In the New York experiment, black applicants were half as likely as equally qualified whites to receive a callback or a job offer. Moreover, white testers were frequently encouraged to apply for better positions (especially those involving more public contact), while no black testers received such suggestions. On the contrary, black testers were often “channeled down,” offered positions less advanced than the one for which they had applied. Thus, Pager and colleagues conclude that “these results

42 Ibid. pp. 32-35.
point to the subtle yet systematic forms of discrimination that continue to shape employment opportunities for low-wage workers."  

These findings dovetail with Pager’s similar early 2000s field experiment in Milwaukee, in which she found, for pairs of testers for whom the only meaningful differences were race and a fictional criminal record, that whites without a criminal record had a 34 percent call back rate, compared to 14 percent for blacks without a criminal record (about the same percentages as found in the New York City experiment). Whites with a criminal record had a callback rate of 17 percent, three times the callback rate (5 percent) for blacks with criminal records, and, more strikingly, a callback rate higher than for equivalently qualified black applicants without records. Pager concluded that “employers, at least in Milwaukee, continue to use race as a major factor in their hiring decisions.”

**Minority Business Ownership**

Studies have consistently shown that Milwaukee lags far behind other metropolitan areas in the rate of minority business ownership in the region. This is an important factor not only for wealth creation in minority communities, but also business development linkages in minority neighborhoods, and for minority employment (as minority-owned firms employ a disproportionately larger number of minority workers than do other firms).

Milwaukee ranked dead last among the nation’s 50 largest metropolitan areas in the number of black-owned firms per 1,000 black population in 1992; and 48th out of the 50 in 1997. As for Hispanic-owned firms, Milwaukee ranked last in 1992 and 49th of 50 in 1997. The most recent available data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census confirms that Milwaukee continues to lag other large metropolitan areas in the rate of minority business ownership. Although the absolute number of minority owned firms in metro Milwaukee tripled between 1992-2007, the rate of minority business ownership, controlled for the size of a region’s minority population, remains dismal in Milwaukee. In 2007, among 36 large metropolitan areas for which data were available, Milwaukee ranked last in the number of black-owned businesses per 1,000 black residents, and last in the number of Hispanic-owned firms per 1,000

---

Hispanic residents in the region.\textsuperscript{47} Clearly, to a degree greater than any metropolitan area in the country, minorities in Milwaukee remain peripheral to the levers of economic control in the region.

\textbf{Race, Ethnicity, and Mass Incarceration}

Since the mid-1970s, for a variety of reasons, the incarceration rate in the United States has nearly quintupled, rising from 110 inmates per 100,000 persons to 507 inmates per 100,000 in 2007 (it has subsequently declined slightly to 497 per 100,000 in 2010).\textsuperscript{48} Incarceration has become so pervasive in the U.S. that it has become a “normal stage in the life course for many disadvantaged young men, with some segments of the population more likely to end up in prison than attend college.” Scholars such as Harvard sociologist Bruce Western have labeled this state of affairs “mass incarceration.”\textsuperscript{49}

Mass incarceration in America, as Western and other scholars have documented, has a distinctly racial hue: African-American males, in particular, are disproportionately likely to be (or have been) incarcerated, and in cities such as Baltimore and Chicago, studies have revealed that over 50 percent of young black males, concentrated in inner city neighborhoods, are either in prison or are on parole or probation – “in the system,” as the expression goes.\textsuperscript{50}

Wisconsin has been a state strongly exhibiting racial disparities in incarceration rates. The most recent available data (2005) reveal that Wisconsin has the second highest black incarceration rate of any state in the nation, more than double the rate in states such as New York, Ohio, and Illinois, and nearly triple the rate in states such as Maryland or Massachusetts. What’s more, the data show that blacks were incarcerated at 10.6 times the rate of whites in Wisconsin, the fifth largest racial disparity among states.\textsuperscript{51}

These racial disparities, building on patterns of hypersegregation and extreme poverty noted earlier, show up in Milwaukee in what Harvard sociologist Robert

\textsuperscript{47} Data calculated from U.S. Bureau of the Census, \textit{Survey of Business Owners, 2007: Statistics for all U.S. Firms, by Industry, Gender, Ethnicity, And Race.}
\textsuperscript{49} Bruce Western, \textit{Punishment and Inequality in America} (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2006).
Sampson has called “concentrated incarceration.” Over 40 percent of black males in Milwaukee County between the ages of 25-34 have spent time in the Wisconsin corrections system, compared to only 5 percent of whites and 5 percent of Hispanics. Concentrated incarceration overlaps with concentrated poverty: 67 percent of African Americans and 49 percent of Hispanics released from Wisconsin correctional institutions live in the poorest Milwaukee neighborhoods where, as one report put it, “combinations of race, transportation barriers, and educational levels further limit the labor market for the large number of those released to the poorest neighborhoods.” Moreover, as the Devah Pager study noted earlier concluded, black employment prospects in Milwaukee “may be more strongly affected by the impact of a criminal record.” By contrast, only 16 percent of whites released from the DOC live in these high-poverty neighborhoods.

Summary

As the foregoing analysis makes clear, Wisconsin’s and Milwaukee’s black and Hispanic communities manifest deep and enduring socioeconomic effects of historic discrimination across a wide range of areas. Along a daunting array of dimensions, conveniently summarized in Table 4 below, the state and its largest metropolitan center display overwhelming patterns of racial inequality, racial disparities, and racially-based socioeconomic distress: most segregated metropolitan area in the nation, widest racial income gap, highest black poverty rate, among the highest levels of concentrated poverty in neighborhoods and schools, lowest rate of black male employment, second widest racial gap in school test scores, lowest rate of minority business ownership, second worst racial disparities in incarceration rates. Minority communities in Wisconsin and metro Milwaukee (where 80 percent of the state’s black population lives and 45 percent of the state’s Latino population resides) clearly bear the socioeconomic effects of racial inequities, which hinder their ability to participate in the political process on an equal basis with other members of the electorate.

54 Devah Pager, “The Mark of a Criminal Record.”
# Table 4: Summary of Racial and Ethnic Socioeconomic Disparities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator/Issue</th>
<th>Metro Milwaukee/Wisconsin Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black-White Residential Segregation</td>
<td>Worst in nation of 102 largest metro areas (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-White Residential Segregation</td>
<td>9th worst in nation (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-White School Attendance Segregation</td>
<td>2nd worst in nation of 100 largest metros (2009-2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-White School Segregation</td>
<td>8th worst in nation (2009-2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-White Income Inequality</td>
<td>Black HH income 46% of white; lowest ratio in the U.S. (2008-2010) among 40 large benchmark metropolitan areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-White Income Inequality</td>
<td>Hispanic HH income 61% of white; ratio ranks 14th worst among 40 large metros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty rate 36.5%, the highest among 40 large benchmark metropolitan areas (2008-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-White Poverty Disparity</td>
<td>Black rate 5x greater than white – largest disparity among 40 metros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Poverty</td>
<td>Rate of 25.5%; 15th highest among 40 metros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-White Poverty Disparity</td>
<td>Hispanic rate 3.6x greater than white – 9th worst disparity among 40 metros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Extreme Poverty</td>
<td>33% of Milwaukee black population lives in extreme poverty census tracts (2006-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-White Extreme Poverty Disparity</td>
<td>Black rate 20x greater than white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Extreme Poverty</td>
<td>13% of Milwaukee Hispanic population lives in extreme poverty census tracts (2006-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate of Schools Attended by Average Black Student</td>
<td>78.1% -- the 10th highest rate for blacks among the 100 largest metros in U.S. (2009-2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate of Schools Attended by Average Hispanic Student</td>
<td>70.5%-- the 29th highest rate for Hispanics among the 100 largest metropolitan areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate of Schools Attended by Average White Student</td>
<td>24.2%-- the 91st highest rate for whites among the 100 largest metropolitan areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-white school test score gap</td>
<td>2nd highest among 100 largest metros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-white school test score gap</td>
<td>14th highest among 100 largest metros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male employment rate (ages 25-54)</td>
<td>52% -- the lowest in country among 40 benchmark large metropolitan areas (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-white male employment disparity (ages 25-54)</td>
<td>32.4 percentage points – widest racial gap in employment rates among 40 metros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic male employment rate (ages 25-54)</td>
<td>72.6% - ranked 28 of 32 large metro areas with available data (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-white male employment disparity (ages 25-54)</td>
<td>12.5 percentage points – the 3rd widest gap in employment rates among 32 metros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-owned businesses per 1,000 black residents</td>
<td>Worst in nation among 36 benchmark large metropolitan areas (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-owned businesses per 1,000 Hispanic residents</td>
<td>Worst in nation among 36 benchmark large metropolitan areas (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-white disparity in incarceration rates</td>
<td>Wisconsin ranks 2nd worst in country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voter ID, Race and Socioeconomic Status, and Political Participation

There is a vast body of academic research on how socioeconomic status (SES) affects political participation, especially voting behavior. In their classic book, *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*, Verba and colleagues outline the critical roles that resources, political will/engagement, and recruitment play in driving political participation. Political participation is more difficult for some people than for others, regardless of their interest in politics or whether they are "recruited" by political campaigns. And research suggests that greater access to particular resources, such as higher SES or education, facilitates political participation; on the other hand, those lacking resources will be less likely to participate in politics, including voting in elections.

Thus, there is substantial research showing that those with lower SES are likelier not to vote than more affluent citizens. Wolfinger and Rosenstone, for example argue that voters who are insecure in their basic needs are less interested in politics; they have more pressing concerns. Consequently, they are less likely to vote than those with higher incomes. In addition, there are numerous studies correlating higher education with higher political participation, and employment with voting behavior: "the expectation is that citizens who are not in the paid labor force are more likely to be non-voters than those who are in the paid workforce." These disparities in political participation by SES have profound consequences for democracy: as research by Princeton University political scientist Martin Gilens has revealed, "when Americans with different income levels differ in their policy preferences, actual policy outcomes strongly reflect the preferences of the most affluent but bear virtually no relationship to the preferences of poor or middle-income Americans. The vast discrepancy...in government responsiveness to citizens with different incomes stands in stark contrast to the idea of political equality Americans hold dear."

---

In addition to a “resources/SES” perspective in explaining voting behavior, a different but complementary angle focuses on the costs and benefits of voting. As Marjorie Randon Hershey of Indiana University puts it: “People are more likely to vote if the benefits they expect to receive from voting (their expected utility) are greater than the costs. A great deal of research shows that voter turnout declines as the costs of voting increase, and that even small increases in cost may make a real difference in turnout rates.”

Thus, the pervasive racial disparities and racially-based socioeconomic distress in Milwaukee and Wisconsin delineated in this report provide compelling evidence of the kinds of resource discrepancies likely to impede full and equal participation in the electoral process. As Hershey notes, “the costs of voting fall more heavily on some subgroups than on others and therefore reduce the voter turnout of those groups disproportionately.” Given that “even small increases in cost may make a real difference in turnout rates,” especially for resource-disadvantaged populations, what is the likelihood that the application of the voter ID law in Wisconsin under Act 23 will deter or prevent black and Hispanic citizens from voting?

There are several reasons to believe that Wisconsin’s voter ID law will present new barriers to political participation that disproportionately and deleteriously affect disadvantaged minority communities. The political science literature on the “costs of voting” reveals that requirements ranging from advance registration to strict voter-ID laws “do reduce voter turnout to some degree and that the impact seems to fall disproportionately on the least educated and the least wealthy.” Although there is not a vast literature on the impact of voter ID laws on turnout, some evidence suggests that voter ID requirements have depressed turnout. The most extensive study, by Alvarez, Bailey, and Katz (2008), found that stricter rules – the combination of having to present an ID and a signature match, and the photo-ID requirement—did depress the turnout of registered voters relative to the requirement of stating one’s name at the polls. Although the Alvarez, Bailey, and Katz study (using individual-level, CPS data) did not find a specific disproportionate racial effect of strict voter ID laws over four election cycles between 2000-2006 (controlling for socioeconomic status), they did find that “voters with lower levels of income of all racial/ethnic groups are less likely to vote the more restrictive the voter identification regime.” Their controls for SES, though, obscure the potential

---


61 Hershey, ‘What we Know about Voter-ID Laws, Registration, and Turnout”: 87.

62 Ibid. p. 90.


racial consequences of voter ID laws as the "disproportionate effect of stricter voter ID rules on blacks may well reflect the fact that blacks tend to be lower in SES."\textsuperscript{65}

As we have seen, to a degree as extreme as anywhere in the United States, the overlap between minority communities and low SES in Milwaukee and Wisconsin is especially strong, across virtually all indicators. Thus, to the extent that voter ID inhibits the voter turnout of low SES citizens, it is likely to disproportionately affect Milwaukee’s and Wisconsin’s black and Hispanic communities. This likely impact can be discerned from racial and socioeconomic disparities in the degree to which: a) minorities currently hold government identification that would be required for voting under Act 23; and b) minorities have access to the documentation that would be necessary to secure such identification.

Studies of Indiana and Georgia, two states with stringent voter ID laws, show that blacks and Latinos were less likely to possess the necessary identification to vote (especially driver’s licenses), even after controlling for income, age, and residential differences.\textsuperscript{66} A widely cited 2005 study by the UW-Milwaukee Employment and Training Institute found that while 83 percent of Wisconsin whites held a valid driver’s license, slightly fewer than half of blacks and Latinos did.\textsuperscript{67} For young men, the disparity was especially striking: while 64 percent of Wisconsin white men ages 18-24 held valid drivers’ licenses, only 22 percent of young black males and 43 percent of young Hispanic males had a valid license.\textsuperscript{68}

A 2012 survey of eligible voters in Milwaukee similarly found that 14.9 percent of Latino eligible voters lacked an accepted form of photo ID (mandated by Act 23), 13.2 percent of African American eligible voters lacked such an ID, compared to only 7.3 percent of white eligible voters. Put another way, black and Latinos are twice as likely to lack accepted identification as are whites. An estimated 28,000 black and Latino citizens, “who are otherwise eligible to vote, will not have access to the ballot

\textsuperscript{65} Hershey, "What we Know about Voter-ID Laws, Registration, and Turnout": 90. Another study, less rigorous than Alvarez, Bailey, and Katz and examining only the 2004 presidential election, found that identification laws reduced the probability of voting by about 10 percent for Hispanics, 6 percent for African Americans, and 2 percent for white voters. Timothy Vercellotti and David Anderson, “Protecting the franchise, or restricting it? The effects of voter identification requirements on turnout,” Paper presented at meetings of American Political Science Association, September 3, 2006, p. 13.


\textsuperscript{67} John Pawasarat, “The Driver License Status of the Voting Age Population in Wisconsin,” UW-Milwaukee Employment and Training Institute, June 2005, p. 4

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid. p. 5.
box because they do not possess an accepted photo ID as defined by current Wisconsin law.”

Moreover, the Barreto and Sanchez survey reveals that not only are blacks and Latinos statistically less likely than whites to possess the photo ID required for voting by Act 23, but they also are “less likely to possess all three of the necessary underlying documents [proof of citizenship, identity, and residency] to acquire such ID. Essentially, African America and Latino eligible voters are doubly impacted by the voter ID law, not only in terms of current possession of ID, but also in the means to obtain an accepted photo ID.” As just one example of the impediment to voting imposed by Act 23 on low-income, minority communities, they point out the high percentage of blacks and Latinos born outside of the state of Wisconsin, which would require, for instance, navigating the bureaucracy of a state or jurisdiction outside Wisconsin, simply to obtain documentation necessary to then obtain a voter ID. It is not too much of an inferential leap to predict, given the “cost of voting” model noted earlier, that a non-trivial number of otherwise eligible, “resource-disadvantaged” minority voters will be discouraged by these additional steps to exercising their franchise.

In sum, metro Milwaukee and the state of Wisconsin are rife, in the extreme, with the racially based socioeconomic distress and daunting litany of racial and ethnic disparities targeted in Senate Factor Five of the VRA. These racial socioeconomic factors represent resource deficiencies that political scientists agree impede full participation of low-income minorities in the electoral process. Moreover, disadvantaged groups are particularly likely to have their participation depressed when the “costs” of voting are high, or are increased. Voter ID laws, such as Act 23, impose such costs. Act 23 makes requirements (photo ID) that a disproportionate number of otherwise eligible minority voters cannot meet. Moreover, given the challenges that resource-disadvantaged minorities without photo IDs face in securing the documentation necessary to obtain an ID, Act 23 imposes a double roadblock on voting for substantial numbers of eligible voters from communities that have borne the historical and contemporary legacy of discrimination and entrenched inequality.

As Alexander Keyssar, a Harvard University expert on the history of voting rights, has written:

The targets of exclusionary laws have tended to be similar for more than two centuries: the poor, immigrants, African-Americans, people perceived to be something other than “mainstream” Americans.


70 Ibid. p. 23-24.
The current wave of procedural restrictions on voting, including strict photo ID requirements, ought to be understood as the latest chapter in a not always uplifting story: Americans of both parties have sometimes rejected democratic values or preferred partisan advantage to fair democratic processes. Acknowledging the realities of our history should lead us all to be profoundly skeptical of laws that burden, or impede, the exercise of what Lyndon B. Johnson called “the basic right, without which all others are meaningless.”\textsuperscript{71}

Section II: Racialized Politics in Milwaukee and Wisconsin

**Senate Factor Six** of the VRA calls for assessment of “whether political campaigns have been characterized by overt or subtle racial appeals.”

The injection of race into political campaigns may take several forms. There may be explicit racial appeals – the rhetoric of openly segregationist governors in the 1960s, for example, or expressions of overt racism-- or more “oblique” but unquestionably racial appeals such as a white mayoral candidate running against a black and running advertisements that call for voters to support him, “before it’s too late.” Candidates may also more subtly racially “prime” voters, by running political ads feeding racial stereotypes-- the infamous “Willie Horton” ad of the 1988 presidential campaign is a classic example—or by running on “neutral” campaign issues that play into racial stereotypes (i.e. running campaign ads on “wasteful government spending,” showing images of predominantly black inner city neighborhoods). Princeton University political scientist Tali Mendleberg has identified 17 public opinion research studies documenting the racial effects of racial cues in campaigns since the early 1990s.\(^\text{72}\) The use of “coded” language has been an especially effective way of smuggling racial appeals into political campaigns.\(^\text{73}\) As Princeton’s Martin Gilens has observed: “Political issues such as crime and welfare are now widely viewed as ‘coded’ issues that play upon race (or, more specifically, on white Americans negative views of blacks) without explicitly raising the ‘race card.’ Many believe that by engaging such issues, politicians can exploit whites’ racial animosity and resentment while diminishing the appearance of race baiting.”\(^\text{74}\)

In an astonishingly frank interview, national Republican Party operative Lee Atwater bluntly revealed how racialized appeals had morphed from overt to coded in political strategy over the years:

> You start out in 1954 by saying “nigger, nigger, nigger.” By 1968, you can’t say “nigger” -- that hurts you. Backfires. So you say stuff like forced busing, states’ rights, and all that stuff. You’re getting so abstract now [that] you’re talking about cutting taxes...Obviously sitting around saying “we want to cut this” is much more abstract than even the busing thing and a hell of a lot more abstract than “nigger, nigger.”\(^\text{75}\)

---


In 2005, in fact, the then-chair of the Republican National Committee apologized to the NAACP national convention, meeting in Milwaukee, for years of “trying to benefit politically from racial polarization,” in the manner described by Atwater. “I am here today as the Republican chairman to tell you we were wrong.”

Milwaukee and Wisconsin have a long history of such racialized politics. What follows is a brief overview of some examples.

In the 1950s, racial issues figured prominently in political campaigns against Milwaukee Mayor Frank P. Zeidler. The Mayor faced intense opposition to his public housing policies, with “whispering campaigns,” accompanied by overt racial epithets and innuendo, asserting that Zeidler was building such housing to attract “Negroes” to Milwaukee and that there should be “time limits” for living in public housing. These racial tensions came to head in the 1956 mayoral campaign, when Alderman Milton McGuire ran against Zeidler in a highly racialized campaign. A few days before the 1956 election, a McGuire advertisement ran in the city's newspapers, widely viewed as raising the racialized specter of Zeidler’s Milwaukee out of control, with teenage “hoodlum mobs...ranging Milwaukee with wolfpack viciousness.” Although McGuire publicly disavowed the ad, the “whispering campaign” encouraged by his operatives continued, including false allegations that “Zeidler was plastering the South with billboards inviting Negroes to Milwaukee,” and that “Zeidler’s sister is married to a Negro.” McGuire’s aides were reported in the media as “sneering at Zeidler workers for associating with a ‘nigger lover.”

The racial vitriol in Milwaukee was so intense that national media took notice: Time magazine published an article on the 1956 mayoral campaign entitled “The Shame of Milwaukee,” describing the “vicious rumor campaign against Zeidler.” In the end, Zeidler won re-election, but it was his last political campaign. Years later, in his memoirs, he wrote that he left politics, in part, because “the issue of whether or not I was ‘too friendly’ to minorities was once again going to be raised and I should have liked to have fought it out once more, but enough was enough.”

Milwaukee and Wisconsin also received national attention for surprisingly racialized politics in the 1960s and early 1970s, during Alabama Governor George C. Wallace’s campaigns for the presidency. Wallace came to Wisconsin in 1964 to run
in the state’s presidential preference primary, and his campaign was overtly segregationist (“we believe in segregation and say so”) as he railed against federal civil rights legislation and state open housing laws. Racial tensions surrounded Wallace’s rallies. In the end, Wallace astounded national observers by winning 34 percent of the statewide vote against stand-in candidate Governor John Reynolds, and 38 percent of the vote in Milwaukee County; the Wallace vote was widely seen as demonstrating the power of his racialized appeal in the North and revealing the depths of an incipient Northern “white backlash” to civil rights. Said Wallace after the primary: “If I ever had to leave Alabama, I’d want to live on the south side of Milwaukee.” Wallace also ran in the 1972 Democratic primary in Wisconsin, finishing second in the state to George McGovern, but running strongly again on Milwaukee’s south side. By 1972, however, his campaign was more “coded” than “overt” (following the Atwater approach above): his main issues were taxes, and especially tax resentment at paying for “welfare loafers.”

In the aftermath of the racially tense late 1960s in the city, Milwaukee politics endured a peculiarly racialized mayoral campaign in the mid 1970s, when, amidst a maelstrom of tension surrounding school desegregation, possible busing, and the recent memory of racial disturbances and open housing marches in the city, a Nazi candidate ran for mayor and received 5.5 percent of the vote in the primary. The Nazi (Arthur Jones) ran in 1976 as “the white people’s candidate,” and in his campaign hit on all the touchstones of the emerging white backlash in the city:

Are you fed up with runaway crime and unsafe streets?—with soaring property taxes— with bigger and bigger welfare handouts?—with forced busing and integrated jungles? With reverse discrimination in jobs and hiring?—with seeing white people pushed around?—with the same old, sell-out politicians?

A post-election survey of voters by UWM researchers found, incredibly, that Jones’ views were much more widely held than hypothesized; that a substantial portion of the so-called “extremists” voted for Mayor Henry Maier (favorably impressed with his coded rhetoric on “no coddling criminals”); and that “extremist
beliefs differed from general public opinion in Milwaukee only in shades” – that there was a thin line separating “mainstream” politics and extremism in the city.  

In the 1980s, racialized politics persisted in Wisconsin, in less overt form, around the “coded” issue of welfare reform. In the 1986 gubernatorial campaign, Tommy Thompson made welfare cutting the cornerstone of his campaign. Although widely disparaged in political circles at the time for his lack of inquisitiveness on matters of public policy, Thompson ran on an issue that was gaining more and more currency in Wisconsin political circles: that the state, with its generous benefits, had become a “welfare magnet” and was a destination for “welfare migration.” During the 1986 campaign incumbent Governor Tony Earl critically noted that “Tommy Thompson wants to reform welfare and make Wisconsin like Mississippi.” Thompson’s response: ‘With you in charge, we’re attracting all the people from Mississippi up here anyway.”

The Mississippi comment was fraught with racial coding. The vast majority of Milwaukee blacks, from the 1930s through the 1990s, had been born out of state, and the largest single source of black migration to Milwaukee was from Mississippi. As noted earlier, anxieties about southern black migration to Milwaukee had been stoked during Frank Zeidler’s mayoralty in the 1950s (public housing generosity rather than welfare generosity was the alleged inducement then, as well as apocryphal “recruiting” billboards). And in the 1960s, a report from Mayor Henry Maier’s administration in Milwaukee asserted that black problems in the city “derived from the large proportion originating from the rural South. The study concluded that these young men, women, and their children did not know how to live successfully in a large northern, urban, industrial city.” Language about “attracting people from Mississippi,” then, tapped into a rich historical vein of racial

---
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anxieties in Milwaukee and Wisconsin about the migration of southern blacks to the state and city.

Thompson rode the issue of "welfare migration" to an upset victory and became known nationally as a welfare reformer with his "Wisconsin Works" (W-2) program, riding that reputation to four terms as governor. "It's a fantastic campaign issue," Thompson told The New York Times' Jason DeParle in 1994 (emphasis added).95 Other Wisconsin politicians gravitated to the issue as well. "We like that it's safe here, and we don't want it to get less safe," said Joseph A. Strohl, the Democratic majority leader in the Wisconsin Senate in 1989.96 The Mayor of Madison warned "against the 'duplication of ghetto neighborhoods' with the same problems that families came to Madison to escape."97 By the late 1980s and early 1990s, as Lawrence Mead has pointed out, aggressive campaigning in Milwaukee and statewide in Wisconsin against welfare was widespread, even among some black politicians.98

But welfare was a campaign issue heavily freighted with racial subtexts and coded language. Welfare magnet, welfare migration, "attracting all the people from Mississippi" – all had undeniable racial coding attached. As Martin Gilens has written in his definitive review of survey data on attitudes about welfare policy: "Despite welfare's formally race-neutral structure, beliefs about blacks are central in shaping white Americans' view of welfare."99 Whites’ welfare views were “strongly influenced by their perceptions of blacks and thus the popular belief that welfare is a ‘race coded’ issue appears warranted. Whatever other reasons whites may have for opposing welfare, their negative views of blacks appear to constitute an important factor in generating that opposition."100

Since the 1990s, racial overtones –some overt, some coded-- have figured in several Milwaukee and Wisconsin campaigns. In a high-profile aldermanic race in the city of Milwaukee in 1989, a candidate’s campaign literature accused his opponent of wanting to open largely white areas of the district to minorities, and vowing not “to force people on people, nor...stop people from living where they want to.” The candidate was roundly condemned for “polluting politics with racist

95 Ibid. p. 74.
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fears." A 1996 judicial race in Milwaukee County was also highly racialized, with campaigning marked by overtly racial cues. The white challenger, Robert Crawford, linked incumbent Russell Stamper to a “black militant” (Michael McGee) in Milwaukee who advocated the creation of a separate majority black city and the use of violence to receive more economic and political resources. Crawford also criticized Stamper’s support of electing judges by single-member districts rather than at large as racial gerrymandering, a term that has a negative racial connotation.

Increasingly, however, racialized politics in the state and region took a more coded form. An example was the policy issue of whether to build a light rail transit system in the Milwaukee region. Favored by urban leaders such as the mayors of Milwaukee in the 1990s and 2000s, and pursued, in one form or another, in almost every other large metropolitan area in the country, opposition to light rail as a “taxpayer’s nightmare” and “billion dollar boondoggle” became a mantra for politicians in Milwaukee’s overwhelmingly white, hypersegregated suburban and exurban communities (as well as for a candidate for mayor of Milwaukee in 2000). As pro-light rail Mayor John Norquist put it: “The right-wing talk radio guys would always promote it to their listeners that somebody from the city would come out to the suburbs and steal their TV set...I think the Republicans from the suburbs around Milwaukee found light rail to be an issue that excited their base at election time, so they ended up running against it.” Suburban politicians such as Brookfield’s Scott Jensen, Waukesha’s Dan Finley, and Wauwatosa’s Scott Walker all incorporated opposition to light rail into their campaigns. And George Watts, an Ozaukee County resident, downtown Milwaukee merchant, and candidate for mayor of Milwaukee in 2000, based his campaign largely on opposition to light rail; earlier he had explicitly raised the largely suburban fears that “urban criminals could use the trains to prey on suburbanites” by saying that “light rail brings strangers who are not only a threat to your property, but to your children.” Transit advocates
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described these references as “code words for race,” and in Milwaukee several black politicians decried Watt’s remark about “strangers” as a racial reference.107

Although political rhetoric has become more coded in recent years – veiled references to “Milwaukee” by suburban politicians, especially around taxes and spending can be viewed in this regard108 -- there nevertheless continue to be episodes of overt racialization in Wisconsin and Milwaukee-area politics. In the 2008 race for the Wisconsin Supreme Court, white challenger Michael Gableman ran an overtly racial campaign against the incumbent Louis Butler, an African American, accusing Butler of having worked as a public defender “to put criminals on the street,” including by finding “a loophole” to release a girl’s rapist. As the New York Times has noted, “in addition to playing to the fear and racism of some voters, the charge was false.”109 Gableman ran television ads showing the rapist’s mug shot next to an image of Butler, with the question: “Can Wisconsin families feel safe with Louis Butler on the Supreme Court?” As a columnist for the Minneapolis Star-Tribune noted: “In a reprise of the 1988 Willie Horton gambit, one vile ad for Gableman pictured Butler and a photo of a rapist whom Butler had defended while working as a public defender. No mention was made of any constitutional right to an attorney. Instead, the race-baiting ad made a visceral appeal to the worst elements of backwoods justice. Rapist? Black. Supreme Court justice? Black. Get it?”110

In recent years there have also been a few examples in Wisconsin of coded political racialization involving Latinos, especially in Milwaukee’s western exurbs. In 1997, the Waukesha County Board, “shrugging off pleas not to be divisive,” passed, by a vote of 29-2, a resolution supporting adoption of English as the official language of Wisconsin. One supervisor remarked that he gets “upset” when he sees “people who can’t speak English” and have their “hands out for welfare.”111 In 2006, Waukesha County District Attorney and candidate for State Attorney General Paul Bucher ran, in part, on a platform of crackdowns on illegal immigration, requesting local immigration enforcement authority and running radio ads claiming that he was “the only candidate for Attorney general with a plan to deal with illegal immigrants who commit crimes.” “If you’re in this country illegally, and you commit
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107 Ibid.
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crimes,” said Bucher in the ad, “I say, start packing, you’re going home.”

Opponents criticized Bucher’s plan as divisive and even racist.

Also in 2006, gubernatorial candidate Mark Green aired a television ad against incumbent Jim Doyle claiming that “as illegal aliens stream in, [Doyle] actually wants to give them welfare and subsidized home loans” and “even wants to give illegal aliens in-state tuition breaks at the [University of Wisconsin], while Wisconsin kids are being turned away.”

The issue of voter fraud, as well as the emergence of voter ID as a policy issue in Wisconsin, fit into this historical pattern of racially coded politics. Despite the paucity of evidence of voting fraud in the state and the even more scant evidence “of any serious problem with voter impersonation fraud, the only form of illegal voting that a strict ID law could hope to address,” voter fraud and voter ID emerged as political issues in the 2000s. As Minnite points out, “the targeting is not overt, the language is rarely explicitly racial,” but the coding of voter fraud allegations is unmistakable: pointing “the finger at those belonging to the same categories of voters accused of fraud in the past – the marginalized and formerly disenfranchised, urban dwellers, immigrants, blacks, and lower status voters.”

In 2001, the Wisconsin Policy Research Institute began this kind of finger pointing, with an article noting the “unfortunate but true [sic] phenomenon that, historically, most cases of voter irregularities have arisen in regions that strongly support Democratic candidates, usually urban areas.” The article then offered anecdotal evidence of “multitudes of voting irregularities” that allegedly occurred in the razor-thin 2000 presidential election (Gore carried Wisconsin by 5,700 votes), all in Milwaukee, and few confirmed by subsequent investigations. “Ground zero for many of these election day follies,” claimed the article, “was the voting polls at the Highland Park public housing facility on North 17th street” – in the heart of
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Milwaukee’s predominantly black inner city, as if the racial reference were not clear.117

Since 2000, stoked by right-wing talk radio and some political candidates, the coded (though sometimes overt) racial subtext of voter fraud and voter ID politics in Wisconsin has only grown. In 2004, top-rated Milwaukee talk radio host Mark Belling incited considerable controversy, using the word “wetback” to describe illegal Mexican immigrants on his show about potential voter fraud in Wisconsin. “You watch the voter turnout on the near south side, heavily Hispanic, and compare it to the voter turnout in any other election, and you’re going to see every wetback and every other non-citizen out there voting,” said Belling.118 In the aftermath of the 2004 presidential election, spurred by partisan allegations of widespread voter fraud, federal prosecutors indicted 14 individuals in Wisconsin for illegal voting (only five were convicted). All but one of those charged with felonies were African-American, and all were Milwaukee residents. “I definitely cannot say that this was any intent to suppress the black vote,” said Nancy Joseph, a federal public defender. “But I can say this: The state of Wisconsin is a predominantly white state. It was curious to me that the alleged voter fraud investigations were done in the city of Milwaukee, with Milwaukee residents.”119

In 2008, the “election fraud” issue took on racial tinges with Attorney General J.B. Van Hollen’s announcement, a week before the election, that he would dispatch 50 criminal prosecutors and special agents from the Division of Criminal Investigation to State polling places.120 At the same time, a brief filed by the Democratic National Committee claims that Van Hollen’s former staff, as partisan operatives, recruited additional individuals to intimidate voters.121 An e-mail from Jonathan Waclawski, Election Day Operations Director for the Republican Party of Wisconsin sought “people who would potentially be willing to volunteer...at inner city (more intimidating) polling places. Particularly, I am interested in names of Milwaukee area veterans, policemen, security personnel, firefighters, etc.”(emphasis added).122 As the ACLU of Wisconsin and the Milwaukee branch of the NAACP
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pointed out, in response to Van Hollen’s actions: “The formation of a voter fraud task force only in Milwaukee County reinforces an unsubstantiated perception that City of Milwaukee residents are more prone to commit election fraud. And, regardless of intent, a racial subtext is barely below the surface, given the fact that Milwaukee is the only majority-minority city in the state (emphasis added).”  

Finally, the racialization of the voter fraud issue continued in 2010, with an incident a month before the gubernatorial election, in which dozens of billboards were placed throughout Milwaukee’s inner city, showing people behind jail bars, with the words “We Voted Illegally” and the penalty for voting illegally prominently displayed. The billboards, according to news reports, apparently were paid for “by a private family foundation.” Community leaders saw clear racial coding behind the billboard campaign. The Rev. Kenneth Wheeler, pastor of Cross Lutheran Church and a member of the Milwaukee Innercity Congregations Allied for Hope said: “The message is offensive and implicitly and explicitly creates a climate of fear in the African-American community that was historically denied justice and discouraged from voting.”

In short, from the apocryphal billboards of the 1956 Milwaukee mayoral campaign to the very real billboards of the 2010 Wisconsin gubernatorial election, Milwaukee and Wisconsin have long histories of racialized electoral politics. Sometimes, consistent with the frank description of electoral strategy offered by Lee Atwater, these appeals have been overt and raw; but more frequently, especially in the modern era, the racialization is more coded, cast in “neutral” policy terms like “cutting wasteful government programs” or “fighting voter fraud.” But as Princeton’s Martin Gilens notes, “race coded issues are attractive to some politicians precisely because they can exploit the power of racial suspicion and animosity while insulating themselves from charges of race-baiting.”

Submitted by:  /s/ Marc V. Levine  May 18, 2012
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City of West Bend (co-PI), “Economic Analysis,” $5,000 (awarded December 2004).


Milwaukee Graphic Arts Institute, “Analysis of the Milwaukee-Area Printing Industry,” $3,000 (awarded December 2002).


City of Milwaukee, Community Development Block Grant (principal investigator), “Inner City Transportation and Jobs Analysis,” $4,000 (awarded January 1998).

City of Milwaukee, Community Development Block Grant (principal investigator), “Near South Side Business Marketing Analysis,” $15,000 (awarded January 1998).


Northeast Milwaukee Industrial Development corporation (principal investigator), "NMIDC Technical Assistance," $6,000 (awarded February 1997).

East Side Housing Action Corporation (principal investigator), "Riverwest Community Schools Project Technical Assistance," $13,500 (awarded February 1997).

South Milwaukee Public Schools, (principal investigator) "South Milwaukee Public Schools Strategic Planning Technical Assistance," $1,500 (awarded December 1996).


Sinai Samaritan Medical Center, "An Analysis of the Economic Impact of Sinai Samaritan Hospital on Greater Milwaukee," $14,600 (awarded February 1996).

City of Milwaukee, Common Council Economic Development Committee (principal investigator), "A Feasibility Study of an Economically Targeted Investment Program in Milwaukee," $10,000 (awarded October 1995).

Milwaukee County Pension Board (principal investigator), "A Feasibility Study of an Economically Targeted Investment Program in Milwaukee," $15,000 (awarded October 1995).


International Longshoreman Association Local 815 (principal investigator), "Employee Ownership Feasibility Study," $21,500 (awarded January 1994).
International Longshoreman Association Local 815 (principal investigator), "Employee Ownership Feasibility Study: Proposal Preparation," $1,500 (awarded August 1993).

Northeast Milwaukee Industrial Development Corporation (principal investigator), "Industrial Corridor Technical Assistance," $1,800 (awarded July 1993).


Walnut Avenue Improvement Corporation (principal investigator), "Economic Analysis of the Walnut Avenue Area," $500 (awarded June 1993).

Esperanza Unida (principal investigator), "611Project Technical Assistance," $1,000 (awarded May 1993).


TEACHING AND RESEARCH EXPERTISE:

- 19th and 20th century Urban History (United States and Canada)
- Urban Economic Development Policy
- Politics and Policy in Canada and Quebec
- 19th and 20th century U.S. Political History
- The Politics of Multicultural Societies