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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although it is hoped that certain significant items might be developed in this study, the intentions of the author are mainly: (1) to investigate the voting behavior in certain specific areas of Kalamazoo, (2) to revise and compile the voting records of Kalamazoo, and (3) perhaps to add knowledge to the field of voting behavior.

The original interest in the subject of this thesis was primarily obtained from Elton Ham of Kalamazoo College. Discussions with him seemed to intensify my curiosity about voting behavior in Kalamazoo. We were particularly interested in finding possible reasons for the high-national and low-local voting frequency in certain low-income areas on the northeast side of Kalamazoo.

A study of this type becomes much more reliable when it covers a fairly long period of time. This is complicated in Kalamazoo by the fact that the geographical boundaries of all of the Kalamazoo precincts were greatly altered in 1944. However, precinct #3 (on the northeast side) was little affected by this change. This precinct lies in census tract #2 (bounded by the city limits on the north, the Kalamazoo
River on the east, Rose Street on the west, and a line approximating Parsons Street on the south).

Our investigation found the following facts about precinct #3: low average income, large percentage of Negroes, high turnover of occupancy, and some actual slum conditions. It was then decided that any conclusions about precinct #3 could be better substantiated if a contrasting area were studied. Precinct #22 (on the southwest side of Kalamazoo) was chosen because it has high income, only one racial group, low turnover of occupancy, and no potential slum conditions.

It is hoped that any conclusions made will be useful as there was great effort made to keep all variables at a minimum; that is, the questionnaire was practically identical in both precincts, the same interviewers were used in both precincts, and the same general methods were used in both precincts.

**Methodology**

Perhaps social research will not become an exact science which makes it difficult for any study such as this to proceed with universally-accepted methods. For this reason, effort was made to contact many social agencies in this area so that a general agreement concerning methodology might be obtained. A brief outline of the methodology employed in this study follows: in studies of this
type, it is desirable to talk with as many people as possible. Both areas in this study contained about 900 registered voters, and it was felt that a 20 per cent sample would be adequate. (Only registered voters were considered as respondents inasmuch as it is only they who can possibly vote.) The selection was done by choosing a number between one and five and using that number and each fifth number thereafter as the basis for choosing the respondent list. The registration lists for these two precincts were used as the basis for obtaining the sample. The same numbers and multiples were used in both precincts.

The voting registration lists were very helpful, because they allowed us to determine the birthplace and voting record for each individual studies. After these names had been picked, each person was interviewed by means of a questionnaire. (The questionnaire appears in appendix A.)

Studies of this type usually involve certain inherent problems, some of which are: 1) it is difficult to choose questions which will obtain the desired results; 2) there is the problem of communication between the interviewer and the interviewed; and 3) a most difficult problem is in establishing a valid relationship between the response to the questionnaire and voting behavior. The
person writing this thesis and questionnaire has preconceived assumptions which might flavor many of the conclusions. However, social research has these inherent difficulties, and it is still desirable to proceed in spite of them.
CHAPTER II

THE PEOPLE

When Titus Bronson roamed the woods in lower Michigan early in the nineteenth century, he probably had no idea that this desolate area would one day become a large industrial and educational center.

Bronson's small village is now known as Kalamazoo, Michigan, which is the center of a Standard Metropolitan area of more than 100,000 persons.¹

Today, Kalamazoo is the center of a diversified industrial area, and the home of three colleges. More than 8 per cent of the adult Kalamazoo population has attended college which is 2 per cent higher than the median for the United States.²

The educational attainment of the Kalamazoo population does not necessarily mean that the Kalamazoo population


is therefore prosperous. The 1949 median family income in Kalamazoo was $2853 and the median value of owner-occupied dwellings was $7316, both of which were well under the National median. 3

Kalamazoo is unique in that most of the important industries are locally owned. Upjohn, Sutherland, and Shakespeare are three large companies that have local ownership and/or management. This fact is important because these companies contribute a good deal of their resources to Kalamazoo with a resulting familial atmosphere which few communities of this size possess. The Upjohn Company, for instance, has never been seriously approached by any union because the company has been so enlightened. Many of the other companies in Kalamazoo have only company unions, if any at all.

These above factors were significant because during the course of the interviewing, only a very few of the respondents displayed more than a passive liking for unions. Many of the poorest people expressed a dislike for unions. One elderly gentleman in the north Krom street area told me that "unions are run just like Hitler ran Germany--I'm against them." In the next breath the man said that he had been a member of a union and thought that they had

3 Ibid., p. 2.
financially benefited him.

Something else unique to Kalamazoo is the high-percentage of Protestantism; only 13.6 per cent of the adult Kalamazoo population classify themselves as members of the Roman Catholic Church.  

This unusually low percentage of Catholic membership made it statistically questionable to test some of the common assumptions concerning Catholic voting habits.

Let us now turn to an examination of the two areas which constitute the major interest of this study.

Although Kalamazoo is very predominately Republican, there are still a few areas which display strong Democratic tendencies. One of these areas lies along the Kalamazoo River on the far north (and slightly east) side of the city. The people within this area vote quite regularly every four years and then take little or no part in local elections. One of the original purposes of this thesis was to determine the reason or reasons for this apathy. Why do 70 per cent of these people vote in a presidential election, while less than 15 per cent of them vote in a local election involving a multi-million dollar

---


5 The area of study is precinct #3, which is bounded by Rose Street on the west, the city limits on the north, the Kalamazoo River on the east, and Parsons Street on the south.
school-bonding issue? In order to determine the reasons for this apathy a comprehensive questionnaire was devised which was to be given to about 20 per cent of the people in this area. However, it was felt that if a contrasting area was also studied, more reliable conclusions would result. Therefore, precinct #22, on the southwest side of the city, was chosen as the contrasting area.  

The decision to include a contrasting area of study was probably a good one inasmuch as it invalidated many beliefs thought peculiar only to precinct #3.  

On Monday, July 9, 1956, we began the task of interviewing 175 persons in precinct #3. Our success in obtaining completed interviews is shown in graph #1 on page 10.  

The interviewing in precinct #3 was completed by July 18, and we then began interviewing the people in precinct #22 on July 23.  

6Precinct #22 is bounded by Park Street on the east, Montrose Avenue on the south, Alta Vista on the west, and Maple Street on the north.  

7For instance, we found similarities in mobility of population and interest in politics which might have been incorrectly related to income and educational levels had we not studied a contrasting area.  

8It should be remembered that all interviews were completed prior to the Democratic and Republican conventions.
All of the interviewers were amazed at the differences we found between the people of precincts #3 and #22. The superficial differences are obvious, but there was something more than divergence of income and education. The people in precinct #3 were flattered that someone seemed interested in their views and problems. It was always difficult to end an interview, as these people insisted that we stay and talk with them. These people are materially unsuccessful and yet had little to complain about. Many of them knew little about political problems, and yet they seemed anxious to ask questions about national and local happenings.

In precinct #22, very few respondents showed a willingness to be interviewed to the degree that the respondents in precinct #3 displayed. There seemed to be no genuine, inquisitive interest in political events amongst the respondents in precinct #22.

However, an interesting sociological discovery was made concerning "fringe-area" people in both of the precincts. The wealthier people in precinct #3 (the poor precinct) and the poorer people in precinct #22 (the wealthy precinct) seemed to have the most complaints concerning their neighbors, Kalamazoo, and the country. They were much more dissatisfied than their poorer or richer neighbors. Perhaps
RESPONSE TO OUR QUESTIONNAIRE (BY PERCENTAGES)
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(Each of the succeeding graphs is based on the completed interviews which numbered 80 in precinct #3 and 87 in precinct #22).
the simplest explanation of this phenomenon is the better one: the wealthier people in precinct #3 live on the far northern end of Rose, Burdick, Krom, and Edwards Streets. Most of these persons have lived in this section all of their lives and have seen an established neighborhood deteriorate into a potential slum area. The Negroes, the southerners, and the city commission have all become the scapegoat for this slum condition.

In precinct #22, the less wealthy people probably play the role of the conspicuous consumer and the social climber, and they consequently seem more frustrated. These "unestablished people" were the most difficult to interview and were more careful in answering the questions. They always appeared anxious to say the correct thing and conform to the more successful and influential persons in their district.

Some of the answers to the question of low voting frequency in precinct #3 (in local elections) might well be answered by a strict sociological comparison between those people in precinct #3 and those in precinct #22.

Graph #2, on page 13, tells us that almost one-third
of the respondents in precinct #3 were born in the deep south. This fact is important inasmuch as almost 10 per cent of our Negro respondents stated that they had never voted in the south because of poll tax and a fear of voting. It is difficult to imagine these people coming to the north and suddenly becoming frequent voters.

Moreover, voting frequency on local issues might be proportional to the familiarity with the locale. Most of the respondents in precinct #22 have lived in or near Kalamazoo all of their lives, while the mobility is much higher in precinct #3. In fact, since 1952, twice the number of people have moved in precinct #3 than have moved in precinct #22. In addition, most of the moves in precinct #22 involved another Kalamazoo address, while many replies in precinct #3 went: "He's a gone back to Miss'ipi."

There is also a tendency among voters in precinct #3 to abstain from the polls when they don't like a particular proposal, rather than to vote against it. There is a definite dislike for people with money, although this dislike remains far short of being unanimous. Quite a few

---

9 The racial breakdown of respondents in precinct #3 was: forty-six whites and thirty-four Negroes. In precinct #22 all of the respondents were whites.

10 The exact ration is 69:36. Refer also to graph #1 on page
Graph #2
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respondents stated that they preferred being governed by wealthy people because "those people got more time and they are smarter." Graph #3 shows the response to the question: "Do you think that the wealthy people are running this town?" (See page 15.) A similar question was used which asked how people thought successful people got to be that way. The variance of answers was very interesting. In short, the wealthy people stated that ability was the major element in success, while the poorer people felt that opportunities given a person by his family contributed most to success. The importance of graphs #3 and #4 are that they portray some fundamental difference in attitudes among these people. (Graph #4 is on page 16.)

Although we have just shown some psychological differences in the make-up of these people, they still all have something in common. That is, all people tend to fear classes and groups below themselves. This feeling prevailed in both precincts and increased in relation to class elevation. The higher the class, the more intense and repeated the response became. Almost 75 per cent of the people in precinct #22 who answered the question: "Which groups do you think are getting more power than is good for the country?" answered "unions." In precinct #3, the most common answers to this question were: "Catholics," "Negroes," "southerners," and "Dutchmen," depending upon the race or
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religion of the respondent. About one-fourth of the respondents in both precincts didn't think that any group was getting too much power. The majority of people in the latter category were the younger people (many of whom were Negroes) in precinct #3 and the wealthier people in precinct #22.

There are many other differences amongst the people in these two precincts. More than 70 per cent of the respondents in precinct #22 have attended college, while less than 8 per cent of the respondents in precinct #3 stated that they had any college attendance. Amazingly enough, there was still almost no difference in reading habits between these two groups. In both areas, the Kalamazoo Gazette, Chicago Tribune, and Detroit Free Press were the most frequently read newspapers. Magazine preferences were also very similar. Both groups of people read for escape, and those who read for stimulation apologized for doing so.11 (Education and reading habits are shown in graphs #5, #6, and #7 on pages 20, 21, and 22 consecutively).

A great deal of the apathy in precinct #3 might be due to the fact that most respondents feel that their vote

---

11 Only one respondent in precinct #22 reads the New York Times. Three people subscribe to Atlantic, and two take Harper's and Saturday Review. Only two people read any strictly political magazines. Both of these persons live in precinct #3. One subscribes to the Democratic Digest, and the other to Progressive.
is unimportant. Almost half of the respondents in precinct #3 felt that they had little influence on government. Most of these people flatly stated that voting was "just not worth the time and trouble." In precinct #22, about 38 per cent felt that they had little influence on the government but qualified this statement by saying, "Of course, I have a vote." This latter attitude was considerably less prevalent in precinct #3. (Many people in precinct #3 seem to believe that it is futile to vote.) This perhaps allows us to answer the question as to why people in precinct #3 do not vote on local issues:

(1) Inasmuch as these people sense a futility in voting, they are never going to be greatly interested in "politics."

(2) Their interest is then likely to be greatest only when the most pressure is brought upon them. Perhaps they do not understand the complexities of governmental structure and think that the presidential vote will "hold" them for four years.

(3) Many of these people grew up amid the depression and firmly believe that the Democratic party has been their champion. They now feel obligated to return their vote but feel no such obligation nor necessity for voting in local elections.

(4) The mobility of population is high in precinct #3 which might help to explain why the voters in this area do not identify themselves with the community. A third of the respondents were born in the deep south, in a rural atmosphere, where familial identification was primordial. It is doubtful whether these people truly understand or comprehend what urbanites refer to as "civic pride," "public-mindedness," etc.
(5) The federal government has devised a very "painless" way of extracting money from the laboring man. The same psychology which has boosted installment buying has been applied with success by the federal government until everyone now speaks of "take home pay," unmindful that 20 per cent of his wages have already been extracted. The local governments must still send their tax bills, which (although smaller) are much more resented by the average wage-earner. Consequently, an antagonism arises towards local governments, which is never leveled against the federal government. This negative feeling at the local level might be exhibited by abstinence at the polls.
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CHAPTER III

VOTING

Many political analysts today believe that the Negro voter no longer identifies himself with the Democratic party to the degree that he has in the past. Although this contention might be valid for some areas, it doesn’t appear to be true of the Kalamazoo Negro voter.

The questionnaire used in this study traced the voting records of our respondents from 1940 to 1952. The Republicans strengthened their position in each of the four elections between 1940-52. But as the charts (below) illustrate, the Kalamazoo Negro voter has remained much more loyal to the Democratic party than has the white voter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NEGRO</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt 15</td>
<td>Roosevelt 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkie 4</td>
<td>Wilkie 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt 14</td>
<td>Roosevelt 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey 6</td>
<td>Dewey 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman 17</td>
<td>Truman 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey 6</td>
<td>Dewey 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson 18</td>
<td>Stevenson 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower 10</td>
<td>Eisenhower 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the white and the Negro voter in precinct #3 were more Democratic before 1952, but it was the white who
abandoned the party in that year. Some of the whites have indicated that they will return to the Democratic fold in 1956. (1956 preference):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEGRO</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Undecided&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is really in precinct #22 that we can see the popularity that Roosevelt had, even among those who consider themselves as "normally" Republicans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republicans Only -- Precinct #22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940 Wilkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944 Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948 Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952 Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same trend towards a greater degree of "Republicanness" among "normal" Republicans is see in precinct #3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republicans Only -- Precinct #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940 Wilkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944 Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Republicans Only — Precinct #3

1948
Dewey .................. 12
Truman .................. 6

1952
Eisenhower ............. 21
Stevenson ............. 2

The Democrats have also solidified themselves to some degree:

Democrats Only — Precinct #3

1940
Roosevelt ............. 16
Wilkie ................. 1

1944
Roosevelt ............. 16
Dewey ................. 2

1948
Truman ................. 18
Dewey ................. 3

1952
Stevenson ............. 21
Eisenhower ............ 4

These trends of partial and complete solidification seem to indicate that deviation from one's party has only

12This trend should not be misread so as to imply that there is an absolute closing of the ranks within either party. People considered as Republicans in precinct #3 are those who state that they are voting Republican in the 1956 presidential election. Therefore, there is considerable room for fluctuation between parties which this questionnaire couldn't uncover. This error was lessened in precinct #22 by adding the question: "Do you normally consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican, or an independent?"

13That is, no Democrat of the four voting Republican in 1952 will vote Republican in 1956. None of the four Democrats in precinct #22 has ever voted Republican. See appendix B for a summary of all of the "trends."
limited duration. It seems that the typical voter ultimately identifies himself with the party that is most acceptable to his own economic group. Three substantiations for the above conclusions were found during our study.

(1) The Republicans in precinct #22 deviated less from the Republican party each election year from 1940 until 1952, when no Republicans voted Democratic. The pro-Republican (anti-Democratic) atmosphere in precinct #22 makes it increasingly difficult for a Republican to vote otherwise.

(2) In precinct #3 (where there is a Democratic atmosphere), there was considerably less fluctuation amongst Democrats than amongst Republicans. A majority of the Republicans have voted Democratic one or more times, while only a very few Democrats have ever left their party at election time.

(3) The majority of the respondents in both precincts voted as their fathers did only when to do so there would be no conflict with their own economic group. In precinct #3, 75 per cent of those who do not vote as did their fathers had Republican fathers and now vote Democratic. This identification with economic class is even stronger in precinct #22. Almost one-fourth of the respondents had fathers who voted Democratic. More than 90 per cent of the people in this group now vote Republican. Only one respondent had a Republican father and now votes Democratic. (See graph #8, on page 27.)

Point 3 (above) led to another interesting finding: the higher the level of income, the more that politics was discussed in the home. More than 25 per cent of the respondents in precinct #3 either didn't know or didn't remember how their fathers voted. Only 6 per cent of the respondents in precinct #22 didn't know how their fathers voted.
Do People Vote as their Fathers did?
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There is also a significant difference in voting frequency in these two precincts. Voting frequency is highest for white males in the high-income group and lowest for non-white females in the lower income groups. Graph #9, on page 29 shows that the average voter in precinct #22 votes more than twice as often as does the average voter in precinct #3. Similarly, graphs #10, #11, compare differences in voting frequency by race and sex. (Graphs #10 and #11 are on pages 30 and 31 consecutively.)

The greatest difference between these two precincts is shown by comparing voting frequency in national and local elections. More than 30 per cent of the respondents in precinct #22 voted on an 18 million dollar school-bond proposal in the summer of 1956. Only 1.7 per cent of the respondents in precinct #3 participated in that election. Another examination found that more than one-third of the voters in precinct #3 vote only during even-numbered years.14 (Graph #12, on page 32 shows these differences.)

Strangely enough, although persons in precinct #22 seem to discuss politics more frequently in the home than those in precinct #3, they avoid political discussions with outsiders. Almost one-fifth of all the respondents stated

14 Most local issues are voted on in the odd-numbered years. Some elections, such as the one for the city commission, are held every other (odd) year.
VOTING FREQUENCY
by precinct

Average for precinct #3 (since 1932)
Average for precinct #22 (since 1932)

(each vertical number equals)
ONE TIME VOTED.
VOTING FREQUENCY
(BY RACE)

Precinct #3 (Only)

Each vertical number equals one voting time
(each vertical number equals one vote. This figure is obtained by averaging the votes cast since 1932 by each sex).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Year and Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Vote Only In Even-Numbered Years</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote Only In Even-Numbered Years (Precinct #3)</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Voted In 1952 Only</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Precinct #3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>Voted In 1952 Only</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Precinct #22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Voted in 1952 School-Bonding Proposal</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Precinct #3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>Voted In 1952 School-Bonding Proposal</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Precinct #22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that they do not discuss politics, even with their closest friends. This fact might well be answered by the attitude in business circles that it is unwise to discuss politics because of the danger that one might offend a business associate. More than one respondent stated, "You should never discuss religion or politics with anyone." Persons in precinct #33 do not, however, travel in closed circles; more than 60 per cent of them stated that they have very close friends who disagree with their political opinions. In precinct #3, there was an even division between those persons having and those persons not having close friends who disagree with their political views. (See graph #13, on page 34.)

Although the people in precinct #22 are less apt to openly discuss their political views, they are still far more interested in politics than are their neighbors on the north side. More than 80 per cent of the respondents in

15 This does not mean that open discussions exist within this group. Persons might disagree as to whether the 80 per cent or 90 per cent parity is the better policy and still agree on the fundamental philosophy and policies of a party. It is doubtful that many persons in the 22nd precinct disagree on fundamentals. The majority of answers to questions posed in this precinct were very similar.
Do any of your closest friends disagree with your political opinions?

(Precinct #3)

Y E S  
N O  
D O N ' T  K N O W
D O N ' T  D I S C U S S

(Precinct #22)

(each vertical number equals 10%)
precinct #22 said that they were greatly or somewhat interested in politics. Less than 60 per cent of the people in precinct #3 answered this question similarly. (See graph #14, on page 36.) Many persons in precinct #3 acknowledged this fact and added, "I vote for so-and-so and like the fact that wealthy people are running the town, because they have more time and money and therefore know more about politics than I do."

The high degree of Republicanness in Kalamazoo has a pronounced effect on the voting behavior of the religious and racial groups.

There were actually too few Catholic and Jewish respondents interviewed in this study to justify inferring much about their voting behavior. (Of the 167 respondents, only 23 were Catholic.)

However, it does appear that the Catholic voter in Kalamazoo votes Republican to a greater degree than is commonly true of Catholic voters elsewhere.

---

16 This perhaps explains why people in the poorer areas of Kalamazoo do not champion and elect one of their own people. There was great similarity between both precincts on the question of which commissioners were most popular.
HOW INTERESTED ARE YOU IN POLITICS?

"A GREAT DEAL" "SOMETHING" "NOT VERY"

(each vertical number equals 10%)
The following chart indicates how the major religious groups divide politically:

"Degree of Republicanness" 17

(Independents Not Included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Precinct #3</th>
<th>Precinct #22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Chapter II, a breakdown was made of the birthplace of our respondents. It was found that there is a definite relationship between birthplace and party preference. There is a very dominant Democratic preference among people born in the south—regardless of race. Negroes and whites born in the south preferred the Democratic party by a two to one margin. The Republican party is favored by those born in the north. In fact, precinct #3 would be Republican if it weren't for the high concentration of people there who were born in the south.

After the 1952 presidential election, a Democrat told me that he was certainly proud of himself on election day. After months of serious effort, he had persuaded his wife to vote for Stevenson and was certain that many of his

---

17 There were no Jewish respondents in precinct #3 and only four in precinct #22. The Jewish element in precinct #22 did show significant variance from the norm in that area. Of the four Jewish respondents, one was Republican, one was Democratic, and two were "independents."

18 i.e., assuming that the dominant political atmosphere of an area (such as the south) has been embedded before these people move.
friends had done the same. His wife later admitted that she had gotten into the election booth and then decided that she would instead vote for Eisenhower. This is not an isolated case, as we found many other families who had done the same. In precinct #3, only 60 per cent of the respondents were certain that their wife (or husband) voted as they do. The degree of concurrence between members of a family rose to 77 per cent in precinct #22. This also substantiates a conclusion made earlier in this chapter; namely, that politics is discussed much less in the home in precinct #3 than in precinct #22. More than 12 per cent of the respondents in precinct #3 admitted that their mate doesn't vote as they do. (Only 4.6 per cent in precinct #22 stated having voting differences with their mates.) Perhaps George Gallup should revise his definition of an independent to: "one who either secretly or openly defies the wishes, command, or dictates of his or her mate."

(The following maps trace the Kalamazoo precinct voting records in state and national elections for the years 1928-54.)
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS of Kalamazoo, Michigan

Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

Election Type: National

Year: 1928

LEGEND

- 100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.
- 75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.
- 60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.
- 50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.
- 40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.
- 25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican

Democrat
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

of

Kalamazoo, Michigan

Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

Election Year 1930

Type State

LEGEND

100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
of
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

Election Year 1932
Type National

LEGEND

100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican

Democrat
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
of
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

Election Year 1934
Type STATE

LEGEND

100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican
Democrat
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
of
Kalamazoo, Michigan
Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

Year: 1936
Election Type: National

LEGEND

100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican
Democrat
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

of

Kalamazoo, Michigan

Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

Election Year 1938

Type State

LEGEND

100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican

Democrat
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
of
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

Election Year: 1940
Type: National

LEGEND

100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS of Kalamazoo, Michigan

Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

Election Year 1942

Type State

LEGEND

100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican

Democrat
ELECTION PRECINCT MAP

of

Kalamazoo, Michigan

After 1944

 Election Type National

Year 1944

LEGEND

100% to 75% Rep., 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Rep., 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Rep., 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Rep., 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Rep., 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Rep., 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican
Democrat
ELECTION PRECINCT MAP
of
Kalamazoo, Michigan
After 1944

Year 1946
Election Type State

LEGEND
100% to 75% Rep., 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Rep., 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Rep., 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Rep., 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Rep., 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Rep., 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican
Democrat
ELECTION PRECINCT MAP
of
Kalamazoo, Michigan
After 1944

LEGEND
100% to 75% Rep., 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Rep., 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Rep., 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Rep., 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Rep., 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Rep., 75% to 100% Dem.
ELECTION PRECINCT MAP
of
Kalamazoo, Michigan
After 1944

Legend:
100% to 75% Rep., 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Rep., 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Rep., 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Rep., 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Rep., 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Rep., 75% to 100% Dem.

Republican
Democrat
ELECTION PRECINCT MAP
of
Kalamazoo, Michigan
After 1944

Year 1954
Election Type STATE

LEGEND
100% to 75% Rep., 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 60% Rep., 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Rep., 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Rep., 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Rep., 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Rep., 75% to 100% Dem.
CHAPTER IV

ATTITUDES CONCERNING NATIONAL EVENTS

Barring another physical setback, it appears that President Eisenhower will obtain a substantial majority of the Kalamazoo vote in 1956. Almost 86 per cent of the registered voters in precinct #22 have indicated that they will vote Republican in the 1956 presidential election. Most of the people in this precinct state that Eisenhower's illness makes no difference in how they will vote. A majority of the Democrats in both precincts stated that Eisenhower's illness has absolutely no bearing on their voting choice. (More Democrats than Republicans stated it made a difference.) The "undecideds" or "independents" were much more vocal about Eisenhower's two illnesses than either the Republicans or Democrats. The majority of the "independents" in both precincts are

---

19 Although this chapter was compiled and drafted before the 1956 election, the author feels that it would be poor scholarship to change the chapter in any way. Moreover, statistics are usually more valuable than is hindsight.

20 This could very well be a mere rationalization for not having yet made up one's mind. The wording of the question was: "President Eisenhower has had two serious illnesses in the last year. Has this had any affect on your decision to vote?"
apparently exercising "suspended judgment" about the issue of Eisenhower's health.

Vice President Nixon appears to be a greater handicap to the president than heart attacks and obstructions of the ileum. Unfortunately, our questionnaire did not cover voters' reactions to Nixon as a running-mate. Nevertheless, some people volunteered an appraisal of the vice president. No one in precinct #3 mentioned the issue of Nixon, but it was sometimes mentioned in precinct #22.

Most Democrats in Kalamazoo are not particularly enthused by their presidential candidate, Adlai Stevenson. Throughout our weeks of interviewing in precinct #3, no one ever mentioned Stevenson with any zeal. Some of the Negroes wished that Stevenson would clarify his stand on civil rights, while others hoped that he would adopt a much stronger position. Nevertheless, the Kalamazoo Negro

21Four people in precinct #22 questioned Nixon as a running-mate. Specifically, they were: one Democrat, two Republicans, and one "independent." The Democrat and one of the Republicans would vote for Eisenhower if Nixon wasn't running, but they will now vote for Stevenson. The other Republican and the independent will not vote in this year's presidential election. Inasmuch as all of these people voted for Eisenhower in 1952, this could represent a 6 per cent loss to the Republicans. If this anti-Nixon feeling is true for the country as a whole, the Republicans could conceivably lose in 1956. A Democratic victory is not probable because as an election approaches, "independent" thinking vanishes. The Berelson, et al, study demonstrated quite conclusively that most voters ultimately return to the ranks of their party. The June and July "independent" voter suddenly becomes partisan in November.
approves of Stevenson's position by almost a five to one margin.

The white people in precinct #3 were very much against Stevenson's stand, regardless of party preference. The "undecideds" in precinct #3 all are in favor of Stevenson's stand on civil rights, and it appears that the Democrats will win a substantial majority of the "independent" vote. (Graph #15, on page 56 summarizes the feeling about Stevenson.)

If considered by party category, Stevenson and civil rights were no less popular in precinct #22. The Democrats and "independents" favored Stevenson's position, and the Republicans were only against it by a four to three margin. In both precincts, most people said that they either didn't know what Stevenson's position was—or had never heard of it.

The prevailing tone in Kalamazoo has made Kalamazoo Democrats very pessimistic about their chances of obtaining a majority in 1956. Most of the Democrats in precinct #3 and all of the Democrats in precinct #22 say that the Republicans will win this year. Only 4 per cent

\[\text{Since this poll was taken, Stevenson clarified and strengthened his position to the extent that it is reasonable to assume that Stevenson is now more popular with the Negro than he was at the time of the poll.}\]
ATTITUDES TOWARD STEVENSON'S STAND ON CIVIL RIGHTS
(By race, precinct #3)

(Each vertical number equals 10%)
of the Republicans in both precincts feel that the Democrats will win the presidency.\textsuperscript{23} Graphs #16 and #17, on pages 58 and 59 give a complete breakdown of whom people in either party and either precinct think will win the presidency.

The Democrats are not only pessimistic about the chances of their own party winning the election this year; they also haven't as yet made up their minds about voting Democratic in the November election. In July, 26 per cent of them in precinct #3 had not as yet made up their minds. This is in sharp contrast with precinct #22, where practically everyone has already made his decision--prior to the conventions.

More than 86 per cent of the total respondents in precinct #22 said that they were going to vote Republican this year. This is only a 2 per cent difference from the

\textsuperscript{23} These findings are of little aid to those who wonder whether people vote to "get on the band-wagon" or whether people vote against the favored party because of an inner desire to upset the poll. There seems to be no particular evidence to support either belief.

\textsuperscript{24} The author is assuming that most of the people who now list themselves as "undecided" or "independent" voted Democratic in 1952. The basis for this assumption is that the present Republican preference is identical with the total per cent received by that party in precinct #3 in 1952. The present Democratic preference is almost 24 per cent less than the totals received in precinct #3 in 1952.
WHICH PARTY WILL WIN THE 1956 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?

Precinct #3

Precinct #22

Think Republicans will win

" Democrats "

Don't know who will win

(each vertical line equals 10%)
HOW MEMBERS OF EACH PARTY THINK THEIR PARTY WILL DO IN THE 1956 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

(Totals of both precincts)

REPUBLICANS   DEMOCRATS   "UNDecideds"

(Each vertical number equals 10%)
total Republican vote in 1952. The Democrats might receive less than 10 per cent in the 22nd precinct this year. The following chart indicates how the respondents in both precincts intend to vote this year. (Graph #18 is on page 61.)

The three maps at the end of this chapter show party affiliation (by area) since 1928.
HOW ARE YOU GOING TO VOTE IN 1956?

Precinct #3

Precinct #22

Democrat
Republican
"Independent"
Other

(each vertical number equals 10%)
VOTING BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

of

Kalamazoo, Michigan

Precinct Arrangement up to 1944

MAJOR PARTY AFFILIATION 1928-1940

LEGEND

100% to 75% Republican, 0% to 25% Dem.

75% to 60% Republican, 25% to 40% Dem.

60% to 50% Republican, 40% to 50% Dem.

50% to 40% Republican, 50% to 60% Dem.

40% to 25% Republican, 60% to 75% Dem.

25% to 0% Republican, 75% to 100% Dem.
ELECTION PRECINCT MAP

of

Kalamazoo, Michigan

After 1944

LEGEND

100% to 75% Rep., 0% to 25% Dem.
75% to 50% Rep., 25% to 40% Dem.
60% to 50% Rep., 40% to 50% Dem.
50% to 40% Rep., 50% to 60% Dem.
40% to 25% Rep., 60% to 75% Dem.
25% to 0% Rep., 75% to 100% Dem.

- SOLIDLY DEM.
- FRINGE AREA
- SOLIDLY REP.
- Republican
- Democrat
MAJOR PARTY AFFILIATION 1950-1954

ELECTION PRECINCT MAP

of

Kalamazoo, Michigan

Solidly Dem.

Solidly Rep.

Fringe area
It is practically impossible today to pick up a newspaper and not witness considerable concern and discussion about the nature and the role of the "independent" voter.

The so-called "independent" voter is the subject of much interest although few people agree as to the definition of "independent" voter.

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines an independent voter as one "not bound by party; exercising a free choice in voting."

It is a commonly-shared myth that the "independent" voter is one who rationally weighs all of the objective factors, and after having done so, casts his ballot accordingly.

My contention is that we cannot identify "independent" voters by asking people whether or not they are an "independent" voter. More voters are self-styled "independents" than seems to be the case. George Gallup, Lewis Harris, and David Lawrence all contend that the
"independent" voter exceeds 15 per cent of those voting.25

There are possible explanations as to why Gallup, Harris, and Lawrence place the independent electorate as high as they do. Perhaps their totals include: (1) those persons who do not wish to reveal their voting preferences but have already made up their minds; (2) those persons who do not intend to vote and state that they are "undecided" at the present time; (3) those persons who always vote for the same party but who consider themselves as "independent" until the evening before election day, when they "suddenly" make their decisions; and (4) the remaining "independents" might be those who actually weigh all available evidence each election year and then cast their votes accordingly.

On the basis of my limited evidence, it appears

Lawrence has stated: "there are tens of millions of independents and they are not a minority of the electorate by any means." Quoted in an editorial appearing in the August 29, 1956 Kalamazoo Gazette.
that all of these estimates about the size of the "independent" electorate are too high (at least for Kalamazoo).

In precinct #3 more than 26 per cent of the respondents listed themselves as "undecided." Does this mean, therefore, that these people are to be classified as "independent"? Let us examine these twenty-one questionnaires: Five of the twenty-one respondents listing themselves as "independents" have always voted Democratic. Five more have always voted Democratic (i.e., when they did vote). One "independent" has always voted Republican (when he voted). Two more people declined to say for whom they were voting. This leaves us with eight persons who might be placed in the category of "independent."

I shall rule out three of these eight, because the respondents had voted a straight Democratic ticket in every election but one since 1940.

The remaining respondents (6.25 per cent) are not necessarily "independent."

The chart on the following page indicates how the five possible "independents" have voted since 1940.

---

26 This might indicate that many voters abstain from voting when their party doesn't please them. This is quite different from the orthodox concept that the "independent" usually votes, once he has weighed the issues and the candidates.
Precinct #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent &quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1944</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1952</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV*</td>
<td>D*</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent &quot;C&quot;</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent &quot;D&quot;</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent &quot;E&quot;</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart is interesting because we shall notice a striking similarity between this one and the one for precinct #22.

A different approach was used in precinct #22 when an additional question was inserted, which asked: "Do you normally consider yourself to be a Republican, Democrat, or independent?" (See graphs #19 and 20 on pages 69 and 70.) About 20 per cent of the respondents answered that they were "independent."

Five of these respondents have always voted straight Republican; one has never voted; two voted only once (for Eisenhower); and two have voted a straight Republican ticket since 1940. The following chart indicates how the eight remaining possible independents have voted since 1940:

*DV = didn't vote or don't remember.
D = Voted Democratic.
R = Voted Republican
WHICH POLITICAL PARTY PEOPLE IN PRECINCT #22

CONSIDER THEMSELVES MEMBERS OF

Each vertical number equals 10%
DO YOU VOTE A STRAIGHT-PARTY TICKET?
(precinct #22 Only)

(each vertical number equals 10%)
Precinct #22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1944</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1952</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>DV*</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>D*</td>
<td>R*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the great similarity between the "independent" voters in both precincts. The great majority in this category voted for Truman in 1948, while all of them who voted, voted for Eisenhower in 1952. This "independent" category represents more than 7 per cent of our respondents and is certainly a large enough group to be able to swing most any election. There is then an "independent" voter; and even if this category is only 7 per cent of the total registered voters, it is still a very strong and important segment. Practically no presidential election has ever been so one-sided that this 7 per cent element couldn't have been the decisive factor. Truman's 1948 and Eisenhower's 1952 victories probably resulted from winning the 'independent

*DV = Didn't vote.
D = Voted Democratic.
R = Voted Republican.
vote.

27. If we then project our conclusions about a 7 percent "independent" element to 60,000,000 voters, we find more than 4,000,000 voters who can change the results of any election. Lawrence's figure of "tens of millions of independents" appears to be an overstatement.

27. The results of our poll do not indicate that Truman's victory in 1948 was due to the fact that the Republicans failed to vote. The Republicans voted, but the "independent" or marginal voter favored Truman.
CHAPTER VI

KALAMAZOO

In general, most voters in Kalamazoo are quite satisfied with the present city commission. During the course of this study a question was posed to our respondents which asked: "Do you feel that the city commission has solved most of the problems in Kalamazoo?" About 60 per cent of the respondents in both precincts answered "yes" to this question, while less than 30 per cent answered the question in the negative.

A similar question was asked which received a somewhat different response. (Perhaps the difference was due mainly to the fact that the question allowed for more possible answers.) Less than 50 per cent of the persons interviewed in precinct #3 felt "that the city commission has done a good job," while almost 70 per cent of the respondents in precinct #22 answered the question similarly. (See graph #22 on page 75.)

Kalamazoo voters do appear to be particularly satisfied with two proposals which were considered as highly controversial before their adoption. These two proposals were: the annexation of certain contiguous areas, and the
DO YOU FEEL THAT THE CITY COMMISSION HAS
SOLVED MOST OF THE PROBLEMS IN KALAMAZOO?

Precinct #3

Precinct #22

YES
NO
DON'T KNOW

(each vertical number equals 10%)
DO YOU FEEL THAT THE CITY COMMISSION HAS DONE A GOOD JOB, A FAIR JOB, OR A POOR ONE?

Precinct #3

Precinct #22

Each vertical number equals 10%
one-way street plan. Both measures are more popular in precinct #22 than in precinct #3, but the margin of approval is very high in both areas. (Graphs #23 and #24 illustrate the margin of approval.)

The pride that goes with a larger community seems to play an important role when it comes to the question of annexation. How else does one explain why Kalamazoo city residents overwhelmingly favor the annexation of surrounding areas even though many of them admit that only annexation area residents benefit from joining the city? The prestige gained from living in a larger city seems to have considerable appeal.

This factor of pride seems to be important in the annexation areas also, but here it works inversely: i.e., more opposition to annexation appears in these areas than in the city which may be caused by the fear that these people will lose their "identity" once they have joined with the city. The anti-annexationists tell their people that political domination will result from

---

28 Almost 20 per cent of the respondents in precinct #3 (30 per cent in precinct #22) stated that annexation area residents alone benefit from annexation. A larger number of respondents than this seemed to be aware that taxes may go up when new areas are annexed. (See graph #25 on page 79.)
DO YOU THINK THAT THE ONE-WAY STREET PLAN HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL OR UNSUCCESSFUL?
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DON'T KNOW
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Annexation area residents
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Both
Neither

Precinct #22

Each vertical number equals 10%
annexation. But during the past few years, Kalamazoo has witnessed considerable annexation which has added approximately 20,000 persons to its population.

The one-way street issue is more easily discussed because there is a great similarity between the margin of the original vote and the present popularity. It is interesting to note that opposition (at election time) to one-way streets primarily came from those people who live in the areas directly affected by the new street system.

At a city commission meeting early in 1954, a question was raised concerning accounting practices used in the accounts of the Kalamazoo city light department. No dishonesty was charged, there was only disagreement as to certain methods of accounting. However, this relatively insignificant charge was soon to explode into one of the bitterest political battles in recent Kalamazoo history.

Soon after this question of accounting practice was raised, some members of the commission began to question whether or not the city of Kalamazoo should even have

---

29 Under Michigan law, voters in both the annexing area and the city proper must separately favor annexation. City residents usually vote overwhelmingly in favor of annexation while it is usually very close in the annexing areas. It is somewhat doubtful that the annexing areas would come in at all if it weren't so economically desirable to annex. Many areas benefit from lower taxes (and better services) once they join with the city. See the maps at the end of this chapter.
a light plant. Some commissioners felt that the city was exceeding proper governmental domain (i.e., by selling power to private individuals), while others contended that the government should sell power as one of its services.

A brief outline of the events follow: commissioners Upjohn and Todd took opposite positions in this dispute and became principal participants in the fight over the light plant. Todd was definitely opposed to the sale of the light plant and believed that the city light plant had shown considerable net-profit earnings over a long period of time. Upjohn stated that the light plant had been losing money and that the city should sell the light plant before large expenditures became necessary.

Soon after the feud began, the Consumer's Power Company (a large private utility in southern Michigan) offered the City of Kalamazoo $1,625,000 for the plant. This sum was considered to be generous to practically everyone, regardless of their position on the issue. In fact, the commission seriously considered immediate sale of the light plant. Todd fought this most vigorously and saw an apparent "loop-hole" which would prevent sale of the light plant.

The city light plant was a municipally-owned utility which supplied energy for city purposes. A small area of residences (about 10 per cent of the total) and commercial establishments in the city were also served by the company for many years.
plant by the commission without referendum. But the com-
mission decided to have an advisory vote and the proposal
to sell the light plant was placed on the ballot in June,
1955.

The result of this election was surprising to those
advocating sale of the light plant. Out of a total vote of
more than 6,000, the proposal carried by exactly 62 votes.
(This proposal was actually defeated in 23 out of the 32
Kalamazoo voting precincts.) This was vastly different
from the landslide victory that the proponents of the sale
felt would take place at the polls. (See the maps at the
end of the chapter.)

This controversy demonstrated the apathy that the
majority of Kalamazoo voters have concerning local matters.
The maps at the close of this chapter illustrate that apathy
was greatest in those precincts most opposed to the sale of
the light plant.

We conducted our survey in precinct #3 about
thirteen months after the election and still found a great
deal of bitterness and opposition to the sale of the light
plant. Most respondents in precinct #3 who answered the
question, "Do you think that the sale of the Light Plant
was in your best interest?", still felt that it was not. 31

31 In precinct #22 the response to this question was 7 to
1 in the belief that it was in the best interest.
Another indication of resentment to the sale of the light plant was brought out in precinct #3. When we asked which commissioners the respondents in precinct #3 would vote for, Paul Todd was frequently mentioned. 32 (Graph #26 on page 84 shows the sentiment of our respondents toward the sale of the light plant.)

Some city officials were fearful that a real storm might develop in 1956 after plans were announced concerning the city’s housing redevelopment plan. The redevelopment plan is a long-range project designed to alleviate problems created by rapidly deteriorating areas. Kalamazoo is worse off than most communities because of the number of older homes which are rapidly becoming dilapidated. The Kalamazoo city government became concerned about this problem and applied for federal aid to finance the redevelopment project. Soon after the initial phase was completed, an area on the north side was designated as needing immediate attention. The Kalamazoo Gazette printed a map delineating the exact area and many persons inferred from this map that

32 This is surprising inasmuch as Todd was defeated in his bid for re-election in the November 1955 city election. When we asked the question of "which commissioners would you vote for?", we implied: "which of the present commissioners."

DO YOU THINK THAT THE SALE OF THE LIGHT PLANT WAS IN YOUR BEST INTEREST?

(Precinct #3)

- YES
- NO
- DON'T KNOW

(Precinct #22)

(each vertical number equals 10%)
a specific "slum-area" was existent on the north side. City officials were then fearful that serious repercussions would result.

We asked questions concerning this project and found very little resentment to it. In precinct #3, the margin was 4 to 1 in favor of the plan. Most persons hadn't even heard of the redevelopment plan.

In precinct #22, the plan was favored by a 9 to 1 margin. More than 40 per cent of the respondents in this area had never heard of the plan either.

It might be helpful to the commission and other interested persons if some of the comments given were listed. The most typical remarks by persons in precinct #3 were:

I was very much opposed to the article in Gazette.

... shouldn't tear houses down—let people alone.

... plan is good but they shouldn't have said property was worth $2,000-$3,000; this spoils all chances to sell houses in this area.

... should be done without federal money.

34However, many people did not answer the question in a simple affirmative or negative way, but offered other comments.

35It appears that opposition to the redevelopment plan is recently mounting now that more people know about it.

36That is, typical remarks by those people who didn't simply favor or oppose the project, but instead offered other comments.
In precinct #22, the comments were generally more favorable. Some of them were: "I'm 100 per cent for it." "There should be (such a plan)." "Good--should be speeded up more."

Most people believe that a redevelopment plan is needed and that the problem of providing adequate housing in Kalamazoo is a serious one. (See graph #27 on page 87.)

Other problems (in addition to housing) were covered in our survey. The following chart shows which problems we found to be most frequently mentioned in both precincts. The reader will notice that while there is some similarity in the responses received in these two areas, the emphasis varied to a great degree. Housing and re-development meant much to persons living in the poorer neighborhood; swimming pools and recreational facilities were frequently mentioned in the wealthier district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems in Kalamazoo that Need Immediate Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Precinct #5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic (too snarled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streets need repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor street lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirty rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juvenile delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban renewal needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 Listed according to frequency that they were mentioned.
HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE WAY IN WHICH THE URBAN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN IS BEING HANDLED IN KALAMAZOO?

Each Vertical Number Equals 10%
The "timing" of the questionnaire undoubtedly had some influence on the answers shown on the previous chart. The housing program was much in the news when we were in precinct #3, and the garbage ordinance was being considered at the time the survey was being conducted in precinct #22.

It was stated during the discussion of the City Light Plant that former commissioner Todd was still popular with those persons who were against selling the light plant to the Consumer's Power Company. Todd was mentioned frequently in precinct #3 (where the light plant proposal was soundly defeated), and never mentioned in precinct #22. The following is a chart which compares the relative popularity of the commissioners as found in our survey. A comparison is made between the 1955 commission election and the question on the poll which asked: "If an election for the city commission were to be held tomorrow, whom would you vote for?"
**Precinct #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1955 election</th>
<th>1956 poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Dunbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estill</td>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Mulholland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schrier</td>
<td>Upjohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusbaum</td>
<td>Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar</td>
<td>Knapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upjohn</td>
<td>Schrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Precinct #22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1955 election</th>
<th>1956 poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar</td>
<td>Dunbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upjohn</td>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Upjohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Knapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapp</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulholland</td>
<td>Mulholland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton</td>
<td>Schrier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dunbar and Allen seem to have maintained their previous strength and no significant changes were noted.
in either district.

The city commission might be gratified to learn that people are quite happy in Kalamazoo, no matter how many problems there might be. More than 90 per cent of the respondents in precinct #22 felt that Kalamazoo was a "very good place in which to live." In precinct #3 less than 20 per cent thought that Kalamazoo was "not a good place in which to live and almost 60 per cent thought that it was very good. (See graph #28 on page 91.) Most Kalamazooans are happy in their community and although they readily admit that there are many problems, they seem to have complete trust in their commission and are quite willing to let this commission work out the problems of their community.
IN GENERAL, WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS IS A VERY GOOD COMMUNITY TO LIVE IN; ONLY FAIRLY GOOD, OR NOT GOOD.

(each vertical number equals 10%)
Results of April, 1955, Annexation Election
(This proposal carried by 6,229 to 2,416)
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Kalamazoo, Michigan
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 " " " 2-1 " " "
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 " " " Defeated
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ELECTION PRECINCT MAP of Kalamazoo, Michigan

Favor One-Way Streets

Against One-Way Streets
VOTE ON SALE OF LIGHT PLANT
JUNE, 1955
ELECTION PRECINCT MAP
of
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Totals
For Sale: 2,160
Against Sale: 3,098
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OPPOSED SALE
MOST OPPOSED (MORE THAN 2-1)
Percent of Eligible Voters Voting in Light Plant Election
(or, how 9 precincts can defeat 23 others)

ELECTION PRECINCT MAP

of

Kalamazoo, Michigan

- 30% or more
- 25 - 29%
- 20 - 24.9%
- 15 - 19.9%
- 14.9 or less
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

While it has been the intention of the author to present the preceding graph, maps, tables, and other material in easily comprehensible terms, the busy reader might prefer to read a summary of this study.

The summary does not list all of the findings but includes most of the major findings as well as some findings not heretofore presented for reasons of continuity.

The following observations are based solely on the findings obtained in precincts #3 and #22.

Economic

1. People with low income believe that they have less influence upon governmental decisions than do the wealthier people. On the other hand, people with low incomes prefer to have the wealthier people govern them.

2. Voting frequency in the higher-income area is approximately twice that of the lower-income area.

3. Voting frequency is greatest in national elections and least in local elections, at all economic levels. People with low incomes vote much less frequently in local elections than do the wealthier people. However, this difference of voting frequency decreases in national elections.
4. Interest in politics increases with the level of income.

5. Politics is discussed more at home in the wealthier district than it is in the poorer area.

6. The degree of "Republicanness" increases with the level of income.

7. People with low incomes like labor unions better than do the wealthier people. However, people in the low income categories approve of the "billion-dollar" corporation to almost the same degree as do the wealthier respondents.

8. While the majority of people at all economic levels preferred that the presidential candidate have government experience; people with higher levels of income were more insistent that presidential candidates have some business experience.

Educational

9. It is difficult to attribute interest in politics to educational attainment alone. While it is true that the respondents in precinct #22 were more interested in politics than were the respondents in precinct #3, the reading habits were similar in both precincts. Very few respondents in either precinct read more than the daily newspapers for their political information; and the newspaper reading habits were strikingly similar in both areas.

10. While it appears that the degree of "Republicanness" increases with the level of educational attainment, this does not preclude the possibility that behavioral correlations do not establish causal relationships.

Familial Relationships

11. Members of the same family tend to vote alike. However, this "rule" is only true when members of the family (particularly father and son) are of the same economic class. When economic distinctions arise, people are more likely to vote with their economic groups than with their family.
Racial

12. White voters vote more frequently than do Negro voters. The ration of frequency is approximately 11:7.5.

13. Negroes born in the north vote more frequently than do Negroes who were born in the south and have moved to the north.

14. Negroes who were born in the south and have since moved to the north are more Democratic than are Negroes who are born in the north. The same thing is true of whites who were born in the south and have since moved to the north.

15. Stevenson's stand on civil rights during the 1956 presidential campaign was favored three times as much by the Negro voter as by the white voter (in precinct #3).

Religious

16. Catholics vote more Democratic than do Protestants except at the very highest income levels.

17. Jewish voters feel the least strong party affiliation of any religious group.

Political

18. Voters read the newspapers that agree with their own political beliefs.

19. Republicans vote more frequently than do Democrats, particularly at the state and local level.

20. Republicans are more certain that their own party will win the presidency than are the Democrats about their own party chances.

21. People who classify themselves as Republican decide at an earlier date for whom they will vote than do those persons who classify themselves as Democrats.
Psychological

22. People are very reluctant to admit non-voting habits. In June, 1956, Kalamazoo voters considered a school-bonding proposal. Our survey (conducted the following month) revealed that one-fourth of the respondents in both precincts stated that they had voted although they actually had not.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
USED IN THIS STUDY
The questionnaire used in this study is mainly taken from the one used in the 1948 Voting Study in Elmira, New York. The reader should refer to that study, particularly Appendices A and B: Bernard R. Berelson et al., Voting, University of Chicago Press, 1954, pp. 327-81.
Appendix A

Questionnaire used in Survey of Precinct #3

1. Where do you get most of your news about things like the coming elections -- from the radio, from the newspapers, from magazines, from talking to people, or where?
   - Radio
   - Newspapers
   - Magazines
   - Talking to people
   - Other (specify)
   - Don't know

2. On the whole, would you say it is more important this year to elect a president who has had experience in government, or one who has had experience in business?
   - Government
   - Business
   - Both
   - Don't know
   - Other (specify)

3. As things look now, for which party do you think you will vote in the presidential election?
   - Republican
   - Democratic
   - Other
   - Don't know
   - Do not intend to vote

3a. Right now, how strongly do you feel about your choice -- very strongly, only fairly strongly, or not very strongly at all?
   - Very strongly
   - Fairly strongly
   - Not strongly
   - Don't know

3b. (If no party choice and "don't know") what would you say is the reason you haven't made up your mind?

4. Regardless of which party you yourself might vote for, which party do you think is actually going to win the election?
   - Republican
   - Democratic
   - Other
   - Don't know
   - Depends on who runs
5. Do you remember for certain whether you voted in the 1952 election (between Stevenson and Eisenhower)?
   Voted
   Didn't vote
   Too young to vote
   Don't remember

5a. If voted, for whom did you vote?
   Eisenhower
   Stevenson
   Other
   Don't remember

6. How about the presidential election of 1948, between Dewey and Truman -- Did you vote then?
   Voted
   Didn't vote
   Too young to vote
   Don't remember

6a. If voted, for whom did you vote?
   Dewey
   Truman
   Other
   Don't remember

7. How about the presidential election of 1944, between Roosevelt and Dewey?
   Voted
   Didn't vote
   Too young to vote
   Don't remember

7a. If voted, for whom did you vote then?
   Roosevelt
   Dewey
   Other
   Don't remember

8. How about the presidential election of 1940 between Roosevelt and Willkie -- Did you vote then?
   Voted
   Didn't vote
   Too young to vote
   Don't remember

8a. For whom did you vote then?
   Roosevelt
   Willkie
   Other
   Don't remember
9. As you remember it, for which party did your father usually vote in presidential elections when you were too young to vote?
   Republican
   Democratic
   Sometimes one, sometimes other
   Father couldn't vote
   Other party (specify)
   Don't know

10. Does the other adult (wife or husband) in your home usually vote the same as you do?
    Usually does
    Usually doesn't
    Don't know

11. Which of these statements do you come closest to agreeing with?
    1. Labor unions are doing a fine job
    2. Labor unions are doing more good than harm
    3. Labor unions do more harm than good
    4. We would be better off without any labor unions at all
    5. Don't know

12. Recently there has been a number of companies that sold one billion dollars or more of goods each year. Which of these four statements comes closest to describing your feeling about a company that does this much business?
    1. It is dangerous for any companies to be this big
    2. While it may be necessary to have some very large companies, we should watch their activities very closely and discourage their growth as much as possible
    3. There may be some drawbacks to having such large companies, but on the whole they do more good than harm to the country
    4. It is foolish to worry about a company just because it is big.
    5. Don't know

13. Do you think that you have any influence on the government?
    A lot
    Some
    Not much
    Don't know
14. Do you think some groups are getting more power than is good for the country? How about in Kalamazoo?

   U.S.A.       Kalamazoo

   Protestants
   Catholics
   Jews
   Negroes
   Labor unions
   Business men
   Foreign born
   None

15. Which of these groups do you consider yourself a member of?

   Upper
   Upper middle
   Middle
   Lower middle
   Working class

16. In general, how do you feel about living in this community -- would you say it's a very good community to live in, only fairly good, or not good at all?

   Very good
   Only fairly good
   Not good
   Don't know

16a. (If only fairly good or not at all good) why do you feel this way?

17. Do any of your closest friends disagree with your political opinions?

   Yes
   No
   Don't know

18. Which newspapers do you read more or less regularly?

   Kalamazoo Gazette
   Detroit Freepress
   Detroit News
   Detroit Times
   Chicago Tribune
   Chicago Daily News
   Chicago Sun Times
   Chicago Defender
   Pittsburgh Courier
19. Which magazines do you read more or less regularly?
   Time
   Life
   Saturday Evening Post
   Good Housekeeping
   Ladies Home Journal
   Ebony
   McCall's
   Woman's Home Companion
   Reader's Digest
   Colliers
   Look
   All others (specify)

20. How interested are you in politics?
   A great deal
   Somewhat
   Not very
   Don't know

21. What do you think of the Kalamazoo City Commission? Do you think that they are doing a good job, that they are doing a fair job, or that they are doing a poor job?
   Good job
   Fair job
   Poor job
   Don't know

22. If an election for the City Commission were to be held tomorrow, which ones would you vote for?

23. Do you think it was in your best interest that the City Light Plant was sold to the Consumer's Power Company?
   Was in best interest
   Was not in best interest
   Don't know
   Don't know it was sold

24. Did you vote on the City Light Plant issue?
   Did vote
   Did not vote
   Don't remember

25. If you did vote on this issue, did you vote in favor of the sale of the Light Plant?
   Voted for sale
   Voted against sale
   Don't remember
26. Do you feel that the City Commission has solved most of the problems in Kalamazoo?
   Yes
   No
   Don't know

27. (For those who answered "no" to question 26) What problems do you feel that the City Commission needs to solve or hasn't solved to your satisfaction?

28. Do you think that the present one-way-street plan has been successful or unsuccessful?
   Successful
   Unsuccessful
   Don't know

29. Did you vote on the one-way-street proposal?
   Did vote
   Didn't vote
   Don't remember

29a. (If answer was "yes" to question 29) How did you vote on this proposal?
   For one-way streets
   Against them
   Don't remember

30. Are you in favor of annexing the surrounding areas to the City of Kalamazoo?
   Yes
   No
   Don't know

31. Whom do you think benefits most from such annexation?
   Annexation area residents
   City residents
   Both
   Neither
   Don't know

32. Did you vote in the recent school bonding proposal?
   Yes
   No
   Don't remember

32a. (If answer to question 32 was "yes") Were you for the proposal or against it?
   For
   Against
   Don't remember
32b. (If answer to question 32 was "no") Would you have been in favor of a smaller bonding issue or were you in favor of no bonding at all?
   - In favor of smaller issue
   - In favor of no bonding at all

33. Do you feel that the wealthy people are running this town?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

34. Which of the following would you say is the reason most people who are successful have gotten ahead?
   - Because of their ability
   - Because of their luck
   - Because they have had pull
   - Because of the better opportunities their families have given them
   - Other

35. Do you think labor unions should have a political party of their own?

36. About what year do you think you were the most interested in political affairs?

37. President Eisenhower has had two serious illnesses in the last year. Has this had any affect on your decision to vote?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

38. Do you personally agree with Adlai Stevenson's stand on civil rights?
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Don't know

39. What is your church preference?
   - Protestant
   - Catholic
   - Jewish
   - Other
   - None
FACTUAL:

40. What was the last school you attended?
   None
   Some grammar school
   Grammar school graduate
   Some high school
   High school graduate
   College

41. Are you a member of a labor union?
   Yes
   No
   Don't know

42. If answer to question 41 was "yes," which labor union do you belong to?

43. Do you own or rent?

44. How do you feel about the way in which the urban redevelopment plan is being handled in Kalamazoo?
The questionnaire used in precinct #22 was identical to the one used in precinct #3 except that two questions were added in the survey of precinct #22. The additional questions were:

20b. Do you normally consider yourself to be a Republican, Democrat, or an independent?

45. Do you usually vote a straight-party ticket?
This is another important election year; and as usual, interest is mounting. Your interest has been shown by the fact that you are a registered voter.

Our interest is in you and in knowing how you feel about many issues and events of the day. Furthermore, we would also like to know why you feel as you do.

The Institute of Government at Kalamazoo College is therefore conducting a survey in Kalamazoo so that we will know voting behavior patterns better than we do at the present time. Another reason for the survey is that a study is currently being made throughout Michigan, and our survey will provide information about the people of Kalamazoo.

Because you are a registered voter, you have been selected to be interviewed by one of the members of the Institute within the next two or three weeks. We would appreciate about ten minutes of your time so that we may ask you your opinion on some issues -- and why you feel this way.

You can be assured that your name will never be used in connection with our interview -- we are only interested in knowing how you feel and in hearing any suggestions which you might have.

We are looking forward to seeing you soon.

Sincerely,

William C. Baum
Institute of Local Government
Kalamazoo College
Kalamazoo, Michigan
APPENDIX B

VOTING TRENDS

The following pages give a voting history for voters in each party group. The basis for placing persons into Democrat, Republican, and the independent category was obtained by asking the respondents which party they were voting for in the 1956 presidential election.
City Totals
(Only those voting)

1940  Willkie..............56  1944  Dewey.................60
      Roosevelt............45  Roosevelt............47
      Thomas.............. 1  Thomas.............. 1

1948  Dewey.................80  1952  Eisenhower.........111
      Truman..............48  Stevenson........... 37
      Thomas.............. 1

1956  Republican...........96
      Democrats............38
      Undecided...........32
      Socialist........... 1
Precinct #3 Totals
(Only those voting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Precinct #22 Totals
(Only those voting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Precinct #3
Democrats Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>Republicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Precinct #3
#### Whites Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whites-Precinct # 3  
(according to category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1956</strong></td>
<td><strong>1956</strong></td>
<td><strong>1956</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 12</td>
<td>Total 16</td>
<td>Total 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1944</th>
<th>1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt 3</td>
<td>Roosevelt 7</td>
<td>Roosevelt 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie 4</td>
<td>Dewey 5</td>
<td>Truman 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt 6</td>
<td>Dewey 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey 7</td>
<td>Truman 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower 14</td>
<td>Truman 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stevenson 1</td>
<td>Dewey 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower 3</td>
<td>Stevenson 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plus 1 Socialist
### Negroes—Precinct #3
(according to category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total 9</td>
<td>total 8</td>
<td>total 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Roosevelt</th>
<th>Willkie</th>
<th>Roosevelt</th>
<th>Willkie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Democrats Only-Precinct #22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Republicans Only-Precinct #22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Candidate 2</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Didn't vote</th>
<th>Couldn't vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Couldn't vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Couldn't vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Couldn't vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Couldn't vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undecided-Precinct #22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Democrats Only</td>
<td>Republicans Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>Willkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't remember,</td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too young,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>didn't vote)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td>Don't remember,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>Truman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't remember,</td>
<td>Didn't vote,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Didn't vote,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>Republicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independents or Undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willkie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote, etc.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't remember, etc.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn't vote</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't remember, etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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