

The Birmingham Voter Registration Project

REGISTRATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

AND ANALYSIS

Written and Compiled

by

Miss Jo Freeman

THE BIRMINGHAM VOTER REGISTRATION PROJECT
SPONSORED BY
THE SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR., PRESIDENT

UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF VOTER REGISTRATION
AND POLITICAL EDUCATION
HOSEA L. WILLIAMS, DIRECTOR

OFFICE STAFF

Ben Clarke.....Field Director
Isaac Mitchell.....Office Administrator
Shirley White.....Secretary to the Director
Anne Peterson.....Office Secretary
Timothy L. Quinlan.....Production Editor
Jo Freeman.....Director of Research

INTRODUCTION

The information contained herein is not intended for a report nor was it written to justify the Birmingham Voter-Registration Drive. But rather, it is to be looked upon as the basis for the Director and Staff to evaluate the progress of community organization and community mobilization in the past with anticipation of determining our weak areas and program in light of productive areas and program.....

In essence, the material you are now holding is intended to serve as "THE WORKING PAPERS FOR BIRMINGHAM" and suggestive outlines to The Department of Justice; Director of Voter-Registration for SCLC; and, The Field Director of that Department

Before closing, my appreciation is extended to Miss Jo Freeman whose ingenuity and intelligence allowed her to produce the pages hereafter.

Benjamin Van Clarke
Field Director
Birmingham, Alabama
March 14, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Registration Analysis.....	1
Registration Recommendations.....	6
Summary of Suggested Locations for Registrars.....	12
Explanation of Appendices.....	13

Appendix I

A	Federal Registration by Voting Box 1/24--2/19.....	16
B	Precincts and Voting Boxes of Jefferson County.....	23
C	Precincts and Voting Boxes of Birmingham, Bessemer and Vicinity.....	Enclosure

Appendix II

A	1960 Population by Census Tracts.....	24
B	Estimated 1964 Population.....	29
C	Census Tracts of Jefferson County.....	30
D	Census Tracts of Birmingham and Bessemer.....	31

Appendix III	--	Composit Map.....	Enclosure
--------------	----	-------------------	-----------

Appendix IV	--	Negro Communities.....	Enclosure
-------------	----	------------------------	-----------

ANALYSIS

In the period from January 24 to February 19 the Federal Examiners registered about 12% of the Negro Voting Age Population (NVAP) of Jefferson County of approximately 120,000. Of the 15,300 people registered during this time the official records do not specify how many were Negro and how many white but general observation indicated that less than 5% were white. In the following areas the attempt was made to ascertain the closest congruency possible for the Negro neighborhoods, the 1960 Census Tracts and the latest Voting Box divisions. The maps and the statistics used as the basis of the analysis appear, with explanations of sources and errors, in the appendices. It must be realized that a breakdown of the registration statistics by Voting Box was available only for those people registered by the Federal Examiners and only for this four week period. Thus the total number registered, and the percentage of the corresponding NVAP, is actually much larger than that stated.

SW B'ham--Brownsville--Ishkooda	Census Tract	NVAP	Voting Box	Reg.
	38	504	9-5	200
17.5% Registered	52	586	9-6	200
	57	2557	9-8	757
	130	2115	25-6	46
	131	2100	33-16	362
	TOTAL	7	TOTAL	1394
Pratt City	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	11	1931	29-1	297
6% Registered	12	2551		
	TOTAL	4382		

Ensley	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	32	2686	45-1	532
10% Registered	33	3394	45-2	73
	TOTAL	6080	45-3	64
			45-4	28
			TOTAL	688
Titusville--Honeysuckle Hills	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	41	1640	9-4	802
9% Registered	42	2955	9-11	71
	51	4711	TOTAL	873
	TOTAL	9306		
Southside	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	43	2156	21-8	199
10% Registered	44	396	21-14	121
	49	472	TOTAL	320
	TOTAL	3024		
Southtown	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	45	2563	21-5	382
10% Registered	46	1376	21-4	16
	TOTAL	3939	TOTAL	398
Smithfield	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	13	1733	9-1	708
12% Registered	14	2938	9-13	127
	29	4827	21-13	152
	TOTAL	9498	29-3	168
			TOTAL	1155
Finley--Slossfield	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	9	3982	42-2	216
6% Registered	10	2020	42-5	124
	TOTAL	6002	TOTAL	409
Central Business District (CBD)	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	16	480	21-7	81
5% Registered	26	2132	21-9	328
	27	347	TOTAL	409
	28A	1304		
	28B	2994		
	TOTAL	8254		
West Hooper City	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
26% Registered	8	1708	42-1	435
East Hooper City--Fairmont Collegaville	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	7	3285	42-3	657
18% Registered	55	1710	42-4	222
	TOTAL	4995	TOTAL	879

It would be desirable to break this area down into its three component parts but the voting boxes and census tracts were not sufficiently congruent on a smaller scale to allow this.

Woodlawn	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	18	1900	10-1	2
7% Registered	19	844	10-7	64
	23A	800	10-8	162
	TOTAL	3544	TOTAL	288
(North) Brown Springs	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	20	148	10-2	70
14% Registered	22	434		
	TOTAL	552		
Zion City--Newcastle	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	53	441	10-5	36
7% Registered	119	2484	10-14	82
	TOTAL	2925	16-3	49
			22-2	31
			TOTAL	198

An analysis of that part of Zion City within the Birmingham city limits can be made by looking at the figures for Census Tract 53 and Voting Box 10-5. However this neighborhood extends a good deal beyond the city limits (boundaries not shown due to lack of information) so a larger comparison was felt to be more informative.

Wylam	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	35	627	52	217

Percentage indeterminate. Precinct 52 includes significant parts of Census Tracts 124 and 125 but is not sufficiently co-extensive with either to justify inclusion. Furthermore, as there are no separate voting boxes it is impossible to break down the 217 registration figure sufficiently to determine those registered who reside in census tract 35.

East Birmingham	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	4	538	10-11	74
12% Registered	5	875	10-7	41
	6	2534	10-12	381
	17	409	10-11	152
	24	864	10-12	648
	25	426		
	TOTAL	5646		

Due to the fact that Voting Box 10-12 neatly cuts right through the middle of three Negro sections no individual calculations of the many small Negro communities in this general area were possible. Therefore what has been designated "East Birmingham" is a large, amorphous region sprawled out over two-thirds of the width of the city and enveloping a spattering of neighborhoods. The figures on this area aren't too meaningful.

Bessemer	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	101	3437	33-1	605
11% Registered	102	1743	33-2	358
	103	2829	33-3	193
	104	2058	TOTAL	1156
	TOTAL	10067		

As can be seen in Appendix I-A the Registrars failed for the most part during the first week to indicate which voting box those registering in precinct 33 were in. Therefore the 11% figure is quite low and probably should be somewhere between 15% and 20%.

Mulga--Edgewater--Docena	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	125	1770	33-8	112
			33-15	52
			33-22	112
			TOTAL	276

Only a very rough and ill-fitting juxtaposition was possible for the census tracts and voting boxes of this area rendering the information derived somewhat circumstantial. Docena is actually in the Southern part of Census Tract C-0124 which has a NVAP of 512. Information on whether the Negro population of C-0124 is located primarily or even substantially in Docena was not available so it was not included in the NVAP computations for this area. Similarly Census Tract C-0125 includes part of Precinct 52 whose total registration is included in the Wylam analysis rather than this one. Due to the many variable and indeterminate factors involved establishment of a percentage registration figure would have been arrogant and was not attempted.

Fairfield	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
19% Registered	106	4524	53	865

Brighton	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
	137	951	33-15	52

Voting Box 33-15 encompasses a good deal more than Brighton so a percentage determination is unfeasible.

Greysville--Adamsville	CT	NVAP		Reg.
	121	948		35
11% Registration				66
				101

Irondale	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
20 Registration	126	450	20-1	92

Though Voting Box 20-1 covers considerable territory not in Census Tract C-0126 the area is sparsely settled, with a low Negro population, and it is likely that most of those registered from this Voting Box resided in Irondale. Speculation would indicate that a good percentage of those registered from this Voting Box would be white, due to the difficulty of Negroes getting into the Main Post Office to register. But since a registrar has since been sent to this area any calculations are superfluous.

Leeds	CT	NVAP	VB	Reg.
5% Registered	110	849	12	43

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to facilitate the registration of Negroes in Birmingham it will be necessary for the Federal Registrars to set up offices in even the smallest of the neighborhoods and communities within and without the city. This, in concert with a concentrated field campaign in these areas should speed up registration considerably. However the registrars should first be placed in areas where Negroes predominate and not where they are to be found only in limited numbers as in Irondale, Wylam and Homewood.

Titusville--Honeysuckle Hills and Smithfield have fairly high registration percentages for the four week period (9% and 12% respectively). Too, because of their proximity to the downtown area county registration in the past has probably also been as high as for any area in the city. However there are a tremendous number of Negroes of voting age in both these sections (9,000 and 10,000 respectively) and therefore the absolute number of Negro unregistered eligibles is higher for these areas than virtually any others. Hence it would be extremely profitable to place registrars in these areas. In fact, it is strongly recommended that three registrars be placed in Smithfield; one each in the middle of Census tracts 13, 14, and 29. If sufficient registrars are not available then one should be assigned to spend a week or two in each of these tracts, preceded and accompanied by an appropriate staff task force. Similarly a registrar should be placed in the middle of both Titusville proper and Honeysuckle Hills, or follow an analogous procedure to that recommended for Smithfield.

The Ensley--Pratt City area is also one with a high concentration of Negroes (NVAP equals 10,500). For the period under consideration there was a high disparity between the percentage registration figures of the two areas (Pratt City 6%; Ensley 11%) which was probably due to the more frequent placement of staff in the latter area. Nonetheless both areas have strong local leadership and have experienced local voter registration drives in the past so the actual percentage registration is probably fairly high. As with Smithfield and Titusville--Honeysuckle Hills the NVAP is quite high so the absolute number of unregistered eligibles is also likely to be quite high. For this reason it is recommended that a Federal Registrar be located in this part of the city. Preferably a further division of the area should be attempted. There are seven Negro neighborhoods comprising the Ensley--Pratt City community. These are North Pratt, South Sandusky, Pratt City, South Pratt, Sherman Heights, Moro Park and Tuxedo. If a registrar were to be placed in each of these neighborhoods for a few days, exact time varying with the size of the area, a large percentage of all the people in each vicinity could be registered quickly.

The Finley--Slossfield area has both a high NVAP (10,000) and a low percentage registration (6%) for the first month of Federal registration. A registrar should definitely be placed here. If sufficient registrars are impossible to obtain it is suggested that the Sayerton registrar be moved here. He is currently stationed in a somewhat inaccessible location and

the North Birmingham area which he served has a high percentage registration. West Hooper City shows 26% registered during the first month and the East Hooper City--Fairmont--Collegeville area shows an 18% registration.

The Woodlawn area likewise has a high NVAP (estimated at near 4,000 by now) and a low percentage registration (7%). It is somewhat distended and scattered out so if possible it would be desirable for a registrar to spend some time in the component neighborhoods of New Caldonia, Wauhoma, Washington Heights and Woodlawn proper.

Zion City extends both inside and outside of the city limits and between it and Newcastle contains a NVAP of approximately 3,000 with a percentage registration of 7%. This is a substantial number of unregistered eligibles and as the area is not proximate to any of the current stations it is strongly recommended that a registrar be sent here.

The registrars in Irondale, Homewood and Wylam aren't doing too much good there as there are few Negroes to be registered. These areas have now been worked by the staff so it would be advisable to remove the registrars from these localities and put them where they can be more useful.

In the areas outside the city limits the concentration of Negroes is much lower but as it is difficult for local people to get into town and the Birmingham project is waiting for transportation facilities it will be necessary to bring the registrars to them.

The Mulga--Docena--Edgewater distract has a NVAP of 2,500 and could be served by the Wylam registrar if sufficient transportation were available. However this is not the case and as the Wylam area is predominately white it is recommend that the registrar there set up an office in one of these three town. It would be better if he would spend some time in all three.

The Dolomite--Woodward area could be served by either the Bessemer or the Fairfield registrars but Census Tracts C-0139 and C-0136 contain a sufficiently high NVAP (about 3,000) to warrant a registrar spending at least a week or two in each of these areas. This is especially recommended in light of the transportation problem.

Although Brighton was worked by the staff the percentage registration figure is still quite low (5%) even if all of the registration in Voting Box 33-15 was attributed to the Brighton area. It has a NVAP of only 1,000 and could easily be served by the Bessemer registrar but since 62.8% of the total population is Negro the potential possibilities for success in local election would seem to justify requesting that a registrar be placed here.

The Greysville--Adamsville area has a NVAP of only 1,000 but it is quite far out and a federal registrar there could qualify the eligibles in a short period of time. It has an active voters league, which is probably responsible for the high percentage registration during the first month. If a registrar were located there the local people, and in particular the civic league, could most likely handle the registration process without much assistance from the staff, freeing the field workers for work elsewhere.

Leeds, likewise is quite far out and isolated, which accounts for its low registration percentage. Though the NVAP is only about 1,000 it will take the placement of a Federal registrar in this area to get the people there on the books.

Census Tracts C-0143 is the only tract even partially outside the Urban Fringe area which shows a large Negro population, (NVAP about 1,500). However, the only municipality within it is Shannon which is quite small. Despite the difficulties presented to fieldworkers it might be worthwhile to place a registrar here as it is no doubt quite inconvenient for the people to get into the city.

If sufficient registrars can be obtained there are several comparatively minor areas within the city which have a high enough NVAP to warrant a registrar being placed there. In particular Southside with a 3,000 NVAP, Southtown with a 4,000 NVAP and Collegeville with a 3,500 NVAP should be considered. Parts of these areas have been worked extensively by the staff but the absolute number of eligibles unregistered is high enough to justify the placement of a registrar and even more extensive work by the staff. The East Birmingham Community, with its miscellany of areas might also be a potential location of a registrar, providing he would move around to the different neighborhoods. East Birmingham is sparse enough and spread out enough to warrant a registrar only under this condition.

To the Field Director it is suggested that there are areas which do not seem to have been worked extensively which could utilize and capitalize on the present locations of the registrars.

In particular the CBD shows a NVAP of 8500 with a surprisingly low 5% registration percentage. This area surrounds the Birmingham Post Office and includes some of the worse slums in Birmingham. It is not the lack of a registrar in the area which accounts for the absence of activity in this section. The Brown Springs area shows a low NVAP (600 for the Northern two-thirds) and a high registration percentage (14%). But workers here could take advantage of the registrar in Irondale for as long as he is stationed there. Field workers in the South Sandusky and Sherman Heights could utilize the Wylam registrar. Attention is also called to the Comptor • Rising area with a NVAP of 1100. It could well warrant some staff effort. Likewise many of the small East Birmingham neighborhoods probably have not been worked.

Furthermore it would seem that the Brighton--Dolomite--Woodward area has not been adequately exhausted. People from these areas can be registered in Bessemer without extreme difficulty. The most shocking discreptancy, however is in the SW Birmingham Brownsville--Ishkooda area. There is currently a registrar there and though registration was high during the first week in that location it has fallen off considerably since. Reported, there have been several days in which the two regis there have registered absolutely no one. Though the age registration figure is relatively high (17.5%) the absolute number of eligibles (8,000) is so high that the potential there can hardly be said to be depleted.

SUMMARY

Major Areas

Smithfield
 Census Tract 13
 Census Tract 14
 Census Tract 29

Titusville
 Honeysuckle Hills

Ensley--Pratt City
 North Pratt
 South Sandusky
 Pratt City
 South Pratt
 Sherman Height
 Moro Park
 Tuxedo

Finley---Slossfield

Woodlawn
 New Caldonia
 Wauhoma
 Washington Heights
 Woodlawn

Zion City---Newcastle

Dolomite
 Woodward

Mulga
 Docena
 Edgewater

Brighton

Greysville--Adamsville

Leeds

Shannon

Minor Areas

Southside
 Southtown
 Collegeville
 East Birmingham Community
 visit varying neighborhoods

EXPLANATION OF APPENDICES

Appendix I-A consists of a breakdown of those persons registered by the Federal Examiners during the period from January 24, 1966 when they first arrived in Jefferson County, to February 19, 1966. The breakdown was derived from an analysis of the official records of all those persons examined and declared to be qualified under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These records have been released only for the period up until February 19 and so it was not possible to include material from subsequent weeks in this report. During the first week of operation the Federal Examiners not only assigned people to the wrong voting box but frequently placed them in voting boxes which do not exist, nor ever existed. Or worse, they listed them with a precinct number but not a voting box number. All cases of this nature have been placed under the Miscellaneous category. This makes the validity of the first weeks figures, and for some subsequent days, somewhat dubious. Furthermore the voting boxes lines of some precincts have been changed within the last few months, eliminating some voting boxes and adding others. The alterations were not too drastic, except in a few cases, but of the maps the registrars used to ascertain the voting boxes of applicants one was marked with the new lines and one with the old. Thus for example, figures are given for voting boxes 21-1 and 21-6 which no longer exist. Appendix I-B was obtained from the Republican Party and gives the old precinct and district lines. But it illustrates fairly accurately the non-metropolitan precincts which was the reason for its inclusion. Appendix I-C shows the current

precinct and district lines of Birmingham, Bessemer and vicinity as they now exist. These were derived from maps drawn by the county engineers for the Federal examiners and should be correct.

The total and nonwhite tract populations shown in Appendix II-A were taken from the U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960, (Final Report PHC (1)--17) for Birmingham and Jefferson County. The Negro Voting Age Population was computed by adding up all the age group breakdowns for the nonwhite population age 20 and over. This inclusion of an extra year in the derivations is not expected to compensate for the increase of population in the last six years so therefore all area NVAPs were rounded up in the Recommendations section of this report.

The estimated 1964 Population in Appendix II-B is only for municipalities of 1,000 and more. It was taken from the 1964 Annual Report, Bureau of Records and Vital Statistics, Jefferson County Department of Health. The report for 1965 has not been published yet. Appendices II-C and II-D are meant as supplements to the census tract data and should be self explanatory.

All the Birmingham maps have the Negro and mixed neighborhoods delineated on them for easy reference. These were derived from an analysis of the housing statistics of the Census of Housing: 1960, Series HC (3)-2 for the City of Birmingham and Bessemer. These statistics are not published for any other areas in the county and thus it was impossible to mark out the Negro neighborhoods for them. However, those other areas which were known to be Negro neighborhoods by personal observation were indicated as such.

Appendix III, the composit map, was the basis of the attempted correlation of the Negro neighborhoods, census tracts and voting boxes which allowed this report. It's confusing but informative. Appendix IV was included for ready location of the named areas referred to within the city. Most of these names were taken from the Neighborhoods and Communities analysis of the Birmingham Planning Commission.

FEDERAL REGISTRATION BY VOTING BOX 1/24/66-2/19/66

PRECINCT # 9

Voting Boxes	MISC	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13
1-24--1-29	61	355	12	40	434	64	8	19	181	2	17	44	30
1-31--2-5	6	169	6	36	181	39	5	21	124	4	2	13	13
2-7---2-12	0	116	2	9	111	32	6	6	89	0	1	6	5
2-14--2-19	0	68	2	3	77	72	3	1	363	0	4	8	3
TOTAL	67	708	22	88	802	207	22	47	757	6	24	71	51

PRECINCT #10

Voting Boxes	MISC	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1-24--1-29	2	9	40	30	39	23	23	18	76	28	2	34	191	69	31	0
1-31--2-5	0	5	18	6	9	7	6	12	41	5	3	24	89	35	26	1
2-7---2-12	0	2	8	1	11	3	6	17	30	4	1	11	57	24	11	1
2-14--2-19	0	2	4	2	3	3	0	17	15	4	1	5	44	24	15	0
TOTAL	2	18	70	39	62	36	35	64	162	41	7	74	381	152	83	2

FEDERAL REGISTRATION BY VOTING BOX 1/24/66--2/19/66

PRECINCT # 11

Voting Boxes	MISC	1	2
1-24--1-29	5	4	16
1-31--2-5	0	0	20
2-7---2-122	0	0	9
2-14--2-19	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
TOTAL	6	5	52

PRECINCT # 12

Voting Boxes	1
1-24--1-29	7
1-31--2-5	16
2-7---2-12	19
2-14--2-19	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	43

PRECINCT # 13

Voting Boxes	1	2	3
1-24--1-29	2	0	0
1-31--2-5		0	0
2-7---2-12	3	0	0
2-14--2-19	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	7	0	0

PRECINCT # 15

Voting Boxes	1	2	3	4
1-24--1-29	4	3	0	1
1-31--2-5	6	0	0	2
2-7---2-12	1	0	0	2
2-14--2-19	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	14	5	0	5

PRECINCT # 16

Voting Boxes	1	2	3	4
1-24--1-29	3	7	25	0
1-31--2-5	0	0	13	0
2-7---2-12	1	0	4	0
2-14--2-19	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	4	7	49	0

FEDERAL REGISTRATION BY VOTING BOXES 1/24/66--2/19/66

PRECINCT # 19

Voting Boxes	1	2	3
1-24--1-29	0	4	0
1-31--2-5	1	0	0
2-7---2-12	1	1	0
2-14--2-19	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	3	5	0

PRECINCT # 20

Voting Boxes	1	2
1-24--1-29	36	7
1-31--2-5	8	0
2-7---2-12	40	6
2-14--2-19	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	92	13

PRECINCT # 22

Voting Boxes	1	2
1-24--1-29	5	8
1-31--2-5	1	8
2-7---2-12	2	10
2-12--2-19	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
TOTAL	9	31

PRECINCT # 21

Voting Boxes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	13	14	MISC.
1-24--1-29	3	11	3	6	84	73	26	85	176	69	50	4
1-31--2-5	4	3	4	4	149	36	27	31	83	43	32	0
2-7---2-12	0	1	0	2	93	17	13	21	40	30	25	0
2-14--2-19	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	8	15	7	16	382	135	81	199	328	152	121	4

FEDERAL REGISTRATION BY VOTING BOXES 1/24/66--2/19/66

PRECINCT # 25

Voting Boxes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	MISC.
1-24--1-29	17	8	14	5	2	14	9	0	1	5
1-31--2-5	5	8	10	4	5	18	4	5	4	1
2-7---2-12	3	2	5	2	1	2	1	1	1	0
2-14--2-19	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	25	20	38	13	9	46	16	6	9	6

PRECINCT # 29

Voting	1	3	4	MISC
1-24--1-29	137	92	1	17
1-31--2-5	69	43	5	0
2-7---2-12	43	12	4	0
2-14--2-19	<u>48</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	297	162	11	17

PRECINCT # 33

Voting Boxes	MISC.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1-24--1-29	1,072	343	222	93	9	18	1	17	24	129	58	103	65
1-31--2-5	35	168	86	57	45	34	12	12	35	122	33	46	32
2-7---2-12	5	55	35	29	30	21	0	0	45	28	7	27	34
2-14--2-19	<u>0</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>7</u>
TOTAL	1,112	605	358	193	180	93	17	30	112	287	106	205	138

FEDERAL REGISTRATION BY VOTING BOX 1/24/66--2/19/66

PRECINCT # 33 cont

Voting Boxes	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1-24--1-29	14	3	25	160	2	31	9	11	34	60	7	7	8
1-31--2-5	34	1	19	115	3	23	3	14	6	37	2	19	2
2-7---2-12	27	4	2	34	0	12	4	2	6	12	0	8	5
2-14--2-19	8	0	6	53	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	43	4
TOTAL	83	8	50	362	5	66	16	27	51	112	9	77	55

PRECINCT # 38

Voting Boxes	1	2	Voting Boxes	1	2	Voting Boxes	1	2	3	4	5	MISC
1-24--1-29	10	2	1-24--1-29	15	17	1-24--1-29	147	115	300	40	40	3
1-31--2-5	7	3	1-31--2-5	4	18	1-31--2-5	77	39	95	81	54	0
2-7---2-12	16	1	2-7---2-12	41	32	2-7---2-12	73	41	25	57	11	0
2-14--2-19	2	3	2-14--2-19	6	17	2-14--2-19	138	21	21	44	19	0
TOTAL	35	9	TOTAL	66	84	TOTAL	435	216	657	222	124	3

FEDERAL REGISTRATION BY VOTING BOX 1/24/66--2/19/66

PRECINCT # 44

Voting Boxes	1
1-24--1-29	5
1-31--2-5	5
2-7---2-12	4
2-14--2-19	<u>3</u>
TOTAL	17

PRECINCT # 45

Voting Boxes	1	2	3	4	5	MISC.
1-24--1-29	200	38	29	14	12	74
1-31--2-5	135	28	20	6	10	2
2-7---2-12	109	5	5	7	1	2
2-14--2-19	<u>79</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	523	73	64	28	25	79

PRECINCT # 50

Voting Boxes	1	2
1-24--1-29	11	0
1-31--2-5	5	2
2-7---2-12	1	0
2-14--2-19	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	17	3

PRECINCT # 52

Voting Boxes	1
1-24--1-29	128
1-31--2-5	50
2-7---2-12	15
2-14--2-19	<u>24</u>
TOTAL	217

PRECINCT # 53

Voting Boxes	1
1-24--1-29	637
1-31--2-5	134
2-7---2-12	55
2-14--2-19	<u>49</u>
TOTAL	865

PRECINCT # 59

Voting Boxes	1	2	3	4
1-24--1-29	2	0	6	2
1-31--2-5	1	0	3	0
2-7---2-12	0	1	1	3
2-14--2-19	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	3	1	10	5

FEDERAL REGISTRATION BY VOTING BOX 1/24/66--2/19/66

PRECINCT #	9	10	11	12	13	15	16	19	20	21	22	25
1-24--1-29	1,319	612	27	7	2	8	32	4	43	597	13	
1-31--2-5	658	287	20	16	1	7	13	1	8	415	9	64
2-7---2-12	397	187	9	19	3	3	5	2	46	242	12	18
2-14--2-19	614	140	9	1	2	6	7	1	8	200	6	31
TOTAL	2,988	1,226	65	43	8	24	57	8	105	1,454	40	83

PRECINCT #	29	33	38	39	42	44	45	50	52	53	59	TOTAL
1-24--1-29	247	3,123	12	29	645	5	362	11	128	627	10	7,947
1-31--2-5	122	1,010	10	22	346	5	201	7	50	134	4	3,411
2-7---2-12	59	431	17	73	207	4	129	1	15	55	5	1,941
2-14--2-19	65	289	5	23	459	3	95	1	24	49	0	2,039
TOTAL	493	4,853	44	150	1,657	17	787	20	217	865	19	15,338

1960 POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACTS

TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION	NONWHITE	NVAP	%NONWHITE
Jefferson County	634,864	219,829	118,812	34.6
Birmingham	340,887	135,267	75,777	39.7
Bessemer	33,054	18,991	9,967	57.4
Balance	260,923	65,571	33,068	25.1

Birmingham Census Tracts

1	3273	5	4	.15
2	4332	7	4	.16
3	4436	174	87	3.9
4	6236	1048	538	16.8
5	6747	1701	875	25.1
6	4889	4521	2534	92.4
7	6836	6788	3285	99.4
8	8098	3288	1708	40.6
9	8338	7636	3982	91.6
10	4688	3807	2020	81.2
11	6285	3593	1931	57.2
12	8690	4686	2451	53.9
13	3168	2803	1733	88.4
14	5011	5006	2918	99.7
15	7369	2219		30.1
16	8512	771	480	9.04
17	1870	714	409	38.0
18	6179	3404	1900	55.0
19	4021	1630	844	40.5
20	3684	115	118	4.78

Birmingham Census Tracts Con't

25

TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION	NONWHITE	NVAP	%NONWHITE
21	5237	1	1	.0191
22	4306	813	434	18.8
23A	3926	1453	800	37.0
23B	7887	456	256	5.78
24	2522	1532	864	60.7
25	1569	814	426	51.2
26	4773	3706	2132	77.6
27	2841	347	328	12.2
28A	1970	1920	1304	97.5
28B	7045	6950	3991	98.7
29	7999	7931	4827	99.2
30	8925	214	146	2.39
31	5661	0	0	0.0
32	5950	4756	2686	79.9
33	7314	6082	3394	83.2
34	5629	657	353	11.4
35	4573	1157	627	25.3
36	5661	441	291	7.79
37	5637	4	4	.0700
38	13119	848	504	6.46
39	4141	1739	1027	41.9
40	9054	152	61	1.68
41	4196	2929	1840	69.8
42	6072	4820	2955	79.3
43	3614	3604	2156	99.7
44	1265	614	396	47.7
45	4759	4590	2563	96.5

Birmingham Census Tracts Con't

TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION	NONWHITE	NVAP	%NONWHITE
46	2476	2439	1376	98.5
47	9576	236	179	2.48
48	4669	184	137	3.79
49	6930	678	472	9.78
50	4800	102	75	2.13
51	8858	8724	4711	98.5
52	5969	969	586	16.2
53	6775	866	441	12.8
54	1179	0	0	0.0
55	5914	3445	1710	58.3
56	4443	2	1	.045
57	10972	4899	2567	44.6
58	51	3	2	5.88
59	10028	72	41	.718

JEFFERSON COUNTY CENSUS TRACTS

TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION	NONWHITE	NVAP	%NONWHITE
A-0100	5997	1	1	.01
A-0101	7418	6394	3437	86.0
A-0102	7837	3338	1743	42.6
A-0103	10064	5247	2829	52.1
A-0104	7735	5012	2058	51.8
A-0105	2811	512	287	14.6
A-0106	15816	8297	4524	52.5
A-0107	20404	2327	1396	11.4
A-0108	12680	148	142	1.20
A-0109	7810	847	413	10.8
A-0110	5818	1723	849	29.6
C-0111	3828	701	369	18.3
C-0112	5942	308	177	5.18
C-0113	5475	742	352	13.5
C-0114	4632	623	305	13.4
C-0115	3156	47	25	1.49
C-0116	3711	360	181	9.70
C-0117	9212	456	211	4.95
C-0118	8116	51	40	.628
C-0119	8413	4783	2484	56.9
C-0120	6226	749	254	1.20
C-0121	6859	2002	948	29.2
C-0122	2294	425	211	18.5
C-0123	8357	1403	687	16.8
C-0124	6485	1071	512	16.5

Jefferson County Census Tracts Con't

TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION	NONWHITE	NVAP	%NONWHITE
C-0125	7032	3616	1770	51.4
C-0126	5642	835	437	14.8
C-0127	2593	210	121	8.09
C-0128	5556	432	211	7.78
C-0129	9298	60	55	.646
C-0130	5052	4467	2115	88.4
C-0131	4870	4287	2199	88.0
C-0132	3806	1	1	.0263
C-0133	4461	3767	1903	85.0
C-0134	2873	104	49	3.63
C-0135	2312	2239	997	96.8
C-0136	4181	3191	1586	76.3
C-0137	3127	1728	951	54.9
C-0138	5605	3970	1919	70.8
C-0139	6038	2502	1217	41.4
C-0140	5774	1180	503	20.4
C-0141	6252	1861	921	29.9
C-0142	4849	415	190	8.56
C-0143	6757	3016	1429	44.6
C-0144	6303	31	24	.492

ESTIMATED 1964 POPULATION

MUNICIPALITY	TOTAL POPULATION	NONWHITE POPULATION	%NONWHITE
Adamsville	2,333	990	42.4
Bayview	937	0	0.0
Bessemer	35,013	19,722	56.3
Birmingham	347,196	137,453	39.6
Brighton	3,394	2,132	62.8
Fairfield	16,938	8,485	50.1
Fultondale	2,298	1	.0435
Gardendale	5,311	3	.0565
Graysville	3,716	1,294	34.8
Homewood	23,609	2,361	10.0
Hueytown	6,345	1	.0158
Irondale	4,194	950	22.6
Leeds	6,919	2,254	32.6
Lipscomb	2,921	507	17.4
Midfield	3,760	1	.0265
Mountain Brook	14,516	93	.547
Pinson	1,185	0	0.0
Pleasant Grove	3,649	0	0.0
Tarrant	7,912	821	10.4
Trussville	2,909		0.0
Vestavia Hills	4,263	19	.445
Warrior	2,899	645	22.2
Remainder of County	<u>164,921</u>	<u>46,892</u>	<u>28.4</u>
Total County	667,128	224,597	33.7

REGISTRATION FIGURES

County Registrars

	Birmingham	FF	Bessemer	Total
Wed. 12-22	354			354
Mon. 12-27			² 425	425
Tue. 12-28			432	432
Wed. 12-29			459	459
Thu. 12-30			525	525
Fri. 12-31			<u>584</u>	584
Mon. 1-3	300		² 425	300
Tue. 1-4	321			321
Wed. 1-5	343			343
Fri. 1-7	363			363
Sat. 1-8	640			640
Mon. 1-10	311			311
Tue. 1-11		315		315
Wed. 1-12	338			338
Fri. 1-14	347			347
Sat. 1-15	743			743
Mon. 1-17	217			217
Tue. 1-18	247			247
Wed. 1-19	300			300
Fri. 1-20	600			600
Sat. 1-22	809			<u>809</u>
TOTAL				9,033

Federal Registrars

Mon. 1-24	400	350	430	² ³ 1,180
Tue. 1-25	680	279	562	1,491
Wed. 1-26	720	292	408	1,420
Thu. 1-27	891	332	387	1,610
Fri. 1-28	780	339	463	1,582
Sat. 1-29	339	60	288	<u>677</u>
Mon. 1-31	727	255	295	² ³ 1,277
Tue. 2-1	460	127	159	746
Wed. 2-2	241	50	55	346
Thu. 2-3	227	16	90	333
Fri. 2-4	198	13	62	273
Sat. 2-5	236	49	50	335
Mon. 2-7	353	64	69	486
Tue. 2-8	316	61	49	427
Wed. 2-9	219	34	58	311
Thu. 2-10	163	43	48	254
Fri. 2-11	149	37	29	215
Sat. 2-12	97	7	10	<u>114</u>
TOTAL				13,077