

The Materiality of
FREEDOM
Archaeologies of Postemancipation Life

Edited by Jodi A. Barnes



The University of South Carolina Press

Race, Displacement, and Twentieth-Century University Landscapes

An Archaeology of Urban Renewal and Urban Universities

The stereotype of an idyllic college town lingers in the minds of many contemporary observers, but in the wake of World War II federal urban renewal legislation radically reshaped higher education, rewriting the relationship between race, place, and universities. Supported by state slum clearance funding from the 1940s onward, a host of city universities grew or were born almost uniformly in what were once African American neighborhoods. Urban renewal legislation extended a lengthy heritage of state monitoring and surveillance of urban impoverishment and the color line, but its marriage to university planning and expansion was a significant new postwar mechanism that radically reshaped the American city.

The effects of such expansion hang over many contemporary universities that are consciously troubled by a heritage of mass displacement and eager to address community heritage, yet many of the same institutions continue to seek space for future growth. In the late 1950s Indiana University eyed expansion of its Indianapolis Medical School campus and proposed an adjoining undergraduate campus that would be built in a densely settled, predominantly African American neighborhood surrounding the medical school. The University Medical Center had annexed modest slices of the surrounding neighborhoods as early as the 1920s, but by the 1950s federal funding made rapid expansion possible for many comparably ambitious institutions. Some municipalities seeking federal funds partnered quite aggressively with universities, and in some cases those institutions rapidly leveled broad swaths of neighboring communities and targeted other spaces for eventual growth. In 1959, for example, the *New York Times* concluded that after such wholesale removals the communities surrounding much of the University of Chicago "resemble German cities just after World War II" (Wehrwein 1959: 61). Indianapolis's city government, though, was driven by a distinctive Hoosier devotion to the free market and a professed reluctance to turn over redevelopment to federal funders and external parties. Consequently the

real estate acquired to assemble what became Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) came through piecemeal property purchases that took more than 20 years. The gradual rate of this development effectively minimized the scope of displacement, but the change was no less profound than in communities that eliminated whole neighborhoods in one fell swoop.

Today hundreds of acres of homes that stood in the neighborhood in 1960 are all gone, their heritage is often completely unrecognized, and the vast scope of the transformation and the university's complicity in that transformation is ignored or inelegantly remembered. A retelling of this story of urban transformation and the color line is exceptionally well suited to archaeology. Over the space of a century, the current-day IUPUI campus spent moments as a thriving African American business district; hosted myriad churches, schools, and leisure spaces; and witnessed the affluent lives of African American gentility and impoverished working-class folks alike, sometimes at the exact same moments. Rapid demolition episodes left behind distinct material deposits. Decades of recurrent parking lot paving and landscaping ironically provide exceptional preservation, and the university's ownership of the property provides unparalleled access to sites.

Research on urban campuses provides a powerful opportunity to conduct truly engaged scholarship and make unrecognized but deep-seated privileges visible. Much of the archaeological story to be told on such campuses revolves around the racial and class privileges that made university expansion possible and now have rendered it rather invisible, even as many of these institutions now experience a tension between the willingness to face up to their institutional complicity in urban renewal and simultaneously continue spatial expansion. Archaeology provides some insight into the development of such communities over the long periods leading up to urban displacement, which inevitably complicates the transparent claims many ideologues made to rationalize mass removals. Nevertheless archaeology does not provide a transparently nostalgic mechanism to recast the lives of many profoundly impoverished people, although it can very soberly underscore the genuine material and social challenges of poverty along the color line, and it reflects how structural racism and classism ensured a twentieth-century material decline that cities were compelled to address by the 1950s.

Archaeology on a university campus is an especially public discourse that invites a vast range of stakeholders beyond former residents and descendants alone. The ways in which descendants, former residents, and various campus constituencies stake claims to the century-and-a-half heritage of these now-dispersed spatial and social neighborhoods in Indianapolis provides a complicated picture of how heritage can be claimed based on archaeological insight. It also illuminates the strategically unrecognized privileges that made mass displacement possible and confronts the ways many universities continue to clumsily negotiate their complicity in mass removals while they aspire to grow further. The challenge is to connect the relatively

recent heritage of urban renewal and campus originations to longer histories of the same landscapes, examining persistent inequalities and transformation that continue into the present without lapsing into romanticized histories, failing to circumspectly interrogate a host of heritage claims, or ignoring the link between historical injustices and contemporary inequalities.

Blight and the Urban University

A vast range of legislation had taken aim on “blighted” urban spaces from the nineteenth century onward, typically introducing codes to regulate housing deficiencies and contain the spatial expansion of slums, but by World War II many planners backed by state ideologues turned to wholesale slum clearance to transform the American city. Universities profited from much of this displacement as early as the 1930s, but they were not firmly married to such codes until the Federal Housing Act was amended in 1959 to expressly direct federal aid for “urban renewal areas involving colleges and universities” (Hechinger 1961: E7). Higher education subsequently became a significant civic partner leveraging federal funds and reshaping urban America.

Like many communities that targeted urban “blight,” the neighborhoods targeted by Indiana University and the city had deteriorated significantly by the 1950s. In 1953 the *Indianapolis Star* lamented that 20 percent of the city was in need of slum clearance, and the newspaper found a vast number of homes with dirt floors, no plumbing or electricity, and significant rat populations (Connor 1959a). Nearly 1,000 Indianapolis dwellings had no access to indoor plumbing at all, more than 12,000 shared a flush toilet with another household, and nearly 21,000 had no indoor shower or bathtub (Connor 1959b: 1). Nevertheless that physical condition often was not restricted to particular neighborhoods or even single blocks, and it belied the near-Westside’s rich heritage and residents’ deep connections to the space. Much of the Indianapolis community neighboring the hospital had been settled by African Americans and European newcomers from the 1870s onward, and by the turn of the century it was the center of African-America life in central Indiana, though pockets of mostly European immigrants continued to live in the area into the 1960s. Migration waves at the turn of the century and again during World War II significantly expanded the population density of the neighborhood and included increasingly more impoverished residents in deteriorating conditions.

In 1961 the *New York Times* recognized the dramatic conflicts between urban campus growth and existing communities, arguing that such institutions “must simultaneously plan their own development and clear actual and potential slums” (Hechinger 1961: E7). Urban renewal legislation expanded the power of eminent domain to secure properties in the service of slum clearance, and for some newly born universities and their expanding peers, such codes allowed administrators and city leaders

to engineer surrounding communities in ways that conformed to their own preconceptions of an appropriate university climate. Yet in 1963 education scholar Kermit Parsons (1963: 208) recognized that since “the urban university’s ideas about the right kind of neighborhood environment are likely to vary from those of residents, some bitter battles have been fought.” In 1953, for instance, the Illinois Urban Community Conservation Act targeted “conservation areas” that were likely to become slums, a code that helped the University of Chicago reshape much of the surrounding Hyde Park–Kenwood community (cf. Hirsch 2000; Proudfoot 1954: 418; Teaford 2000: 452–453). The project rehabilitated much of the historic architecture in the community, but it displaced many of its African American residents who could not make a claim to “middle-class” standing. In 1949 Columbia University president Dwight D. Eisenhower likened the growth of the university to the nation’s wartime resolve, arguing that “nothing can defeat Columbia” (*New York Times* 1949: 50). Eisenhower foresaw the university’s expansion “right down to the Harlem river.” By 1964, though, that growth had resulted in a suit accusing the university of singling out African Americans and Puerto Ricans for eviction, complaining that Columbia aspired to make the neighborhood “lily white” (Schanberg 1964: 15). Throughout the rest of the 1960s Columbia continually faced accusations that it failed to consult neighbors or displaced residents as it expanded into Morningside Heights (for example, Axel-Lute 2008; Bird 1968; Millones 1968; Roberts 1966).

In 1921 the Indiana University Medical Center took its first aim on the neighboring community when it developed a plan for a convalescent park adjoining the Riley Hospital then under construction. African American physician Sumner Furniss questioned whether the facility would serve any of the black residents it intended to remove, and he warned that “he did not think it wise to throw from 1500 to 2000 persons out of their homes” (*Indianapolis Star* 1921a: 5). During the construction of the park, one of the homes was identified as the oldest dwelling in Indianapolis, and its yard was dotted with the graves of the city’s earliest European settlers, including a Revolutionary War veteran. The hospital association was reluctant to uproot such a history and resolved in September 1921 to “preserve the dwelling as a landmark” (*Indianapolis Star* 1921b: 8). Nevertheless the home was soon thereafter razed, and a boulder was used to mark the place of the graves; they too were finally bulldozed without comment or removal in about 1958.

Like many urban universities, Indiana expanded somewhat opportunistically, seizing land when it became available in the absence of particularly clear plans for its use and routinely failing to measure up in practice to the grandiose master plans. In 1958 the Indianapolis Redevelopment Commission produced what would become one of numerous master designs for the near-Westside, and they alluded to the development of an undergraduate campus that would occupy three buildings adjoining the hospital—and in a somewhat different configuration those three buildings did appear in 1969. But the plan also aspired to place dental and medical school students in new

dormitories, leave most of the neighborhood untouched, build a shopping center, and rehabilitate the city canal to turn its mouth into a serene paddleboat and leisure space, though the canal had been an open sewer for over a century. That plan did not address how the land would be acquired, but in the 1950s two major urban renewal projects directed by the Indianapolis Redevelopment Commission clearly benefited Indiana University. One 19-acre 1956 project referred to as Project F razed 104 homes, citing the significant deterioration of the neighborhood that qualified it as a blighted neighborhood, and Project D cleared a roughly 18-acre neighborhood immediately adjoining the University Medical Center (*Indianapolis Star* 1956; Indianapolis Redevelopment Commission 1959). In each case the city purchased the individual parcels and relocated residents before clearing the land and selling both tracts back to the university at whatever cost the city first absorbed.

In the early 1960s the city and its influential Chamber of Commerce became leery of dependence on external funding and surprised the university by rejecting federal urban renewal financing. This left the university compelled to determine how it could expand into the densely settled neighborhoods around the medical center (cf., Hardy 1989: 27; Wood 1996: 21). By about 1964 the university began to purchase individual properties, and through the late 1960s the university typically acquired between 10 and 20 properties each month. One such space was the 400 block of Agnes Street, which had been residential since about the Civil War and included the Bowers Building, a former department store that became a stationery supply office before its



Homes on Beauty Street targeted for slum removal near the Indiana University Dental School. Courtesy of IUPUI University Library Special Collections and Archives, Indianapolis.

purchase by the university in the summer of 1967 (Indiana University Board of Trustees 1967). By 1970 the university had acquired all but one of the properties on the block, which included about 34 residences in the decades following World War II. A circa 1956 assemblage at 458–460 Agnes Street included a dense assemblage from these last moments of the neighborhood. Some of the material culture hints at the complex ways in which racism and the color line shaped everyday materiality. For instance, the assemblage includes a significant volume of rubber clearly identifiable as bicycle tires that would normally be consigned to an artifact catalog or simply discarded in the field. Indianapolis has always had a special affection for car culture, and in 1953 the city discontinued service on its last electric streetcar, with a local trolley bus service ending four years later (Taggart 1994: 1305). Modest bus service remained in place, but public transportation had always been patrolled through a variety of mostly de facto mechanisms. A rich range of photographs from twentieth-century Indianapolis confirms that some African Americans negotiating the confluence of race and space had been riding bikes for a long time. For the many Indianapolis residents who remained without reliable transportation in the 1950s, bikes negotiated structural inequalities and reflect the subtle ways city spaces were structured along color and class lines. Those who did have cars were often exceptionally attached to them and recognized the class standing and self-determination they symbolized. One proud car owner on California Street, for instance, joined the Goodrich Silver-town Safety League and likely displayed an excavated emblem on the household car. These reflectors were available from Goodrich dealers in a campaign that launched in 1931 for those consumers who signed a safe-driving statement.

Like most Cold War households, the Agnes Street assemblages are dominated by standard mass-produced goods that reflect the American immersion in consumer culture that cut across class and color lines. Nevertheless that immersion took various forms, and there are some trinkets that reflect cultural distinctions even as they mirror the extension of consumer culture into everyday life. The most interesting example is a mass-produced good-luck coin, which was manufactured by King Novelty. Morton Neumann ran several firms, including King Novelty and its sister companies Valmor and Famous Products, that marketed a vast range of cosmetics and curios to African Americans from the Depression until the late 1950s (Yronwode 2003). Neumann's products were advertised in the most prominent African American newspapers and sold throughout the South and Midwest by agents who were often beauticians or root workers, since many of these goods were rooted in hoodoo folk practices (Yronwode 2003). The Agnes Street coin was laden with 21 "good luck" symbols, including John the Conqueror root, lodestone, a Mo-Jo Head, a four-leaf clover, and a burning candle, all of which were invoked in hoodoo practices. Similar practices reaching into the earliest moments of captivity are now well known in archaeological circles, since many hoodoo deposits were intentionally buried to fix spells. Lodestone, for example, was sometimes buried to draw money to a home, and

LUCKY MO-JO
Alleged
GOOD LUCK COIN
 ALWAYS CARRY ONE

DO YOU believe it is **LUCKY** to carry a so-called **GOOD LUCK COIN** in your pocket? Whether it is **Lucky** or not the fact remains that thousands of people carry **POCKET PIECES** which they have faith in as their **MASCOT** and to **KEEP THE JINX AWAY**. Throughout the years certain symbols and objects were worn and are still worn by some people as amulets and charms because it was believed that these could produce extraordinary **POWERS TO KEEP AWAY EVIL AND BRING GOOD LUCK.**

21 SYMBOLS ON THIS COIN

1. Cat's Eye	8. Mo-Jo Head	15. Key
2. Burning Incense	9. Elephant	16. Heart and Arrow
3. John the Conqueror Root	10. 3 Wise Monkeys	17. Number Seven
4. Tiger Head	11. Black Cat	18. Star
5. Clasped Hands	12. Burning Candle	19. Horseshoe
6. Horn of Plenty	13. Rabbit's Foot	20. Horseshoe Nail
7. Lodestone	14. 4 Leaf Clover	21. Wishbone

We call this the **LUCKY MO-JO** alleged **GOOD LUCK COIN** because it has on it symbols of objects that have been used by some people for **BRINGING GOOD LUCK**. However, we do not claim that carrying this coin will bring **Good Luck** and **Drive Away Evil** but sell only as an interesting **POCKET PIECE**. Bright yellow color metal. The coin is especially made for us. You cannot buy it any where else. **ORDER YOURS NOW.** Order by No. A-418
Price 50c 3 for \$1.25



Advertisement in the King Novelty catalog for a Lucky Mo-Jo Coin like the one recovered on Agnes Street. Courtesy of Paul Mullins.

The coin recovered on Agnes Street. Courtesy of Paul Mullins.

lucky tokens were sometimes used in the same manner, though the coin on Agnes Street was in an undifferentiated context and certainly not in the sort of feature or location that would be used to seal a spell. Lucky tokens have a heritage that reaches beyond hoodoo, but unlike the generalized lucky tokens mass-produced in the 1930s, the Agnes Street coin included distinctive African hoodoo symbols that would have passed unnoticed by most white consumers, and King Novelty sold herb bags, oils, and raw materials like red flannel and lodestone that routinely appeared in conjure assemblages. The token was simultaneously a mass commodity even as it acknowledged cultural distinctions and the dynamism of diasporan practice.

Urban renewal displacements were routinely driven by transparent slum ideology that linked race and poverty. Consequently contemporary scholars hoping to undo such misrepresentation often use material culture and historical texts to demonstrate how residents lived symbolically rich lives and even adhered to many dominant standards despite the appearance of utter destitution. Yet in Indianapolis this risks ignoring the genuine impoverishment that racism created over more than a century, leading to a truly deteriorated neighborhood that was indeed in need of systematic redress, even though displacement was not necessarily the most appropriate mechanism. Archaeology delivers a predictably complicated picture of indigence in the houses along Agnes Street; material culture underscores the residents' material marginalization even as it reveals the range of ways consumers thoughtfully negotiated poverty and were not defined by economic circumstance. For instance, the faunal assemblages from two sites on Agnes Street provide some clues to a diverse range of food consumption tactics. Agnes Street sits a quarter mile from the White River, and residents have fished in the river since the earliest settlers arrived. The home is nearly as close to the Central Canal, an aborted 1839 transportation artery that cuts through the city for nine miles. Fishing often was saddled by racist and class caricatures like that wielded by Edward King (1875: 427), who indicated that African Americans in Georgia "love hunting and fishing; they revel in the idleness which they never knew until after the war." Traveler Julian Ralph (1896: 376) witnessed African Americans fishing throughout the South, noting that "the Southern colored people . . . seem to be eternally at it wherever they and any piece of water, no matter how small, are thrown together." He noted that African Americans even "fish in the canals and open sewers in the streets. . . . It is delightful to see them." For many poor Americans fishing was not a leisure activity but a significant foodway, yet observers like Ralph cast fishing as an aesthetic reflecting essential racial inferiority. But the more pressing challenge in Indianapolis was that the White River was a profoundly polluted waterway. For over 150 years the river has had raw sewage piped into it from the city's sewer system, overflows that continue even today, and upriver farms and local factories continually introduced a vast range of pollutants into the river. The canal had served as a makeshift sewer for more than 100 years and was an equally unpleasant space. Consequently fishing has long provided a charitably problematic food source. A dense assemblage at 458–460 Agnes Street included no fish remains, suggesting that at least those mid-1950s households were avoiding local waterways. A contemporary deposit at 444 Agnes Street had a more modest assemblage of 278 bones, and it included 11 fish elements indicating some modest fishing, alongside six rabbit bones, a raccoon mandible, and a groundhog femur that suggest the residents still did some opportunistic household hunting—or were exterminating pests—in the heart of the Cold War city. Still, the 444 Agnes Street assemblage was dominated by pork and to a lesser extent beef and chicken, as many contemporary assemblages would have been as well. Of the 278 bones in the assemblage, 62 were pork (22 percent), 37 were

beef (13 percent), and 41 were chicken (14 percent). That broad-based consumption strategy contrasted to that of the neighbors at 458–460 Agnes Street. The home at 458–460 Agnes Street had a much more overwhelming dominance of pork; 756 of the 1042 elements in that feature were pork (73 percent), 92 were chicken (8 percent) and only four elements were beef (0.3 percent). While pork is a commonplace food on African American tables, the home at 458–460 was home to several residents who worked at the massive pork-packing plant, Kingans, directly across the river. It seems likely they were bringing home some food that had been discarded, and they may also have been furtively pilfering food from their workplace. Such tactical consumption was likely most common among marginalized laborers, which included the men on Kingans' factory line as well as the many domestics and food service laborers who brought food home from their workplaces. Such consumption is very challenging to "see" archaeologically, but clearly many African American households developed a rich range of consumption tactics negotiating consumer space and workplace racism.

The comparison of the bottle assemblage at 458–460 with a neighborhood corner store suggests the decline of the neighborhood retailing that had once supported black consumers' staple needs. By the turn of the twentieth century, modest corner stores were dotted all over the near-Westside, including a typical store at 800 Camp Street that likely hawked canned and bottled goods, some fresh foods, and basic goods like coal and ice. Similar stores dotted almost every corner of the near-Westside into the Depression, and some continued in business into the 1960s. In the early twentieth century, the store was appointed with a rich range of household decorative material culture and includes a large assemblage of toys that suggest it was a common neighborhood gathering space until around World War II. Many such stores began to disappear in the 1930s, hit first by the invasion of chains, then by an exodus of many residents in the wake of World War II, and finally by urban renewal's nearly complete removal of remaining customers. When the Camp Street proprietors filled their backyard privy around 1960, they discarded a toilet and then followed it with a range of goods including 135 bottles (Rosenberg 2008: 56). The functional range of products the store was selling in its final days appears to have been quite restricted: one-third of the assemblage was liquor bottles, another 23 percent were soda, and another 15 percent were wine vessels, which together accounts for 95 of the 135 vessels. Like many eroding retailers, the store appears to have focused on a handful of goods and hoped that convenience would continue to provide some modest but steady income. Yet in 1960 the store appeared in the city directory simply as an ice dealer, and it closed soon afterward (Polk 1960: 172). In comparison the assemblage at 458–460 Agnes Street was composed of 42 percent liquor bottles, an even higher percentage than the corner store, but only 2.5 percent of that assemblage was soda vessels, and no wine bottles were included. The Agnes Street assemblage was even more restricted in its functional diversity than the neighborhood store, which likely reflects the decline of community consumption spaces as well as household

poverty. The clearest distinction between the assemblages is that the Agnes Street household had 31 preserving jars, which made it the second-most-common vessel form. Alongside the opportunistically consumed pork remains, the residents appear to have developed a range of market tactics that included household food preservation and tactical reappropriation in addition to conventional retail space.

A Campus and Its Neighbors

Like many urban campuses, IUPUI was torn over how it could effectively marry an existing neighborhood and a working university landscape, and the union of historical residences, campus architecture, and the logistical demands of a university was an unwieldy fit. In September 1966 the university and Indianapolis's Redevelopment Commission hired Victor Gruen Associates to develop a master plan for the campus landscape, adding to a series of broader city plans executed in the 1950s and many more to follow. Gruen was best known as a shopping mall designer who popularized regional shopping centers, designing the world's first enclosed shopping mall, the Southdale Center in Edina, Minnesota, in 1956 and Indianapolis's own Glendale Shopping Center in 1958. In 1953 Gruen likened malls to medieval markets and rural New England towns in which citizens gathered in a space that melded civic and retail dimensions, but he concluded that contemporary "Western civilization, especially the growth of big cities, tended to wipe out a lot of that" (Palmer 1953: 37, 39). Gruen's firm had designed retail centers and pedestrian-friendly urban landscapes in other communities using urban renewal funds and included a university campus plan as part of at least one renewal project prior to its master plan for IUPUI (for example, *New York Times* 1959, 1961). Yet like many emerging urban campuses the Indianapolis administrators had no especially clear sense of the ultimate scope their institution hoped to reach. When the university's intent to build became public, a rush of landlords was eager to sell, and in 1974 the university acknowledged that a "substantial backlog of property owners wanting to sell endangers the University's commitment to the immediate campus neighborhood" (IUPUI Master Plan 1974: 65). The initial 1958 plan of three buildings surrounded by neighbors quickly became hundreds of acres as a law school, administrative spaces, parking dilemmas, and a host of programs gradually emerged. Even today the university has developed another master campus plan that ironically makes many of the same suggestions made by a host of planners over more than 50 years.

A significant amount of resistance to university expansion was rooted in the perception that the university might grow unchecked for decades, a sentiment that persists even today. In the 1960s, for instance, there was some apprehension from residents of the exclusively black public housing Lockefield Gardens that opened in 1938 and sat alongside the medical center. Lockefield had itself displaced 383 homes in 1935 as the city's first urban renewal project, but these had made way for an exceptionally



Photograph (1971) of the new campus of IUPUI and the homes across Blake Street.
 Courtesy of IUPUI University Library Special Collections and Archives, Indianapolis.

well-appointed, exclusively African American community. In a 1973 university plan, the authors hoped to assuage concerns that the university's eyes were trained on Lockefield, underscoring that "THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIVERSITY SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE MAINTENANCE OF LOCKEFIELD GARDENS AS A DESIRABLE HOUSING AREA FOR LOCAL CITIZENS AND REAFFIRM PUBLICLY THE UNIVERSITY'S POSITION OF NOT ACQUIRING THAT PROPERTY" (IUPUI Goals and Objectives Committee 1973: 82). The university never acquired the complex, but in the late 1970s the residents were all expelled when the city closed the development. In 1983, 17 of the complex's original 24 buildings were razed.

Just as the twentieth-century city is an artifact of racist and classist policies, urban campuses are profoundly shaped by more than a half century of state mechanisms that aspired to reshape racial and political landscapes. IUPUI is perhaps typical of the institutions that struggle with practical needs like ever-more parking, declining and insufficient academic and office space, and an apparent desire to measure up to the models of a stereotypical college campus—and such problems extend well

beyond the youthful urban campus to many well-established state universities. Like many institutions born in the second half of the twentieth century, IUPUI was crafted opportunistically. In terms of its spatial scale and ambitions, the institution has spent 40 years determining its role and in turn creating a space that satisfies those ambitions, and the process of acquiring these spaces has been somewhat haphazard and even today witnesses the university's growth into nonresidential neighborhoods north of campus. The degree to which displacement was intentional social engineering by university administrators and their civic government partners may be irrelevant, and apologists are inclined to point to the economic benefits of such universities to rationalize their social effects (for example, Cummings et al. 2005: 156–157). The mechanics of displacement as wholesale clearance or more gradual removals have quite comparable material and social effects, so efforts to rationalize such histories inevitably ring hollow or sound socially uninformed. Archaeology provides one mechanism to simply have public discussions on inequality and landscape transformation that are geared less toward confirming the university's guilt or exonerating urban renewal than they are intended to soberly confront the conditions that made the institution's very existence possible. The long-term effects of such discourse remain to be determined, but archaeology aspires to begin placing questions of heritage and privilege in public discussion.

References

- Axel-Lute, M. 2008. Will Columbia Take Manhattanville? *Shelterforce* 22 March. Electronic document, <http://www.shelterforce.org/article/print/213>, accessed February 2, 2009.
- Bird, D. 1968. 300 Protesting Columbia Students Barricade Office of College Dean. *New York Times*, 24 April, pp. 1, 30.
- Connor, L. 1959a. Slums Blight 20 Pct. of City. *Indianapolis Star*, 17 August, pp. 1, 14.
- . 1959b. Bad Sanitation, Water in Slums Take Heavy Toil of Infants. *Indianapolis Star*, 19 August, pp. 1, 3.
- Cummings, S., M. Rosentraub, M. Domahidy, and S. Coffin 2005. University Involvement in Downtown Revitalization: Managing Political and Financial Risks. In *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*, edited by D. C. Perry and W. Wiewel, pp. 147–174. New York: M. E. Sharpe, Armonk.
- Hardy, C. 1989. Interview with Charles Hardy conducted by Philip Scarpino and Sheila Goodenough, 17 October. Unpublished manuscript on file, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis Archives, Indianapolis.
- Hechinger, F. M. 1961. Campus vs. Slums: Urban Universities Join Battle for Neighborhood Renewal. *New York Times*, 1 October, p. E7.
- Hirsch, A. R. 2000. Searching for a "Sound Negro Policy": A Racial Agenda for the Housing Acts of 1949 and 1954. *Housing Policy Debate* 11(2):393–441.
- Indiana University Board of Trustees 1967. Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 22 September. Unpublished manuscript on file, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis Archives, Indianapolis.

- Indianapolis Redevelopment Commission 1959. Progress Report. Indianapolis Redevelopment Commission, Indianapolis, Indiana. Electronic document, <http://images.indianahistory.org/cdm4/document.php?CISOROOT=/dc018&CISOPTR=4344&REC=7>, accessed April 7, 2009.
- Indianapolis Star* 1921a. Urge Plan for Hospital Park. 1 September, p. 5.
- . 1921b. May Preserve Landmark. 21 September, p. 8.
- . 1956. Medical Center to Build on Slum Cleared Acres. 4 October, pp. 1, 9.
- IUPUI Goals and Objectives Committee 1973. Preliminary Report. Unpublished manuscript on file, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis Archives, Indianapolis.
- IUPUI 1974. IUPUI Master Plan. Unpublished manuscript on file, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis Archives, Indianapolis.
- King, E. 1875. *The Great South*. Hartford, Conn.: American Publishing Company.
- Millones, P. 1968. Community Discontent and an Increase in Protests Sow the Seeds of Concern at Columbia University. *New York Times*, 3 March, p. 51.
- New York Times* 1949. Eisenhower Sees Columbia Growing. 9 October, p. 50.
- . 1959. Newark Unveils Renewal Plans. 13 September, p. 36.
- . 1961. Town Gets a Plan for Model Living. 19 February, p. 338.
- Palmer, C. B. 1953. The Shopping Center Goes to the Shopper. 29 November, pp. SM-14–15, 37–42, 44.
- Parsons, K. C. 1963. Universities and Cities: The Terms of the Truce between Them. *The Journal of Higher Education* 34(4):205–216.
- Polk, R. L. 1960 *Polk's Indianapolis City Directory*. Indianapolis, Ind.: R.L. Polk and Company.
- Proudfoot, M. J. 1954. Public Regulation of Urban Development in the United States. *Geographical Review* 44(3):415–419.
- Ralph, J. 1896. *Dixie, or Southern Scenes and Sketches*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Roberts, S. V. 1966. Columbia's Expansion to Uproot Area Residents. *New York Times*, 2 November, p. 47.
- Rosenberg, S. A. 2008. *Corner Stores and Bottles: African-American Consumption in Indianapolis*. Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Ball State University, Muncie, Ind.
- Schanberg, S. H. 1964. Columbia Named in Rights Inquiry. *New York Times*, 28 February, p. 15.
- Taggart, C. J. 1994. Streetcars. In *The Encyclopedia of Indianapolis*, edited by D. J. Bodenhamer and R. G. Barrows, pp. 1305–1306. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Teaford, J. C. (2000). Urban Renewal and Its Aftermath. *Housing Policy Debate* 11(2):443–463.
- Wehrwein, A. C. 1959. Chicago U. Spurs Renewal Project. *New York Times*, 1 November, p. 61.
- Wood, C. 1996. Interview with Richard Pierce, 28 November. Indiana Historical Society. Electronic document, <http://images.indianahistory.org/cdm4/document.php?CISOROOT=/dc018&CISOPTR=3680&REC=7>, accessed January 27, 2009.
- Yronwode, C. 2003. Hoodoo: African-American Magic. Electronic document, <http://www.lucky Mojo.com/hoodoohistory.html>, accessed February 2, 2009.