

**Madison, Wisconsin: The Danger of Liberal Havens**  
**An analysis of neighborhood formation**

by

**Mackenzie Jordan Carroll**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honors in the Geography Major  
at the University of Wisconsin-Madison,  
May 2017.

Madison, Wisconsin.

Dr. Sarah Moore, Thesis Advisor

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	2
I. Low-Income Housing and the Emergence of Urban Renewal in Madison, Wisconsin	6
II. The Triangle Redevelopment Project	17
III. The Origins of the Inferior Conditions in South Madison	26
IV. Conclusions	33
Bibliography	36

In 1978, Republican Governor Lee Sherman Dreyfus, in a derogatory statement on the city's liberal reputation, called Madison, Wisconsin, "30 square miles surrounded by reality."<sup>1</sup> Locals quickly popularized and repurposed the statement to represent the idea that Madison is a great place to live and a sanctuary for progressive thought. The perception of the city as a liberal haven is reinforced by not just the locals and Wisconsin politicians, but also by the media. The *New York Times* listed it as a contender for America's most liberal city, it repeatedly makes the *U.S. News*' "Best Places to Live" list, and *Livability* and *Business Insider* both crowned Madison the best place to call home.<sup>2</sup> Despite the prevalence of Madison as a liberal haven and an ideal place to live, both of these generalizations, like all overarching labels, are to a certain degree incorrect. With the presence of significant inequalities and racial disparities, the question becomes for whom is Madison, Wisconsin a liberal haven?

The common acknowledgement of Madison as a liberal bastion is not surprising considering the state's long tradition of progressivism stretching back to Governor LaFollette, one of the founders of the Progressive movement. Liberal values require more than just voting for Democrats; the ideology espouses that it is the duty of the government to alleviate social ills in order to achieve equal opportunity and the elimination of discrimination in all aspects of society. Examples of common issues include raising the minimum wage, protecting the environment, and supporting social issues like same-sex marriage. Proponents of progressivism aim to increase

---

<sup>1</sup> "Madison mayor proposes city's first official motto: '77 square miles surrounded by reality'," *Star Tribune*, July 12,

<sup>2</sup> Corey Adwar, "7 Reasons Why Madison, Wisconsin Is The Best Place To Live In America," *Business Insider*, September 24, 2014, accessed April 3, 2017, <http://www.businessinsider.com/why-madison-wisconsin-is-the-best-place-to-live-2014-9>; Sewell Chan, "Name America's Most Liberal City," *New York Times*, November 21, 2007, accessed April 3, 2017, [https://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/11/21/name-americas-most-liberal-city/comment-page-4/?\\_r=0](https://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/11/21/name-americas-most-liberal-city/comment-page-4/?_r=0).

citizens' opportunities to engage with and shape the government.<sup>3</sup> In order to ensure "a more egalitarian claim to the city's resources," efforts are made to curtail the influence of corporations and big money interests.<sup>4</sup> Former Madison Mayor Dave Cieslewicz, a Progressive politician, argues that liberal ideologies can make the greatest inroads at smaller scales. "Local governments," he says, "are the only place[s] where progressive ideas can get any traction...Cities are where you can break through the big money, the media spin-everything that is wrong with our politics-and capture the public's imagination."<sup>5</sup> Dr. John Mollenkopf, professor at the CUNY Graduate Center, concurred that "many small- and medium-size cities are quite liberal," especially those which are home to a university, such as Madison.<sup>6</sup>

However, progressive cities and politicians are caught in the struggle between eliminating inequalities and promoting economic interests. An argument in Paul Peterson's *City Limits* highlights this conflict by saying, "the city is limited because it cannot risk capital flight by taxing it."<sup>7</sup> This lure of economic opportunity for cities is evident in "the history of urban renewal and downtown redevelopment through the latter half of the twentieth century."<sup>8</sup> Richard C. Schragger argues, "Downtown redevelopment schemes used slum clearance and blight removal to replace poor minority residents and the businesses that sustained them with higher-income residents and amenities intended to appeal to wealthy suburbanites."<sup>9</sup> Conventional scholarship believes that there are limits to progressivism, because "Even progressive mayors go out of their way to be

---

<sup>3</sup> James R. McKeag, "Creating a Culture of Progressive Planning Practice in America's Medium-Size Cities," (Masters diss., Tufts University, 2015): 10, <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/docview/1725144025?accountid=465>.

<sup>4</sup> Richard Schragger, "Is a Progressive City Possible? Reviving Urban Liberalism for the Twenty-First Century," *Harvard Law & Policy Review* 7, no. 2 (July 2013): 237, accessed April 3, 2017, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=ift&AN=90231653&site=ehost-live&scope=site](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=ift&AN=90231653&site=ehost-live&scope=site).

<sup>5</sup> John Nichols, "Urban Archipelago," *Nation* 280, no. 24 (2005): 14, accessed April 3, 2017, ISSN: 00278378.

<sup>6</sup> Chan, "Name America's Most Liberal City."

<sup>7</sup> Schragger, "Is a Progressive City Possible? Reviving Urban Liberalism for the Twenty-First Century," 235; Paul Peterson, *City Limits* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 27-29.

<sup>8</sup> Schragger, "Is a Progressive City Possible? Reviving Urban Liberalism for the Twenty-First Century," 235.

<sup>9</sup> Schragger, "Is a Progressive City Possible? Reviving Urban Liberalism for the Twenty-First Century," 235.

business-friendly, promoting a low-tax, low-regulatory environment.”<sup>10</sup> The shortcomings and failures of progressive local governments to enact its ideals both create and perpetuate inequalities:

“While economic growth is and always has been geographically uneven, the fact that poor minorities are more often stuck in poor geographies is a function of political decisions: decisions that reinforce the jurisdictional separation between city and suburb; that make local property-tax wealth the determinant of school quality; or *that simply put poor and minority residents out of sight through discriminatory housing, development, land-use, and zoning policies*” (emphasis added).<sup>11</sup>

To combat neoliberal urbanism, progressive social scientists and geographers utilize Henri Lefebvre’s idea of ‘the right to the city’ to challenge “exclusionary developmental processes” like “segregation, slum clearance and urban renewal, urban decline and the gentrification.”<sup>12</sup> Mark Purcell believes “Lefebvre’s right to the city is an argument for profoundly reworking both the social relations of capitalism and the current structure of liberal-democratic citizenship.”<sup>13</sup> Within this realm of scholarship, there is the agreement that inhabitants inherently have rights to the city, which include, “an individual liberty to access urban resources, to have a role in the shaping of urban spaces, to avoid spatial segregation and exclusion, and to be provided with public services that meet basic needs in health, education, and welfare.”<sup>14</sup> To ensure these rights, there is the need “to restructure the power relations that underlie the production of urban space, fundamentally shifting control away from capital and the state and toward urban inhabitants.”<sup>15</sup> Overall, ‘the right to the city’ framework allows cities to evaluate which of its citizens are being excluded from the planning and development process, which is necessary in Madison.

---

<sup>10</sup> Schragger, "Is a Progressive City Possible? Reviving Urban Liberalism for the Twenty-First Century," 236.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 238.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Mark Purcell, “Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant,” *GeoJournal* 58 (2002): 101, accessed April 15, 2017, <http://faculty.washington.edu/mpurcell/geojournal.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.; Schragger, "Is a Progressive City Possible? Reviving Urban Liberalism for the Twenty-First Century," 238.

<sup>15</sup> Purcell, “Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant,” 101-102.

To better explore the question of Madison as a liberal haven, I have chosen to study the low-income, minority neighborhood of South Madison. Due to Madison's large white population, there is little inter-racial mixing in the neighborhoods.<sup>16</sup> However, South Madison, in contrast to the rest of the city, has relatively high concentrations of black, Asian, and Hispanic residents, and a correspondingly low white population.<sup>17</sup> Ethnic and racial neighborhoods can serve as a support system, and African Americans have made South Madison their own by developing a strong community in the confined space. However, this area is not originally where African Americans wanted to live. Historically, South Madison has always been a racially mixed neighborhood, made so by housing discrimination, redlining, economic inequality, and urban renewal. The neighborhood, in contradiction to the city's progressive values, was not formed organically or justly.

South Madison's geographic isolation from the city partly contributes to the widespread surprise that its residents face significant inequalities, because the majority of Madison's citizens are not proximate to the neighborhood or its residents. South Madison's geographic separateness results in the community's specific concerns and problems, which differ from white, more affluent citizens, going largely unnoticed. This isolation is the result not only of geography, but also of specific policy decisions made by the City of Madison going back to the 1920s. Today, Madison's growing Hispanic and Hmong populations live in the neighborhood, and going forward, their voices could be glossed over in a similar fashion to African Americans due to their

---

<sup>16</sup> According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 78.9% of Madison's population was white. Social Explorer, "Census 2010: Madison, Wisconsin," accessed September 20, 2016, <http://www.socialexplorer.com/tables/C2010/R11407734>.

<sup>17</sup> In 2015, according to U.S. Census data, census tract 14.01's (includes South Madison) population was 15.767% black, 20.02% Asian, 27.58% Hispanic, and 8.087% two or more races. Social Explorer, "Total Population: ACS 2015 Estimates," accessed September 20, 2016, <http://www.socialexplorer.com/6f4cdab7a0/explore>.

lack of proximity. To ensure Madison meets its liberal ideals, the City and its citizens must pay greater attention to the members of South Madison.

In many ways, Madison, Wisconsin is indeed a liberal city, but the question is to the benefit of whom? Class, occupation, and geographic location create for significantly different experiences within the city. The acceptance of the ‘liberal, progressive haven’ label has obscured the significant racial and economic disparities that exist. In 2014, the “Race to Equity Report” sought to reveal that Madison’s alleged progressivism helps only a certain portion of the population.<sup>18</sup> Breaking down the perception of Madison as a liberal haven is crucial for attention to be given to all demographics and for work to be done to create a more inclusive city. Currently in Madison, ‘liberal haven’ is a preordained title, when instead, it should be a reality the city strives to achieve. And in order to solve a problem, its presence and its origins must first be understood and acknowledged by community members and leaders.

#### I. Low-Income Housing and the Emergence of Urban Renewal in Madison, Wisconsin

The history and development of the South Madison neighborhood is deeply intertwined with urban renewal efforts that redistributed local minority populations and altered the city’s geography to such a significant extent that it is evident on the landscape today. These changes in Madison did not occur in a vacuum; rather, similar initiatives were occurring across the United States as cities big and small took advantage of federal funds to alleviate supposedly problematic, blighted areas in their communities.<sup>19</sup> Early urban renewal legislation, like the 1937 Wagner-

---

<sup>18</sup> Race to Equity, “Race to Equity: A Baseline Report on the State of Racial Disparities in Dane County,” (Madison, WI: Wisconsin Council on Children and Families, 2013), accessed September 1, 2016, <http://racetoequity.net/baseline-report-state-racial-disparities-dane-county/>.

<sup>19</sup> The FHA contributed to the dialogue and concern of slums and blight by arguing, “Cities need rehabilitation and redevelopment,” because, “For many years urban slums and blighted areas have been spreading, becoming more intensified, and breaking out in new spaces. Collectively they have reached startling proportions. This has been a long process of degeneration and neglect, bringing grave financial and economic difficulties.”

Steagall Act, focused on the government's responsibility to "remedy the unsafe and unsanitary housing conditions and the acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low-income...that are injurious to the health, safety, and *morals* of the citizens of the Nation" (emphasis added).<sup>20</sup> The Federal Housing Administration's (FHA) 1941 *A Handbook on Urban Redevelopment for Cities in the United States* laid the groundwork for future national legislation and called for "Federal loans or subsidies to communities for the elimination of *slums and blighted areas*" (emphasis added).<sup>21</sup> President Truman's Housing Act of 1949, part of his Fair Deal legislation, would incorporate the FHA's focus on slum removal, thereby shaping the primary objective of urban renewal projects across the nation.

There is a subtle, but notable shift in goals between the Wagner-Steagall Act and the Housing Act of 1949. The aim of providing low-income housing to residents spoke to the belief that people have the right to affordable and safe homes.<sup>22</sup> While low-rent housing programming remained in the Housing Act, it would be overshadowed by blight removal objectives.<sup>23</sup> By expanding the discussion of housing efforts to include blight and slum removal, the primary focus became improving the city overall to the detriment of individuals' well being, especially for marginalized citizens. "Blighted" and "slums", both race neutral terms, were often used to

---

Federal Housing Administration, *A Handbook on Urban Redevelopment for Cities in the United States*, U.S. Government Printing Office (Washington, D.C.: 1941), <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000341192>.

<sup>20</sup> "United States Housing Act of 1937," 75th Congress, Pub. L. 93-383, 88 Stat. 653 (codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. 1437 et. seq.), [http://www.congressionaltimeline.org/Documents/75th\\_pg1\\_09011937\\_doc1\\_pg1-12.pdf](http://www.congressionaltimeline.org/Documents/75th_pg1_09011937_doc1_pg1-12.pdf).

<sup>21</sup> In *A Handbook on Urban Redevelopment for Cities in the United States*, the FHA lists the symptoms of blight which include overcrowding in dwellings, buildings in disrepair, and "precarious financial status of developed properties." A full listing is on page 2 and 3.

In *A Handbook on Urban Redevelopment for Cities in the United States*, the FHA lists the symptoms of blight which include overcrowding in dwellings, buildings in disrepair, and "precarious financial status of developed properties," 2-3; Ashley A. Foard and Hilbert Fefferman, "Federal Urban Renewal Legislation," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 25, no. 4 (1960): 635-684, doi:10.2307/1190625.

<sup>22</sup> While no racial distinctions were specifically made in these acts, the impact of urban renewal would negatively affect ethnic and racial minorities.

<sup>23</sup> Title I of the Act provided federal "assistance to local areas for slum clearance and low-rent housing programs." Howard Samuel Martin, "Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959," (Masters diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1954), 5-6.

"Provisions of the Housing Act of 1949," *Monthly Labor Review* 69, no. 2 (1949): 155-59, accessed September 24, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41831843>.

describe racial and ethnic minority neighborhoods, resulting in specific identities being disproportionately displaced and excluded from the benefits of urban renewal. Consequently, blight removal would improve certain areas and potentially the city's image, but in its failure to address systemic inequalities, urban renewal efforts only perpetuated existing disparities.

With the United States government offering monetary aid to improve neighborhoods, cities across the nation took advantage and began to identify 'slums', and the City of Madison was no exception. In compliance with the requirements created by the initial Housing Act, the local government established the Madison Housing Authority (MHA) in 1939 to ensure that the city could qualify for federal assistance should it be accepted.<sup>24</sup> In the same year, officials proposed a public housing project that called for a \$1 million investment; the City of Madison would only need to contribute \$100,000, and the US Housing Authority (USHA) would supply the rest.<sup>25</sup> As a result, the Authority's first order of business was to investigate the city's housing situation and "to provide the factual basis for the consideration of a federal housing project and of alternative plans for the provision of adequate housing in the city."<sup>26</sup> The Common Council used the MHA's subsequent report, "The Low Income Area Housing Survey," to decide whether to proceed.<sup>27</sup>

The MHA report found there to be a dearth of low-income housing in Madison. Despite additional housing being constructed, surveyors argued, "none of this new construction [would]

---

<sup>24</sup> The MHA was created in response to the 1937 Housing Act.

Martin, "Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959," 31.

<sup>25</sup> "USHA Slum Loan Support Sought Here," *Wisconsin State Journal*; "U.S. Earmarks \$900,000 Fund for Low-Rent Housing Project Here; Now Depends on Council," *Capital Times*, October 29, 1939, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P74-5712.

<sup>26</sup> Paul James Collins, "Real Property and Low Income Area Survey of Madison, Wisconsin," (Masters diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1941), 3; "USHA Slum Loan Support Sought Here," *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 14, 1939, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P43893.

<sup>27</sup> "USHA Slum Loan Support Sought Here," *Wisconsin State Journal*.

satisfy the need for housing in the low cost range.”<sup>28</sup> Consequently, the council conceded that Madison “does have a shortage of housing available to low-income groups,” and City Plan Engineer Walter Johnson went so far as to argue, “the shortage of housing in Madison had existed for 100 years.”<sup>29</sup> The overall housing shortage in the city resulted in a “premium [being] placed upon all types of housing. As a result, even sub-standard houses are in demand, which lessens the chance of them ever being replaced,” if left only to market forces.<sup>30</sup> The Council also acknowledged that exorbitantly high rent prices were a hindrance to economically marginalized groups.<sup>31</sup> One Madison resident wrote to the *Wisconsin State Journal* in 1939 saying that 50% of his income went towards rent because, “A shortage of houses enables the landlord to charge what he considers a fair price for rent, and at the same time to make only those improvements which he considered necessary.”<sup>32</sup> Thus, renters were at the mercy of the landlord and left at a clear disadvantage. The prevalence of substandard housing and the disproportionate rent to income ratios of many Madison citizens made clear, “that the incomes of many of these groups [were] so low that under no circumstances would they be able to pay the rentals necessary for adequate housing. It is in this field, therefore, that the need for municipal or other governmental intervention and aid is most probable.”<sup>33</sup>

Despite the reality of the housing shortage being documented by the MHA, the government and the public fiercely debated the USHA’s low-income housing proposal. Support

---

<sup>28</sup> Low-rents at this time were considered as under \$30 per month according to the MHA.

Collins, “Real Property and Low Income Area Survey of Madison, Wisconsin,” 25.

<sup>29</sup> Martin, “Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959,” 79.

<sup>30</sup> William A. Atkins, “The Rehabilitation of South Madison as Part of A Residential Neighborhood,” (Masters diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1961): 11.

<sup>31</sup> Martin, “Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959,” 79; “Here is Complete Text of Madison Common Council’s Report on Housing,” *Capital Times*, November 25, 1939, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P74-5712.

<sup>32</sup> The general recommendation is to spend no more than 30% of your gross monthly income on rent.

“Out of the Mail Bag,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, December 7, 1939, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P43900.

<sup>33</sup> Collins, “Real Property and Low Income Area Survey of Madison, Wisconsin,” 107.

for the project drew on the City of Madison's liberal values, especially the idea of a government being obligated to help its citizens. The Madison Common Council partly acknowledged this responsibility when they responded to the housing survey by saying, "It cannot be denied that there is here indicated a problem which the city must meet."<sup>34</sup> Another appeal urged the city to follow precedents being set nation-wide: "Almost all progressive cities have been making some efforts to improve living conditions and become more attractive. Although Madison has long been attractive as a residential city, the conditions just cited point to a definite field for improvement which would be of benefit to the entire city."<sup>35</sup> Clearly, the local government and citizens, in adherence with the general, progressive values of the city, viewed the housing conditions, not only as the problem of the homeowner or renter, but also of the city.

In light of the poor housing conditions found in South Madison and throughout the city, the MHA recommended participation in the federal government's slum clearance program.<sup>36</sup> Mayor Law of the City of Madison also supported the USHA proposal, because he was concerned with the city's reputation. During Law's terms in office, the local government focused on efforts to keep the city clean and to improve the appearance of residences and businesses under the justification that, "Madison has thousands of visitors yearly, either attending conventions in our city, or tourists passing through. We must always bear in mind that we are the capital city of this great state and should present an appearance that will be not only be a credit to ourselves but also to our state."<sup>37</sup> When the mayor toured the homes deemed necessary of rehabilitation by the MHA, he described them as "awful."<sup>38</sup> By supporting the USHA proposal, Law and the MHA

---

<sup>34</sup> "Here is Complete Text of Madison Common Council's Report on Housing," *Capital Times*.

<sup>35</sup> Collins, "Real Property and Low Income Area Survey of Madison, Wisconsin," 110.

<sup>36</sup> "Will City Council Muff Madison's Housing Project," *The Wisconsin State Journal*, November 7, 1939, 1.

<sup>37</sup> Common Council Proceedings, April 18, 1939.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

tacitly agreed that the government had a responsibility to, “compel restoration of [any] premises” deemed unsuitable or unsafe should the homeowners be unable or *unwilling* to take action.<sup>39</sup>

Beyond aesthetics, the dilapidated conditions of South Madison were financially draining. By annexing a portion of the neighborhood in 1923, the city had in theory, assumed responsibility for the region, which meant diverting more resources in terms of “fire, health, [and] police protection.”<sup>40</sup> Unfortunately, significant infrastructure investments by the City would not occur until the 1960s. This is due to the fact that not all Madison residents believed the city needed to help the low-income populace. The USHA proposal required the city to provide a portion of the funds to support the project, which, in addition to the low-income houses being tax free, caused people to have qualms about the endeavor.<sup>41</sup> In a direct contradiction to progressive values, opponents disapproved of increased government intervention and oversight, and upheld the conservative view that owners should fix their properties themselves, regardless of income.<sup>42</sup>

In spite of the Common Council saying, “Unsafe and unhealthy conditions should not and will not be allowed to continue,” the low-income housing project garnered a significant amount of resistance from city council members.<sup>43</sup> Government officials claimed that the USHA programming was more specifically geared towards slum clearance, and according to the Common Council, the MHA identified no slums or blight within the city limits, just dispersed substandard housing.<sup>44</sup> By claiming that substandard housing was minimal, the city could reject

---

<sup>39</sup> The mayor’s belief that the city has the right and responsibility to interfere with private property would result in future housing decisions that while meant to help Bram’s Addition residents, would actually prove detrimental to people’s ways of life and housing options.

Chic Young, “Text of Council Committees’ Report on Federal Housing Plan,” *The Wisconsin State Journal*, November 25, 1939, 1.

<sup>40</sup> “Mayor is Told Housing Program Won’t Increase Tax Rate for Madison,” *The Capital Times*, November 19, 1939, 6.

<sup>41</sup> “Out of the Mail Bag,” *The Wisconsin State Journal*, December 7, 1939, 4.

<sup>42</sup> Young, “Text of Council Committees’ Report on Federal Housing Plan.”

<sup>43</sup> “Here is Complete Text of Madison Common Council’s Report on Housing,” *Capital Times*.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

the project without seeming to contradict its liberal values. A local newspaper quoted Mayor Law as recognizing the city's significant problem of low-income housing, but he ultimately did not think the USHA proposal was designed to best help cities the size of Madison.<sup>45</sup> In the end, the Council defeated the proposal in a 16-1 vote, passing on the opportunity to build 200 to 225 new homes for impoverished Madison families.<sup>46</sup> So, in 1939, housing initiatives could not attract the necessary public or governmental support, indicating that the provision of low-income housing would be an uphill battle in Madison, despite the alleged progressive values of the city. Further, government officials partly based their rejection of the housing project on the absence of slums and blight in Madison. In less than ten years, the rhetoric towards slums and blight by the City would change.

World War II postponed the MHA's work, but after the war's conclusion, the organization reengaged in the fight for increased public housing. A 1949 publication entitled, "General Report on a Housing Condition Survey of Selected Areas in Madison, WI," identified blight and the emergence of slums as the foremost issue affecting housing, signaling a change in the local government's perception of neighborhoods.<sup>47</sup> The MHA primarily identified slums as "areas having dwellings predominate, which by reason of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack ventilation, light, or sanitary faculties, or any combination of these factors are detrimental to safety, health or morals."<sup>48</sup> Additionally, the report acknowledged the correlation between low-incomes and substandard housing by stating, "43% of families involved in slum housing had incomes below \$2,250 per year, while 42% of the families in the blighted

---

<sup>45</sup> "Ask Housing Bodies to Reconsider City, C.U. Leader Pleads," *Capital Times*, January 26, 1940, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P74-5715; "City Housing," *The Capital Times*, January 26, 1940, 4.

<sup>46</sup> Martin, "Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959," 30; "U.S. Earmarks \$900,000 Fund for Low-Rent Housing Project Here; Now Depends on Council," *Capital Times*

<sup>47</sup> Martin, "Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959," 10.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

units were below this figure.”<sup>49</sup> More than a decade had passed, but the city still had not solved the issue of insufficient affordable housing. In an attempt to alleviate the problem, the MHA proposed the local government take action by accepting federal financial assistance, removing substandard housing, and constructing 150 units of public housing.<sup>50</sup>

In contrast to 1939 when the City Council decided the outcome of public housing, Madison citizens voted on whether to implement the proposed public housing initiatives via a referendum. An obstacle to the public housing initiative was the ballot itself in which voters “had to vote ‘no’ in order to say ‘yes, I want public housing.’”<sup>51</sup> This resulted in ads from both sides being careful to explain the voting procedure. Two local newspapers, the *Wisconsin State Journal* and the *Capital Times*, reflected opposing viewpoints and wrote about the debate daily.<sup>52</sup>

Arguments in support of public housing included the elimination of slums, rehousing for affected families, and increases in local tax revenues.<sup>53</sup> A certain subset of the population viewed the proposal as an opportunity to solve the longstanding housing shortage in Madison: “This need hasn’t been met, and won’t be met by purely private action...because private building interests simply can’t afford to charge our low-income families the low rentals for decent housing which MHA can charge with federal help.”<sup>54</sup> *Capital Times* journalists used the progressive argument that the MHA housing plan was about “bettering our low-income groups so that they become self-supporting citizens,” and about denying big business and real estate interests control over annexed

---

<sup>49</sup> Calculated for inflation, \$2,250 is equivalent to roughly \$22,856 today based on the United States Department of Labor’s CPI Inflation Calculator. For a family of four in 2017, the poverty line is \$24,600 according to the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

Department of Health and Human Services, “Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines,” 82 FR 8831 (Washington, D.C., 2017), accessed February 1, 2017, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/31/2017-02076/annual-update-of-the-hhs-poverty-guidelines>; Martin, “Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959,” 55.

<sup>50</sup> Martin, “Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959,” 58.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>52</sup> The *Wisconsin State Journal* opposed public housing initiatives while the *Capital Times* supported them.

<sup>53</sup> Martin, “Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959,” 14.

<sup>54</sup> “Capital Times Readers Discuss Hot Election Issues,” *Capital Times*, November 6, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P23902.

city land.<sup>55</sup> An ad appearing on Election Day proclaimed, “Help make Madison a better city to live in-Vote ‘No’ on the housing referendum.”<sup>56</sup> These appeals for the government to intervene and to be responsible for helping all citizens caused opponents to derogatorily declare the plan was socialist.<sup>57</sup> The negative connotations of such a label caused supporters to claim that “[the plan was] responsible democracy, not socialism,” and that everyone in Madison would benefit by ensuring low-income residents had safe, affordable housing.<sup>58</sup>

Opponents of the proposal continued to utilize Cold War era fears of socialism and communism along with the threat of federal government intervention, heightened taxes, and the disruption of local enterprises as key arguments against the initiative.<sup>59</sup> The *Wisconsin State Journal*, Madison’s more conservative newspaper, criticized the fact that the provided housing would be tax-free and objected to the burden taxpayers could potentially face. Instead of viewing public housing as a positive, necessary effort at leveling the playing field, the newspaper and its readers resented the offer of aid to only certain citizens.<sup>60</sup> Citizens earning “a maximum income of \$2,200 per annum,” qualified for the housing project.<sup>61</sup> One editor asked the question, “Why should the taxpayers furnish new \$12,500 homes for those whose income may be greater than

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Voting ‘No’ actually meant voting in favor of the MHA housing project. The “tricky wording” served to hinder the possibility of success.

Paul Raushenbush, Advertisement, November 6, 1959, *Capital Times*, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P23902.

<sup>57</sup> An ad in the *Capital Times* claimed that the public housing campaign was using, “gestapo tactics, distorted facts, a smear campaign,” and that “These are the methods used by those who would sell our citizens on the Socialistic way of life. Step by step their insidious program is being promoted.” The ad concluded with the statement, “Stop the drift towards socialism.”

Madison Home Protective Council, Advertisement, November 6, 1950, *Capital Times*, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P23902.

<sup>58</sup> Martin, “Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959,” 14.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>60</sup> “Public Housing Held Vulnerable to Facts,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 24, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3027; “The Mail Bag,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, November 5, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3033.

<sup>61</sup> Ivan Nestingen, “Important Points,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, October 30, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3033

theirs when they themselves live in less expensive homes?”<sup>62</sup> An opposition ad implied public housing residents did not work by proclaiming, “Working people own their homes. They pay taxes. Are they for public housing? No!”<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, the editorial board’s recommendations for how citizens should vote, printed on election day, claimed that politicians were, “Cheating, hoodwinking, twisting, and hiding facts from those who will have to pay for the bill.”<sup>64</sup> One writer pessimistically predicted that, “The day is not too distant when the little taxpayer may be forced ‘out of the tent,’ to live, perhaps out of the city limits and commute to Madison, home of higher taxes and public housing.”<sup>65</sup> In response to the negative coverage, the MHA released a statement accusing the *Wisconsin State Journal* of “terrifying residents” and circulating false representations of the facts.<sup>66</sup>

Another potential reason for the citizens’ reluctance to support public housing was its partial association with minority groups. Horace Wilkie, chairman of the MHA, said, “Dwellings occupied by minority groups in Madison are more frequently substandard than those occupied by other groups.”<sup>67</sup> The MHA housing survey found minimal homes in poor condition and a small number without infrastructure like sewer or water. However, despite the limited overall number, African Americans were far more likely to live in substandard houses without basic facilities than

---

<sup>62</sup> Ivan Nestingen, “Important Points,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, October 30, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3033; “Public Housing Held Vulnerable to Facts,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 24, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3027; “The Mail Bag,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, November 5, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3033.

<sup>63</sup> Madison Home Protective Council, Advertisement, November 1, 1950, *Capital Times*, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P23902.

<sup>64</sup> “On Today’s Charter Ordinance Referendum for Mayor: Vote ‘No’ to Keep Council-Manager,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, November 7, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3033.

<sup>65</sup> “A Little ‘Trial’ ...of 40 Years,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, November 3, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3033.

<sup>66</sup> “Under the Terror,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, July 29, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3029.

<sup>67</sup> “Better Housing for Minority Groups Urged,” *Capital Times*, February 25, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P23893.

their white counterparts.<sup>68</sup> Wilkie further criticized Madison for its “‘poor record’ for providing housing for minority groups, and that it [was] time for the city to take affirmative steps to improve this record.”<sup>69</sup> In an expression of progressive values, the MHA chairman said, “All families in Madison are entitled to decent living quarters, and it is our community responsibility to see that families in minority groups are provided with adequate housing;” as such, “The Madison Housing authority’s projected 300-unit low-rental program is aimed at part of this problem by providing units for minority and other families whose incomes are so low that they cannot get adequate housing.”<sup>70</sup> Interestingly, the MHA and Wilkie would largely refrain from continuing to make such strong, ardent appeals for low-income housing for minority residents. Even the supportive *Capital Times* did not promote this benefit of the project after its initial reporting of Wilkie’s statement in February 1950, perhaps in an effort to avoid associating minorities with public housing. Additionally, in an apparent contradiction, the MHA also referred to areas in contentious, racially charged terms such as ‘blighted.’ Ultimately, the plea to provide for marginalized residents would be overshadowed by rhetoric of blights, slums, and taxes.

On Election Day in 1950, the public defeated the housing project, leaving unresolved the issue of inadequate housing for low-income residents.<sup>71</sup> In spite of its progressive values, the City of Madison and its citizens continued to be unwilling to support the less fortunate of its population. Additionally, the claimed presence of slums and blight advanced by the MHA housing report did not sway the election enough to overcome the fear of increased taxes and

---

<sup>68</sup> “Less than 1% of houses on a city-wide basis are without water, sewers, and other basic facilities, while 16% of minority group families are without them...and 2.5% of units show deterioration, but that 25% of these are occupied by minority families.” Finally, “Wilkie also pointed out that 10% of minority groups live in overcrowded dwellings while the ratio on overcrowding among all families is 2%.”

“Better Housing for Minority Groups Urged,” *Capital Times*.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Martin, “Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959,” 80-100.

socialism. In future years, these issues would become a more prominent concern. While substandard housing did exist in Madison, economic development opportunities would be the main factor motivating renewal projects, and the lack of direct economic benefit to the city with this public housing initiative is partly why it failed. Local officials utilized the rhetoric of urban renewal, especially its popularization of the problematic terms ‘blighted’ and ‘slum’, to justify predominantly economic motivations. Finally, the failure to pass public and low-income housing proposals would come to haunt the City of Madison as it began its first urban renewal initiatives in the 1950s and 1960s.

## II. The Triangle Redevelopment Project

While the MHA’s public-housing initiatives were unsuccessful in the 1940s and 1950s, they did, for better or worse, posit the idea of slums and blight as threats to the city. In 1954, the citizens and local government conceded to implementing the first urban renewal project in the Brittingham neighborhood.<sup>72</sup> Soon after this initial effort, the Madison City Council explored opportunities for more-extensive urban renewal development by approving the MHA’s 1957 request for a survey of the Triangle neighborhood, colloquially referred to as the Greenbush or simply Bush neighborhood.<sup>73</sup> Madison’s minority citizens lived in Greenbush, and as a later government report recognized, “...the Bush was an ethnic enclave where immigrants black, white, and Jewish from Eastern and Western Europe settled, in part because they were not

---

<sup>72</sup> League of Women Voters of Madison, *Madison at Your Service* (Madison, WI: League of Women Voters of Madison, 1968), 27, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records, 1954-1975, Box 11, Folder 3.

<sup>73</sup> Citizens also voiced their support of this initiative by voting favorably on a “bond issue covering costs involved in the Triangle project.”

“Page of Opinion: Here’s Public Housing Again,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 11, 1961, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3167.

welcome in other parts of Madison.”<sup>74</sup> Officially, the City targeted the area for development because the 1949 MHA housing report had revealed evidence of blight; however, the city’s plans entailed more than just removing blight.<sup>75</sup> Economic and real estate development opportunities fueled interest in the area to the detriment of the racial and ethnic minorities who lived there.<sup>76</sup>

The City of Madison told Greenbush residents that “The Triangle Project offers an opportunity for citizens to work hand-in-hand with governmental agencies in helping to beautify a part of our City, and to bring about better living conditions for *many people*” (emphasis added).<sup>77</sup> However, the government failed to specify who exactly would be the recipients of better living conditions as a result of urban renewal. Certainly, the neighborhood benefited from the clearance of decrepit housing and the modification of streets to improve traffic and reduce crowding.<sup>78</sup> Unfortunately, over 1,000 residents, predominantly ethnic and racial minorities, were excluded from these potential benefits due to their forced relocation, the decrease in the number of houses in Greenbush, and the subsequent increases in land values as a result of the improvements.<sup>79</sup> The fact that the most marginalized members of the community were excluded from practices meant to improve the city brings into question the liberal and progressive nature of these urban renewal policies. Additionally, as mentioned above, the City’s primary motivating factor for intervening in

---

<sup>74</sup> South Madison Neighborhood Steering Committee and Department of Planning and Development, “South Madison Neighborhood Plan,” (Madison, WI: City of Madison, 2006): 11, accessed September 20, 2016, [http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/ndp/southmadison\\_plan.pdf](http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/ndp/southmadison_plan.pdf); The Greenbush Memorial, “The Spirit of Greenbush,” (Madison, WI: The Greenbush Memorial, 2000), Pamphlet, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.

<sup>75</sup> It is worth remembering that in 1950, the City of Madison and the public did not think the alleged blight in the Greenbush neighborhood was significant enough for them to provide public housing and redevelopment options.

<sup>76</sup> City Plan Division, “Preliminary Report Triangle Renewal Area A Proposed Clearance Program,” (Madison, WI: City of Madison, 1957): 3, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.

<sup>77</sup> Madison Redevelopment Authority, “Triangle Redevelopment and You,” (Madison, WI: City of Madison, 1959): 21, Pamphlet, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.

<sup>78</sup> City Plan Division, “Preliminary Report Triangle Renewal Area,” 3.

<sup>79</sup> “Relocation in Triangle Unsolved,” *Capital Times*, February 3, 1961, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1; “Concentrated Low-Cost Housing Plans Opposed,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, March 3, 1961, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.

this area was clearly not the supposed presence of blight and inferior housing considering the 1950 “Census Block Housing Reports,” found only 30% of dwelling units to be substandard.<sup>80</sup> A Madison Redevelopment Authority (MRA) informational pamphlet distributed to residents verified this, stating, “...all buildings that are in poor condition, and *a considerable number of those which are in good condition but which do not fit in with the new land use plans for the area,* will have to be removed” (emphasis added).<sup>81</sup> The City used the alleged presence of blight as a method to acquire the necessary land for hospital and University of Wisconsin-Madison expansion.<sup>82</sup> The Triangle Project dispels the notion of the City engaging in urban renewal efforts as an enactment of its progressive values, and instead reveals its prioritization of economic development over just living conditions, particularly for minority and poor populations.<sup>83</sup>

Federal stipulations determining project funding required the City of Madison to create a service to help all affected families find alternative housing with costs proportional to their annual income and family size. A 1959 Common Council Resolution said, “Any family displaced from the urban renewal project, which is unable to secure decent, safe and sanitary housing accommodations within their financial means will be accepted in the permanent units of the Madison Housing Authority at gross rents not to exceed 25% of their gross monthly income.”<sup>84</sup> The MRA, created in the prior year, was specifically charged with “provid[ing] relocation

---

<sup>80</sup> City Plan Division, “Preliminary Report Triangle Renewal,” 3.

<sup>81</sup> The Madison Redevelopment Authority (MRA) was “...a semi-independent agency administering urban renewal projects which are financed primarily with federal funds. The MRA was created in 1958 by the Common Council under authorization of the state to plan and carry out the city’s urban renewal program.” The MRA and MHA worked together to administer urban renewal projects.

MRA, “Triangle Redevelopment and You,” 8; League of Women Voters of Madison, *Madison at Your Service*, 2, 71; City Plan Division, “Preliminary Report Triangle Renewal,” 3.

<sup>82</sup> While it is true that some houses were in poor condition and in need of repairs, this did not necessitate the forced removal of almost the entire populace of Greenbush.

<sup>83</sup> City Plan Division, “Preliminary Report Triangle Renewal,” 2.

<sup>84</sup> “A Resolution Accepting the Offer of Assistance from the Madison Housing Authority,” Madison, WI: City of Madison, October 15, 1959, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban renewal project records, 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.

assistance for persons displaced from project areas.”<sup>85</sup> However, distributed informational material was explicit that despite proffered aid, residents were ultimately responsible for themselves: “Of course, you are also expected to help yourself,” and “There is no need for alarm. The Redevelopment Authority will continually assist you to work out your housing problems as long as you: Pay your rent. Do not use the premises for unlawful purposes. Cooperate with the Authority.”<sup>86</sup> Plus, the Authority optimistically stated in its relocation plan, “No special problems are anticipated with respect to the relocation of minority-group families,” and there was “no expectation of any lack of access to the general housing market.”<sup>87</sup> While the federal government required such housing services to ensure affected residents were supported, successful implementation was not guaranteed. The stipulations by the MRA curtailed the promises of governmental assistance and progressivism. Poor planning and a lack of foresight into the specific needs of low-income and African American residents made the Madison Common Council’s resolution inadequate.

The consequences of the City’s prior denials of low-income, public housing projects became evident to government officials only after the Triangle Project had been approved and was about to begin. The MRA divided the neighborhood into three sections to allow for the removal to occur in phases.<sup>88</sup> The Redevelopment Authority confidently stated in June 1959, “The families can move out gradually, in order to take advantage of the constant turnover of housing in

---

<sup>85</sup> League of Women Voters of Madison, *Madison at Your Service*, 71.

<sup>86</sup> MRA, “Triangle Redevelopment and You,” 16, 19.

<sup>87</sup> The League of Women Voters of Madison published a report saying, “the Triangle relocation arrangements have run into much difficulty,” which they attributed to the following problems: the lack of completed public housing, the assumption of equal access to the housing market, and the failure to anticipate the additional challenges minority residents would face when trying to find a new home.

“Urban Renewal in Madison: Legal, Economic, Aesthetic and Human Factors,” (Madison, WI: League of Women Voters of Madison, February 1963): 2-4, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 11, Folder 9.

<sup>88</sup> “City of Madison, Wisconsin: Survey and Planning Application-Triangle Renewal Area,” (Madison, WI: City of Madison, 1957), Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1; MRA, “Triangle Redevelopment and You,” 14.

Madison,” seemingly forgetting the numerous previous reports by their sister agency, the MHA, citing the lack of affordable housing.<sup>89</sup> It was not until February 1961, only seven months before the first house would be bought, that the MHA conceded, “additional public housing units [were] needed”, especially “for low-income persons and the needy elderly to be displaced by Triangle and University development projects.”<sup>90</sup> A MHA official revealed the complete inadequacy of the organization’s preparation by asking in a public meeting, “What the devil are we going to do with the people of the Triangle while we’re clearing it out?”<sup>91</sup> Under such circumstances, it is clear why some Triangle residents failed to trust the Housing Authority and chose to move without their assistance.<sup>92</sup>

Ironically, in May 1961, the MHA would oppose a proposed low-income housing project because they objected to the “concentration” of low-income families and argued, “it [was] likely to create slums of the sort the authority is buying up in order to eradicate them.”<sup>93</sup> Even more ironic, by failing to act on this opportunity, low-income residents would become concentrated in South Madison. Only after intense public criticism did the MHA reverse its position and urge the Common Council to approve a public housing bill in July 1961.<sup>94</sup> Unfortunately, this did little to help displaced Triangle residents, because the housing plan was still undergoing negotiations and

---

<sup>89</sup> MRA, “Triangle Redevelopment and You,” 14; “Concentrated Low-Cost Housing Plans Opposed,” *Wisconsin State Journal*.

<sup>90</sup> The MHA bought their first home in September 1961, and by October 1962, over 70% of the buildings had been bought.

“Relocation in Triangle Unsolved,” *Capital Times*; “Developments with the Madison Redevelopment Authority Newsletter,” Madison Redevelopment Authority, October 3, 1962, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.

<sup>91</sup> “Relocation in Triangle Unsolved,” *Capital Times*.

<sup>92</sup> Chester Zmudzinski, *Chester Zmudzinski to Albert J. McGinnis, March 19, 1962*, Letter, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.

<sup>93</sup> “Concentrated Low-Cost Housing Plans Opposed,” *Wisconsin State Journal*.

<sup>94</sup> “Public Housing Plans Win Council Backing, 17 to 2,” *Capital Times*, July 26, 1961, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.

surveys in May 1962, after relocation had already begun.<sup>95</sup> The City of Madison's failure to seriously consider public housing prior to implementing urban renewal initiatives illustrates the differences and transition between the Wagner-Steagall Act and the Housing Act of 1939. Instead of low-income housing being the focus, it becomes an afterthought as blight removal and economic development become the most important consideration.

Due to these conditions, Triangle residents unsurprisingly complained that the Housing Authority was not benefiting them. The Local Committee on Urban Renewal, formed by homeowners in the project area, complained that the MRA had moved up its timeline by twelve months, abandoning the original plan of phased removal for an alternative "shot gun" style method.<sup>96</sup> The predominant concern of the Committee was the treatment of elderly and minority residents who faced unique challenges when trying to find adequate housing. Chester Zmudzinski, the group's leader, wrote to the MRA, "What about our minority groups? Some of our Negro neighbors have panicked and left the area to pick up anything possible in South Madison while it is still available. They have done this without regard to benefits in the way of moving costs and/or inspection of the premises to determine whether or not they are safe, decent and sanitary."<sup>97</sup> It was commonly acknowledged that, "South Madison was one of the few areas of the city where blacks could afford to build new homes. It was also the only place in the city where blacks could buy homes without hassle."<sup>98</sup> While urban renewal was a challenge to all low-income residents in Madison, it was especially difficult for African Americans who faced the

---

<sup>95</sup> "Public Housing Project Given Council Approval," *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 9, 1962, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3179; "Page of Opinion: Here's Public Housing Again," *Wisconsin State Journal*.

<sup>96</sup> Chester Zmudzinski, *Chester Zmudzinski to Albert J. McGinnis*.

<sup>97</sup> Chester Zmudzinski, *Chester Zmudzinski to Albert J. McGinnis*.

<sup>98</sup> League of Women Voters of Madison, *Madison at Your Service*, 143.

additional challenge of racial discrimination in both housing and employment.<sup>99</sup> Reverend JC Wright told the Madison Special Committee on Minority Housing about the challenges African Americans faced as they attempted to relocate:

“There has been an increase of minority housing problems because of Triangle relocation plans. Families have even been moved in vans to new housing, then told they could not live there. Apartments are ‘no longer available’ when approached by a Negro family. Housing is in short supply and neighborhoods are reluctant to welcome Negroes.”<sup>100</sup>

African American citizens were forced to relocate without the protection of the law, because it was not until 1963 and 1967 that the City of Madison passed the Equal Opportunities Ordinance prohibiting discrimination in housing.<sup>101</sup> Overall, for the unaffected, white population, “the physical and social upheaval involved in the city’s urban renewal program brought racial discrimination into the open;” however, local organizations had made efforts to highlight housing inequalities in the years prior to the Triangle Project.<sup>102</sup>

The local chapter of the NAACP believed the issue of housing discrimination in Madison to be of the utmost concern, and in 1959, released their report, “Negro Housing in Madison.”<sup>103</sup> The publication made clear that there were only a few select neighborhoods where African Americans could live, which were: “...South Madison; the triangle bounded by West Washington, South Park, and Regent, known as the Greenbush area or “The Bush”; and a small area on the near east side on North Blair, East Dayton, East Mifflin, and Williamson Streets a short distance

---

<sup>99</sup> Reverend JC Wright told the Madison Special Committee on Minority Housing that the relocation experience varied amongst Greenbush’s minority groups. According to the Reverend, the Jewish and Italian populations relocated to the far west side and other parts of the city with “no trouble.”

“Madison Special Committee on Minority Housing Minutes,” (Madison, WI: Madison Special Committee on Minority Housing, April 27, 1962), Wisconsin Historical Society Archives-Milwaukee, Lloyd Barbee Papers, Box 11, Folder 5.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> League of Women Voters of Madison, *Madison at Your Service*, 61.

<sup>102</sup> League of Women Voters of Madison, *Madison at Your Service*, 3.

<sup>103</sup> NAACP Madison Branch, “Negro Housing in Madison,” (Madison, WI: NAACP Madison Branch, 1959): 1, Pamphlet, Wisconsin Historical Society.

from the square.”<sup>104</sup> The small African American population in the city meant that no neighborhood in Madison had greater than a 40% black population. Such neighborhoods were often characterized by the low-incomes of their residents.<sup>105</sup> As the NAACP noticed, “...the Negro has been prevented from moving into higher class residential areas when his economic situation improved,” making race a primary factor determining geographic location.<sup>106</sup> The fact that the NAACP’s report was released in 1959, two years before the Triangle Project removals would begin, gave city officials ample time to help alleviate the extraordinary housing challenges African Americans experienced. Instead, no such preparations were made.

The Madison chapter of the NAACP focused on housing, because where citizens live in the city can create for vastly different experiences and opportunities. Lloyd Barbee, a prominent figure in Wisconsin’s civil rights movement, created a film in 1962 about the housing problem for African Americans in Madison, which he tentatively titled both “A Good Place to Live,” and “Racial Discrimination in Housing (in a middle-sized northern city).”<sup>107</sup> Barbee, like this paper, noted the hypocrisy and contradictions in Madison, and argued that while “Life and Holiday magazines saw the city as it sees itself—a good place to live,” where the “educational level and social awareness of the citizenry is high,” significant problems persist.<sup>108</sup>

“A city has many different images. It all depends on how you look at it. And how you look at it, depends on who you are. The city may mean one thing if you’re married, and another if you are single. The job you hold and the hobbies you explore all influence your opinion. And perhaps what you see, may even depend on the color of your skin.”<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>105</sup> The 1960 United States Census reports that 1,611 African Americans lived in Dane County, which constituted 0.7% of the population.

Social Explorer, “Census 1960: Dane County, Wisconsin”; NAACP Madison Branch, “Negro Housing in Madison.”

<sup>106</sup> NAACP Madison Branch, “Negro Housing in Madison,” 3.

<sup>107</sup> Lloyd Barbee, “Certified Typescript from film in production,” (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Madison, 1962), Wisconsin Historical Society Archives-Milwaukee, Lloyd Barbee Papers, Box 11, Folder 1.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., 1-2.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 5.

Barbee and the NAACP spoke to progressive values when they demanded from the City “the assurance that all persons may be free to live where they choose regardless of race, religion, or national background. Inherent in this goal is the expressed value that equality of opportunity and equal access to all services of the community should be the goal of a democratic society.”<sup>110</sup>

The *Wisconsin State Journal* reached similar conclusions to the NAACP and ran a series of articles during the summer of 1963 entitled, “The Negro in Madison” where they identified housing and employment as the two main issues affecting African Americans. Writing to its majority white audience, the *State Journal* reported that black citizens believed “as many as 80 per cent of the available places in Madison [were] barred to him if he trie[d] to rent or buy a home.”<sup>111</sup> Subsequent pieces highlighted the reluctance of white sellers to accept an offer from a black family. The prevalence of racial discrimination in housing was partly what caused 76% of African Americans to live in the ninth and fourteenth wards of Madison, which included Greenbush and South Madison.<sup>112</sup> As Reverend Wright noted, the greatest number of African American relocations from the Triangle neighborhood were to South Madison.<sup>113</sup> Therefore, discrimination helped form distinct neighborhoods and subsequently influenced their racial make-up, creating a system of de facto segregation in Madison.

According to the promises of the MHA and the City Council, urban renewal would benefit the entire Madison community.<sup>114</sup> In reality, while the City revitalized the Triangle neighborhood, African Americans found South Madison to have the exact same problems as the Bush with poor

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

<sup>111</sup> “The Negro in Madison; ‘Good Life’ Hurt by Discrimination,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, July 28, 1963, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3193.

<sup>112</sup> Before the urban renewal efforts in Greenbush, the majority of African Americans lived in that neighborhood. After the renewal project forced their relocation, the majority of residents found new houses in South Madison. NAACP Madison Branch, “Negro Housing in Madison,” 4.

<sup>113</sup> “Madison Special Committee on Minority Housing Minutes.”

<sup>114</sup> “City of Madison, Wisconsin: Survey and Planning Application-Triangle Renewal Area.”

housing, old utilities, and inferior but heavily trafficked roads.<sup>115</sup> Consequently, the benefits of living in a revitalized neighborhood were systematically denied to African Americans in Madison. The poor, undesirable conditions of the South Madison neighborhood are related to a history of neglect and shirked responsibilities by the City of Madison.

### III. The Origins of the Inferior Conditions in South Madison

Historically, South Madison has always been geographically and physically isolated from the isthmus and downtown, which helped contribute to the area's stunted development. In the 1830s, when residents established the City of Madison, the South Madison area was considered a suburb, and stretches of empty land separated the two settlements.<sup>116</sup> One former settler remembered that when her family arrived in the 1880s, "There were practically no houses in South Madison," nor any businesses.<sup>117</sup> Investors and government officials had little incentive to develop sound infrastructure in the area due to the lack of industry and the small, predominantly poor population.<sup>118</sup> In the 20th century, Madison was steadily growing, "but there was plenty of room to the east and to the west for expansion without the special costs of overcoming the geological obstacles on the south side," plus, "South Madison lacked the physical attractions which tend to draw the better residential developments."<sup>119</sup> For instance, the lower elevation level and the proximity to Lake Monona made the land marshy and water saturated. As such,

---

<sup>115</sup> "South Madison Project, Wis. R-7," (Madison, WI: D.L. Evans Appraisal Co., 1966-1967): 9, Wisconsin Historical Society.

<sup>116</sup> G.L. Richards, *Madison, Wis. and the four lake region* [map], 1:25,344 (Madison: G.L. Richards, c.1909). *Original Madison Plat Map* [map], scale not given (Madison, WI: 1836); Lyman C. Draper, *Madison, the Capital of Wisconsin: Its Growth, Progress, Condition* (Madison: Calkins & Proudfit, 1857), 10-11.

South Madison Neighborhood Steering Committee, *South Madison Neighborhood Plan* (Madison: South Madison Neighborhood Steering Committee, January 18, 2005), 9; Draper, *Madison, the Capital of Wisconsin*, 12.

<sup>117</sup> Madge Yorn, "All Around the Town," *Capital Times*, May 17, 1940, 17; Richards, *Madison, Wis.* [map].

<sup>118</sup> "There was little to attract residential development to South Madison except the economies which might be captured by families of low income who sought to avoid the costs of the usual urban amenities."

"South Madison Project, Wis. R-7," 1-3.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*

significant investments by the city would be necessary to drain the land in order to begin building roads and buildings. Moreover, incorporation would require infrastructure like sewer and water to extend to the neighborhood along with services like fire and police.<sup>120</sup> While maps indicate that Park Street linked the city proper to the southern suburb as early as 1870, the poorly paved road made travel cumbersome, and inferior road conditions would remain a long-standing problem.<sup>121</sup> Therefore, the settlement was connected to the city and affected by its presence, but a certain level of isolation would problematically persist.

Today, South Madison is defined and confined by the breaks that create clear boundaries around the neighborhood.<sup>122</sup> In the early days, the land already featured some man-made, transportation boundaries.<sup>123</sup> For example, by 1881, the two railroad tracks for the Chicago and North-Western Transportation Company cut through the landscape and merged at the top of the Bram's Addition neighborhood of South Madison, creating the most significant division of the land.<sup>124</sup> As for roads, Park Street had been built, but was not yet the major thoroughway it is today. Moreover, until the early twentieth century, paved neighborhood streets that would further cordon off and divide the neighborhood did not exist. In addition to the man-made breaks, Wingra Creek formed the natural, northern border of Bram's Addition, and would later serve to separate the more affluent, lake-side portion of the neighborhood from the more southern, predominantly low-income section. This informal marker helps highlight the difference in the City's level of

---

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>121</sup> *Madison* [map], 2:1, In: Harrison and Warner, *Atlas of Dane County, Wisconsin: Drawn from Actual Surveys and the County Records, to Which is Added a Railroad & Sectional Map of the State of Wisconsin*, Madison: Harrison and Warner, 1873; Walter Plaenert, "Everybody Knows Everybody," *Wisconsin State Journal*, September 24, 1939, 9.

<sup>122</sup> Google Maps, "Madison, Wisconsin," Map, accessed November 20, 2016, <https://www.google.com/maps/place/Bram's+Addition,+Madison,+WI+53713/@43.0455005,-89.3959732,16z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x880652ce4c78a25d:0x47fd87547a2bb4a2!8m2!3d43.045811!4d-89.392609>; Richards, *Madison, Wis. and the four lake region* [map].

<sup>123</sup> Grady Clay, "Epitome Districts," in *Close-Up: How to Read the American City* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), 42.

<sup>124</sup> *Map of Madison and the Four Lake Country* [map], ca. 1:50,688 (New York: Horace Greeley & Co., 1854); "The New and Correct Map: Chicago and Northwestern Railway," *The Wisconsin State Journal*, February 18, 1881, 4.

investment in each of the halves as a result of their demographic makeup. Furthermore, the creek supplied water for irrigation, and the marshy land supported wells for drinking water. These resources were crucial because the region was not connected to the city's infrastructure, which would prove problematic in the future.<sup>125</sup>

South Madison, isolated by the lack of good roads, distance, and Lake Monona, depended on the City of Madison, but the city did not originally have a desire to incorporate the area due to the poor quality of land. As such, South Madison was a part of the Town of Madison instead, further hindering the area's chances at improvement. This would begin to change as the City spread outwards from the original settlement on the isthmus in response to increasing population levels. By 1920, the population was 38,400, and the previously empty land between the Capitol and South Madison had undergone development, allowing the two areas to become linked.<sup>126</sup> The impact of the city's growth and encroachment is clear by looking at the changes in South Madison. By this point, the area's own population had grown to between 1200-1500 people.<sup>127</sup> In order to accommodate the greater population density, the previously large plots of land had been divided into smaller parcels, especially in Bram's Addition.<sup>128</sup> New streets within the neighborhood carved up the land further.<sup>129</sup> The development and the increasing interconnectedness of the region caused Madison City officials and residents to investigate the possibility of South Madison officially becoming a part of the city.

The reasons for annexing South Madison varied. Two previous attempts had failed, because officials thought the region had no resources to offer. The recent addition of Franklin

---

<sup>125</sup> *Map of Madison and the Four Lake Country* [map], 1854; M.C. Dodge, *Map of the Water Works System of Madison, Wisconsin* [map], 1:7,920 (Milwaukee: Milwaukee Litho. & Engr. Co, c.1896).

<sup>126</sup> Ray S. Owen, *Map of the city of Madison, showing population, ward, and precinct changes, 1885-1930/ annotations by Ray S. Owen* [map], ca. 1:10,000, 1830.; Henry Knoll, "South Madison Asks to be Annexed: Mass Meeting Votes to Take Action at Once," *The Wisconsin State Journal*, April 6, 1923, 5.

<sup>127</sup> Noll, "South Madison Asks to be Annexed."

<sup>128</sup> *Map of Madison and Vicinity* [map], ca. 1:32,187 (Madison: Madison Railways Co., 1917).

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*

School, however, made the deal appear more mutually beneficial.<sup>130</sup> Mayor Kittleson argued it was not just South Madison who needed the city, but also the city that needed South Madison.<sup>131</sup> In terms of economic incentives, George Legler, the city assessor, estimated that the addition “would bring into the city property valued at over one million dollars.”<sup>132</sup> But beyond just its monetary value, the alderman believed the land to be necessary for the city to continue its growth while retaining its character. Alderman Garner asserted that expansion would only be possible “...by bringing in the outlying contiguous communities;” otherwise, “Madison will become a city of flats and apartments, not individual homes.”<sup>133</sup>

Still, the area had plenty of disadvantages, and the cost of improvement and modernization would be significant. For example, the distance and isolation from the City meant that the neighborhood was largely without public infrastructure, which created serious health problems. The residents still predominantly relied on well water, which had recently become contaminated, in part because of the lack of sewer lines.<sup>134</sup> Moreover, a majority of the homes, often described as shacks, were constructed out of waste materials and flotsam from the creek.<sup>135</sup> These poor health and sanitation conditions made Dr. Lindsay, the City Health Inspector, an advocate of annexation.<sup>136</sup> The lack of infrastructure, the poor health conditions, and low-incomes of the residents caused some aldermen to believe they had a moral obligation to help the residents, while others argued the money could be better spent on current residents.<sup>137</sup> Overall, the possibilities the neighborhood offered persuaded the aldermen that annexation was the best option for all involved

---

<sup>130</sup> Knoll, “South Madison Asks to be Annexed.”

<sup>131</sup> Common Council Proceedings, April 17, 1939, *Common Council Proceedings: Madison 1935-1939*, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.

<sup>132</sup> Noll, “South Madison Asks to be Annexed.”

<sup>133</sup> “Gill Favors S Madison Annexation,” *The Capital Times*.

<sup>134</sup> Henry Noll, “Annexation of South Madison is Recommended,” *The Wisconsin State Journal*, May 22, 1923, 1.

<sup>135</sup> “Indian Princess, Queen of Hell’s Half Acre, Dies,” *The Wisconsin State Journal*.

<sup>136</sup> Noll, “Annexation of South Madison is Recommended.”

<sup>137</sup> “Gill Favors S Madison Annexation,” *The Capital Times*, July 30, 1920, 1.

parties. By unanimous vote on May 25, 1923, the City of Madison annexed a portion of South Madison, including half of Bram's Addition.<sup>138</sup> The other half would remain in the possession of the Town of Madison.<sup>139</sup> The division of South Madison between the City and Town would make cohesive development impossible.

Despite a portion of South Madison being part of the City of Madison, the neighborhood continued to struggle and did not reap the benefits the residents thought would come from its incorporation. In the annexation agreements, the residents of South Madison signed an affidavit agreeing not to request any improvements from the city for two years, but major changes would not come until seven years later for Bram's Addition.<sup>140</sup> The delay was less significant for the northern portions of the annexed area that had a higher average income meaning that their houses were generally in better condition prior to the annexation.<sup>141</sup> The continuation of poor conditions in Bram's Addition was evident in the neighborhood's widely known nickname, 'Hell's Half Acre.'<sup>142</sup> The area continued to house low-income residents who lacked the financial means to improve their homes themselves. Indoor plumbing was still absent and residents relied on outhouses causing polluted wells from the lack of sanitation facilities and the undrained, marshy land to remain a concern.<sup>143</sup> Furthermore, the majority of houses were poorly constructed shacks, and animals like chickens and hogs continued to dominate the landscape.<sup>144</sup> All of these problems were accentuated by the encroachment of the City as the neighborhood became more condensed and confined. Aware of the situation in South Madison, the City investigated the federal

---

<sup>138</sup> Common Council Proceedings, May 25, 1923, *Common Council Proceedings: Madison 1922-1925*, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.

<sup>139</sup> The separation of the neighborhood between the city and town of Madison would result in the area's future uneven development.

<sup>140</sup> "Annexation Plan Given New Boost," *The Capital Times*, July 16, 1920, 1.

<sup>141</sup> Plaenert, "Everybody Knows Everybody."

<sup>142</sup> "Indian Princess, Queen of Hell's Half Acre, Dies," *The Wisconsin State Journal*.

<sup>143</sup> South Madison Neighborhood Steering Committee, *South Madison Neighborhood Plan*, 10.

<sup>144</sup> "Indian Princess, Queen of Hell's Half Acre, Dies," *The Wisconsin State Journal*.

government's new housing programs, including the possibilities offered in the Housing Acts of 1939.<sup>145</sup> The inhumane conditions reflected poorly on the City and led to the debate of whether federal money from the USHA should be used to improve low-income housing in Madison.

As mentioned previously, the City created the MHA in 1939 and conducted a survey to investigate the housing conditions throughout the city, but with South Madison specifically in mind. The central question to the debate of the USHA proposal was what responsibility the city had to its low-income residents and how much government influence should the city exert over the land. Despite the unacceptable housing conditions in South Madison, the Common Council rejected the USHA's proposal for slum clearance and the construction of low-income housing.<sup>146</sup> However, Mayor Law was determined to improve the "pressing" low-income housing situation and turned to the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) for alternative options under the guidance of City Building Commissioner Gordon Nelson.<sup>147</sup> As a result, in 1940, the city's portion of Bram's Addition experienced the condemning of houses, the construction of minimal amounts of public housing, and the enforcement of regulations to better ensure sanitary conditions.<sup>148</sup> All the changes were made possible by FHA funding.<sup>149</sup> However, Scott Keyes, a UW researcher, argued that these changes, meant to benefit the low-income residents, were actually to their detriment. The public housing built featured rent costs higher than the residents in Bram's Addition could afford; therefore, residents were displaced when their homes were condemned.<sup>150</sup> The best of

---

<sup>145</sup> "USHA Slum Loan Support Sought Here," *Wisconsin State Journal*.

<sup>146</sup> Common Council Proceedings, April 18, 1939, *Common Council Proceedings: Madison 1939-1943*, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.; Rod Van Every, "Civic Drums Roll Death of Hell's Half Acre," *The Wisconsin State Journal*, April 20, 1941, 6.

<sup>148</sup> "Mayor is Told Housing Program Won't Increase Tax Rate for Madison," *The Capital Times*.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid.

<sup>150</sup> "Council's Housing Rejection Called Tragic," *The Wisconsin State Journal*, February 27, 1940, 3.

intentions motivated the programming, but the implementation resulted in harsh consequences for the residents.

The challenges of Bram's Addition were further accentuated by the uneven development due to its partial ownership by both the city and town of Madison. The residents south of Bram Street in the Town of Madison watched as their neighbors' homes and land was transformed while their own shacks remained standing. The efforts by the City did not go unnoticed by the Town of Madison and served as an incentive for town officials to rehabilitate its part of Bram's Addition.<sup>151</sup> Mayor Keyes of the Town of Madison remarked, "The difference between the town and city sections of Hell's Half Acre is monumental." Like Mayor Law, Keyes believed the town would need to intervene to ensure change, so a more stringent enforcement of city zoning ordinances and sanitation laws was implemented.<sup>152</sup> In a similar move to the City, ten prefabricated 'essential housing' dwellings were erected. By 1941, both parts of Bram's Addition had undergone alterations, but the area remained undesirable real estate, low-quality housing remained prevalent, and few businesses relocated to the neighborhood. The initiatives failed to produce the necessary changes to transform South Madison.

From the beginning, conditions in South Madison put the neighborhood at a disadvantage. Its geographic separation and poor land quality resulted in low property values and contributed to only economically marginalized citizens residing in the area. Plus, the national phenomenon of redlining did not escape Madison either, and its impacts helped define South Madison as an 'undesirable' area both in terms of development and residency.<sup>153</sup> Consequently, city planners and

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid.

<sup>152</sup> Van Every, "Civic Drums Roll Death of Hell's Half Acre."

<sup>153</sup> Robert K. Nelson, LaDale Winling, Richard Marciano, Nathan Connolly, et al., "Mapping Inequality," American Panorama, ed. Robert K. Nelson and Edward L. Ayers, accessed September 20, 2016, <https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/#loc=12/43.0765/-89.3800&opacity=0.8&city=madison-wi&area=D1&adimage=3/56/-120&text=intro>; Ira Rheingold, Michael Fitzpatrick, and Al Hofeld Jr., "From Redlining to Reverse Redlining: A History of Obstacles for Minority Homeownership in America," *Clearinghouse*

business interests neglected the neighborhood in favor of focusing their attention to development east and west of the isthmus. The lack of investment for decades did little to improve the already poor infrastructure and housing conditions.

As scholarly literature such as *City Limits* has shown, progressive cities struggle to manage the choice between helping minority communities and economic development. On multiple occasions, public and low-income housing initiatives proposed to help Madison's economically marginalized residents were denied or were inadequate, but the Triangle Project, which offered the chance for profitable economic development, was supported. Discrimination and the lack of affordable housing funneled African American residents into South Madison because the 'progressive' city of Madison gave them no other option.

#### IV. Conclusions

Who has a 'right to the city'? What happens when city officials must choose between economic development opportunities and improving the lives of marginalized citizens? Does it have to be a choice? Historically in Madison, Wisconsin, it has not been minority residents who have benefitted from decisions made about these issues. Instead, urban renewal practices tied to issues of housing availability and racial discrimination funneled African American residents into the undesirable South Madison neighborhood in a form of northern de facto segregation. The geographic and economic isolation of the area left African American residents marginalized and served to further isolate their problems. Especially troubling is how long lasting the impacts of city policy and development plans can be; decisions made in the twenties still impact the geography. Today, South Madison remains a low-income, minority neighborhood, and as the

---

*Review 34* (2001): 643, accessed February 1, 2017, <http://heinonline.org.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/clear34&id=658&collection=journals&index=>.

“Race to Equity” report made clear, the residents face significant inequalities in areas such as employment, educational achievement, and economic status.<sup>154</sup>

This is not to say that the City of Madison has not engaged in efforts to improve the neighborhood, but clearly, the initiatives have failed to eliminate racial and economic inequalities. A historical and geographic understanding of South Madison’s formation provides another example of how racism is deeply imbedded in our society and pervasive in all aspects of life. Moreover, it challenges the perception of racial discrimination and segregation as predominantly a southern problem. People live where they do for a reason, and oftentimes, policy decisions have a significant impact on where citizens are able to reside. South Madison’s formation justifies the need for caution and careful consideration when making housing decisions, especially when they will impact marginalized communities.

The City of Madison is commonly acknowledged as a liberal bastion. The manner in which the City formed the South Madison Neighborhood ensured only certain demographics would live there, thereby violating its liberal values, which espouse that opportunities should not be hindered by factors like race or income. Overall, this paper is a demand for the City of Madison and its citizens to think more complexly about what it means to be a progressive, liberal city. For whom is Madison, Wisconsin a liberal haven? In 1963, the League of Women Voters of Madison said,

“In a northern city like Madison, with a high educational level, very few residents will admit to prejudice. The low percentage of Negroes (1%) in Madison and a scattering of a few Negro families living outside the ‘traditional’ neighborhoods masked the problem of discrimination until the relocation of families in the Triangle

---

<sup>154</sup> Race to Equity, “Race to Equity: A Baseline Report on the State of Racial Disparities in Dane County.”

Urban Renewal Area brought it to the public attention.”<sup>155</sup>

The fact that this quote could be referencing current day Madison signals that work still needs to be done. While the persistent geographic challenges of South Madison’s formation serve as obstacles to change, they are not impossible to overcome. The question is if the City’s majority white and economically advantaged population can develop the necessary initiative and investment to support policies aimed at eliminating inequalities. If Madison residents truly want to earn the label of a liberal, progressive community, significant efforts need to be made to reduce inequalities and to invest more funds into minority communities with the goal of creating a more inclusive, accepting city.

---

<sup>155</sup> “Urban Renewal in Madison: Legal, Economic, Aesthetic and Human Factors,” League of Women Voters of Madison, 5.

## Bibliography

- Adwar, Corey. "7 Reasons Why Madison, Wisconsin Is The Best Place To Live In America." *Business Insider*, September 24, 2014. Accessed April 3, 2017. <http://www.businessinsider.com/why-madison-wisconsin-is-the-best-place-to-live-2014->
- "A Little 'Trial'...of 40 Years." *Wisconsin State Journal*. November 3, 1950. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P3033.
- "Annexation is Being Forced, Keyes Charges." *The Wisconsin State Journal*, April 24, 1923. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P2864.
- "Annexation Plan Given New Boost." *The Capital Times*, July 16, 1920. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P23720.
- "A Resolution Accepting the Offer of Assistance from the Madison Housing Authority." Madison, WI: City of Madison, October 15, 1959. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban renewal project records, 1954-1975. Box 1. Folder 1.
- "Ask Housing Bodies to Reconsider City, C.U. Leader Pleads." *Capital Times*, January 26, 1940. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P74-5715.
- Atkins, William A. "The Rehabilitation of South Madison as Part of A Residential Neighborhood." Masters diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison. 1961.
- Barbee, Lloyd. "Certified Typescript from film in production." Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Madison, 1962. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives-Milwaukee. Lloyd Barbee Papers, Box 11, Folder 1.
- "Better Housing for Minority Groups Urged," *Capital Times*, February 25, 1950, Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P23893.
- "Capital Times Readers Discuss Hot Election Issues." *Capital Times*, November 6, 1950. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P23902.
- Chan, Sewell. "Name America's Most Liberal City." *New York Times*, November 21, 2007. Accessed April 3, 2017. [https://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/11/21/name-americas-most-liberal-city/comment-page-4/?\\_r=0](https://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/11/21/name-americas-most-liberal-city/comment-page-4/?_r=0).
- "City Housing." *The Capital Times*, January 26, 1940. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P74-5715.
- "City of Madison, Wisconsin: Project Eligibility and Relocation Report-Triangle Renewal Area." Madison, WI: City of Madison, 1958. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 4.
- "City of Madison, Wisconsin: Survey and Planning Application-Triangle Renewal Area." Madison, WI: City of Madison, 1957. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.
- City Plan Division. "Preliminary Report Triangle Renewal Area A Proposed Clearance Program." Madison, WI: City of Madison, 1957. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Dane Series 326, Box 1, Folder 1.
- Clay, Grady. "Epitome Districts." In *Close-Up: How to Read the American City*, 39-52. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.
- Collins, Paul James. "Real Property and Low Income Area Survey of Madison, Wisconsin." Masters diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1941.
- Common Council Proceedings. April 17, 1939. *Common Council Proceedings: Madison 1935-1939*. Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.

- Common Council Proceedings. April 18, 1939. *Common Council Proceedings: Madison 1939-1943*. Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.
- Common Council Proceedings. May 25, 1923. *Common Council Proceedings: Madison 1922-1925*. Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.
- “Council’s Housing Rejection Called Tragic.” *The Wisconsin State Journal*, February 27, 1940. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P43902.
- “Concentrated Low-Cost Housing Plans Opposed.” *Wisconsin State Journal*, March 3, 1961. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.
- Department of Health and Human Services. “Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines.” 82 FR 8831. Washington, D.C., 2017. Accessed February 1, 2017. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/31/2017-02076/annual-update-of-the-hhs-poverty-guidelines>.
- “Developments with the Madison Redevelopment Authority Newsletter.” Madison Redevelopment Authority, October 3, 1962. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.
- Dodge, M.C. *Map of the Water Works System of Madison, Wisconsin* [map]. 1:7,920. Milwaukee: Milwaukee Litho. & Engr. Co, c.1896.
- Draper, Lyman C. *Madison, the Capital of Wisconsin: Its Growth, Progress, Condition*. Madison: Calkins & Proudfit, 1857.
- Federal Housing Administration. *A Handbook on Urban Redevelopment for Cities in the United States*. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C., 1941. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000341192>.
- Foard, Ashley A., and Hilbert Fefferman. “Federal Urban Renewal Legislation.” *Law and Contemporary Problems* 25, no. 4 (1960): 635-684. doi:10.2307/1190625.
- “Gill Favors S Madison Annexation.” *The Capital Times*, July 30, 1920. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P23720.
- Google Maps. “Madison, Wisconsin.” Map. Accessed, November 20, 2016. <https://www.google.com/maps/place/Bram's+Addition,+Madison,+WI+53713/@43.0455005,-89.3959732,16z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x880652ce4c78a25d:0x47fd87547a2bb4a2!8m2!3d43.045811!4d-89.392609>.
- Harvey, David. “The Right to the City.” *New Left Review* 53 (2008), 23-40. Accessed April 3, 2017. <https://newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>.
- “Here is Complete Text of Madison Common Council’s Report on Housing.” *Capital Times*, November 25, 1939. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P74-5712.
- “Indian Princess, Queen of Hell’s Half Acre, Dies.” *The Wisconsin State Journal*, December 16, 1923. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P2866.
- Keachie, Geo. R. *Madison* [map]. Scale not given. In *Atlas of Dane County: Including Plats of Towns, Cities, and Villages: Prepared from Surveys and County Records: Published as a Supplement to the Madison Daily Democrat*. Madison: Democrat Print Co., 1904.
- League of Women Voters of Madison. *Madison at Your Service*. Madison, WI: League of Women Voters of Madison, 1968. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records, 1954-1975, Box 11, Folder 3.
- Madison* [map]. 2:1. In: Harrison and Warner. *Atlas of Dane County, Wisconsin: Drawn from Actual Surveys and the County Records, to Which is Added a Railroad & Sectional Map of*

- the State of Wisconsin*. Madison: Harrison and Warner, 1873.
- Map of Madison and the Four Lake Country* [map]. ca. 1:50,688. New York: Horace Greeley & Co., 1854.
- Map of Madison and Vicinity* [map]. ca. 1:32,187. Madison: Madison Railways Co., 1917.
- Madison Home Protective Council. Advertisement. November 1, 1950. *Capital Times*. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P23902.
- Madison Home Protective Council. Advertisement. November 6, 1950. *Capital Times*. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P23902.
- “Madison mayor proposes city's first official motto: '77 square miles surrounded by reality'.” *Star Tribune*, July 12, 2013. Accessed April 3, 2017. <http://www.startribune.com/madison-mayor-turns-dig-into-proposed-city-motto/215245301/>.
- Madison Redevelopment Authority. “Triangle Redevelopment and You.” Madison, WI: City of Madison, 1959. Pamphlet. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.
- “Madison Special Committee on Minority Housing Minutes.” Madison, WI: Madison Special Committee on Minority Housing, April 27, 1962. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives-Milwaukee. Lloyd Barbee Papers, Box 11, Folder 5.
- Martin, Howard Samuel. “Politics of Public Housing in Madison 1948-1959.” Masters diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1954.
- “Mayor is Told Housing Program Won’t Increase Tax Rate for Madison.” *The Capital Times*, November 19, 1939. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P74-5713.
- McCabe, C.E.P. *Map of the City of Madison, Dane County, State of Wisconsin* [map]. 1: 6,000. New York: George Harrison, 1855.
- McKeag, James R. “Creating a Culture of Progressive Planning Practice in America's Medium-Size Cities.” Masters diss., Tufts University, 2015.  
<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/docview/1725144025?accountid=465>.
- NAACP Madison Branch. “Negro Housing in Madison.” Madison, WI: NAACP Madison Branch, 1959. Pamphlet. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Nelson, Robert K, LaDale Winling, Richard Marciano, Nathan Connolly, et al. “Mapping Inequality.” *American Panorama*, ed. Robert K. Nelson and Edward L. Ayers. Accessed September 20, 2016. <https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/#loc=12/43.0765/-89.3800&opacity=0.8&city=madison-wi&area=D1&adimage=3/56/-120&text=intro>
- Nesting, Ivan. “Important Points.” *Wisconsin State Journal*, October 30, 1950. Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm. Reel P3033.
- Nichols, John. “Urban Archipelago.” *Nation* 280, no. 24 (2005): 13-16. Accessed April 3, 2017. ISSN: 00278378.
- Noll, Henry. “South Madison Asks to be Annexed: Mass Meeting Votes to Take Action at Once.” *The Wisconsin State Journal*, April 6, 1923. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P2864.
- Noll, Henry. “Annexation of South Madison is Recommended.” *The Wisconsin State Journal*, May 22, 1923.
- Original Madison Plat Map* [map]. Scale not given. Madison, WI, 1836.
- “Out of the Mail Bag.” *The Wisconsin State Journal*. December 7, 1939. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P43900.
- “On Today’s Charter Ordinance Referendum for Mayor: Vote ‘No’ to Keep Council-Manager.” *Wisconsin State Journal*, November 7, 1950. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm.

- Reel P3033.
- “Out of the Mail Bag.” *Wisconsin State Journal*, December 7, 1939. Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm. Reel P43900.
- “Page of Opinion: Here’s Public Housing Again.” *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 11, 1961. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P3167.
- Peterson, Paul. *City Limits*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- "Provisions of the Housing Act of 1949." *Monthly Labor Review* 69, no. 2 (1949): 155-59. Accessed September 24, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41831843>.
- “Public Housing Held Vulnerable to Facts.” *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 24, 1950. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P3027.
- “Public Housing Plans Win Council Backing, 17 to 2.” *Capital Times*, July 26, 1961. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.
- “Public Housing Project Given Council Approval.” *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 9, 1962. Wisconsin Historical Society, Microfilm, Reel P3179.
- Purcell, Mark. “Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant.” *GeoJournal* 58 (2002): 99-108. Accessed April 15, 2017. <http://faculty.washington.edu/mpurcell/geojournal.pdf>.
- Race to Equity. “Race to Equity: A Baseline Report on the State of Racial Disparities in Dane County.” Madison, WI: Wisconsin Council on Children and Families, 2013. Accessed September 1, 2016. <http://racetoequity.net/baseline-report-state-racial-disparities-dane-county/>.
- Raushenbush, Paul. Advertisement. November 6, 1959. *Capital Times*. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P23902.
- “Relocation in Triangle Unsolved.” *Capital Times*, February 3, 1961. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.
- Rheingold, Ira, Michael Fitzpatrick, and Al Hofeld Jr. “From Redlining to Reverse Redlining: A History of Obstacles for Minority Homeownership in America.” *Clearinghouse Review* 34 (2001): 642-654. Accessed February 1, 2017. <http://heinonline.org.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/clear34&id=658&collection=journals&index=>.
- Schragger, Richard. "Is a Progressive City Possible? Reviving Urban Liberalism for the Twenty-First Century." *Harvard Law & Policy Review* 7, no. 2 (July 2013): 231-251. Accessed April 3, 2017. ISSN: 19352077.
- Social Explorer. “Census 1960: Dane County, Wisconsin.” Accessed September 20, 2016. <http://www.socialexplorer.com/tables/C1960CountyDS/R11403943?ReportId=R11403943>
- Social Explorer. “Census 2010: Madison, Wisconsin.” Accessed September 20, 2016. <http://www.socialexplorer.com/tables/C2010/R11407734>.
- Social Explorer. “Total Population: ACS 2015 Estimates.” Accessed September 20, 2016. <http://www.socialexplorer.com/6f4cdab7a0/explore>.
- South Madison Neighborhood Steering Committee and Department of Planning and Development. “South Madison Neighborhood Plan.” Madison, WI: City of Madison, 2005. Accessed September 20, 2016. [http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/ndp/southmadison\\_plan.pdf](http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/ndp/southmadison_plan.pdf).
- “South Madison Project, Wis. R-7.” Madison, WI: D.L. Evans Appraisal Co., 1966-1967. Wisconsin Historical Society.

- The Greenbush Memorial. "The Spirit of Greenbush." Madison, WI: The Greenbush Memorial, 2000. Pamphlet. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Dane Series 326, Box 1, Folder 1.
- "The Mail Bag." *Wisconsin State Journal*, November 5, 1950. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P3033.
- "The Negro in Madison; 'Good Life' Hurt by Discrimination." *Wisconsin State Journal*, July 28, 1963. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P3193.
- "Under the Terror." *Wisconsin State Journal*, July 29, 1950. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P3029.
- "Urban Renewal in Madison: Legal, Economic, Aesthetic and Human Factors." Madison, WI: League of Women Voters of Madison, February 1963. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975. Box 11. Folder 9.
- "USHA Slum Loan Support Sought Here." *Wisconsin State Journal*, May 14, 1939. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P43893.
- "U.S. Earmarks \$900,000 Fund for Low-Rent Housing Project Here; Now Depends on Council." *Capital Times*, October 29, 1939. Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P74-5712.
- Yorn, Madge. "All Around the Town." *Capital Times*, May 17, 1940. . Wisconsin Historical Society. Microfilm. Reel P74-5720.
- Zmudzinski, Chester. *Chester Zmudzinski to Albert J. McGinnis, March 19, 1962*. Letter. Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Urban Renewal Project Records 1954-1975, Box 1, Folder 1.