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In the 1940s, Los Angeles faced an acute housing crisis. The local housing authority responded with a controversial program of slum clearance and public housing construction along with photography that presented the crisis in innovative ways. This book brings these photographs together with hitherto unavailable sources to reveal a largely uninvestigated concept of housing photography. Case studies from Los Angeles, New York, and Berlin together with FBI records and nearly forgotten bulletins invite a new understanding of the history of housing and photography as one in which women scholars and commercial photographers played pivotal roles.
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PHOTOGRAPHY AND MODERN PUBLIC HOUSING IN LOS ANGELES
EDITORIAL
FROM AN AMERICAN RIGHT TO "A DECENT HOME" IN THE 1940s TO ADEQUATE HOUSING AS A GLOBAL HUMAN RIGHT IN 2021

"Everybody needs a place to rest
Everybody wants to have a home ..."
(Bruce Springsteen, "Hungry Heart," from the album The River, 1980)

"We need more photos that inform, that tell stories, that remain etched in the memory and start the imagination working. The thing we need least of is politicians' faces."
(Frederick Gutheim; quoted in Marion Massen, "Better Annual Reports Are Possible," Journal of Housing 8, no. 1 [January 1951]: 28)

"It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure."
(Franklin D. Roosevelt, "State of the Union Message to Congress, January 11, 1944")

I.

In his hit song “Hungry Heart,” Bruce Springsteen sings about the most basic desires that every one of us has, not least of which are the longing for a “place” and a “home.” Having a “home” without owning or taking possession of a “place” (or even just renting one) is a difficult thing to do, unless you become very philosophical about it. Having a home, in other words, is quite practically and mundanely about having a roof over your head. Even without saying it directly, the iconic singer gives the impression first, that people have a need for “housing,” and that this is a need that unites everyone, and even more, that there is a
human right to *decent* housing, to housing that is fit for human beings. This puts Springsteen in line with the United Nations, which defines “adequate housing” as “a human right enshrined in international human rights law. Failing to recognize, protect, and fulfill the Right to Adequate Housing results in the violation of a plethora of fundamental rights including the Right to Work, Education, Health, and Security.” (See https://unhabitat.org/programme/housing-rights; https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/housing/pages/housingindex.aspx, visited August 23, 2021, 5:20 p.m. See also "Das Recht auf Wohnen": https://www.institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de/themen/wirtschaftliche-soziale-und-kulturelle-rechte/recht-auf-wohnen.) It was former UN staff who founded The Shift, a nonprofit organization that forcefully advocates for the human right to adequate housing. The banner image on the organization’s website (https://www.make-the-shift.org/) shows a stark contrast between a tract of slums and a row of high-rises characteristic of modern cities worldwide, with these architectures appearing to visualize the oppression of the many and the aspiration of the few (fig. 1).
II.

There is currently a lot of talk about “crises,” especially of the “climate crisis,” but of the “housing crisis,” too (https://www.make-the-shift.org/, visited on August 23, 2021, 5:39 p.m.). The interdependence of the “crises” being experienced globally—we could in principle also call them current issues and historical events: as crises of humanity, of the climate, and of aging—poses significant challenges to the sciences. Scientists are more used to analyzing such paradigms (humanity, climate, aging) separately. However simplistic and popular Springsteen’s neoromantic lyrics may seem, in contrast, they connect central, grand themes of being human and of living together.

One is tempted to think that a singer like Springsteen can allow himself to say, in his own genre, what scientists hardly dare. No wonder, then, that politicians seem to be unnerved when their political program or election campaign is unexpectedly confronted with this complexity. The political party CDU’s current candidate for the election of the German chancellor, Armin Laschet, found himself in deep water, literally wet from head to toe (fig. 2), amidst the disastrous floods in mid-July 2021 in the North Rhine-Westphalian town of Stolberg near Aachen. In images that went around the world, he was completely unable to offer any explanation or even address the wider causes for the catastrophe (DIE ZEIT, “Ist er der Richtige?,” Tina Hildebrandt and Stefan Willeke, no. 34, August 19, 2021, 13–15). Entire houses, apartments, washed away—a total of 3000, according to estimates. It didn’t take long for critics to mock Laschet for a stance they found ridiculous. Federick Gutheim’s saying from 1951—“The thing we need least of is politicians’ faces”—might capture the fatally flawed visual strategy of Laschet’s media and election team. In this setting, even a heroic portrait of a politician would have been out of place. The empathy of viewers, one would have to assume, was directed toward the people who had been hit by the disaster, the ones who had lost their homes and everything connected to them. But just who in this situation was and is truly out of their depth in terms of political representation? Perhaps the public? In still expecting clear (black and white?) guidance and answers? Not to mention quick solutions—which certainly won’t be found overnight.

We see this in the issue of the “housing crisis.” It’s been a historical constant since 1900, manifested primarily by the Industrial Revolution. Prominent depictions of miserable housing conditions were famously produced, for instance,
by the F.S.A. (Farm Security Administration) under the Roosevelt administra-
tion, as the destitution and poverty caused by the Dust Bowl sent waves of
migration to California. During World War II, the politicization of the housing
issue in the United States intensified; the main aim was to keep up the morale
of industrial workers for war production. After the war, the destruction of hous-
ing represented a global catastrophe, which was met with reconstruction and,
in Germany, the “economic miracle” aided by the Marshall Plan. In the so-called
migration crisis of the twenty-first century, housing as a phenomenon has once
again captured the attention of the public—images of huge refugee camps and
of shipping containers repurposed as housing for asylum seekers are broadcast
into the living rooms of people in the countries the refugees are trying to reach.
What’s more, some of these camps and containers have been creatively deco-
rated with graffiti and other art projects to reflect politically and aesthetically
on these social places and their architectures.

The historical stages of the housing crisis show that its history has quite
often been causally linked to crises in politics or of the climate. From a scien-
tific point of view, this entails an interdisciplinary complex of issues that will
doubtless be addressed by a wealth of research.

III.

Delving into the “Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles” and its photo
collection, Nicole Krup Oest’s doctoral thesis directly confronts these political
issues. She does not understand photographs as documenting the ambitions of
housing initiatives but rather analyzes them in their multifaceted relationship
to ideas, political strategies, urban planning, and architecture, along with
notions of “good citizenship” and “harmony” among people. The fact that elim-
ninating “slums” often provokes both new slums and racial segregation is one
aspect of the problem’s ambivalent structure, which can be seen in the world’s
first public housing project, Ramona Gardens, initiated in 1940 east of down-
town Los Angeles. Here, tensions between gang members from drug cartels and
the police continue to erode the idea of an “American standard of living” com-
bined with “lasting peace.” (For a current discussion, see the article by Michael
Finnegan in the Los Angeles Times on the prosecution of hate crimes in Ramona
Gardens: “Gang Member Gets 16 Years for Firebombing Black Families’ Homes,”
member-sentenced-ramona-gardens-firebombing, visited August 27, 2021,
2:27 p.m.)
Developments around housing in the United States make it hard to avoid concluding that this is a core theme of the American Dream, despite the global universality the phenomenon claims or all its structural contradictions and ambivalences. President Lyndon B. Johnson declared the right to “fair housing” to be part of the “American way of life,” while also trumpeting his signing of the Fair Housing Act in 1968 in the shadows of Martin Luther King Jr.’s assassination. (See https://nationalfairhousing.org/; https://shelterforce.org/2018/09/05/the-most-important-housing-law-passed-in-1968-wasnt-the-fair-housing-act/, visited August 27, 2021, 2:40 p.m.) The comprehensive significance of the topic has not only provoked intensive work by sociologists and historians—it is so telling and important that it is time, too, for an analysis of this historical process that seeks to determine its impact in the medium of photography.

The author of this study recently curated an exhibition at University of California, Berkeley, devoted to the color slides made by the photographer and housing activist Catherine Bauer (fig. 3). Not least, the exhibition explored Bauer’s prominent involvement with the Housing Act of 1937 and her role as a dedicated and tireless educator in the cause of housing. (See https://archives.ced.berkeley.edu/blog/seeing-modern-architecture-in-color-in-catherine-bauers-kodachrome-slide-collection, visited August 27, 2021, 1:30 p.m.) In her text for the online exhibition, Oest writes that “Bauer’s collection offers material for future research on the creative contributions of women to the history of housing and photography—especially women who never proclaimed themselves [to be] pho-
toographers the way their celebrated contemporaries like Roger Sturtevant and Julius Shulman did. This research promises to destabilize the murky categories of 'applied photography' and 'amateur photography' and to urge historians to look closer not only at what these photographs show, but how they show it.”

IV.

Back to Springsteen: The American singer, with his status as a popular legend, is politically concerned, no doubt about this. However, his work as a musician has a timeless tune of humanistic generalization, even beyond the United States. As a songwriter, his strong narrative style revolves around the fates and dreams of the “little people,” especially of workers. He sings about difficult though eminently human lives lived on the outskirts of big cities, in small towns, or in the countryside, where people marry early and follow in the footsteps of their parents, all the while dreaming of the big wide world—and of a place to call their own that would also mean independence, self-determination, and social advancement, or at least social stability. It is precisely this largely white working class, threatened by unemployment and pushed to the social margins of the American success story, to an industrialized world caught in a cycle of decline, that has in recent years appeared to Europeans to be the bastion of Trump supporters. In popular perception, it is made up of people who live bitter, hard lives in impoverished places that were once industrial centers, often enough in trailers, frequently in run-down single houses or rental units—one might think these are precisely people who could use a housing project.

Of course, though, these kinds of projects don’t usually come from right-wing, conservative politicians or activists, but rather from the progressive, left-wing camp. The paradox embodied by Springsteen is the attraction he has for anti-intellectuals who tend politically to the right, alongside his appeal to Democratic, visionary intellectual figures, from Roosevelt to Kennedy to Obama, who have been attacked and accused for supposedly having socialist, even communist, intentions. Springsteen has always managed to escape this moral dilemma, while at the same time becoming politically involved. Barack Obama visited him in his recording studio to great media fanfare, where the two men carried out a series of conversations under the title: “Renegades: Born in the USA,” a pointed hint at the racist discussion about whether Obama was really born in the USA (the "birther conspiracy," as it was called). The production stylized its interlocutors as heroes in the American struggle to get ahead through prosperity and success—a struggle that is perhaps most acutely expressed in
The visit of the first Black president of the United States to the studio of The Boss, the country’s biggest rock star, was no coincidence. Even before he left office, Obama must have known that a Republican successor would undo his “fair housing regulations.” (See https://www.politico.com/news/2020/01/06/trump-roll-back-obama-housing-desegregation-094874.)

It was especially glaring that it was HUD Secretary Ben Carson, the only Black member of Donald Trump’s cabinet, who was instrumental in this rollback. The color of one’s skin, it hardly needs to be said, does not necessarily correlate with progressive politics. And that’s a good thing, because otherwise political positions would be tied to race, to class, to gender. And this kind of biologicistic determinism is no way to start, it offers the wrong foundation, if we want to build a world based on diversity and reason. Still, and this is also an important argument, it must be said that calls for equality and human dignity, paired with denunciations of racism, have not historically contributed in any sustainable way to fair housing. In today’s debates and discourses, the question is thus often whether a new housing policy must not first begin with an awareness of the existing forms of systemic and structural racism.

It is racism, of course, that produces the construct of “race” to begin with, as Ta-Nehisi Coates, for example, instructively outlines in his preface to Toni Morrison’s volume of essays, *The Origin of Others* (2017). Morrison devotes one of her essays to the “housing” of “blacks,” to “people of color,” during and after the American Civil War (1861–1865), and to their attempt to define themselves in terms of “blackness,” to form a separate community, one that is ostensibly “pure,” in order to escape threats to their life and limb emanating from “whites.” It is a fact that these constructs of skin color, originating since the eighteenth century from racist biological research, still stand in the way of ending the painful dilemmas of human coexistence. Here, though, the crucial new point is the shifts in contemporary discourse. Perhaps it will be possible in the future to dispense with categories of “black” and “white,” with skin color as a basis of identity. Perhaps we might be able to meet each other as human beings sharing a common political, social community, in which skin color has become an obsolete category. But this can only happen if actions are taken to counteract the harms caused by racism, if those whose existence and opportunities have been limited by racism are given ways to overcome these disadvantages.

The meetings with Obama allowed Springsteen to expand the narrow “white” world found in his rock songs and ballads, works conceived, one might say, more as folk songs if not sermons. As though all of them mean to say: everyone’s got problems; everyone has a hungry heart that longs for housing as it does for love, for a family, for peace, for belonging.
It is precisely these universally shared human longings, which come together in the desire for housing, that characterize HACLA’s photo campaigns, with their aim of communicating the idea of fair housing to a broad public. The campaigns also included photographs of before and after situations, such as those also preserved in the archives of the Cincinnati Better Housing League. (See Cincinnati Better Housing League: https://digital.cincinnatilibrary.org/digital/collection/p16998coll44.) Children, moreover, were often employed as visual messengers (fig. 4). The images juxtapose chaotic, desolate housing conditions with the vision of a new model of construction, a new kind of modern housing with clear vertical and horizontal lines and structures: before, dirt and misery; and after, cleanliness and purity, materialized in architectural structures and materials. We have long known that these are binary ideologies. Whereas only a few years ago such a topic would have stood out as isolated in histories of art and photography, today the surfeit of digital images depicting historical housing projects, among other things, is making it possible to reconstruct and critically analyze the significance of how these political and social engagements and initiatives have been visualized.

In contemporary art, the theme of housing is clearly linked to diversity and new sets of values. Artists have long moved past moral appeals, to instead highlight, for example, the incredible creativity of people who are “homeless” but
nevertheless endeavor to create a “home” for themselves—whether it be under a bridge in Kyoto, or on the go on the luggage rack of a bicycle. The images testify to impressive moments of self-empowerment in the face of the depressingly long history of the global housing crisis. One example is the project “The Zero Yen House” (fig. 5), in which Japanese artist Kyohei Sakaguchi has devoted himself to positively conveying this image of housing as a human achievement. (See https://www.spoon-tamago.com/2012/12/19/the-zero-yen-house-kyohei-sakaguchi/.)

VI.

The cover of the book was designed by the Austrian artist Alois Köchl, in keeping with the long-term concept of this publication series (fig. 6). Many of his works have started out with photographs and have a stylistic feel that can be explained through comparisons with graffiti. His intensely colored tonal values, reminiscent of van Gogh and Cézanne—here, a bright yellow—set an accent while making a connection to an abstract-figurative depiction of construction and destruction. We can recognize architectural, plastic forms: precarious, wavering, and reminiscent of some of the “negative” images meant to provide striking visual evidence of the structures in which completely impoverished
people live. On the cover, a group of people emerges in the center right, also precariously caught in their configuration between constitution and dissolution. As his starting point, Köchl took illustrations in Oest’s text, intended to demonstrate a future human coexistence ridden of racism. The Kodachrome slide from the Bauer and Wurster collection (see fig. 58 in this book) was never published, but it was used for Bauer’s lectures. The depiction, almost certainly shot by Bauer herself, shows a street outside Pueblo del Rio, where a bunch of children happily enjoy their day, or so it seems, and an adult seems to take guard and responsibility. A lot could be read into this image—and no doubt, one could and should criticize the obvious discrepancy between the white “father-figure” and the children of color. In any case, it is a document about how activists and architects at the time wanted to communicate their vision. Interestingly, Köchl takes up this seemingly marginal slide for his own creative work, his sharp eye and critical mind at work.

The visual characteristics of Köchl’s work are particularly apt in the context of this research, because after all, the point is to open and adjust one’s eyes to see...
conditions that we can certainly expect a global community, at least on the whole, to improve and eradicate. Köchl’s cover conveys: there’s nothing depressing about the issue the book addresses, because it’s a topic that can be charged with energy and positivity, as long as we learn to see it right.

In the same way that Springsteen connects popular culture and American literature, at least as he is read by Harvard professor Robert Coles, who compares “The Boss” to Walt Whitman, the housing projects and their images interweave diverse elements and levels of society and culture. These range from politically engaged Hollywood stars like Frank Sinatra and Bette Davis, who supported HACLA, to the socially underprivileged protagonists of the housing projects; from the culture of national and international exhibitions to promote the projects, to the lived culture of people’s homes, to architecture and garden design. It is not difficult to understand that these entanglements have always entailed, and still do, not only antihierarchical and progressive aspects, but also political ideologies and strategies. However, there was also this utopian, third, and the way I see it, nonideological position, namely a human right to “better housing”—for all.

The book owes its existence to a collaborative effort by people living in Zurich, Heidelberg, Berlin, Stralsund, and (not least) California. My heartfelt thanks to all of them.

Bettina Gockel
Krummenau (Aemelsberg), August 27, 2021
FOR J.O.
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Starting in 1938, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles took on the task of razing neighborhoods of substandard housing and providing low-income families with modern homes. Over the next decade, the Housing Authority would not only build public housing in the city for over seventeen thousand people and manage a wartime housing program for thirty-six thousand, but also amass a collection of photographs of Los Angeles’s poorer and older neighborhoods, new public housing, and housing officials at work.\(^1\)

Several photographers of diverse professional and artistic backgrounds worked with the Housing Authority to capture the highly visible and vastly transformative effects of the Los Angeles public housing program. These photographs, such as one taken by the art historian and draftsperson Esther Lewittes Mipaas showing children playing in a public housing splash pool, once circulated broadly (fig. 1). Printed and exhibited with construction reports, maps, and records of the many pursuits that public housing residents initiated and engaged in, these photographs presented a public image of the Housing Authority as an advocate for what President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1944 famously pronounced “The right of every family to a decent home.”\(^2\)

The history of housing in the United States, and Los Angeles in particular, has revealed this right to be a largely unrealized dream. The case of the Los Angeles neighborhood of Chávez Ravine is especially demonstrative of the failures of the public housing program. With the aim to build ten thousand public housing units under the Housing Act of 1949, the Housing Authority evicted Chávez Ravine homeowners from their dubiously deemed “substandard” dwellings in what many contemporaries described as an idyllic, semi-rural, and primarily Spanish-speaking neighborhood close to downtown. While experts balked at the idea of moving families from their garden surroundings to the
upper floors of modern high-rises, what ultimately thwarted the project, as several historians have shown, were the politics of the Red Scare. The California House Un-American Activities Committee called several employees of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, including “Public Information Director” and desegregation advocate Frank Wilkinson, to testify to their communist sympathies. Chávez Ravine ultimately became a site not of affordable modern housing, but a baseball stadium for the Dodgers.

Historians have astutely acknowledged the connections between the Housing Authority’s collection of photographs from the 1940s and early 1950s with public housing’s problematic history of racist slum clearance programs and
paternalistic public housing management. They also have viewed these photographs as rare records of this local history and fascinating products of historical photographic practices. In 1990, the photography librarian of the Los Angeles Public Library, Carolyn Kozo, met with representatives of the then fifty-two-year-old Housing Authority to discuss the conservation of its photographs. As Kozo wrote shortly thereafter to the Housing Authority’s Executive Director,

“I was impressed with the collection. Many of the photographs are technically and aesthetically excellent. The subject matter is of most importance because the photographs capture transition phases of many Los Angeles neighborhoods. To my knowledge, photographs of this change and growth are not available elsewhere.”

Deeming the Housing Authority’s photographs a “rare resource,” the Los Angeles Public Library borrowed what appears to be a selection of prints made from the collection, made 4 × 5-inch copy negatives of the prints, then produced 8 × 10-inch prints from the copy negatives for the Library’s Photo Collection. Since then, the Los Angeles Public Library scanned the prints and made them accessible via the Photo Collection’s digital library. More recently, the Getty Research Institute and the Southern California Library also reactivated the circulation of several photographs related to the Housing Authority’s projects through similar digitization initiatives. In contrast, attempts by scholars to access the collection of 1940s and 1950s photographs previously loaned by the Housing Authority to the Los Angeles Public Library for copying have proven unsuccessful, making the copied and surviving prints in public collections rare, indeed.

Taking up these geographically dispersed archival materials, this study accounts for the social, political, and cultural work that the Housing Authority’s photographs performed. It examines the processes and mechanisms by which these photographs contributed to the housing cause with a focus on the practices of making, collecting, and sending photographs of Los Angeles’s public housing often far beyond the limits of the rapidly growing city. In this emphasis, it furthermore aims not simply to read the photographs as promotional tools, but rather to analyze contemporary ideas about how these tools should look and function—ideas akin to what American studies scholar Alan Trachtenberg might call “conceptions of the social and cultural role of photography.”

As outlined in the first chapter of this study, scholarly investigations of the Housing Authority’s photographs concentrate mainly on the work of Leonard Nadel, a photographer who started working for the Authority only after the
Second World War. While some studies consider the context in which these images were used—such as the Housing Authority’s annual reports—they leave many technical and theoretical aspects of these practices unexplained. With the notable exception of two student projects centering on Nadel’s photographs from the mid-to-late 1940s, none have sought to parse the contemporary reception of these photographs that the Housing Authority accrued over its first decade.

The present study goes beyond these previous studies of the Housing Authority’s photographic production by adopting an approach modeled by historian of photography Robin Kelsey and examining photographs as sites of technical and creative negotiations of the social and political conditions of housing reform—as practices shaped by practical considerations and personal convictions. In doing this, it looks closer at the intersections between historical photographic practices and the related histories of housing, urban planning, and architecture. It does not recount a comprehensive history of Los Angeles’s housing program through readings of photographic objects. Historian Don Parson offers an excellent study of the political history of the Los Angeles public program from its establishment through the McCarthy era. Historian of architecture Dana Cuff likewise provides a meticulously researched account of the city’s public housing from the perspective of a history of architecture and urban planning. Cuff’s and Parson’s research helps form the backdrop for this book’s case studies, while the photographs remain at the center of the investigation.

This book furthermore examines the photographs in a greater thematic and geographic context. The study’s focus on the ways in which photographs were made and viewed at times takes the investigation far afield of the local Los Angeles housing program to expose its significance within housing and photography’s transnational histories. This farther-reaching geography of circulating photographs, pamphlets, and exhibits likewise extends the relevance of the present study to the history of art. Informing these commercial photographic practices in 1940s Los Angeles were notions of photography as a socially-relevant art and ideas about its place in books, travelling exhibits, and museums. An examination of these new case studies contributes not only to a better understanding of the connections between photographic history and housing history in the 1940s, but also those between regional practices and transnational political and creative networks in a period which historian of photography Blake Stimson describes as “the last moment for a long while in which art presumed to have a say in the future.”

The approach adopted in this study is indebted to significant groundwork laid by Stimson in addition to several other scholars working in the fields of art
history, photohistory, and the histories of housing and urban planning. First among these studies are those which have developed approaches and methods for investigating the histories of various forms of commercial and applied photography. An excellent early example of this scholarship is David E. Nye's research on photography and “corporate” forms of image making at General Electric as historical attempts at problem-solving. More recently, Robin Kelsey considered the demands of the archive as a similar impetus for creativity in making images for surveys. Additional research adopting perspectives from business history has further expanded an understanding of the pivotal roles played by photographers and photographic firms in the histories of the natural sciences, the social sciences, and war. The photographs in the Housing Authority's collection draw on the visual languages of these categories of corporate photography, worker photography, survey photography, war photography, and the photography of architecture while the present study contributes foundational scholarship to this ever-growing research area with the hope of adding further nuance to the history of commercial photography's interdisciplinary applications.

With regards to photography and the social sciences, this study is also indebted to scholars who have examined the category of “documentary photography” in its longer history from the turn of the century through the end of the New Deal. The importance of housing reform as a context in which early practices of what has since been termed “social documentary photography” flourished cannot be understated. These connections are especially apparent in Maren Stange's detailed reading of Jacob Riis's turn-of-the-century work as it "rationalized" progressive housing reform efforts led by Lawrence Veiller in New York. Still, these connections become obscured in documentary photography's later chapters. Studies of the far more famous documentary photographs created between 1935 and 1943 by the photographers of first the Resettlement Administration and later the Farm Security Administration tend to eschew close readings of photographs of RA/FSA housing. As Stange and other scholars of Depression-era documentary note, one of the Resettlement Administration's tasks was building camps for migrant farmworkers and greenbelt towns modeled on English garden cities. Yet, photographs of these housing projects appear primarily in architectural and planning-historical scholarship rather than in studies in the history of photography, and mainly as illustrations. Like the Farm Security Administration, the United States Housing Authority created under the first public housing law in 1937 was also a New Deal agency, as art historian Elizabeth Bloom Avery reminds us. And as architectural historian Peter S. Reed notes, the FSA was a vital agency in providing wartime
housing. As the first chapter of this study also shows, the now famous photographic file-building practices of the FSA briefly came into close contact with those of some of public housing’s strongest advocates. Especially with regards to these archival intersections with housing history, much more work on Depression-era documentary remains to be done.

More recently, scholarship on American photographs has shifted away from theoretical models that deemphasize photography’s historical and social dimensions. In the introduction to *American Photography: Local and Global Contexts*, historian of art and photography Bettina Gockel describes this shift as “a return to what might be called the ‘FSA moment’ in the history of photography.” Her edited volume historically-critically sounds out the transnational reach of documentary photography with a deceptively simple guiding question: “‘what is the function of photography in the public sphere?’” Furthering the call of Robin Kelsey and Blake Stimson for an “accountability for both the images we consume and the world they represent,” such questions as posed by Gockel aim to identify specific “uses and functions of photography” by taking up the work of identifying and explaining discrete “narratives” in its history.

These approaches return in part to an emphasis placed by Alan Trachtenberg on "specific circumstances," “the conditions of camera work,” “certain ideas and expectations about the role of the representational arts in the Republic,” and "the conditions of culture and politics." This return to more rigorous methods of historical contextualization, Kelsey and Stimson further suggest, is urgent and imperative—the responsibility of photohistorians to a present world in which “[e]ven buried in the weightless image ocean of the Internet, photographs retain the promise of a reality to which we can point, and which in turn points, with its demand for accountability, at us.”

There are many reasons why a historical contextualization is especially appropriate for a study of the Housing Authority’s photographs, but Blake Stimson’s application of it to the art photography of the 1950s illustrates this appropriateness best. Looking at this decade, Stimson identifies a unique historical moment—a moment between modernism and postmodernism, “mass politics” and “mass culture,” “civic”/“idealism” and “consumer” behavior—in which artists and viewers saw in photography “the possibility of a new political identification, the possibility of a civic-minded collective self-understanding that would generate a new postwar, postmodern citizen of the world.” As this study investigates in its final chapter, such a possibility was likely already sensed in the second half of the 1940s, particularly by photographers seeking forms for communicating, and perhaps even realizing, public housing’s promise of belonging.
In a slightly different vein, photohistorians following on the “material” and “ethnographic” turns in photohistory have contributed greatly to the study of photography’s public role in broader geographies, as well.35 Adopting an approach pioneered by Elizabeth Edwards to photographs as objects with “biographies,” this scholarship more closely scrutinizes not only the historical conditions in which photographs were made, but how their functions and meanings changed in acts of exchange or in their afterlives in archives.36 As Edwards and Janice Hart write, “an object cannot be fully understood at any single point in its existence but should be understood as belonging in a continuing process of production, exchange, usage and meaning.”37 This approach, in turn, comes with a reconsideration of the history of photography’s principle players. Turning away from the notion of the “photographer as hero” and toward sociologist Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory, these photohistorians posit a new understanding of photographic history as one of networked processes of making and circulation.38 This network-centered approach underscores the relevance of photohistorical research to studies in the history of science and anthropology, but also, as Kelley Wilder and Gregg Mitman argue, the social sciences.39 This call for interdisciplinary, object-focused, and transnational narratives of socially-relevant photographic practices is one which this study aims to answer.

HOUSING AND PHOTOGRAPHY IN A TRANSNATIONAL CONTEXT

An overview of housing history reveals the 1940s as a decade marked by widespread conflict and change.40 Modelled after the United States Housing Act of 1937, the 1938 California Housing Authorities Law created local housing authorities with a two-part mandate: clear the slums and build affordable developments to house the state’s lower-income residents according to current standards. As several scholars show, the Housing Authority’s work dramatically altered the city’s landscape in its first decade of operation. The Housing Authority brought neighborhoods of older, modest, privately-owned or rented housing to the ground. The spaces vacated by these homes in addition to spaces staked-out in the city’s vacant lots became the sites of multi-family public housing developments, with the larger ones offering new homes for hundreds of families.

The new public housing was nothing short of controversial. On the one hand, it was the American Dream made accessible to everyone. The houses had glass windows, indoor plumbing, and electricity. Leisure opportunities abounded as playgrounds kept children out of the streets and plenty of garden space kept residents busy after work planting flowers, tending lawns, and vying to win the Housing Authority’s yard-of-the-month contest.41 On the other hand, the life
that public housing offered was far from desirable. In 1942, Catherine Bauer, one of the greatest proponents of modern housing in the United States and one of the most recognized internationally, asked a gathering of California housing officials to consider whether the conditions in the state’s wartime developments were “too regimented”—whether their designs, the amenities they offered, and the ways of life they encouraged were ignorant of what residents wanted.42

Catherine Bauer also openly condemned the persistence of racial discrimination in housing policy that was especially manifest in the segregation of housing projects.43 In the face of mounting public concern about racism following the Second World War, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles had reason to be proud of its non-discrimination policy set in the early 1940s. But as historian Josh Sides astutely observes, the persistence of racism elsewhere in the housing market, not least in the federal government’s own system of mortgage insurance, ultimately undermined the dream shared by self-identified progressive public housers of “all races and religions” living as one community (to quote a 1945 anthem sung by Frank Sinatra in the Oscar-winning short film, *The House I Live In*).44 Public housing, conceived as a stepping stone to homeownership, became a dead end for many People of Color, but especially Black people in Los Angeles.45

The legacy of public housing as sites of inescapable poverty tormented in more recent decades by drugs and gang violence has largely overshadowed the spirit of hope on which public housing was founded.46 At the same time, public housing neighborhoods, or “the projects,” continue to be widely recognized for their roles played in the rich histories of graffiti art, hip hop, and rap.47 Grammy-winning rapper and former Los Angeles public housing resident Jay Rock regularly returns to the Nickerson Gardens baseball field to perform with fellow musicians in an annual holiday concert. As he explained to the *Los Angeles Times*, “If I could lead by example and show these kids, “Look I came from just where you came from, and you can do this too,” [...] [j]ust to impart that in their brains and give them some type of encouragement, some type of motivation—whether it’s doing music or whatever they’re doing in their life that’s positive and they come back to give back, that’s important.”48

This social and political history of public housing in America forms just one part of a longer, transnational history of struggles to answer the question of how best to house low-income workers and their families. As historian Daniel T. Rodgers explains, this history was one marked by considerable exchanges of knowledge and experience between progressives such as Lawrence Veiller and Catherine Bauer in the United States with urban planners and architects in
Europe. Early in her housing career, Bauer's two research trips to Europe resulted in the book, *Modern Housing*, published in 1934. *Modern Housing* introduced many American readers to such milestones in Europe's housing history as Ebenezer Howard's development of the garden city concept, the construction of the factory towns of Cadbury in England and Krupp in Germany, and architect Ernst May's building of Römerstadt. With the rise of the National Socialist party in Germany, many of the German architects and planners, Ernst May among them, would also take their work abroad.

As more recent research reveals, not only travelling or exiled architects and planners, but networked international organizations shaped the transnational history of housing, as well. Studies of the Congrès internationaux d'architecture moderne (CIAM) and the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning (IFHTP) stand at the center of this scholarship. Historian Phillip Wagner positions the IFHTP as an agent in the “institutionalizing” of the planning profession in members’ respective countries, and, following a similar actor-network approach utilized by contemporary photohistorians, points to the IFHTP’s “practices of internationalization” and the “performatve construction of expertise” not least through its organization of exhibitions and slideshows. Despite this growing body of scholarship discussed further in the third chapter of the present study, the contributions of Los Angeles’s housers and urban planners to the IFHTP have yet to be fully taken into account.

Finally, not to be lost in this transnational housing history are the pivotal roles played by women like Catherine Bauer or the little-known photographer, Esther Lewittes Mipaas. Historians Clare Midgley, Alison Twells, and Julie Carlier set out the stakes of a gender-focused rereading of history in their proposal for a “rehabilitation of biography, memoir and family archives” as “a corrective both to inward-looking nation-based studies of women’s lives and to ‘grand narratives’ of globalization which, in their focus on ‘macro’ levels of analysis, lose sight of the grounded ‘micro’ realities of everyday lives and of the role of human agency in affecting change.” While women like Bauer have long been recognized as agents of housing reform, a return to archives and specifically to photographs, as further studies by Sigrid Lien and Bettina Gockel show, is indeed in order. It is here that this study begins.

**THE SCOPE AND APPROACH OF THIS STUDY**

The present investigation situates itself within this growing body of research on historical photographic practices, their material and social conditions, and their transnational dimensions. It brings together original readings of largely
obscure portions of the photographic archive produced in connection with the Los Angeles public housing effort in its first decade with such materials as Catherine Bauer’s comments on photography in her unpublished correspondence, the Housing Authority’s Los Angeles Housing News, and the unsuccessful Guggenheim Fellowship application of photographer Louis Clyde Stoumen. Articles and photographs from periodicals including the National Association of Housing Officials’ Journal of Housing, the magazine California Arts and Architecture (renamed Arts and Architecture in 1944), and House Beautiful further inform its historical-contextual approach. Digitized material from the 1940s available on ProQuest and in the HathiTrust and Archive.org online collections helped bring to the fore the obscure initiatives of collecting photographs for the Housing Study Guild’s library, Los Angeles’s engagement with the IFHTP, the American Institute of Graphic Arts’ exhibition of housing reports in New York, and the introduction of Kodachrome to the classroom.

The photographers who contributed to the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s collection remain the subjects of precious few studies. The Los Angeles City Directory and United States Census helped establish biographical details for photographers Arthur Luckhaus and Bob Plunkett. Interviews and correspondence with Judith Hibbard-Mipaas and Debra Mipos provided an illuminating oral history of the photographer Esther Lewittes Mipaas and opened her private archive for the first time ever to research. In the final stages of this project, the Federal Archives and Records Administration scanned and released over four hundred pages collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on Esther Lewittes Mipaas.

The scope of this study was largely determined by the objects in the collections and gaps in research. As fascinating as the photographer Leonard Nadel’s practice of the late 1940s and early 1950s has proven to scholars and as much as Don Normark’s 1999 publication of his 1949 photographs of Chávez Ravine has garnered public attention, the research presented here focuses instead on the work of photographers less studied for their connections with the Housing Authority’s photographic project.58 The study thus spans photographs made in the decade between 1938 and 1948, with a few earlier and later photographs from Catherine Bauer’s collection, and a brief analysis of some of the photographers’ work from their post-Housing Authority years.

Given the sheer volume of the materials consulted, this book leaves several narratives to future scholarship. It analyzes photographs of the work of other local authorities and the Farm Security Administration, but more geographically diverse and rigorous comparisons of housing photographs in terms of image content and style or “visual conventions,” as historian of urban planning
Steven Moga has called for, are in order.59 In this same vein, a comparison of the housing movement’s photography with contemporary painting and sculpture promises a greater understanding of the effects of social movements on the fine arts in this era. The archival and institutional connections charted below ideally pave the way for these more detailed investigations.

Finally, in centering on practices, this study also deemphasizes the historical role of photographic genres and “categories,” to borrow a term from Elizabeth Edwards.60 It does not seek to bring housing photographs into dialogue with the vast body of research on architectural photography, for instance.61 Nor does it gather up the scattered archive of aerial photographs or films that figured in the Housing Authority’s work. Offering rich areas of research, these topics are too extensive to be sufficiently incorporated here. The same claim applies to recent approaches to photography from the perspectives of affect, emotion, and memory. These emphases promise enlightening new inroads into photographs of housing as photographs of communities and homes.62 But this study leaves these avenues to be pursued by future scholars with the hope that the present research offers sound yet nuanced foundations.

RELEVANCE

The question of how photography might contribute to efforts to house a growing and moving population remains highly relevant today as climate change and conflicts force entire regions of people from their homes. Amid the torrent of challenges facing these people is that of finding adequate, affordable shelter. The situation is markedly different from that of Los Angeles in the 1940s, but many of the solutions presented by architects and planners resonate with past experiences in providing affordable, modern housing for the masses. For instance, starting around 2015, the city of Hannover, Germany, converted sports halls into emergency housing for newly-arrived people and constructed new dwellings on undeveloped land.63 Criticism of these solutions likewise resonates with that of public housing in the past. In 2016, one journalist criticized the spatially and socially isolating yard-oriented layout, communal school, and clinic in a project in Ter Apel in the Netherlands.64 The same journalist saw better solutions in architect Jörg Friedrich and his students’ designs for houses that allow migrants to live in close proximity with the rest of the local community in Hannover.65 Strongly opposed to the use of metal containers in fenced-off yards on the edges of German cities, Friedrich and his students advocated social integration through architectural design by building “on top of,” “in,” “between,” “mobile,” and “new,” to name the techniques according to which they organized
their designs. In 2015, the group published digital collages illustrating these concepts in a book, *Refugees Welcome: Konzepte für eine menschenwürdige Architektur* (Refugees Welcome: Concepts for a Humane Architecture), together with a photoessay depicting current housing in the region, co-authored by the editors and the photographer Klaus Frahm (fig. 2). Their chapter is yet another in the history of housing as a humane and humanistic endeavor—their photographs a reminder of our accountability.

**THE STRUCTURE OF THIS STUDY**

The first chapter of this study analyzes the precedents, motivations, and afterlives of the Housing Authority’s first photographic collection-building initiatives. It presents several case studies, including a 1940 Work Projects Administration survey, a “Slum Photo Contest” from the same year, and more recent library blogs and digitization projects. In tracing the afterlives of these photographs, this chapter investigates how the current geographic locations and institutional contexts of photographic objects lend insight into the ways in which they performed and continue to perform their political, social, and cultural work.

The second chapter examines the photographic surveys conducted by Luckhaus Studio in 1941 and 1942. Focusing on Luckhaus Studio’s photographs
of the construction of the Pueblo del Río housing project, it analyzes the contributions of the Second World War and Luckhaus Studio to the shaping of the Housing Authority’s public image. How did the public housing movement position itself as a war “front”? And how did Luckhaus’s photography studio interpret this position visually and formally? Taking up Tom Allbeson and Pippa Oldfield’s concept of a “war photography complex,” this chapter invites a reconsideration of Luckhaus Studio’s photographs in the Housing Authority’s collection as not simply housing or survey photography, but war photography drawing on a transnational history of photography dating to the First World War.68

Turning from war photography to report and exhibit design, the third chapter charts the circulation of housing photographs in the 1940s. Following the movements of these photographs and the imperatives for their movements as voiced in newspapers and private correspondence, it details shifts in the meaning of these exchanges and the responses they elicited from designers. Presented here are several obscure yet important episodes in Los Angeles’s transnational housing history, from an avid campaign to bring the IFHTP congress to the city for the 1932 Olympics, to the Telesis exhibition at the Los Angeles County Museum in 1941, to competitions for reports, and finally to Catherine Bauer’s 1947 campaign to collect and send US housing “materials” to housers abroad. In examining these cases as context for the Housing Authority’s creation of a panel exhibit from the pages of its 1945 annual report, this chapter explains how photographic practices accommodated institutional pressures and pragmatic concerns to create and circulate an image of housing work that was attractive but not wasteful in the eyes of increasingly conservative postwar audiences.

Continuing with the theme of photography as a pragmatic medium, the fourth chapter looks to the only historical color photographs of Los Angeles public housing discovered in the course of this research. Taken almost certainly by Catherine Bauer on her visits to Los Angeles in 1942 and 1950, these 35-millimeter Kodachrome transparencies raise questions about the meaning of color in housing design and display. Comparing Bauer’s practice of making and using color slides from 1942 to the postwar years with contemporary uses of Kodachrome in American classrooms and as part of “good neighbor” politics abroad, this chapter posits Bauer’s color photographic practice as a pragmatic and politically-conscious effort to bring international experience in housing design before US audiences.

Finally, the fifth chapter of this study turns to the diverse practices of the photographers themselves to show how housing photographs created meaning for audiences beyond the observers of the housing movement. Taking photographer Blake Stimson’s and historian Don Parson’s observations on the period
as a point of departure, it examines the practices of Esther Lewittes Mipaaas and Louis Clyde Stoumen alongside histories of postwar race relations and "One Worldism" to ask how housing’s photographers pictured housing as "home."
The photographs created for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles operate within historical investigations conducted over the past three decades in a variety of ways. Adopting perspectives ranging from those of the history of urban planning to the history of public health, much of this scholarship reads these photographs as records of public housing’s promotional endeavors or as evidence arguing for immediate elimination of areas of “substandard” housing, more commonly referred to as “slums.” Few studies of the Housing Authority’s photographs investigate their status as objects in archives and collections today, much less consider the formation of these collections as additional “layers” in the history of housing and its photography.¹

Building on recent scholarship about collections in photohistory, this chapter presents the utterly obscure photographic initiatives of the Housing Authority in its early years as instances of collection building that centered on contemporary notions of photographs as knowledge-carriers critical to the establishment of new housing groups as authorities in a new field.² As Maren Stange illustrates with the example of Jacob Riis’s photographs for Lawrence Veiller’s Charity Organization Society and its Tenement House Exhibition of 1900, “[p]hotography, uniquely documentary and mass reproducible, became particularly useful to reformers intent on communicating a worldview that stressed their expertise and organization,” especially at a time when housing work was still an emerging field of social science.³ As Elizabeth Bloom Avery further argues in her study of housing photographs from the 1930s, housers persisted in calling on the “appearance of objectivity” and a public belief in the “purportedly inherent realism or truthfulness” of photography.⁴ More recent research on photography considers an additional dimension: as Kelley Wilder and Gregg Mitman note in the introduction to their edited volume on photographic collections, much can
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be learned about how photographs claim their “evidentiary weight” from a study of their “abundance.”

This chapter takes projects conducted by housing professionals to amass photographs as its point of departure. It follows photographs submitted to a 1940 photography competition from their publication in a newspaper to their application in an official report to the digitization of the winning photograph. Although historians of the Housing Authority and its photography also begin their studies with sections on the defining and surveying of Los Angeles’s older, lower-income neighborhoods, on a fundamental level, this investigation goes beyond this previous scholarship by closely analyzing a greater variety of photographic objects connected with these endeavors and considering their dispersed geographic and institutional locations as part of their histories. It likewise considers how the instrumentality of these objects as parts of civic collections may remain in many ways remarkably unchanged. Scholarship on photographic collections and cataloguing has demonstrated how photographs can contribute to the perceived value of museum and library collections and the cultural prestige of the regions in which they are located. In light of more recent museum initiatives to situate the Los Angeles region as a globally-networked cultural center, a closer investigation into forgotten examples of what photohistorian Kelley Wilder terms “collecting practices” shows how photographs have long connected local efforts with broader histories of housing, architecture, and art.

PHOTOGRAPHS AS DOCUMENTS, COLLECTIONS AS HISTORY

The little research on practices of assembling photographic collections in connection with public housing history shows that the much of the work happened at the local level. In her study of photographs made in support of public housing policy during the formative New Deal years of the United States Housing Authority (USHA), Elizabeth Bloom Avery notes that the lack of a central archive of these photographs was a result of the USHA’s strategy of decentralizing photographic making similar to the way it encouraged public housing construction as a local initiative. Established with the National Housing Act in 1937, under this law the USHA could not itself build public housing, as Avery indicates. It could simply administer it. As Avery shows, the USHA negotiated its administrative role by encouraging local slum photography contests as well as administering slide lectures that local authorities could customize for their respective audiences. This bureaucratic organization resulted in a rich and dispersed
production of housing photographs—an abundance of local activity that was influenced, but not controlled, by a central federal agency.

This focus on local housing in the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s photographs has captured the attention of scholars seeking to understand the intricate relationships between photography, regional identity, and history. One of the earliest studies to consider the Housing Authority’s photographs, Sophie Spalding’s “The Myth of the Classic Slum: Contradictory Perceptions of Boyle Heights Flats, 1900–1991” weighs the evidentiary claims of Housing Authority photographs from the 1940s against “oral history” and “written history” gathered by a contemporary sociology student as well as in later interviews by the author with local residents of the neighborhoods near where the Los Angeles public housing project, Aliso Village, stood in the early 1990s. The study likewise examines the Progressive-era efforts of the Housing Authority’s predecessor, the Los Angeles Housing Commission, and the Authority’s own efforts with the Housing Survey of 1940 to assert that slums in Los Angeles were structurally different from the multi-storied tenement houses in New York, but no less bad.12 Spalding views Leonard Nadel’s 1940s photographs for the Housing Authority as an attempt to advance this thesis, describing their function as “not to record the complicated nuances of life including the compensations of solidarity and self-help in The Flats and other poor neighborhoods, but rather to depict, in the most poignant and unambiguous terms, the hopelessness and anomie of the stereotypical slum.”13 Photographs do not show history, Spalding’s study implies, any more than housing conditions reflected the moral condition of a community. And yet, Nadel’s photographs presented views that were remarkably similar to those Spalding saw while driving around the neighborhoods in the early 1990s. “At the end of the twentieth century, as at its beginning,” Spalding concludes, “The Flats confound us with the paradox of dereliction and community, anguish and pride.”14 Thus illustrating how photography formed just one view among several in the history of this neighborhood, Spalding demonstrates how it complicates oral and textual histories while inviting a reflection on urban change (or lack thereof) in the present.15

Historian of urban planning Steven Moga picked up this line of inquiry in 1999 when he researched and compiled a “context statement” for the Housing Authority’s photographic collection at the Los Angeles Public Library. Focusing again on Leonard Nadel’s photographs of the so-called slums, Moga’s study revisits Spalding’s observations on the photographs as evidence of an institutional endeavor. Whereas Spalding writes that Nadel “was sent into The Flats and other local ‘slum’ neighborhoods, from Watts to Chávez Ravine, to ‘document’ the case for public housing,” Moga brings this implied thesis to a point in his
distinction between the photographs’ claims to “show the history of people and their communities” and their attempts to “record the activities of a government agency.” Writing from a perspective outside the history of art and photography, Moga offers remarkable insights into the status of these photographs as documents, especially in his acknowledgement of the usefulness of the photographs to historians today in their presentation of “information about people, places, and events that may not be recorded elsewhere.” But most compelling for Moga is the photographs’ function as part of the Housing Authority’s public relations program, specifically in their reproduction in the Authority’s 1945 annual report. In keeping with the notion of the photographs as records of a publicity effort, Moga offers the compelling suggestion that one might study these photographs to gain a better understanding of the “visual conventions in the photography of housing and neighborhoods.” How, Moga asks, might these photographs compare with those of “other similar projects”? What might one learn in tracing visual conventions from archive to archive, from local housing authority to local housing authority? How might one better fathom the national and transnational dimensions of the public housing movement by not just tracing the movements of photographs as objects, but by studying their motifs, their conventions, their style?

Published one year after Moga’s completion of his study, Dana Cuff’s *The Provisional City: Los Angeles Stories of Architecture and Urbanism* provides historical background to some of these questions in its presentation of a wealth of primary sources on the construction of public housing in Los Angeles. Among these are the diary of a schoolteacher who watched from her classroom window as the Housing Authority completed Aliso Village in 1942 and an interview between Cuff and a former student of the same school who continued to live in the neighborhood after the construction of public housing there in the 1950s. The sensitivity of Cuff’s study to these personal histories is complemented by reproductions of photographs of older neighborhoods and new public housing from reports and archives, including the Housing Authority’s now inaccessible collection. In a related article, Cuff studies the presence of residents in photographs of The Flats to fill a gap in records of a 1940 appraisal of the neighborhood. How did these people respond to the inventory and assessment of their homes? For Cuff, the photographs and diaries record the reactions evoked by these encounters that survey results and news articles tend to omit.

In short, photography for Cuff offers a documentation of both the photographic methods of the survey but also its immediate social effects. And like the scholars before her, Cuff does not hesitate to acknowledge photography’s complicity in defining and condemning the slums. The modern housing that
was to replace the slums “was as clean, efficient, and rational as the domestic life it was intended to shape,” writes Cuff. Yet, as she also acknowledges, several photographs from the assessment survey of The Flats show houses that fit these criteria. These houses were hardly substandard according to our eyes today, she concedes, but simply old and in mixed-use neighborhoods and hence “slum houses” according to the definition constructed and wielded in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Cuff recounts showing the appraisal photographs to Frank Wilkinson, the Housing Authority’s former assistant to the director, in 1997. Wilkinson, then eighty-two years old, could not recall the structures, but noted that they probably warranted relocation rather than demolition. Writing from the perspective of a history of architecture and urban planning, Cuff concludes that “it is clear that the interpretation of older buildings has changed.” But as Cuff’s study also suggests, the interpretation of photographs as documents of building conditions and neighborhood characteristics seems to have changed, as well.

Poet and essayist Susan Briante subjects Leonard Nadel’s photographs of The Flats and Aliso Village in the 1940s to similar scrutiny in her 2010 article, “Utopia’s Ruins: Seeing Domesticity and Decay in the Aliso Village Housing Project.” The investigation compares Nadel’s work with art photographer Anthony Hernandez’s color photographic prints of the interiors of the vacated Aliso Village units made in 1999 just prior to Aliso Village’s demolition. Here, Briante likens the fate of Aliso Village to that of the slum that it originally displaced, pointing to how in both instances the city received federal dollars for the new construction projects. In both instances, Briante interprets the housing slated for destruction in the photographs as bearing signs of age—of “ruin”—but also as begging the question of whether the homes could have been renovated rather than torn down. Looking at Anthony Hernandez’s more recent color photographs, Briante regards them as “an archive that humanizes,” as images in which “ruin becomes dwelling,” and as a call to redress the processes by which Los Angeles’s poorer neighborhoods are utterly and irrevocably transformed. “Before such evidence we might consider the negative effects of development and displacement; we might consider the possibility for reassessment, relationship, and actual renewal,” she concludes her essay, proffering the claims to evidence of these art photographs as deserving of the same serious consideration that Leonard Nadel’s photographs allegedly received long ago. Briante thus subtly offers up the boundaries between Nadel’s social documentary project and Hernandez’s socially-conscious art photography as open for renegotiation. Both practices present visual evidence about Los Angeles’s neighborhoods—evidence which Briante reads as not of buildings, but of the lives of the people who inhabit them.
As a more recent viewer to assess Nadel’s photographs of Los Angeles’s slums, geographer Stefano Bloch similarly understands these objects as records, but also views photography more generally “as a practical tool in teaching and as a centerpiece around which scholars and students can discuss the morphology of Los Angeles’s socio-spatial environment and political landscape.” Similar to historian of urban planning Robert Freestone’s article, “The Exhibition as a Lens for Planning History” (discussed in the third chapter in this study), Bloch’s research presents photography as a record deserving of critical investigation. Again, of particular importance to Bloch is Nadel’s position in the controversy of slum clearance. Like Spalding’s reading of the pre-World War II reports, Briante’s comparison of Nadel’s photographs of slums with Hernandez’s of public housing just prior to demolition, and Cuff’s reading of the photographs taken during the assessment of The Flats, Bloch’s analysis reveals Nadel’s project to be fundamentally problematic in its complicity in the eviction of families from their homes to make way for a project that ultimately failed. But Bloch also goes one step further to connect this history with the dearth of scholarship on Nadel: the controversial nature of the slum clearance he photographed, Bloch suggests, has impeded Nadel’s inclusion “on the list of great social reformist photographers such as Jacob Riis.” Although Bloch does not pursue this hypothesis further, it offers occasion to consider the entanglement of the afterlives of Nadel’s photographs with not only the subsequent history of public housing, but also that of the institutions of art and culture which define and promote photographic “greatness.”

Recent research in the history of photography offers productive approaches to studying photographs in archives and collections. The exhibition _Subjective Objective: A Century of Social Photography_ (Zimmerli Art Museum, 2017–2018) and others have encouraged examination of the discrete historical and often “networked” processes involving makers, viewers, collectors, and institutions that define such photographic “categories” as the “document” or “documentary.” Kelley Wilder and Gregg Mitman’s call for photohistorians to look away from Dorothea Lange’s _Migrant Mother_ to the vast production of the Farm Security Administration and the “long tradition of the social science survey” of which it was a part invites a better way of understanding “the hybrid properties of photography and film as media of art, of science, and of their interrelationship.” Looking at the photographs produced by the United States Housing Administration in the 1930s, Elizabeth Bloom Avery remarks on how the “decidedly unaesthetic” and “pictorially unremarkable” photographs that resulted from the pursuit of a scientific “appearance of objectivity” challenge historians who approach them with traditional art historical methods. Still, the solution
is not to do away completely with art historical approaches, but as Wilder and Mitman suggest and as Avery demonstrates, to look to a “mixture of methods and crossing of boundaries across the fields of photographic and film history, visual anthropology and science and technology studies.”

Even with an art historical approach, such boundary crossing introduces new narratives. For instance, in his art historical investigation of the graphic and photographic production of three surveys sponsored by the United States government in the second half of the nineteenth century, Robin Kelsey makes a compelling case for an “archive style” by examining how the hired photographers often approached the problems presented by survey assignments in ways that reflected personal and social concerns. Although his analysis tends to avoid the word “document” in its discussion of individual photographs, Kelsey nonetheless suggests that these entire projects constitute documents in the history of photography: “the archives document their [the photographers’ illustrators’, N.K.O.] economic plight,” he writes of the clues left in the archives regarding the roles of the photographers and graphic artists in making them. Such readings based in individual images certainly risk bringing these images to the surface of the archive when they in fact might not have stood out in their time. Nonetheless, in its firm grounding in the graphic objects and their historical circumstances, Kelsey’s study presents a method that ultimately challenges the categories of art and survey photography while also offering a more critical perspective on how these archives have since operated for historians of art.

Finally, not to be forgotten among the strengths of these new approaches is their invitation to historians to consider local documenting practices within greater geographic networks. In American Photography: Local and Global Contexts, Bettina Gockel traces appearances of ears of corn in photographs from the nineteenth century to photographs taken of President Barack Obama’s 2012 campaign as signs of the enduring “usefulness” of photography “as a medium of social and political content as well as of patriotic motives.” This reading of a visual motif, as Gockel further demonstrates, urges an understanding of the photographic medium that extends beyond America’s borders to a global context with which America, not least through its corn exports, was and remains inextricably interlinked.

Following Gockel’s and Wilder’s examples, a reconsideration of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s photographic production as part of a longer history of picturing homes of low-income workers for viewers situated far beyond the city limits is in order. Whereas Kelsey offers examples of understanding the function of the archive as a determinant of style and Edwards impels an understanding of the historical mutability of photographic collections’ meanings and
functions, the present approach to the scattered Los Angeles collection ultimately places greater emphasis on the connection of photographic content to place as a criterium in early collection building. This specificity, as will now be shown, corresponded to a usefulness of housing photography to a variety of viewers up until the present.

THE LIBRARY OF THE HOUSING STUDY GUILD

The photographs in the library of the New York-based pro-housing group, the Housing Study Guild, offer a point of departure for understanding how the histories of photographic collections afford greater insight into the role of photography in promoting public housing policy. The Housing Study Guild and its effort to build a library offer a direct point of comparison to the collecting of photographs connected to the housing initiatives in the years that followed.

One of the important figures in the history of the Housing Study Guild’s library was Catherine Bauer. Bauer started her career in 1930 when she attended the Frankfurter Kurse für neues Bauen led by the architect and Frankfurt’s director of building, Ernst May. Bauer then submitted an article on the social housing she saw at Frankfurt to a contest at Fortune magazine and won. Declaredly stopping short of suggesting a US public housing program, her prize-winning essay nonetheless boldly criticized what she perceived as the United States’ general dislike of modern, economical rowhouse architecture such as that developed by Ernst May in Römerstadt. As historian of architecture Taina Marjatta Rikala observes, this 1931 article “attracted national attention” to Bauer, who was then twenty-six years old, “and secured her identity as expert on European housing matters.” Bauer took her career a step further with the publication of her book Modern Housing in 1934. Reprinted in London the following year, the book brought Bauer international attention in its overview of housing history from the English garden city movement to the modernist housing projects of the 1920s in Germany. But it also set her the challenge of realizing a public housing program for the United States—a challenge which she would meet first in her rallying of labor groups behind the housing bill that would eventually become the Housing Act of 1937, but also a challenge with which she would continue to grapple as a researcher and lecturer for the rest of her life.

More celebrated for her influence on housing policy and research, Catherine Bauer’s role as a maker, collector, and exhibitor of photographs often goes over-
looked. Offering a notable exception to this tendency, historian Daniel T. Rodgers remarks on how Bauer’s photographs from her trip to Europe in 1930 and a subsequent trip in 1932 “formed the backbone of social modernism’s first American exhibits,” which included, among others, Henry Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson’s landmark 1932 *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition* at the Museum of Modern Art in New York.56 Bauer’s biographers H. Peter Oberlander and Eva Newbrun similarly note that photographs from Bauer’s collection “were displayed in 1933 in Housing Study Guild’s library” and reprinted in books on housing-related topics.57 Still, despite the preservation and public accessibility of Bauer’s photographs at the Bancroft Library and Environmental Design Archives at the University of California, Berkeley, historians of art, architecture, and photography have yet to investigate this foundational collection.

Bauer’s boxes of photographs and personal papers suggest that photography was indispensable in her early housing work. Of the photographs reproduced in her book *Modern Housing*, for instance, Bauer explained to Lovell Thompson at Houghton Mifflin that they “tell the whole story by themselves [...].”58 She worked closely with the designer Robert Josephy in creating the layouts of the book’s alpha-numerically-arranged plates to ensure the photographs’ visibility and clarity of meaning.59 On “the matter of bleeding at the side,” Bauer wrote to Thompson,

“I favor it (although admitting that in so far as L’Art pour l’Art is concerned, his [Josephy’s, N.K.O.] layout is probably better, bleeding only at the top) because it would tend to make each page a distinct unit, which is as should be in so far as the sense is concerned, and because my way the pictures would be readily visible to anyone thumbing carelessly or hastily through the book. [...] I have made some paste-ups of both his layout and my own [...].”60

These pragmatic concerns are further evident in Bauer’s consideration of one photograph for the book’s dustjacket: it “would be effective if a trifle mystifying,” she writes.61 However banal, Bauer’s deliberations posited her photographs as tools which, when wielded right, fulfilled purposes of scholarly research and promotion.

Bauer’s work with photography extended to her organization of research libraries for housing groups, as well. Starting in 1932, she played a central role in acquiring materials for the library of another New York-centered group—the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA). Bauer served as the RPAA’s Executive Secretary, working alongside the historian Lewis Mumford and urban planner Clarence Stein.62 As communicated to the RPAA by Secretary Mumford,
in 1932, one of Bauer’s projects for that year was the gathering of “material on regionalism and related subjects” from the RPAA’s members, including “any article, report or pamphlet which seems [...] of real interest in this connection.”63 “Regionalism,” which Mumford championed as “a method of enforcing the political principle of States Rights by building regions and regional cities, capable of working, living, thinking, acting for themselves,” was indeed a subject related to but much broader than public housing.64 The membership of the RPAA and a newer housing-focused group, the Housing Study Guild, soon overlapped, as did the two groups’ practices of pooling the resources from members’ private libraries for the reference of the greater membership and the public.65

BUILDING A LIBRARY, FORMING A FIELD OF RESEARCH

Founded in 1933 by a group of architects and urban planners that included Carol Aronovici, Albert Mayer, Lewis Mumford, Henry Wright, and Henry Churchill, the Housing Study Guild maintained a favorably-located space at 101 Park Avenue in New York with the express goal of positioning housing issues as matters of public concern.66 The group received funding from the New York Housing Association and the Lavanburg Foundation, then administering a building of low-income housing units in New York City, and used these funds to offer classes on housing topics as well as coordinate the publication of housing literature.67

Among this literature was the Housing Study Guild’s bulletin, which Samuel Ratensky, a former student of Frank Lloyd Wright and current secretary of the Guild, regarded in 1934 as “the record of our activities and the mouthpiece for the social orientation which we, as a group, are slowly achieving.”68 For members of the Guild, this “social orientation” was as much about winning contracts as it was about positioning themselves as housing experts. This orientation was pervasive. Architects working during the 1930s in the Western region of the Resettlement Administration, for instance, later recounted their formation of the socially-minded San Francisco Telesis group as born of their admiration for the way a similar group in Switzerland was beating out more inveterate architects in national competitions.69 Following the passage of the 1937 Housing Act, Bauer herself published an article in Architectural Forum notifying its readers that public housing “is here to stay, come boom or depression” and that twenty-three million dollars of the USHA’s budget of eight hundred million were presently earmarked for “architectural services.”70 Similarly, in 1934 the members of the Guild saw little contradiction in working for the public good and getting paid for it. As Ratensky wrote to Catherine Bauer of the
Housing Study Guild’s bulletin, “it’s selling handsomely and I think that proves there’s a big housing market.”

The Housing Study Guild studied this market avidly. Founder Carol Aronovici described one of the Guild’s primary tasks as “the assembling of basic data necessary for the study of technical, social and economic problems connected with large scale housing and community planning.” Guild members gathered much of this “basic data” by conducting highly detailed surveys around New York. This concern with current field research further prompted the formation of a small library dedicated to international topics in housing research and design to which Catherine Bauer contributed a sizable portion of her personal collection of housing photographs in 1934.

Bauer’s loan was a windfall for the Guild. With photographic prints and postcards showing housing, community facilities, and aerial views of new developments from across Germany but also other places in Northern and Western Europe, the loan consisted of many images that Bauer acquired in the course of her research that resulted in her recent book, Modern Housing. Many of these photographs were quite possibly otherwise unavailable in the United States. During the time that the Guild acted as the custodian of this collection, it thus strove to circulate its objects among its members and the patrons of its library with great care that they be returned. The photographs that the Guild eventually returned to Bauer exhibit marks of the Guild’s library administration. Stamps on photographs bear the Guild’s name and address and provide places to pencil-in file numbers. Another stamp commands the reader to “Return to Catherine Bauer.”

The loan and circulation of Bauer’s photographs aligned with the Guild’s mission of making housing materials available to a greater public. The Guild regularly added new literature to its holdings and published the titles in its library in a list that was sent to the New York Public Library two blocks away. One early project at the Guild involved expanding the 1935 bibliography of housing literature as compiled by another young organization, the National Association of Housing Officials. The Guild also translated housing literature into English, thereby making such material as abstracts from international conferences available to a larger readership.

These activities surrounding the administration of the Guild’s library were further shaped by the Guild’s creation and circulation of housing exhibits. Exhibits offered a way for the Guild to publicize its research as well as position itself as a contributor to this emerging international field more recently analyzed by Phillip Wagner in his study of the “internationalization” of city planning. Such exhibits were also shown to political ends. Bauer, for example,
rented a Housing Study Guild exhibit to show at a meeting in 1935 of the Labor Housing Conference and the American Federation of Labor in Atlantic City. A second audience of the Guild’s exhibits was made up of students. In the spring of 1935, the Guild loaned one exhibit of a reported “twenty-two photographic posters and illustrated charts” to Columbia University for display in Avery Hall. As one student wrote in the college newspaper, the exhibit offered startling statistics gathered from a 1934 survey conducted by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in which enumerators tabulated information for homes across the country including the number of rooms, the presence of stoves, toilets, and showers or tubs, and whether the dwelling was “in need of minor repairs,” “in need of major repairs,” or “unfit for use.” In addition to remarking on these statistics, the student commented on three posters in the exhibit making up a section titled “The Unplanned City: what it is and what it does.” “The conollaries [sic] of the unplanned city, delinquency, fire hazards, overcrowding, human waste, ugliness, accidents and disease hazards, are fully and strikingly illustrated,” the student reported. A second reviewer, although failing to comment on the visual elements of a once again “striking” and this time “effective” exhibit, nonetheless expressed confidence in its veracity: “Propaganda? Maybe—but try to disprove it.”

“OUR CHAIN OF PHOTOGRAPHS OF HOUSING THROUGHOUT THE WORLD”

The Housing Study Guild—and Catherine Bauer specifically—soon earned a reputation for their skills in exhibit design. In the spring of 1934, just around the time Bauer began calling on labor support for public housing at the Labor Housing Conference in Philadelphia, Samuel Ratensky wrote to her to say that the Guild had “inaugurated a study of exhibit methodology” and that he hoped to speak to Bauer about the project as well as view any relevant “material” in her personal collection. Bauer responded by sending the requested “material,” which Ratensky soon assured her was being cataloged and “stamped with your [her, N.K.O.] name.” A few months later, Ratensky wrote to Bauer again, only this time describing a project for the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians—an organization largely responsible for ensuring regional minimum wages for employees of the Public Works Administration. The project entailed “the production of a series of photographs and drawings and posters telling the housing story with good swift virile propaganda, without text, (for publication in book form 8 ½ × 11),” as Ratensky described it, adding that he hoped to discuss the project with Bauer, “since I think that’s up your alley.”
In August of 1934, two months after the accession of Bauer’s collection, Ratensky found himself approaching Bauer, again. The Guild had depleted the funds in its endowment, but still had several employees on its payroll and its Park Avenue facilities. These facilities, Ratensky reminded Bauer, housed “a Library, Reference File and the beginnings of a Technique that must not be disintegrated” (capitalization in original). For Ratensky, at stake in the preserved integrity of its library was not so much the continuation of housing study as it was the Guild’s chance to make better housing a part of US law: “If Government policy has put us among the ranks of the visionaries and idealists,” Ratensky wrote, “we must continue as an organization to the end of transforming that ideal into a direct political challenge.”

Ratensky’s desideratum and the ensuing action to save the Housing Study Guild Library from disintegration are indicative of the meaning the library and its contents held for the Guild. Work on the library’s catalogue continued after Ratensky announced the impending financial crisis to the Guild’s members and friends. A representative from the Guild, Theodore Jacobs, wrote to Catherine Bauer in March of 1935 with a list of nineteen of her photographs that the Guild still had on loan from her. Although brief, the descriptions of the photographs, much like Bauer’s collections presently housed in the archives at the University of California, Berkeley, offer a prodigious geographic overview of housing developments in Europe until that time. Photographic content ranged from the by then famous Römerstadt to developments from Leningrad to Zurich and Berlin to Bournville. The list also included a view of one of the courts in Henry Wright and Clarence Stein’s own Sunnyside development in the New York borough of Queens. Jacobs’s letter to Bauer echoed Ratensky’s desire to maintain the connections between the library’s parts in his evocation of the integral role Bauer’s photographs played in it: “They [the photographs, N.K.O.] are now being classified and when catalogued will form an important link in our chain of photographs of housing throughout the world.”

The ensuing history of the Housing Study Guild Library reveals its continued service to the housing movement as housing issues gained heightened attention from voters and policymakers. In the late months of 1935, the library was packed-up and moved from New York to the premises of the Suburban Resettlement Division of the Resettlement Administration in Washington, DC. Recently created by an executive order from President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Resettlement Administration had taken to task the rehousing of America’s rural and urban poor in new rural and suburban communities. The RA’s Suburban Division, under John Scott Lansill, would be responsible for the building of the United States’ first greenbelt towns. Some housers were skeptical of the
federal government’s building as “incidental to an emergency relief program” and the work of “temporary agencies,” as Alfred K. Stern wrote in the January 1936 issue of Survey Graphic. For other less skeptical colleagues in Bauer’s circle, however, this formation of the Resettlement Administration signaled a chance to make progress on the housing problem. Ratensky himself, for instance, began working at the RA’s Research Division while continuing with his Guild-related activities, the Guild’s library still close at hand.

The Resettlement Administration gave the Housing Study Guild’s library new purpose. The library continued to grow during the first year of the loan. It also soon became a classroom tool in a housing manager training program offered by the National Association of Public Housing Officials in the winter of 1935–1936. Alternately classified as an “emergency” but also a “pioneer” course, some housers were hopeful that the training, with its lessons in sociology and economics, might offer a blueprint for a related university curriculum. The Housing Study Guild’s library doubtlessly added to the scientific nature of the course and its attractiveness to universities who likewise sought to attract students aspiring to careers in this emerging field, and the RA extended the loan of the library multiple times, expanding its holdings and continuing to use them even at the end of the “planning period of Resettlement.”

In 1937, however, the question of where to house the library arose, again. Bauer suggested that the housing library be permanently moved to the Russell Sage Library in New York on the grounds that the Russell Sage Library’s holdings in the areas of economics and sociology would aid in the study of the housing library’s materials. Her priority, however, was that the housing library stayed current with the help of funds raised by either the Housing Study Guild (especially should the Guild hope to get the library back) or the Sage library, itself—that is, if the transfer remained permanent. It was not. The Guild transferred the library from the Resettlement Administration to the Russell Sage Foundation, which in turn gave it to the fledgling Federation Technical School, founded in 1936 by the same Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians regarding whose “propaganda” Ratensky had consulted Bauer. Housing matters formed an important part of the school’s curriculum. In 1937, the school offered a promising new home to the itinerant library in its newfound role in the housing classroom. Renamed the Henry Wright Memorial Library in honor of the recently deceased Guild founder and architect, the library of housing literature and photographs served the Federation Technical School’s students in New York for two years before the Guild presented the “more than 250 books, 500 photographs, and 7,000 architectural items on planning and housing” to the Avery Library at Columbia University.
Charting the history of the Housing Study Guild’s library offers invaluable insight into the functions it performed in the early years of a movement that would ultimately create the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles along with other local housing authorities across the United States. The paths of these photographs link collections in New York to those in Washington and connect efforts of private research groups with those of new federal agencies. The movements of these photographs especially as parts of larger libraries reflect in material and geographic terms the pressures of the 1930s economy and progressive ideals. The various showings and printings of the photographs, themselves, moreover, offer evidence of collaboration between private and public agencies marked by a shared and enduring faith in the photographs’ capacity to work alongside panels of housing statistics and within pages of planning research. Although often paling next to statistics or standing alone on pages with sparse captioning and not necessarily “telling the whole story by themselves,” the value of photographs of modern housing was confirmed in their continued circulation and their desirability, especially in the case of the Guild’s photographs at the Resettlement Administration.

The histories of such libraries also promise an enriched understanding of one of the most celebrated periods of photographic practice in the United States. In a letter dated from the summer of 1936, Ratensky reported to Bauer rather vaguely that “the library is being used by Management and other Divisions of Resettlement.” Which items in the library were being used? How? By whom? It is noteworthy that among the RA’s divisions were not only the Suburban Resettlement Division, responsible for building the United States’ greenbelt towns based on European garden city models, but also the group of photographers that included Dorothea Lange and Arthur Rothstein, headed by Roy E. Stryker at the Historical Section. What function might the Housing Study Guild Library and its photographs of international examples of modern housing have performed for these photographers—photographers whose work remains to this day highly visible in histories of the United States, the Depression years, and the history of photography? Such questions require a careful examination of photographic collections, the processes by which they are assembled or scattered, and the cultural work they continue to perform.
FROM THE “SLUM PHOTO CONTEST” TO THE REGIONAL COLLECTION

Returning to Theodore Jacobs’s metaphor of the “chain of photographs of housing throughout the world,” one cannot help but notice the invocation of geographic scope in his celebratory description of the Housing Study Guild Library. Housing in the mid-1930s, Jacobs seems to say, was a geographically far-reaching object of study. Jacobs’s metaphor of the chain is also noteworthy: the photographs of housing, his remark suggests, forge global connections in photographs compiled in a small Manhattan office far away from the offices of the mainly European architects and planners whose work the Guild followed with keen interest. Jacobs’s metaphor, in other words, casts housing as a transnational subject and ascribes a special role to photographic collections in articulating this geographic reach.

The scope of these collections of photographs of housing from the 1930s is easy to forget upon closer inspection of the first photographic projects of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles following its establishment in 1938. As Elizabeth Bloom Avery explains, housing reform continued largely on a regional basis following the passage of the Housing Act of 1937, with local authorities sponsoring amateur photography contests to encourage local citizens to seek out and photograph low-income housing conditions in their respective regions as well as evaluate others’ photographs displayed at their local libraries. In reference to an early contest sponsored by the Washington Housing Association, Avery also observes that the contest format “inexpensively provided the Association with photographs they could use in subsequent publications and exhibitions.” A closer look at the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s adoption of this practice of holding contests and circulating contest photographs reveals the stylistic breadth of the photographs it produced in the early years of the local public housing program. It also reveals the extent to which these early exercises in collection-building aided in housing research and promotion beyond the local region.

HOUSING SURVEY, 1940

The construction of public housing in Los Angeles following the establishment of the local authority in 1938 began with the collection of not photographs, but much needed “statistics,” as historian Don Parson observes, by means of a survey of the city’s housing conditions conducted by the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles together with the Work Projects Administration. The purpose
of this survey was to locate substandard housing in the city in a way that “would permit the U.S.H.A. to work on a scientific basis with the local Authority in the latter’s endeavor to rid our city of slums and to construct new, safe and sanitary housing in their place,” the Housing Authority and WPA later explained. As housing historian Gail Radford and others have noted, the 1937 Housing Act’s requirement for “equivalent elimination”—that is, the clearance of slums by the city roughly equivalent in size to planned public housing projects—was not part of the proposed housing bill, but a compromise on behalf of housing proponents to win conservative support. Equivalent elimination did not allow the government to increase the housing supply and in turn lower rents. It allowed housing authorities to modernize this supply. Yet, the slum clearance requirements, in contrast to the stringent rules for public housing construction, were rather lax. The number of demolished structures needed only to be about the same as the number of public housing units built, and, quite problematically for evicted residents who were promised new homes, the demolished slums did not need to be replaced by new buildings on the same site. Unlike the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s first project at Ramona Gardens, the sites for Pueblo del Rio, Aliso Village, William Mead Homes, Estrada Courts, and Rose Hill Courts were already built on when they were purchased for the public housing program. By the fourth year of its operations, the Housing Authority’s construction projects had forced the removal of sixteen hundred families, approximately twenty percent of whom owned their homes. When families resisted for financial reasons, the Housing Authority claimed to have extended aid. But following the start of the Second World War, the policy of slum clearance left many of these uprooted families fending for themselves. As the Housing Authority openly admitted in its annual report covering its activities from the summer of 1941 to the summer of 1942, “Under procedure forced by the war, only war workers are eligible for the new homes. Thus the former residents of the cleared land must wait until after the war when all the regular developments will be returned to their original low-income, slum clearance status.”

As Don Parson’s study deftly explains, the stakes in proving the presence of slums in Los Angeles at the end of the Depression decade were high. With the passage of the 1937 Housing Act, the United States Housing Authority set twenty-five million dollars aside for slum clearance and public housing construction in Los Angeles alone. To obtain these funds, the city needed to provide the USHA with evidence of the presence of slums and a plan for its local program that demonstrated support for the new local housing authority by the City
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Yet, as Parson also shows, this process was slowed by City Council members who insisted that the city was slum-free.124 One of the greatest challenges housing proponents perceived in making the slums visible to local voters and policymakers was the Southern California region’s own myth. As relayed by historians of the region, in the late 1930s Southern California business groups still circulated imagery inspired by that created in the booster decade of the 1920s to advertise the region as a tourist destination and health resort complete with miles of fragrant orange groves, warm sunshine, and affordable bungalows.125 Slums were simply not a part of this picture. In one of the earliest efforts to expose the presence of substandard housing in the city, the African American newspaper, the Sentinel, described this problem as a “theory that there are no slum areas in Los Angeles that need clearance.”126 At the root of this theory was a prevailing notion that slums were a problem unique to New York.127 In 1937, the Sentinel reminded readers that “poor housing can exist even where there are no tenements” and soon called on visual evidence in making this point.128 Now available only as a grainy scan from a microfilm, this image—almost certainly a reproduction of a photograph—shows a single house, the details of its condition now obscure (fig. 3). In 1938, however, the editors of the paper presumed that the visual details of this image and their meaning were clear in their designation of it a “picture of a home that is obviously unfit for human habitation.”129 The Sentinel published this photograph together with an editorial that explained how members of the City Council had failed to approve a budget of twenty-five thousand dollars for the planned housing survey needed by the Housing Authority and urged each reader to “phone, wire, or write his councilman and demand action.”130 Thus positioned as comprehensible evidence that a greater problem of slums existed in the vast reaches of the city, the image of the single abode reproduced in the Sentinel invokes notions of not only the news photograph, but also the social-scientific document.131 Such applications of photography in the news, and specifically the African American press, deserve further study as practices often forgotten in photography’s social history, but also as comparisons for the practices that soon followed.

The WPA enumerators finally took to the streets of Los Angeles’s neighborhoods in the spring of 1939 to commence work on what the Los Angeles Times called “the most intensive survey ever conducted in Los Angeles.”132 Covering an area of twenty-nine square miles bounded by “Hoover Street on the west, a line in extension of Fountain Avenue on the north, Indiana Street, extended, on the east, and the Vernon city limits and Jefferson Boulevard on the south,” the survey employed a total of 575 people to study maps from the Los Angeles Gas
and Electric Company, the Southern Counties Gas Company, the City Planning Commission, and the County Regional Planning Commission, and visit the areas to record the desired housing "data" using checklists.133

This WPA housing survey was critical for the Housing Authority in providing satisfactory evidence of slums that opened the door to the federal funding of ninety percent of public housing construction.134 The Housing Authority expressly wanted to survey the entire city to these ends, but financial constraints forced it to concentrate on “the oldest section of the city” and an area for which it hoped to compare current findings with those of the 1930 census.135 Whether a building was substandard was determined with regards to two categories. The first considered the physical structure of the building, including the state of repair, the presence of a private bath, “flush toilet,” “running water,” and whether the building was “equipped for lighting by either gas or electricity.”136 The second category considered the occupancy, including the number of persons per room and the number of families per unit, as well as the “rental value.”137 In the end, the surveyors found 58,709 (24 percent) of the units surveyed fulfilled either or both of these criteria.138

The Housing Authority had already begun to redress this lack of good affordable housing just one month prior with Ramona Gardens, the first public housing project constructed in the history of the city.139 The start of construction at Ramona Gardens was a celebratory affair: heralded by an announcement in the Los Angeles Times, the groundbreaking ceremony kicked-off on Saturday, March 16, 1940, at two o’clock in the afternoon with the pro-housing Citizens’ Housing Council President Monsignor Thomas J. O’Dwyer providing the invocation.140 The afternoon’s program included speeches by Mayor Fletcher L. Bowron and Governor of California Culbert L. Olson. The “Spanish Dancers” of the Catholic Welfare Bureau and the Musicians Protective Association #47 provided entertainment for the twelve hundred people who attended the ceremony.141 Those who could not attend were able to tune their radios to a live broadcast.142

With checklists, ceremonies, radio broadcasts, and announcements in the press, many of these initial activities surrounding the construction of public housing in Los Angeles were anything but dependent on photographs in the achievement of their respective aims. In an untitled memo composed prior to the publication of the final report, the Housing Authority anticipated that the WPA project would create jobs for “messengers, clerks, field workers and squad leaders,” but made no mention of photographers.143 This is noteworthy, especially because another WPA initiative happening in the region—the Federal Writers’ Project follow-up to its guidebook series with research on regional foods—produced a handful of photographs now in the collections of the Library
of Congress.¹⁴⁴ One such photograph showing men gathered near a mound of meat for the Los Angeles Sheriff’s barbecue uses a visual formula later taken up by the Housing Authority photographers after the war: the group portrait of people of diverse heritage, all working together toward a shared aim (fig. 4).¹⁴⁵

With photographers in its employ who could capture these portraits of Los Angeles’s residents, the question of why no known records suggest that the city sent a photographer door to door with the WPA survey’s enumerators as it would in an appraisal survey of the future site of Aliso Village later that year remains puzzling, but also a reminder that not all surveys were necessarily photographic, nor photography a ubiquitous tool of housing work.¹⁴⁶

In the late spring of 1940, the Housing Authority and the WPA published their final report, Housing Survey Covering Portions of the City of Los Angeles, California, with only two pages of photographs. One, titled “Types of Residential Structures,” offered illustrations for the “definitions” of the different residence
“types” outlined on the previous pages (fig. 5). By no means distinguishing between “good” and “bad” structures, these “types” established categories for all housing, whether standard or substandard. Structures range from “single family detached” to “apartment,” according to the captions, and architectural styles from the so-called “Spanish Colonial Revival” style to a more sparsely decorated modern architecture. The symmetrical arrangement of the photographs on the page at various angles as opposed to the more rigid structure of the grid suppresses any invitation to comparison among these types while at

5) Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Work Projects Administration, and A.E. Williamson, Housing Survey Covering Portions of the City of Los Angeles, California, vol. 1 (Los Angeles: Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, April 1940), n.p., Oakland Public Library, Oakland History Room.
the same time distancing the project from more celebrated forms of modernism, including the grilles developed by the international group of architects at the Congrès internationaux d'architecture moderne. Indeed, much might be read into this small collection of photographs in its strange combination of the formal characteristics of the amateur album page with a scientific evocation of categories and types. But such a reading would miss some of the most important questions this page raises about how and why the Housing Authority collected or commissioned these few photographs in the first place.

To think of the Housing Authority’s photographs as a collection-building project is also problematic because nowhere in the Authority’s publicly accessible literature from the late 1930s and early 1940s is any reference made to their administration of a centralized collection of photographs. Quite similar to the earlier practice of the Housing Study Guild and the Suburban Division of the Resettlement Administration, the Housing Authority began to operate an office library at as late a date as 1947, occasionally publishing the titles of accessioned books in its monthly newsletter, Los Angeles Housing News. The only photographic material mentioned in these lists was University of Southern California film student Chester Kessler’s What We Can Do for Joe, a “16 millimeter housing film complete with sound-track” that the Housing Authority added to the library in 1948. Los Angeles Housing News announced that the film was “available at the Housing Authority Library for showings by any interested group or organization upon request,” thereby suggesting that much like the library’s books, the film was accessible to the greater community. Still, the dearth of records detailing the Authority’s earlier operations offers little insight into when and how this library began, or whether photographic prints counted among its holdings much like Bauer’s did at the Housing Study Guild.

A “CONTEST REVEALS WRETCHED CONDITIONS”

One of the Housing Authority’s first photography-centered initiatives was a contest held in April 1940 together with a local paper, the Los Angeles Daily News. The winning photographs published in the paper under the title “Contest reveals wretched conditions” exhibit a similar variety of photographic approaches as identified by Elizabeth Bloom Avery in her study of amateur competitions centered on this theme (fig. 6). Consider, for instance, Earl Bench’s fifth-place photograph, captioned “a study in desolation.” The barely discernible reproduction shows children with a woman and another larger figure obscured beneath the shadows of a stairway in a dirt yard. The woman and one of the two children look up at a pair of children playing dangerously close to the
edge of the exterior stairway one story above. A child on the stairs leans over the railing, while a boy on the landing clutches the single rail just below his chin as he peers down to the group below. The boy’s light trousers are completely visible for lack of any additional enclosure of the stairway. He extends his left foot dangerously over the edge of the platform. Shot at an angle to the
building, the photograph captures the exterior landing without the reassuring backdrop of the solid wall. Instead, it appears as an exposed ledge from which the child might fall. Bench’s photograph is a study not just in desolation, but more specifically in dangerous living conditions presented by a multi-storied structure to its inhabitants.

Stairways also play a prominent role in George Dodge’s third-place photograph reproduced in the upper right corner of the page. In Dodge’s photograph, the stairways wending up the side of a multistoried complex appear devoid of life; inhabitants of the building are absent or hidden in the shadows created by the raking light. Instead, Dodge’s photograph takes the exterior of the tenement as subject, aligning the facade of the building with the surface of the negative inside the camera. Most visually pronounced in this composition are the light wooden stairways as they zig-zag their way in sharp diagonals up the side of the building and contrast with their background of shadowed balconies. The result is not a study in “disorder,” but an orderly and dynamic geometry of diagonal lines and strong contrasts. At the same time, this straight-on looking seems set up to capture this building neatly as a “type” in housing science, much like the biological specimen placed flat under a microscope.

Such winning photographs doubtlessly would have reminded Los Angeles’s readers of the recent news about the new Housing Authority’s WPA survey, the findings of which were published that same month. Still, nowhere in the description offered on this page does the newspaper mention any connection between the contest and the recent activities of the local Housing Authority. Nor does it suggest that these revealed conditions can be changed, much less should be changed, at all. This omission of any political context points to a painful fact of this early photographic project—namely, that as much as the contest’s theme and timing might have helped rally support for public housing, it also was a strategic undertaking in the paper’s operations as a business. Contests conceivably offered a cost-effective way to build the photographic archives of not just housing groups, but also newspapers. A capitalization on the luridness of slum photography was doubtlessly at work here, as well. Many of the winning photographs offer a not-so-subtle invitation to voyeurism, or a satisfying act of looking, as concisely defined by Michelle Henning, “dependent on the object of this gaze being unaware, not looking back.” This “not looking back” is especially apparent in Tom Garcia’s second-place photograph showing a man with his back to the picture plane, a gap where his right leg should be is painfully obvious beneath the man’s dark cloak. As he leans onto his crutches, making
his way towards the pool hall up the hill—perhaps to the company of other veterans of the Great War or survivors of debilitating work accidents—his body appears an analogue for the weary building itself, its windows shuttered, likewise not returning the viewer’s gaze.156

With the contest’s invitation to voyeurism came a violation of privacy. As in the case of the prize-winning photograph shot at 627 Ceres Street, some of winning photographs included captions that offered substantial identifying information. Such information might have been read as a testament to the depicted housing’s existence and a presentation of the photographs as social-scientific documents. It also implied an invitation to masses of non-specialist readers to seek out the address and take a look.157 The Ceres Street photograph, furthermore, offers a relatively rare view of not a front yard or housing court more commonly found in the Housing Authority’s photographs, but an interior. Aiming the camera into the farthest corner of the room, the photographer reveals a small, closed, and cluttered space. A rumpled bed stands next to a hutch filled with canisters and paper that spills from the shelf onto the floor. A single kerosene lamp placed dangerously close to a stack of newspapers indicates a lack of adequate electric lighting (and a fire hazard). A large bottle in the lower left of the composition might be read as a vestige of alcoholism. Captioned an “untidy interior” and printed in the upper left corner of the layout at a slight angle to add dynamism to the scene, the newspaper lays the housekeeping captured in the photograph open to derision. And for readers still not sure why the photograph was selected, the second title to the layout assures that “Disorder, dirt win first prize.”158

Until now overlooked in histories of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, the photo contest was not just a project running parallel to the more closely scrutinized WPA housing survey. The two efforts overlapped. Along with the page of housing “types” published in its final Housing Survey report, the Housing Authority and WPA team also included a single-page reproduction of a “photographic montage” (to borrow a term devised by photohistorian Matthew Biro to differentiate this cutting, pasting, and assembling of photographs from the more blatantly absurd or fantastical modernist photomontages of the Dadaists and Surrealists).159 On the montage’s facing page, the Housing Authority and WPA included a note that the photographs “reproduced on the following page” were printed “[t]hrough the courtesy of Manchester Boddy, publisher of The News” and had been submitted by “amateur photographers” to a contest held the same month the report was being finalized (fig. 7). “They [the photographs, N.K.O.] afford a graphic illustration of substandard housing conditions existent in certain portions of the city of Los Angeles today,” the compilers
of the published *Housing Survey* attested, alluding to the photographs’ factuality and currency.\(^{160}\)

Historians of photography in housing reform tend to read montages much like city planners interpreted unplanned neighborhoods—as “chaotic,” obscure, and illegible.\(^{161}\) The Housing Authority/WPA montage challenges this reading. Comprised of what one might deem the “losing” photographs from the competition that the Authority and WPA referred to on the facing page as the “Slum Photo Contest,” the montage published in *Housing Survey* presented a more
From the “slum Photo contest” to the regional collection

It offered a distinct set of photographs of the city’s older neighborhoods. These photographs of weathered wooden houses with patched roofs and propped-up fences are trimmed, some carefully following the outlines of roofs, another simply creating rounded borders around a tree-framed view down a dirt street. Several of these photographs are then outlined in a thick, white line and superimposed upon one another in an imaginative arrangement showing houses on top of houses. Some photographs are pasted on an angle, making the houses appear as though they are leaning and unstable on their foundations. Rooftlines converge on the towering, if somewhat leaning, bright white facade of Los Angeles’s City Hall—the location of the Housing Authority’s first offices during these years—at the montage’s center. The effect is a juxtaposition of old and new, but also an overt visual statement that the conditions of private housing are both a public problem, as Steven Moga notes in his evaluation of photographs of City Hall in the Housing Authority’s collection, and a problem that demands the government’s intervention. The superimposition on the lower part of the facade of City Hall of a photograph of three children engaged in what appears to be a game of marbles in a dirt yard adds to this rhetoric. The visual theme of play juxtaposed with the symbol of governance, like the tilt of the tower, itself, undermines the notion of governmental stability and reliability. Also like the tower of City Hall, a boy stands watch over the competitors below him. Be it a competition of skill at marbles, or a real-life challenge of making a home on limited means, the photomontage deftly opens up multiple readings of the relationship between public entities and private lives.

The Housing Authority’s inclusion of this photographic montage in Housing Survey offers itself up to multiple readings, as well. On the one level, the borrowing of the photographs already collected by a different agency, even if this agency’s aims were partially at odds with the housing movement’s, was well within the scope of the movement’s pragmatism. The Housing Authority approached the mass of collected photographs much like a stock of images for illustrating its second annual report published in 1940. As also shown in its report on its operations from 1942 to 1945, even after several years of building public housing and commissioning photographs, the Housing Authority continued to reproduce photographic material from newspapers in its publications. On another level, however, with this reproduction the Housing Authority also presented the 1940 photography contest in new terms. Whereas the compilers of Housing Survey simply thanked The News for the permission to print photographs from its contest, in the annual report the Authority took credit for having “fostered” the competition; The News, on the other hand, “conducted” it. Thus
rewritten, the Slum Photo Contest figured strategically within the Authority’s operations as an “undertaking in the field of public relations” for that year. Many [photographs, N.K.O.] were published and additional thousands of residents became conscious, hundreds of them for the first time, that ‘Cabbage Patches’ have developed in Los Angeles, some so old they have gone to seed,” the Housing Authority reported, alluding to the same processes of seeing and knowing that other housing authorities hoped to encourage with similar contests.

DIGITIZED HOUSING PHOTOGRAPHS AS REGIONAL HISTORY

Historians of housing photographs have remarked on the functions of photography to raise public awareness of slums as well as the civic role played by the newly established local housing authorities. As one of the first major activities led by the Housing Authority, the 1940 housing survey posed an opportunity for the Authority to articulate the many benefits that the project—and, by extension, the future work of the Authority—would bring to other municipal departments and local businesses. In the published findings, the Housing Authority outlined the benefits of the survey to the broader community, naming such civic bodies as the Department of City Planning and the City Engineer, but also, of course, the United States Housing Authority (USHA), the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), and the Home Owners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC). First mentioned among the private entities that the Housing Authority hoped the survey would benefit were newspapers, who “could spot on rental maps the location of their subscribers and use these maps as an indication of the income levels reached in their circulation,” the surveyors claimed. Finally, among the supporters of the survey the Housing Authority and WPA listed such diverse groups as the Catholic Welfare Bureau, the Department of Water and Power, the Japanese American Citizens League and Japanese Chamber of Commerce, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Mexican Chamber of Commerce, and the Southern California Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. These lists of groups relay the broad audience the Housing Authority perceived for public housing, but also suggest the importance it placed on positioning itself as part of a larger network of government offices and interest groups.

Photohistorian Sally Stein notes that montage practices in the United States between the wars “captured the imagination of conventional amateurs” who often combined these photographs into visual messages of “cooperation” and “collectivity,” especially in response to crisis. Given the amateurish appearance of the Housing Authority’s reproductions of the Slum Photo Contest submissions and the Authority’s emphasis on the community connections forged
by the survey project, it is tempting to read the photographs reproduced in the montage and in the pages of the report along similar lines. But more profound still is the network of public institutions evident in these photographs’ circulation. When the Housing Authority produced the compilation of the report’s findings, it filed these volumes at the Doheny Library at the University of Southern California, at Occidental College, and at the University of California, Los Angeles. The public library in Oakland, California, where the city established a local housing authority around the same time that Los Angeles established its city housing authority in 1938, added copies of at least the first two volumes of the report to its holdings in 1941. The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles further produced a shortened Digest of Final Report, currently in the holdings of libraries in California, but also at the University of Chicago and Harvard.

Not to be forgotten in this distribution is the circulation of the winning photographs, as well. Currently, a clipping of the first page of the contest feature can be found in the personal files of Catherine Bauer at the Bancroft Library. Assuming Bauer acquired the clipping shortly after its publication, this connection raises several questions. Bauer, who in the spring of 1940 taught her first courses on housing at the University of California, was deeply engaged in the task of turning housing’s longer but also recent history into teachable material, as the fourth chapter of this study explains. Bauer’s possession of this clipping adds to the “layers” of meaning in the Slum Photo Contest by positing it as not simply a business endeavor or attempt to collect photographs to illustrate reports, but also as a source of useful visual material in housing research and education.

The utter obscurity of the Slum Photo Contest in histories of photography and housing in Los Angeles raises the question of why this early photographic project deserves mention in this study, at all. Printed in the newspaper, the widely circulated Housing Survey, and in the Housing Authority’s second annual report, the photographs indeed appear to have garnered a large audience in their time. But this moment of public attention was brief. In the Housing Authority’s third annual report detailing the work completed the following year between July 1, 1940, and June 30, 1941, the Authority cited the housing survey in several instances, but made no mention of the photo contest or any allusion to the ways in which the photographs contained in the current report were made or collected. Any concerted collaboration between the Housing Authority and the community to assemble a body of photographs, in other words, appeared to be old news. The presence alone of the photographs in the newest report hinted at the Authority’s continued engagement with photography. Unattributed, sparsely
captioned, and with few textual references to their making other than descriptions of the events they depict, the photographs challenge the historian seeking to understand the meaning they had for the Housing Authority, and how this apparently untheorized photographic practice figured strategically in the Housing Authority’s processes of slum clearance and public housing construction.

But as the scholarship outlined above shows, much as one might learn about the history of photography from a study of the context of a photograph’s making and initial reception, its history as an object in a collection illustrates how it continues to perform cultural work in surprisingly similar ways. Consider, for example, the first-place photograph in the Slum Photo Contest, Bob Plunkett’s “photo of untidy interior.” Aside from the accolades it received from The News, Plunkett’s winning photograph stands out visually as the only winning photograph of an apparently vacant interior (fig. 6). It also, however, deserves attention for the pressure it places on the Housing Authority’s claims to the contest participants’ amateur status. Plunkett, the caption in The News noted, worked for the City of Los Angeles Health Department. As both The News and the Housing Authority fail to mention, Plunkett also had some experience photographing substandard housing conditions in his work in this position. During his time at the Health Department, Plunkett fulfilled several functions from that of a café and soda counter inspector to that of the “Health Department Editor” for the University of Southern California’s newspaper. As late as 1947, Plunkett also led a session on food poisoning at a “Food Handlers’ School” in Long Beach, according to one news report, “illustrating his talk with slides.” These slides, almost certainly photographic, may well have been made by Plunkett, himself. In 1938, Plunkett had already produced original photographic prints for a survey for the Los Angeles Bureau of Housing and Sanitation—a survey requested by the City Council to determine whether a city housing authority was needed in the first place. And among them was none other than the photograph of the “untidy interior,” which would be published two years later as the winner of the Slum Photo Contest in The News.

Pasted by hand into an album titled *Pictorial Representations of Some Poor Housing Conditions in the City of Los Angeles* which is now digitized on the website of the Oviatt Library at California State University, Northridge, the photograph is part of a unique object created to accompany the 1938 report that offers further layers to the obscure Slum Photo Contest, connecting it to a longer history of photographs of slums. As the studies of the Housing Authority’s history outlined at the beginning of this chapter indicate, housing reform and health reform prior to the Second World War were closely interrelated initiatives. In Los Angeles, the city’s earliest official housing department, the Housing Commission,
operated alongside the Health Department from 1913 until 1922 when its operations became completely incorporated.\textsuperscript{187} When the California Housing Authorities Law of 1938 made possible the establishment of a separate housing authority, the City Council called on the Bureau of Housing and Sanitation to furnish a survey predating the published \textit{Housing Survey} of 1940 to determine the “need.”\textsuperscript{188} The establishment of the Housing Authority in 1938 again separated the offices for housing and health reform, but each continued to provide the other with statements and acts of support in their overlapping missions. With the publication of \textit{Housing Survey} in 1940, the Housing Authority listed the City Health Officer among the multiple officials who could benefit from the data in that he “will have made available to him the specific location of substandard housing, and thus will be able to more efficiently isolate the causes of diseases due to lack of sanitary facilities.”\textsuperscript{189} Late in the following spring when the Housing Authority commenced demolition of the old housing on the site of the future Pueblo del Rio housing project, the director of the Bureau of Housing and Sanitation who led the survey, M.S. Siegel, was reportedly in attendance to witness “the brief ceremony,” including the “actual wrecking” of the first house, as the Authority recorded in its annual report for that year.\textsuperscript{190}

The histories of collecting practices explained in this chapter reveal the instrumentality of photography in early housing reform while providing a context to the Housing Authority’s practice that extends beyond the Los Angeles region. As the case study of the Housing Study Guild showed, collecting and the international exchange of photographs stood at the center of early housing research, education, and training in New York and Washington, DC. The Housing Study Guild members took pride in their collection of photographs, books, and other housing materials as a symbol of their cosmopolitan practices and starting in 1934 strove to ensure that it grew, stayed together, and circulated before audiences of students and new housing professionals. In 1940, the Slum Photo Contest might have appeared to depoliticize early housing reform in Los Angeles had not the Housing Authority selected from and presented the losing photographs as a form of public education and a star on its own record of public relations. Catherine Bauer’s possession of the photo contest clipping further points to the possible research and educational purposes that the contest winners—or even the contest format more generally—presented to an international housing expert and avid maker and collector of photographs of housing from around the world.

Comparisons of photographic collections may thus seem to offer simply another way of charting the collaboration between public housing and public health departments in the years after the new housing laws established housing
as its own entity. But these comparisons are also profoundly revelatory of the meaning of these intersecting practices in the administration of photographic collections today. In 2014, a student worker at the Oviatt Library composed an entry for the library’s blog featuring pages from the *Pictorial Representations* album. With the title “Peek in the Stacks,” the blog invites readers to take a brief privileged look into such special holdings at the library as historical objects from local high schools, old magazines helpful in researching a history of guitar competitions, or documents pertaining to the establishment of the university’s own ethnic studies programs.\(^{191}\) The preparation of these blog entries by different students furthermore fulfills an educational imperative in providing a platform for them to engage with these noteworthy objects and present these findings alongside representations of the objects in the form of digital photographs and scans. Most remarkable, however, is this student blogger’s positioning of the album, itself. Situating the album in the context of the Great Depression, the student claims, “This period in our regional history comes to life through M.S. Siegel’s *Pictorial Representations of Some Poor Housing Conditions in Los Angeles,*” thereby attesting before an international internet audience to the perceived ability of the photographs to animate a local history.\(^{192}\)

Such digitizations of photographs showing Los Angeles’s lower-income neighborhoods reveal a “historical slippage” of function and meaning, to borrow a phrase from the historian of photography and curator Christopher Morton.\(^{193}\) As the photographs created in connection with Los Angeles’s housing movement moved into the special collections of regional libraries and state research institutions and then into their online holdings, their function changed from that of public education on the presence of slums to that of public education in the promotion of a regional library and state university. But through these changed functions run continuities, as well. As Kelley Wilder writes, “the theme of region” in photographs and their functions in collections is “never very far away.”\(^{194}\) Consider again the clipping in Bauer’s collection at the Bancroft Library. When it was pulled for the research for the present study, the “Slum Photo Contest” article was filed in a folder of clippings labelled “California: Los Angeles.” One wonders whether this organization reflected that of Bauer’s papers when they were accessioned, and in turn whether the clipping concerned Bauer for its references to the Los Angeles region or the larger region of the “West Coast” that she studied avidly in these years.\(^{195}\)

The Housing Authority’s photographs have also noticeably contributed to efforts to promote the study of a regional photographic history. In 2005, the photographer and theorist Allan Sekula together with photographers James Baker, Anthony Hernandez, Karin Apollonia Müller, and filmmaker Billy Woodberry
grouped the results of five years of creative work into a 2005 exhibition at the REDCAT center titled *Facing the Music*.\(^{196}\) Funded by a research grant from the J. Paul Getty Trust, the project was, as Sekula recounted in a 2005 interview, “to document the building of Walt Disney Concert Hall” in downtown Los Angeles.\(^{197}\) The photographers adopted what Sekula termed a “contextual approach” in their photographs of transplanted trees and filmic montages of footage shot at the Los Angeles River with that of the Hall’s construction.\(^{198}\) Part of the aim of this “contextual approach” was to address “a retreat from civic memory,” Sekula claimed, as well as the forgotten, civically-minded work of Angeleno photographers.\(^{199}\) Describing “a great period of social documentary in Los Angeles stretching from the 1930s through the early 1960s,” whose photographers “gave us distinctive Los Angeles versions of Lewis Hine and the Ashcan School,” Sekula counted Leonard Nadel among these photographers, thus deploying him as a figure to broaden the history of “social documentary” and specifically inscribe local Los Angeles practices within a history understood by many scholars as distinctly “American.”\(^{200}\)

In addition to providing context to Sekula’s project, the Housing Authority photographs play a vital role in the more recent activities of the Photo Collection of the Los Angeles Public Library. In 1990, the group Photo Friends began working with the Photo Collection librarian and staff “to improve access to the collections and promote them through programs, projects, and exhibits.”\(^{201}\) Under this banner, the group exhibits photographs, publishes books, and writes blog entries interpreting photographs from the library’s collection of several hundred digitized images depicting Housing Authority and housing-related activities.\(^{202}\) Also in Los Angeles, the more specialized Southern California Library likewise promotes access to their Housing Authority photographs by digital means. A sizable portion of their over two-hundred photographic prints can be viewed on the Online Archive of California—a digital database of collection guides, finding aids, and digitized objects from archives throughout the state.\(^{203}\) In this online archive are also links to digitized photographs of Housing Authority projects in the collections of the photographers Leonard Nadel and Julius Shulman, both acquired by the Getty Research Institute in the early 2000s.\(^{204}\) Searches for Nadel and Shulman’s names on the internet lead to countless additional appearances of their digitized photographs.

Still, at the time of writing this study, other photographs made for the Housing Authority such as the sizable collection of black and white negatives in the collection of Otto Rothschild’s studio remain freely accessible only in person.\(^{205}\) While versions of Rothschild’s photographs can be found in the digital collections of Housing Authority prints and negatives at the Los Angeles Public Library...
and the Southern California Library, his personal collection at the University of California, Los Angeles, adds further context to his practice as a photographer of public housing and the Housing Authority’s practices as commissioners and collectors of housing photographs. The collection of Esther Lewittes Mipaas, still in private stewardship, likewise promises a better understanding of the role of public commissions in the portfolio of a woman designer and photographer. Still missing, and perhaps never created, is an inventory of the Housing Authority’s photographic collection at the critical moment in 1990 in which the Los Angeles Public Library created copies of an unspecified selection of the Authority’s holdings. As Sekula alludes, there is much historical work yet to be done on these collections. And as the response to the digitization projects of other Housing Authority collections shows, the digitization of analogue collections is a promising first step.

The history of photographic collections in housing reform as well as in the more recent promotion of public and cultural institutions charted here is as much about the building of the collections as it is about their disintegration, to borrow a word from Samuel Ratensky of the Housing Study Guild, and the continued circulation of their individual parts. With a focus on one of the first photographic projects of the Housing Authority from 1940, this chapter traced related objects made during the New Deal to a variety of actors and institutions to show the complexity of the category of the “housing photograph” as identified by previous scholarship, as well as the breadth of contributors and contexts for the reception of photographs of local substandard housing and modern “housing throughout the world.” Bearing in mind the geographic and political dimensions of the housing movement, itself, as well as the institutional and personal, digital and analogue collections that now house its photographs, the following chapter now examines the transnational and interdisciplinary connections forged in the Housing Authority’s photography upon the United States’ entry into the Second World War.
In the early 1940s, Luckhaus Studio counted among the first of Los Angeles’s commercial photographers to find a new client in the young Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles. Between the summer of 1941 and the winter of 1942, Luckhaus produced a collection of black and white photographs showing the demolition of some of Los Angeles’s oldest low-income neighborhoods and the construction of at least five of the Authority’s modern developments in their place. Over one hundred of these images survive as prints in the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles Photograph Collection at the Southern California Library, as copy prints at the Los Angeles Public Library, or reproduced in housing publications still held by libraries in the United States and Europe. Beyond these scattered objects and scant notes in census data and periodicals, any other records that might explain how Luckhaus Studio’s work functioned as part of the Housing Authority’s operations in its first few years remain lost.

An examination of the extant photographs against the backdrop of Luckhaus Studio’s and its founder Arthur Luckhaus’s largely overlooked history reveals that public housing, as client and subject, provided a new and stimulating challenge to photographic businesses with a reputation for creating salable images of local architecture. As will also be shown, however, Luckhaus Studio did more than draw on its experience in photographing Los Angeles’s downtown commercial behemoths in portraying the Housing Authority’s modern but modest public housing developments: it deployed a unique combination of photographic techniques that were practiced by army surveyors during the First World War. With this example of Arthur Luckhaus and his studio, this chapter thus aims to explain the meaning that public housing held for wartime commercial photographers and the role their photographs played in picturing public housing as part of an international conflict.
This approach to housing photography as war photography is based on several precedents. Although focused mainly on images for Congress and the United States Department of War in the second half of the nineteenth century, Robin Kelsey’s *Archive Style* offers a model for bringing the surveyor’s transnational biography to bear on pictures of geographic boundaries. This chapter follows a similar approach to the study of Luckhaus’s work for the Housing Authority as a way of explaining Luckhaus’s technical and creative approach to conducting a photographic survey of housing construction during its boom years at the beginning of the Second World War. It also, however, examines the Housing Authority’s conception of the role of photographers as part of the wartime housing effort. Here, the present study responds to the sole sustained examination of Luckhaus’s photography, architect and historian Rubén A. Alcolea’s book, *Picnic de pioneros: arquitectura, fotografía y el mito de la industria* (Pioneer Picnic: Architecture, Photography and the Myth of Industry). In *Picnic de pioneros*, Alcolea presents Arthur Luckhaus as both a westward-moving entrepreneur and a “pioneer” proponent of the New Objectivity in the West. Alcolea’s close readings of Luckhaus’s photographs from archives in Denver and Los Angeles reveal the photographer’s position within the history of modern photography while laying bare Luckhaus’s pragmatic approach to making clear and functional images for architects and the building industry—particularly in his photographs that promoted Los Angeles architect Richard Neutra’s work abroad.

Several of Rubén A. Alcolea’s findings resonate with those of the present study. As with Robin Kelsey’s analysis of nineteenth-century survey photographs, Alcolea’s notes the hallmarks of Luckhaus’s work for his Los Angeles-based clientele. Automobiles as modern machines par excellence form a motif through many of Luckhaus’s photographs, while human figures are almost always absent. As *Picnic de pioneros* further demonstrates, these motifs carried into Luckhaus’s work for the Housing Authority. Noting how Luckhaus’s photographs of Aliso Village show only demolition and construction, but no finished housing projects, Alcolea identifies in them a “scientific rigor” and conduciveness to before and after comparisons. These transnational, technical, and pragmatic dimensions of Luckhaus’s practice all provide background for a closer examination of the present question: how did Luckhaus’s photography fulfill the Housing Authority’s commission? The answer may be found by taking Alcolea’s astute application of the metaphor of the “pioneer” a step further to reveal an understanding of the photographer as a war figure. As Kelsey’s study and the longer history of California show, photography in the western part of the United States has long been entangled with the violence of redrawing geographic
Weapon boundaries. Luckhaus, as a photographer from Colorado and a veteran of the First World War, was both a pioneer and a soldier, and a prime example of a new concept of the photographer as a fighter on the wartime housing front.

COMMERICAL PHOTOGRAPHY AND PUBLIC CLIENTS

The scant records of Arthur Luckhaus’s life suggest that he learned the business of photography at a young age. Born in 1880 in London to the Alsace-Lorraine-born photographer August Luckhaus and the British woman Clara Luckhaus, Paul Adolph Arthur Luckhaus immigrated to the United States as a small child. He completed three years of high school before entering his father’s trade, as did his younger sister, the now utterly forgotten photographer Gertrude E. Carpenter. Prior to immigrating to the United States, Luckhaus’s father maintained a business producing cartes de visite and “views” in Falkirk, Scotland. Whether he reestablished this business in the United States, however, remains uncertain. August and Clara set up a homestead near the town of Pueblo, Colorado, in the years prior to the First World War. Their son Arthur Luckhaus, meanwhile, carried on the family’s tradition of photography over one hundred miles away in the Colorado state capital of Denver.

Arthur Luckhaus spent several years of his early career based out of Denver. He found work at the Van Noy Railroad News Company as late as 1913—the same year his father, according to one sensational news report, died from a bullet wound allegedly inflicted in an altercation on the outskirts of Pueblo. While providing a home to his mother who found work as a nurse in Denver, Arthur Luckhaus maintained an affiliation with Van Noy for at least a decade, taking on the job of “newsagent” by 1920, just around the time the company was renamed the Van Noy Interstate Company. Punctuating this work at Van Noy was Luckhaus’s service in the American Expeditionary Forces as a sergeant in Company M of the Twenty-Ninth Engineers, the unit charged with the task of “surveying and printing” during the First World War. Following the war, Luckhaus returned to Denver for only a few years before moving to California and taking his photographic business with him. Sometime between 1923 and 1926, Luckhaus began managing a photographic business by the name of Luckhaus Hoops in a rented space on West Seventh Street in Los Angeles.

Arthur Luckhaus set up shop in Los Angeles at the height of the “booster” era following the First World War when businesses began to actively promote California as a place where one could take a sunny vacation or settle down and enjoy a good life. The timing was excellent for Luckhaus, for booster groups
saw photography as instrumental in their promotional efforts. In 1927, two such groups, the All Year Club of Southern California and the Ambassador Hotel System, announced competitions with prizes of one hundred dollars each “for the best new scenic view of any place in Southern California” that was “suitable for reproduction” and had “advertising value.” Finalists were to be exhibited at the Los Angeles Convention of the Pacific International Photographers’ Association, where the All Year Club’s Advertising Committee would select the winning photograph for use in an advertising campaign. The contest rules encouraged the submission of photographs showing “typical subjects” such as “mountains, palms, eucalyptus, missions, desert, sea-shore, canyons, or any phase of outdoor life or scenery distinctively reflective of Southern California.”17 As a further testament to boosters’ eagerness to encourage photography of Southern California, the Ambassador Hotel System hosted the convention. This sponsorship of the competition and hosting of the convention received warm welcome. The nationally circulating San Francisco-based photographic monthly Camera Craft printed the announcement of the competition together with the rules in its section regularly dedicated to the Pacific International Photographers’ Association’s news, extolling “the importance of these conventions” and the chance they presented “to bring credit to our craft.”18 Such incentives were attractive to many commercial photographers looking to set up practice in the growing Southern California metropolis.19

Luckhaus rose to prominence in the midst of this flurry of commercial photographic activity. In the second half of the 1920s, the simple name “Luckhaus Studio” began receiving several bylines in the Los Angeles Times for various photographs of paintings.20 In 1926, the Commercial Photographers’ Association of Los Angeles elected Arthur Luckhaus to the position of second vice president.21 Unlike their neighbors at the Pictorialist-dominated Southern California Camera Club, the Commercial Photographers’ Association fashioned themselves as a club of local photographic businesses.22 A press mention of the association from earlier in the decade indicates that it was an intimate organization of about thirty members, including Edward S. Curtis.23 According to a 1923 report in the Los Angeles Times, this association recently “increased its membership 50 per cent, won the western cup awarded at the national convention; produced a cost survey for commercial photographers and worked out a credit system of value to its members.”24 A few years later, the editor of Camera Craft reported that the group of Los Angeles-based photographic professionals began participating in an exchange of “new ideas” with the New York Commercial Photographers’ Association.25 Organized, networked, and in the photographic press, the Commercial Photographers’ Association of Los Angeles surveyed exciting
business prospects to its members as it placed Los Angeles on the map as a center of lucrative photographic enterprise.

In addition to joining the Commercial Photographers’ Association, Luckhaus spent considerable time and energy developing his business prior to working for the Housing Authority. In 1930, at the same time Zeitlin’s Book Store was showing photographs by Brett Weston, Luckhaus was showing his studio’s photographs in the California State Exposition Building in Exposition Park. In 1932, he hired a printer. Around 1938, he appointed another man of the auspicious name William Talbot as an assistant photographer. As a photographer in her own right, Luckhaus’s wife, Margaret M. Luckhaus, might also have done more work for Luckhaus Studio than records attribute to her.

With several employees and an eponym whose résumé included work for the American Expeditionary Forces’ surveying unit as well as membership in a local business group for commercial photographers, the question of how Luckhaus Studio came to work for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles lends itself to several hypotheses. One of the most plausible is that the Authority sought-out a studio with a specialty in photographing local architecture. Dates ascribed to Luckhaus Studio photographs from the sizable collection currently on file at the Los Angeles Public Library allow a rough estimate that Luckhaus Studio started developing this specialty in the mid-to-late 1920s. The photographs offer few clues to their context, thereby leaving open questions about who commissioned them and for what purpose. Yet, in addition to showing primarily large, multi-story governmental and commercial buildings ranging from Los Angeles City Hall to luxury apartments to grocery stores, they offer several insights into the visual conventions prevalent in Luckhaus Studio’s portfolio at the time it took up work for the Housing Authority (figs. 8, 9, 10).

As Rubén Alcolea’s study outlines, extant photographs attributed to Luckhaus show that he (or his studio) adopted such conventions as composing images like drawings in two-point perspective (fig. 11)—a practice Alcolea suggests was both common in the first third of the twentieth century but also perhaps reinforced in Luckhaus’s photographing of architectural drawings.

A second hypothesis that could explain Luckhaus Studio’s commission for the Housing Authority is that both the photography studio and the Housing Authority shared a mutual acquaintance. One of the most famous Luckhaus Studio clients during the 1930s was the Los Angeles-based architect Richard Neutra. Luckhaus Studio photographed Neutra’s architecture, inside and out, including such historically celebrated structures as the Lovell Health House and the Von Sternberg Residence. Although not as widely studied by scholars as the later photographs by Julius Shulman for John Entenza’s Arts and Architecture
8 | Luckhaus Photo, Los Angeles City Hall, 1928, photographic print, 10.24 in. × 8.27 in. (26 cm × 21 cm), Ralph Morris Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.

9 | Luckhaus Studio, Château Élysée apartments, view 3, June 6, 1929, photographic print, 10 in. × 8 in. (25.4 cm × 20.32 cm), Ralph Morris Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.

10 | Luckhaus Studio, Ralphs Grocery Store, exterior view, 1928, photographic print, 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Ralph Morris Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.
magazine, Luckhaus Studio’s photographs of Neutra’s architecture enjoyed a wide circulation during the 1940s long after Luckhaus ceased to fulfill Neutra’s orders. Reproductions of Luckhaus Studio’s photographs appeared in *Built in USA: 1932–1944*, a book compiled to accompany an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in 1944. In 1946, Neutra published a Luckhaus Studio photograph of a Los Angeles kindergarten in *Architectural Record* together with an article calling for a new view of the world’s port cities—Los Angeles here a prime example—as communities that should be planned if they were to be fully integrated into the world’s social and economic fabric (fig. 12). As Rubén Alcolea also notes, Luckhaus Studio’s photographs further aided in building an international following for Neutra’s architecture. That same year, the Paris-based architecture journal *L’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui* published an issue dedicated to Neutra’s work complete with an uncredited Luckhaus Studio photograph captioned “Prefabricated metal school building” (fig. 13). Today, photographic prints by Luckhaus Studio showing the same school, its floor-to-ceiling sliding doors open to the outdoor sunlight, can be found in the CIAM Archive in Zurich.
The reproduction and international circulation of Luckhaus Studio’s photographs showing the architecture of Richard Neutra invite a consideration of the extent to which Luckhaus’s work for Neutra bolstered the studio’s status as an internationally-networked local business. Julius Shulman ultimately took the lion’s share of Neutra’s photographic commissions and remains today one of California’s most celebrated photographers of modern architecture with several monographs, a documentary film, and an archive at the Getty Research Institute. Yet, it is doubtful whether Shulman’s arrival ended Luckhaus Studio’s
work for Neutra. Recent research and a survey of photographs of Neutra’s architecture from the latter part of the thirties suggest that Luckhaus and Shulman may well have shared work for the architect—or at the least for the magazines who showed Neutra’s work—for several years.44 Even once Shulman took over Neutra’s commissions, Luckhaus Studio continued to photograph Neutra’s buildings, only not in Neutra’s employ.

In 1941, both Neutra and Luckhaus Studio were working for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles. Luckhaus photographed the construction

---

of Aliso Village, William Mead Homes, Estrada Courts, and Pueblo del Río, and Neutra contributed to the latter of these projects under chief architect Paul R. Williams as part of the Southeast Housing Architects Associated. Julius Shulman, although still working for Neutra, soon followed suit. The Housing Authority listed his name along with Arthur Luckhaus’s in the photo credits for the Housing Authority’s annual report for the period from July 1941 to June 1942. In 1943, Shulman also recorded payments from the Housing Authority as well as those from Neutra in his personal logbook.

At least for Shulman, the Housing Authority paid a sizable portion of his income. His diary’s “cash account” page for March of 1943, for instance, shows that three of Shulman’s eighteen jobs for that month came from the Housing Authority. Other clients included the Beverly Hills Hotel, John Entenza, House Beautiful, and Architectural Record. While Shulman’s work for these other clients, especially his work for John Entenza’s Case Study House Program for Arts and Architecture magazine, would become some of the most celebrated projects of his career, the Housing Authority was by far Shulman’s highest-paying client that month, netting him a total of one-hundred-thirteen dollars and fifty cents, or a third of his recorded cash received. Shulman continued to take on work from the Housing Authority for the rest of the year. In April, he sold the Authority thirty prints for a total of fifteen dollars and fifty cents and in July he photographed Pueblo del Río, a public housing development occupied mainly by Black residents. Although indicative of work that was intermittent and hardly amounting to a full-time job, Shulman’s records provide a sense of the attractiveness Housing Authority commissions might have had for Luckhaus and his studio a few years earlier.

Shulman’s criticism of his competitor also begins to show the attractiveness of Luckhaus’s portfolio to Los Angeles housers. In an oral history interview recorded for the Archives of American Art in 1990, Shulman described Luckhaus’s practice as one that made no pretensions to the status of fine art: “He [Luckhaus, N.K.O.] tended to be very rigid and very technical about his work, and his photographs, albeit very good, lacked the imagination, the composition, the design, of a composition of photography.” Shulman’s choice of the word “technical” offers a valid insight into just what might have secured Arthur Luckhaus and his studio the commission from the Housing Authority in the first place. But as many of Luckhaus’s photographs for the Authority show, when Luckhaus started working for the office in 1941, the studio took on a largely different subject in focusing on housing developments as opposed to gargantuan commercial buildings or luxurious residences. It also adopted a different approach to its work—one that indeed interpreted “technical” or “rigid” in ways particularly
resonant with the Housing Authority’s goals in those years that coincided with mobilization for the Second World War.

THE PHOTOGRAPHER AS LEGIONNAIRE

The earliest dated photographs suggest that the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles hired Luckhaus Studio at the start of its reporting period spanning from the summer of 1941 to the summer of 1942. This year was the busiest thus far in the Authority’s short history. Six public housing projects filled with workers who had recently taken jobs in Los Angeles’s shipyards and aircraft plants and three more projects were under construction while the Housing Authority worked to acquire additional sites for a new kind of public housing—war housing—mandated by the Lanham Act of 1940 and placed by the Federal Public Housing Authority in local authorities’ care.52

Nowhere was the effect of the war on the Housing Authority’s presentation of itself more apparent than in Homes for Heroes, the report it published for this period from the summer of 1941 to the summer of 1942. Beginning with a quotation from President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s message to Congress delivered May 27, 1942, the report proceeded with language that clearly situated the construction and management of public housing for workers migrating to defense centers like Los Angeles as essential to winning the war:

“This war involves a total national effort and industrial mobilization. Industry cannot effectively mobilize the plants and plants cannot expand with sufficient rapidity unless there are enough houses to bring the worker to the job, keep him on the job and maintain his efficiency and morale. The allocation of war funds for the shelter of the men and women leaving their homes to serve our war industries is a wise and established national policy. That policy should continue.”53

Like the factories the workers filled, the housing these workers lived in was part of the war budget and wholly endorsed by the President of the United States and Commander in Chief. In short, the war presented the public housing movement with a “call to arms,” incorporating housing work into that of the “home front.” This concept of the housing movement as a militant endeavor pervades the text of the report. Quoted in the first pages, Langdon Post, the Federal Public Housing Authority director of Region 10, offered nothing short of the highest praise for Los Angeles:
“In less than two years the Los Angeles City Housing Authority has initiated and brought to final completion 3,468 units of its regular program. It also has built and is managing 6,852 units of war housing for the important men and women who are working on our production lines so our men on the fighting lines can keep fighting democracy’s battle. The Los Angeles Authority has been a major factor, perhaps more important than many realize at this critical period in our history, in making it possible for the United Nations to hold out against the crazed forces of ruthless aggression. When awards of merit are given out for efficient, humane and miraculous work in the field of public housing, the Los Angeles City Housing Authority will be right in the spotlight of well deserved acclaim.”

Housing was part of the war effort and the Housing Authority and its supporters throughout the city of Los Angeles performed their wartime work with technical precision and efficiency. As further outlined in the report, the Housing Authority’s wartime acclaim extended far beyond building and managing housing. From the organization of hospitals and victory gardens within the developments to the offering of courses in air raid preparedness and first aid, the Housing Authority ensured that the residents of its developments were both housed and ready should the battlefront come to the home front. In the meantime, the Authority cast the housing movement as a battlefront of its own. Under the editorship of a columnist-turned-housing manager and activist by the name of Roger C. Johnson and designed by Alvin Lustig, the layouts in *Homes for Heroes* relay housing’s lessons in wartime metaphors. “These are the enemies of good living: disease, fire, delinquency,” reads the text of one layout. Photographs with raw, torn edges illustrate these enemies by showing children crowded on a bed, a column of black smoke rising from a blazing home, and the dark shadows of two boys walking alone up a dirt street (fig. 14). The message “these are the weapons of GOOD HOUSING: health, safety, recreation” appears on the facing page. Pictured in clean-cut, affirming circles are a woman with small children seated at a table, a rather cryptic image of a group of adults with expressions illuminated as though watching a blaze from afar, and in the third photograph a scene that would soon become a motif of Los Angeles housing photography—children splashing in a wading pool.

Photography further foregrounds the housing of war workers as war work, itself. In the first part of the report, an account of the year’s events as well as photographs showing men at work attest to the laborious process of public housing construction, challenged and sometimes thwarted by the material...
shortages of the war. To enumerate just a few of these challenges, in August 1941 the Housing Authority reworked plans for Estrada Courts and Rose Hill Courts to accommodate material rationing. In September, Executive Director of the Housing Authority Howard Holtzendorff led a delegation to Washington “to solve the problem of building material priorities.” Finally, the Authority reported that in January 1942, a steel shortage slowed work on Rancho San Pedro. A photograph at the beginning of the section describing these events offers a dramatic view of the integrated importance of material and labor to housing war workers. Shot from below, the photograph shows giant rolls of remesh suspended side-by-side from the hook of a crane (fig. 15). A construction worker, his face cast in shadow and framed by the circle of the roll of remesh, stands authoritatively with his hands on his hips, looking down at the photographer while another worker guides the lowering of the suspended remesh rolls from the opposite side, his figure visible through its screen of criss-crossing lines. On the opposite page, a member of Holtzendorff’s delegation to Washington, City Councilman Rasmussen, stands with a construction worker “inspecting the substantial type of brickwork which went into the walls of the Aliso Village war housing development,” according to the photograph’s caption. With facial expressions exhibiting a mix of scrutiny, approval, and even pride, the two men hold bricks in outstretched hands as though fully registering the small objects’ importance to winning the war.
The second part of the report dedicates a page to each of the Housing Authority’s sixteen projects. Each page follows the same formula. An uncaptioned photograph shows the completed project at the top of the page. In the middle, a brief description of the project includes the names of architects and contractors as well as technical details about construction. Finally, at the bottom of the page another photograph shows the site prior to or in the early phases of construction or, for two of the projects, during the inventory of the property (fig. 16).

These layouts are simple, but not intuitive. Based on the convention of reading from left to right and top to bottom, each layout places the public housing photographs so that the reader might presumably “read” them before they see the photographs showing the now demolished neighborhoods, tracts of graded dirt, or views of bent-backed construction workers. The story these pairings tell is retrospective, placing the public housing photograph at the start of each project’s “story” but also in the visually prominent area at the top of the page. Proceeding from page to page, moreover, offers little insight into the ordering of the presentation of the projects. Ramona Gardens, the first project built and filled by the Housing Authority, fittingly comes first in this section. But the projects presented on the following pages proceed in no clear order of groundbreaking or completion dates. Turning from one page to the next and following the uniform-sized photographs from left to right across the gutters of the layouts, the reader might wonder what overarching story of housing during wartime, if any, this section aims to tell.

As a preface to these pages, the Housing Authority offers one of its few recorded statements on photography during this period:

“Pictorial records offer the only satisfactory method for displaying what has been accomplished. Photographs taken prior to, or in the early stages of, actual construction can be checked with other pictures showing completed jobs. On the following pages comparison after comparison is made to portray the miraculous transformations which have taken place on the face of the city.”

In this succinct statement, the Housing Authority describes what photohistorians Jordan Bear and Kate Palmer Albers deem “a strategy so commonplace that virtually every disparate photographic discourse has enlisted it”—namely, the making and arrangement of “before-and-after photographs.” As the Authority hints and Bear and Palmer Albers attest, the reading of these pages should be active in its invitation to “checking”—to the analytical, perhaps even skeptical
comparison of the “after” photographs to the “before” or “during” photographs. This activated reading required judgement from the wartime reader in discerning from the photographs whether a “miraculous transformation” took place. This reading also required, as Bear and Palmer Albers claim, “the imaginative participation of the viewer.” That is, the pairings relied on the viewer to imagine the construction and in many cases also the demolition that occurred between the moment when a photographer snapped the photograph reproduced


16] Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Homes for Heroes: Fourth Annual Report of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, ed. Roger C. Johnson ([Los Angeles]: s.n., 1942), n.p., Occidental College Library.
at the bottom of the page and the moment when a photographer took the photograph reproduced at the top. Such a strategy lends support, in Bear and Palmer Albers’s view, to the notion “that the more powerful way of articulating the central event is to leave it unseen.” The central event in this section of the report is only visible in “comparison after comparison.” The pages present numerous pairings of photographs on pages and pairings of pages, themselves, so that a photograph of the shaded courtyards of Aliso Village appears above a photograph showing a view from a hill overlooking The Flats, and this photograph of The Flats in turn might be viewed opposite a photograph showing the building for the Star Sign Company next to an older two-story residence (fig. 16). The effect is a linking of old sites to new projects and of an old city to a new city, utterly transformed.

The suggestion this ordering of photographs and text within the report seems to make is that while the before and after of each project was different, the forces that enacted each transformation were the same—a unified “housing front,” to borrow a contemporary metaphor. In a word of thanks printed in the same annual report, the Housing Authority again extended the war metaphor in its reference to “that great legion of public spirited citizens” who “encouraged and backed housing to the limit of their abilities.” And in one of the few public statements on the contributions of photographers to the housing effort, the Authority’s annual report for July 1941 through June 1942 specifically acknowledged the contributions of “the photographers” right alongside those of “the many architects and contractors whose genius is reflected in homes which are helping American war workers to win the battle of the production front.” The implication of these associations could not be clearer: in the eyes of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, housing photographers were important figures in fighting housing’s multivalent war. The final page of the annual report listed these photographer-legionnaires in a series of names both famous and obscure: Jackie Greene, Florence Homolka, Margaret Lowe, Arthur Luckhaus, Robert Wallace, and Julius Shulman.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND THE “WAR PHOTOGRAPHY COMPLEX”

Research on war and photography offers several inroads into understanding the function of the housing photographer as a legionnaire during these months from July 1941 to June 1942. Marking this research is a turn away from the idea of war photography as the work of individual photographer-warrior-heroes and
a refocusing on photographic businesses such as Kodak, Agfa, and Life magazine. Drawing on James Hevia’s notion of the “photography complex” as well as Steve Edwards’s “photography-as-business” approach to photographic history, historians Tom Allbeson and Pippa Oldfield posit war photography “as a complex of interactions criss-crossing the fields of culture, commerce, government and the military.” Studies that adopt this perspective present new readings on topics ranging from the figure of the war photographer or photojournalist as a business-strategic invention of the American picture press to the ways in which war contributed to the expansion of photographic business operations beyond national borders. In addition to broadening photographic history to such topics, Allbeson and Oldfield offer this integrative approach as a means to more comparative and contextualized scholarship and seeing “how connections and causalities might be drawn across eras and conflicts.”

War provided the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles with both an additional purpose for public housing and a useful metaphor for slum clearance. The notion presented in Homes for Heroes that photographers and public housing’s supporters acted as legionnaires, in turn, reveals a criss-crossing of the histories of public housing, the war, and commercial photographic practice in Los Angeles—indeed, a war photography complex centered around the issue of wartime housing. Following Allbeson and Oldfield’s line of inquiry advances an understanding of housing photography beyond comparisons to social documentary or architectural photography to an understanding of its functions as a business in the context of war—as war photography, created by photographer-legionnaires.

LESSONS IN HOUSING AND PHOTOGRAPHY FROM THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Returning to Arthur Luckhaus of Luckhaus Studio, one sees how war offered ample opportunity for the growth of even small photography businesses. But for Luckhaus, who in 1941 was sixty years old, the war that mattered most in this regard was the Great War of 1914–1918. In 1918, the thirty-seven-year-old Arthur Luckhaus went to Europe as part of the Twenty-Ninth Engineers of the American Expeditionary Forces. His company, Company M, was assigned as part of the eighty-second division to the Toul sector in France, where they remained from September 17 until the Armistice on November 11, 1918. In Toul, Luckhaus would have been charged with tasks aimed at bringing the lay of the land to the printed page in the creation and distribution of maps. According to one list compiled by Colonel William Barclay Parsons of the
Eleventh Engineers shortly after the war, the job of the Twenty-Ninth Engineers included

“surveying; restitution of aerial photographs; map making; map printing; map distribution; special maps and plans for staff branches; triangulation and traverse control of artillery fire; relief map making; panoramic photography and visibility studies; photographic reproduction; type printing, including publications, pamphlets and propaganda; engraving; adopting standards and furnishing technical advice and supervision.”

A photographer by trade before joining the American Expeditionary Forces, Arthur Luckhaus likely performed several of these tasks during his months in France.

Chroniclers of the war held the front-line photographic activity of the Twenty-Ninth Engineers in high esteem. As Colonel Parsons lamented in 1920, the contributions of the majority of the Twenty-Ninth Engineers employed in such dangerous tasks as “running artillery traverses or taking photographs under fire” or engaged in such technical challenges as “the development of airplane photography” risked being historically overshadowed by the tremendous material output of the printers. This appears not to have been the case with Luckhaus. An account of Luckhaus’s early career published in 1931 in the El Paso Herald-Post offers a striking example of the centrality of the photographer’s wartime experience in his postwar public image. Titled “Photographer of War Fame Sets Down,” the article announced that Luckhaus had set up shop in Hollywood before launching into an account of Luckhaus’s past work. According to the article, prior to going to Toul, Luckhaus was stationed as a photographer at Fort Bliss in El Paso. From this post, Luckhaus answered the summons of Commander Pershing to serve as “chief photographer of the American expeditionary forces in Europe” (capitalization in original). In Europe, the article continued, Luckhaus “took pictures along the western front from Flanders to the French Alps…action pictures in the trenches…pictures from ‘sausage’ balloons…photographs from airplanes…pictures of North Sea mine fields” (ellipses in original). In short, Luckhaus’s work in the Great War, according to the El Paso newspaper, encompassed venturing with his camera into the conflict’s most deadly arenas and exercising a cutting-edge knowledge of the latest techniques in aerial photography. Given the timing of the article, this celebration of Luckhaus as a heroic war photographer certainly aimed to fill the pages of the El Paso newspaper with a salable story from local history. By 1931, Luckhaus had already spent quite some time in Los Angeles not settling down into retirement,
but working. Still, the article also raises the question of the role of the Great War in the promotion of Luckhaus’s photographic practice. What promotional weight did it carry? And how might this weight have carried beyond 1931?

As historian Jessica Hammett writes, “We have yet to understand fully the varied and complex uses that First World War memory was put to during the Second World War.” This observation might extend beyond the history of photography to housing history, as well. In all the contemporary writings surrounding the war-related housing crisis in the United States’ defense centers, conspicuously rare are references to the Great War, much less the housing of troops on the West Coast during this conflict. One example stands out: in 1942, houser Catherine Bauer took her summer session students from Mills College in Oakland on a tour of housing from the First World War near the Northern California city of Vallejo. Led by Bauer, who had consulted several publications on housing in the United States during the Great War in writing her book *Modern Housing*, the tour doubtlessly offered several points for comparison with the nearby developments recently built in the response to the latest conflict.

Los Angeles offered little in the way of a similar learning opportunity. World War I ended before the private builders commissioned by the United States Housing Corporation completed the construction of war housing in Long Beach. Housing for war workers in Los Angeles had until then been arranged solely through the Homes Registration Service—an agency that inventoried vacancies in existing housing and provided this information to in-migrant workers. In January 1941, the federal government set up a similar program, with World War I Homes Registration veteran James Ford as a “Consultant” and Sacramento Housing Authority Executive Director Harold Pomeroy as the new director. The purpose of the new Homes Registration Division, the federal journal *Defense* reported, was to “supplement emergency building programs.” Los Angeles took part in the new registration starting in 1942. As the *Los Angeles Times* reported, the proposal suggested including a survey of existing housing as part of a “scientific approach to the problem” and a way of avoiding “that government authority might feel obliged to step in with a program of massed low-cost homes designed to fill a temporary need but unsuited to the permanent development of this community.” The homes registration program threatened the unimpeded construction of public housing to the extent that in the fall of 1941 USHA administrator Nathan Straus took the matter to the Senate. In *Homes for Heroes*, any reference to the program or its First World War roots was avoided. For the Housing Authority, the First World War functioned mainly as a reminder to plan for after the current one: “Millions of discharged fighting men returned to their home towns only to find that they could not be absorbed by a crippled economic
system,” the Authority reported of the Great War’s aftermath.⁸⁶ The lesson for the present, it suggested, was to increase building activity to make more jobs, catch up on home repairs, and, finally, keep clearing the slums.⁸⁷

LUCKHAUS STUDIO AT PUEBLO DEL RIO

Just as the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles saw little to be emulated in the housing programs of the First World War, so also Arthur Luckhaus’s status as a war-photographer-veteran appears to have had little promotional value for the Authority. The Authority certainly credited Luckhaus for his contributions to Homes for Heroes on a final page of the report, but it did not include credit lines under his photographs. Nor did the Authority call upon Luckhaus to reinforce the contemporary notion of the fearless war photographer braving the dangers of housing’s front lines.⁸⁸ Rather, the Housing Authority’s strategy in employing Luckhaus appears to have been one of pragmatism. Drawing on Luckhaus’s combined experience of working with the Twenty-Ninth Engineers and as a local photographer of architecture, the Housing Authority commissioned a body of photographic work that resonated with its concept of housing and slum clearance as battlefronts of World War II. But instead of battlefields, Luckhaus Studio photographed the Housing Authority’s sites for future public housing projects.

As shown by Rubén Alcolea, the photographs attributed to Luckhaus in the greater Housing Authority collection betray a practice that was methodical in its production of meticulously composed and labelled prints.⁸⁹ Inscribed in a thick pen or thin paintbrush most likely directly on the negatives are bold numbers and all-capital letters detailing the official housing development numbers and names (fig. 17). “CA 4-3,” “CA 4-5,” and “CA 4-6” classify the prints as images of both a California state-wide program (“CA”) and a regional initiative (“4” for Los Angeles). The number separated from the 4 by a hyphen designates the local housing project. Luckhaus Studio further included each project’s name in the inscriptions: “Wm. Mead Homes” (for William Mead Homes), “Pueblo del Rio,” etc. Finally, the Studio noted the vantage points from whence the photographer aimed the camera and a date most plausibly indicating when the negative was exposed.

Taken together, these inscriptions offer clues to the photographic techniques that Luckhaus Studio employed as well as the nature of its assignment. The bulk of Luckhaus Studio prints in the Housing Authority collections bear dates between August 1941 and December 1942. These months were a time of intense on-site work for the Authority’s various developments. The sites were
selected and the plans approved, but now the housing had to be built. In the case of all the sites Luckhaus Studio photographed, existing buildings also needed to be cleared. The Studio appears to have taken its cameras to five different locations in Los Angeles during this time: the sites of William Mead Homes, Pueblo del Río, Aliso Village, Rose Hill Courts, and Estrada Courts. The Housing Authority’s annual report of that year detailed the magnitude of the activity that Luckhaus Studio witnessed. The “demolition ceremony” in September 1941 at the site of Rose Hill Courts commenced the razing of seventy-one “substandard” buildings and eight buildings that met Housing Authority standards. The neighborhood on the site of the future Estrada Courts met a similar fate: the groundbreaking for head architect Robert E. Alexander’s design for 214 dwellings first required the razing of 153 buildings, ten of which were deemed built according to standards. At the 17.5-acre site of Pueblo del Río, 207 structures deemed “substandard” plus thirty-nine standard or above-standard structures were cleared so that principal architect Paul R. Williams’s plan for four hundred new public housing units could be realized. Construction on it began little over a month before the Japanese military’s bombing of Pearl Harbor; following the attack, the original plan to rehouse the Black families previously living in the now demolished housing in the area was amended to also house “war workers,” nearly all of whom were also Black, but not necessarily residents of the former community where the new housing now stood.90 The largest site of Aliso Village required more demolition: the Housing Authority razed a total of 417 buildings (387 of which were deemed substandard) to make way for nearly twice as many new dwellings. Likewise opened to occupation by war workers during the period in which Luckhaus Studio worked for the Housing Authority, the construction of Aliso Village began at the end of February 1942. The development was “in the center of one of the worst slum areas in the city,” the Housing Authority reported.91 Construction on the last of Luckhaus’s photographed projects, William Mead Homes, began around the same time as the building of Aliso Village. Making space for William Mead Homes entailed the demolition of 145 buildings on the site of a once industrialized area that had “deteriorated into a slum area.” The Housing Authority earmarked all but four of the existing buildings as “substandard.”92

Apart from Pueblo del Río on Long Beach Avenue, these sites presented a geographically compacted selection of the Housing Authority’s classified “low rent” developments started before and during the war years. All were located not too far from Los Angeles’s City Hall. Pueblo del Río was number three of the Housing Authority’s developments after Ramona Gardens and Pico Gardens. Aliso Village was the fifth development, followed by William Mead Homes,
Estrada Courts, and Rose Hill Courts. The curious absence of photos signed by Luckhaus showing the Housing Authority’s fourth development, Rancho San Pedro, might be explained by the project’s more remote location on the coast.93

During the period spanned by the extant photographs, Luckhaus appears to have worked in the field on assignment for the Housing Authority for no more than three consecutive days a month on an almost monthly basis. In August 1941, Luckhaus Studio seems to have allotted one day to each of the sites it photographed. For example, several prints labelled William Mead Homes bear the date August 4, while those of Estrada Courts are dated August 5 and those of Pueblo del Rio are dated August 6. In September, however, the studio shot several sites in one day while also taking more than one day to shoot others. Luckhaus Studio spent two non-consecutive days in September photographing the larger Aliso Village development, possibly for the first time, while also visiting Estrada Courts on one of these same days. This practice persisted for most of the rest of Luckhaus Studio’s work for the Housing Authority.

But what was the purpose of Luckhaus Studio’s assignment? Most remarkable about this sizable group of meticulously positioned, timed, and labelled photographs is its relative silence regarding the functions it fulfilled for the Housing Authority. For the publication of select photographs in *Homes for Heroes*,
the Authority cropped out Luckhaus’s notations and paired at least two photographs from this commission with photographs of completed housing projects. One of the selected photographs shows a neighborhood prior to demolition to make way for William Mead Homes (fig. 17). The other shows a neighborhood prior to demolition to make way for Pueblo del Rio, which is also shown completed in a separate photograph (figs. 18, 19). The Housing Authority otherwise appears to have not produced any special report of these photographs for broad circulation, nor do any records of its activities suggest that it showed Luckhaus Studio’s photographs in a special exhibit.94

18] Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Homes for Heroes: Fourth Annual Report of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, ed. Roger C. Johnson ([Los Angeles]: s.n., 1942), n.p., Occidental College Library.

19] Luckhaus Studio, Pueblo del Rio Housing Project, August 6, 1941 [copy print made from the photographic print borrowed from the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ca. 1990], 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Housing Authority Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.
Judging from the quantity of photographs and the technical detail they relay both together and separately, the Luckhaus Studio contribution to the Housing Authority's collection of photographs likely functioned as a log for local and national housing officials or political stakeholders, as Steven Moga states in his study of the Housing Authority photographs at the Los Angeles Public Library.95 Luckhaus's labelling made progress measurable both within and across projects, just as the detached nature of the prints conceivably made the photographs easy to rearrange or organize according to time or place. For example, an official could pull all the photographs from September 1941 to obtain a composite image of Housing Authority building activity in that month across all project sites. Likewise, anyone with access to the collection could chart the visible changes to a single site over time. Luckhaus Studio made this second reading possible on an especially fine level by taking photographs from mostly consistent points beyond the perimeter of a project area—an adoption of a “commonplace” before-and-after photographic technique of keeping the point of view constant to aid and invite the viewer to mark the visible evidence of change in the scene over time.96

Searching, gathering, and chronologically arranging these images from the online collections of the Los Angeles Public Library and the Southern California Library reveals a proportionately larger number of surviving prints showing the site for the future four hundred-unit development of Pueblo del Rio. Eight photographs dated to different months between August 6, 1941, and June 2, 1942, show a changing landscape as photographed from "Point #4"—a location just slightly beyond the project’s perimeter. A picket fence stretches across the first photograph, dividing a vacant yard with two lone trees in the foreground from two rows of houses receding beyond the fence at an angle to the upper right (fig. 19).97 A cross-reading of this photograph with the Housing Authority's annual report of the previous year might explain the vacant yard: the Authority reported that demolition began two months earlier in June. Looking closer, one wonders whether the shadows in the scan of the copied photograph in the Los Angeles Public Library's online collection are plants or loosened soil—a visible reminder of housing that was either removed or demolished.98 In the next photograph taken from this point dated November 6, 1941, the signs of this demolition are more apparent (fig. 20). Composed from a point of view only slightly to the right of the previous location of "Point #4," but nonetheless labelled the same, the photograph from this point for this month shows rubble beyond the large tree on the left where a house once stood. A section of the fence that previously divided the area has fallen, inviting a view into this breach. A car on a driveway beyond the fallen fence suggests that life in the neighborhood goes
on. Yet, visible just above the car, beyond a grouping of small wooden structures, the one-story house positioned to the right of the neighborhood’s tallest house has lost its once solid, smooth roof.

The transformations continue to unfold. In the photograph dated December 1941, the walls of this house, the rubble from the house on the left, the fence, as well as the large white house on the right are all gone (fig. 21). In the January 1942 photograph, the photographer moves slightly to the left of the previous point to reveal a scene where the driveway that once ran along the removed fence is also gone and replaced by a new grid of foundations being carefully laid by a handful of workers (fig. 22). One worker just to the right of the center of the composition stands holding a plank. Following the line of his posture reveals a small shack still standing just beyond the scene of construction, shaded by a few trees behind a brightly painted house to its right. But in the next month this shack, too, is gone, replaced at the center of the composition by pallets of new building materials, beyond which the viewer can see cleared ground reaching to a line of palm trees, their bases now visible from across the large lot (fig. 23). A photograph from March 1942 again renders this view temporary as the masonry walls of Pueblo del Rio rise from the foundations, their roofs missing much like that of the small white house in the photograph from November (fig. 24). By May, the base layer of the roofs is on and by June, wires extend from a pole at the center of the composition to these roofs, now shining a bright white (figs. 25, 26).

Such photographs doubtlessly provided the Housing Authority with concise records of the monthly construction progress at each of their sites much as they do for historians today. A return to Rubén Alcolea’s initial observations begins to reveal the meaning behind the photographs’ rigid technical formulae. The emphasis on process over results is underscored by the scarcity in the archive of similar photographs inscribed with dates, locations, and points that show housing that could be considered completed. Another emphasis of this archive is on topography and architecture over more obvious indicators of human activity. While human figures appear in several of the shots, they serve less to draw attention to the labors of demolition and construction but rather, like the man holding the plank in the photograph from January, to structure the composition by directing the viewer’s eye to other physical aspects of the site depicted. The notion of “progress” rendered in these photographs, thus, contrasted with the progress of men moving remesh or inspecting bricks as depicted in the Homes for Heroes annual report. As historian of survey photography Robin Kelsey advises, the labor most apparent in these photographs might well be that of the photographers, themselves.
20] Luckhaus Studio, Pueblo del Rio Housing Project, November 6, 1941 [copy print made from the photographic print borrowed from the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ca. 1990], 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Housing Authority Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.

21] Luckhaus Studio, Pueblo del Rio housing Project, December 5, 1941 [copy print made from the photographic print borrowed from the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ca. 1990], 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Housing Authority Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.

22] Luckhaus Studio, Foundation layout at project’s “Point #4,” January 13, 1942 [copy print made from the photographic print borrowed from the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ca. 1990], 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Housing Authority Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.

23] Luckhaus Studio, Photograph of the construction of public housing development Pueblo del Rio, February 20, 1942, gelatin silver print, 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles Photograph Collection, Ph004, Southern California Library (Los Angeles, California).
24 | Luckhaus Studio, Unfinished buildings at project’s “Point #4,” March 27, 1942 [copy print made from the photographic print borrowed from the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ca. 1990], 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Housing Authority Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.

25 | Luckhaus Studio, Building shells at project’s “Point #4,” May 12, 1942 [copy print made from the photographic print borrowed from the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ca. 1990], 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Housing Authority Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.

26 | Luckhaus Studio, Unfinished buildings at housing project, June 2, 1942 [copy print made from the photographic print borrowed from the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles ca. 1990], 8 in. × 10 in. (20.32 cm × 25.4 cm), Housing Authority Collection/Los Angeles Public Library.
A digression through Robin Kelsey’s landmark study of nineteenth-century survey images offers a reminder that survey history is a part of military history in its bureaucratic ties to the United States Department of War. The War Department sponsored the survey for which the Civil War photographer Timothy O’Sullivan produced his now famous photographs of the American West. Before O’Sullivan, however, the War Department also sponsored a “boundary survey” of the border between the United States and Mexico in the mid-1850s—a survey which Kelsey notes was motivated by further desires to expand railroad and mining operations. Nineteenth-century surveys thus extended the work of the War Department into numerous operations dedicated to economic growth but not always directly motivated by impending armed combat. Luckhaus Studio’s survey of the Housing Authority’s five construction sites was a part of this tradition in its drawing on a long history of the military science of surveying that Luckhaus almost certainly practiced during his service in the First World War.

Returning to the photographs taken from point number four at Pueblo del Rio, one sees that change occurs at the site following two trajectories. First, the elevations of the different objects in the terrain change. Houses become shorter through the removal of their roofs, then disappear from one month to the next, eventually leaving a flat open field from which in turn first one story, then two stories of the Pueblo del Rio public housing units rise. Second, changes occur along a line extending from the position of the camera to the horizon. This trajectory is especially visible in the first photographs depicting different stages in the clearing of the old neighborhood. It recalls Steven Moga’s comment on the recurring motifs of roads or other dividing lines that horizontally bisect this line of sight in several photographs of the Housing Authority’s sites selected for public housing. These lines, Moga notes, appear to set the slums apart from the photographer, but also, one might add, apart from the viewer of the photograph.

In Luckhaus Studio’s photographs of the neighborhood off Long Beach Avenue prior to the construction of Pueblo del Rio, this dividing line is noticeably instable. The fence that establishes it in the first photograph taken in August 1941 appears fallen in the photograph from November. In December, the removal of the fence gives way to a view of the driveway that previously ran parallel behind it, until finally the photograph’s line of sight reaches the base of the row of palm trees planted in the distance at the opposite end of the cleared neighborhood. This receding boundary marks both the extent the photographer can see into the old neighborhood, but also the advance of this neighborhood’s demolition—the extent to which the Housing Authority’s operations radically altered the
“face” of this neighborhood, to borrow a term from *Homes for Heroes.*

This changing line quite literally realizes in the landscape the advancement of a housing “front line” behind which the Luckhaus Studio photographer stands their ground at point four, yet continues to look past. Looking back to the photograph from November 1941, the break in this line created by the partially fallen fence might recall an aggressive “breach” of the old neighborhood’s defenses that allows “good housing” into “bad housing’s” territory.

The metaphor of the housing front extends to Luckhaus Studio’s points system, as well. As a veteran of the American Expeditionary Forces’ topographical unit, Arthur Luckhaus would have been exceptionally adept at the process of mapmaking through triangulation methods, or the plotting and measuring of distances between points in a terrain. By the First World War, the use of photography in triangulation was an established practice, although the author of one contemporary military handbook noted that it was still used on a greater scale in Europe and Canada than in the United States. Triangulation with photography was made especially efficient through the wide availability of phototheodolites, or tripod-mounted cameras specially designed for the job. The primary advantage of the phototheodolite in 1918 was not that it did away with sketching the terrain altogether, but that it obviated the need for copious sketching in the field. Like sketches, these photographs taken with a phototheodolite were used as tools in the making of maps. And in World War I, as historian of cartography Christopher Alario explains, accurately scaled maps became especially deadly weapons with the advent of “map shooting,” or the practice of “carrying out artillery strikes and barrages without having to preregister targets and adjust fire.” Such practice allowed for “rolling barrages” behind which soldiers on the ground could advance closely. Photography, in this sense, was critical to moving the fronts of the First World War.

Whether Luckhaus’s photographs taken from these points around the perimeter of public housing sites were instrumental in mapping the areas is doubtful. The Housing Authority created several general maps showing the locations of the different housing developments in Los Angeles and included these with their publications after 1940, but none show the topographic detail of an intensive photographic survey. Their scattered collection of photographs, moreover, does not indicate the completeness required of survey photography for mapmaking. Handbooks from both the First World War and 1941 advised surveyors to take several photographs along the horizon line as seen from a single point or “station.” Although one photograph at the Los Angeles Public Library shows a view of a housing project pieced together from two photographs, Luckhaus Studio appears to have created no such panorama of the different
While Luckhaus’s photographs appear to shift slightly in perspective from point number four from month to month, it is also doubtful whether these photographs created far apart chronologically would have served to provide stereoscopic views useful for calculating distances. Nor do the Studio’s photographs show the characteristic markings created by cross wires found in the ground glass of surveying cameras from both the First World War and the early 1940s that would indicate the principle line and horizon line on the negative. Despite extensive labelling in the photographs, other critical information for mapping is missing, as well. Commensurate with survey practices, Luckhaus Studio stationed the camera at elevated points around the perimeter of the photographed sites, yet the operators failed to add the exact elevations to their notations on the images.

It is also conceivable that Luckhaus’s photographs aided the construction of the new housing by helping to plot and place the new buildings’ foundations. Their use of elevated vantage points and established stations almost always located directly beyond the corners of the site boundaries that were usually marked by street intersections are hallmarks of topographical surveying. A boundary survey, which Luckhaus Studio could have easily accompanied and aided in, was an essential step in the placement of buildings on a lot. In a table of steps in housing construction published with the Housing Authority’s third annual report, for instance, the line-item “Land Surveys” followed “Land Acquisition.” Surveys were also almost certainly involved in creating the “Plans and Specifications” the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles made available to contractors seeking to submit project bids. Still, the Housing Authority recorded having completed “Land Surveys” for Pueblo del Río on August 12, 1940—nearly a year prior to Luckhaus Studio’s creation of its photograph from
point number four on August 6, 1941. Housing architects doubtlessly consulted such measurements in the drafting of their designs and perhaps even supervised the surveying process, as well.

However adumbrate their functions beyond the *Homes for Heroes* report, a final observation about the style of Luckhaus Studio’s photographs is worth considering here. Luckhaus Studio’s photographs of empty lots slated for public housing construction exhibit striking similarities to photographs of empty battlefields and “no man’s lands” before far-off enemy trenches that circulated in US histories penned shortly following the First World War (figs. 28, 29). Other Luckhaus Studio photographs draw more unsettling parallels. The missing roof of the brightly colored house in the old Pueblo del Rio neighborhood might
offer an analogue to the bombed-out roofs of French villages in photographs printed in one history of the Twenty-Ninth Engineers’ flash and sound rangers, or soldiers charged with determining distances for the more accurate positioning of artillery and advancement of troops (fig. 30). Juxtaposed in some instances with photographs of French villages before the war, these photographs of “ruins,” as the author labels the bombed-out structures in his caption, “Ruins at St. Agnaut [sic],” connote war as destruction and loss, especially when juxtaposed when another photograph labelled “Scenes in St. Maurice before the War.” While a further investigation into unpublished photographs taken by the topographic unit would certainly offer additional insight into the ways in which the photography of the First World War figured in the photographing of the Second World War’s home front conflicts, for Luckhaus Studio, at least, the connections are visible and historical in a very personal way.

A TRANSNATIONAL PRACTICE

Luckhaus Studio’s photographs provide a compelling case study for understanding the historical intersections of housing, commercial photography, and war. But this case study also extends the present investigation beyond a charting of archival holdings and the circulation of photographs in magazines. Much scholarship has addressed the global migrations of people that occurred prior to, during, and after the Second World War. More recently, photohistorians have extended their study of the business of photography at this time to a global context, as well, charting the impact of war policies on the global distribution of technologies and their reception. The topic of aerial photography especially has garnered considerable attention. But the range of photographic practices employed during this conflict has yet to be fully registered in its transnational and intercultural dimensions. As historians of cartography note, one of the main tasks of the Twenty-Ninth Engineers during World War I was to amend maps made by the French army. What practices of creating and interpreting photographs came together in this effort? How did photographers meet the challenges of adding to and altering maps created by the army of another nation? What new practices emerged from this cooperation? What legacy did this cooperation leave, and how might it have functioned in mapping different geographic areas, both on the United States home front and in other areas of conflict during the Second World War? As one scholar points out, the centennial of World War I renewed interest in its photographs. But as Luckhaus Studio’s photographs for the Housing Authority show, there remains much work to be done on this photographic front.
The career of Arthur Luckhaus and the work of Luckhaus Studio for the Housing Authority during the third and fourth years of its operation expose the intersections of housing history and photographic history during a turbulent time. Luckhaus Studio gave form to the idea of a housing front for its client by adopting mapmaking’s photographic techniques. The results were photographs which resonated with the housing movement’s presentation of itself as in legion with the Second World War’s home front war workers and frontline soldiers. In the end, however, one cannot help but wonder whether other ideological and emotional factors might have been at work in Luckhaus Studio’s fulfillment of the Housing Authority’s commission. The founder of the photographic studio, Arthur Luckhaus, certainly had practical skills to offer, but the housing front, quite possibly, also presented the veteran with a project that was meaningful on a personal level—a chance to offer his topographical skills in service to the United States once again. Together with many other men between the ages of forty-five and sixty-five, in the spring of 1942 he submitted his name in the Fourth Registration for the selected service.130 But Luckhaus would never again be called.131 Whether he would have wanted to enlist is another question. In the absence of any diaries or photographs attributed to Luckhaus from his service in the First World War, this chapter has sought to fathom the meaning this conflict brought to his photographs for the housing movement during the Second World War. And while Luckhaus remains a single figure in this long transnational history of war photography, it is worth noting that he carried his topographic work in the First World War with him until the end of his life. When Arthur Luckhaus passed away in 1957, inscribed on his gravestone in Valhalla Memorial Park in North Hollywood was the housing-legionnaire photographer’s transnational life in so many words: “Colorado, Sgt Co M 29 Engineers World War I.”132
The compilation of photographically illustrated annual reports and the construction of housing exhibits formed two interrelated areas of the public relations programs of Los Angeles’s housers and planners in the 1940s and early 1950s. This chapter aims to show the relevance of these efforts to this study in their offering of instances where international practices of photography, design, and public relations in housing converged.

Although the making and circulation of displays were widespread practices among housing groups in the 1940s, the subsequent preservation and storage of display panels was not. All the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s exhibits presented in this chapter are now lost. Clues to the form and content of exhibits, however, survive in descriptions and photographs either stored in personal papers and institutional collections or printed in conference reports and trade journals. Photographically illustrated annual reports by local housing authorities not only reproduced photographs of housing exhibits, but also through processes of photographic enlargement and editing were displayed as exhibits, themselves. These records reveal a breadth of concerns that shaped the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s public relations practices, from those of photographic subject matter and composition, to costs, reproducibility, scale, and the use of color.

In facing these concerns, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles hardly stood alone despite the national prominence of its report designs and exhibition activity. Starting in the mid-1940s, the National Association of Housing Officials regularly circulated photographs of housing exhibits from across the country. These photographs reveal that few of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s design or display techniques were particularly unique or innovative, but rather aligned with national strategies for presenting a positive image.
image of public housing to greater publics. At stake in the Authority’s designs for its exhibits was not an image of the modern housing movement as a creative or original endeavor, but a framing of the enterprise as a worthwhile expenditure of federal and local funds.\(^1\) Closely interrelated, the roles of exhibits and reports shifted during the postwar years away from showcasing wartime photography and design and towards providing visual evidence of the creative negotiation of budgetary constraints.

Research on the historical purposes of housing exhibitions has already identified the promotional role of exhibits and reports. This chapter’s closer look at postwar commentary, however, reveals design directives understudied in former research. As will be shown, inherent in these acts of aligning material photographic production with seemingly straightforward official goals is the making of meaningful technical and formal choices. It is precisely the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s penchant for drawing on the photographic skills of people outside its ranks and re-purposing materials from one publicity endeavor to another that makes it a compelling case study for this investigation into the larger housing movement’s strategies for winning public support. While the extent to which these techniques succeeded in creating policies in favor of public housing remains difficult to gauge, together they nonetheless present a complex portrait of the Housing Authority’s public relations work in its busy first decade.\(^2\) A better understanding of the role of photography in these exhibition practices, in short, reveals not only how exhibitions such as those sponsored or created by the Housing Authority performed this educative, political, and cultural work, but also the ways in which material and iconographic mandates registered in their content and design, ultimately winning them national recognition and bringing them before audiences abroad.\(^3\)

**EXHIBITIONS IN A TRANSCONTINENTAL HISTORY OF HOUSING AND URBAN PLANNING**

Recent research by historians of urban planning illuminates the conditions to which housing and urban planning exhibition designs responded. As Carola Hein explains and several other historians acknowledge, housers and planners around the world, especially in the 1940s, created exhibitions to fulfill similar basic functions. Many exhibitions of the first half of the twentieth century aimed at educating their audiences; they allowed housers such as the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles to explain to lay publics such issues as the problem of the slums and promote a “yes” vote on public housing as a solution.
Historically and today, exhibitions might simply “prompt public discussion and awareness,” Hein explains, “even consensus.” Looking back on their history, at times exhibitions also sought public opinion so that planners could educate themselves about the communities they aimed to serve. Finally, exhibitions allowed housers and town planners to present their work to each other. As an opportunity for self-promotion among professionals in similar disciplines and a chance to exchange knowledge and experience through contributions from housers and planners in different cities or different countries, exhibitions often took place in conjunction with the gathering of experts at competitions or conferences. These practices, historians of planning Marco Amati and Robert Freestone observe, were part of “a tradition of planning as ‘civic education’ now largely forgotten.”

While exhibitions performed similar functions, historians of town planning agree that a closer look at individual exhibitions remains instructive in the variety of ways in which these functions were fulfilled. As Hein shows, planning exhibitions performed their educative work in contexts that varied politically and culturally. Robert Freestone further notes that the study of individual exhibitions brings into focus a history of the “interface between technical and lay worlds,” or the social and political relationships between planning groups and their publics. But researching these histories also presents challenges. Focusing on Britain in the 1940s, Peter J. Larkham and Keith D. Lilley acknowledge that while much of the history of exhibitions can be gleaned from archival research and historical journals, the ephemerality of the exhibitions makes them evasive research subjects, “often only known from minor news items.” Photography likewise occupies a precarious spot in this archive. Historians looking for photographs of exhibition installations are often disappointed, Larkham and Lilley caution. Photographs of the installations alone are rare, but photographs showing how the displays were used are rarer. For these reasons, the authors argue that discerning whether exhibitions in 1940s Britain, for example, promoted “active participation” of lay publics in making plans or constituted mere “exercises in placation and persuasion” remains especially difficult.

A growing body of case studies further places special emphasis on exhibitions as means to understanding housing and planning’s transnational history. This research identifies groups like the Congrès internationaux d’architecture moderne (CIAM) and the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning (IFHTP) as well as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the MARS (Modern Architectural Research) Group as prominent actors in fostering forums for the presentation of housing and
planning achievements.\textsuperscript{14} Exhibitions were often the work of travelling designers who brought ideas for the presentation of planning topics with them to planning groups and other institutions abroad.\textsuperscript{15} Several exhibitions, especially during what Freestone and Amati identify as the “peak” periods of the 1910s and 1940s, also went on tour, taking designs and ideas to viewers as opposed to requiring that viewers travel to the exhibition space.\textsuperscript{16} As Amati and Freestone show in their research on the United States Office of War Information’s \textit{US Housing in War and Peace} (1944–1945) and the British Council’s \textit{Town and Country Planning in Great Britain} (1948–1949), post–Second World War exhibitions functioned both as instruments of knowledge exchange among specialists and “soft power” supported by national governments.\textsuperscript{17}

These investigations into international exhibitions moreover demonstrate the intersections of housing and planning with efforts to develop new means of visual communication. As early as the 1910 Town Planning Conference in London, international housing and town planning conferences were multilingual; Freestone and Amati argue that exhibitions “provided a forum for a language that everyone could speak.”\textsuperscript{18} Indeed, at the CIAM meetings and those of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning, where official congress languages were seldom fewer than three, the extra help of visual media with communicating urban problems and plans was both a practical measure and a call for further experimentation in exhibit design. Many studies of exhibitions since the mid-1920s credit Austrian sociologist Otto Neurath with honing the linguistic inclusiveness of housing and planning exhibitions through his development of the ISOTOPE (International System of Typographic Picture Education).\textsuperscript{19} Although designed for use in a variety of areas of the social sciences, one of the immediate applications of this system was Neurath’s own work in housing and planning reform. As founder of the Österreichischer Verband für Siedlungs- und Kleingartenwesen (Austrian Settlement and Allotment Garden Association), Neurath also worked on the 1924 Hygiene Exhibition in Vienna and in 1932 met with CIAM in Moscow to work on what historian of architecture Iain Boyd Whyte describes as “a set of visual symbols that would enable ‘comparative city planning.’”\textsuperscript{20} This final intended application, although never put into effect exactly as Neurath conceived it, sought to make exhibits “speak” the same language not only for the better understanding of audiences, but so that these exhibits may be set in dialogue with one another.\textsuperscript{21}

In addition to fostering Neurath’s efforts to develop a modern language, other historians comment on the role of exhibitions in the development of a “planning gaze.”\textsuperscript{22} Photographs, as Robert Freestone acknowledges, constituted their own “promotional channel” but also figured with plans and models as
important elements of planning exhibitions and other forms of display, such as the magic lantern show. In this connection, Freestone cites photohistorian Maren Stange’s research on the Danish-born, New York-based journalist Jacob Riis’s photographic lantern slide lectures, noting that these lectures created “the groundwork for tenement housing reform in New York.” Better known for his subsequent publication, *How the Other Half Lives: Studies Among the Tenements of New York* (1890), Riis began working with lantern slides as part of his reform-minded journalism in 1887 and continued to lecture with slides until his death in 1914. As Freestone suggests, a refocusing on housing history’s distinct examples of photographic publication and display promises not only a richer understanding of how housing exhibition technologies and techniques worked, but a broader view of the connected histories of housing with those of design, and here one might add journalism, as well.

In this regard, Peter J. Larkham’s introductory essay to *When We Build Again: The Bournville Village Trust* remains a distinguished study for the importance it places on printed material and photographs. In addition to Larkham’s essay, the publication includes reprints of two pamphlets from the history of the Cadbury chocolate manufacturer’s factory town of Bournville. Established in 1879, Bournville attracted Catherine Bauer’s attention in the early 1930s for its similarity to later garden cities and its transition from a factory town to an “autonomous Village Trust” in 1900. The first of the two reprinted booklets, *When We Build Again* (originally printed in 1941), presents the results of a housing survey conducted by the Trust in 1938. In its examination of *When We Build Again*, Larkham’s essay considers the report’s content as well as the details surrounding the publication, from survey and publication timelines to editing, production costs, and goals for the report as recorded in the Bournville Village Trust papers in the Birmingham City Archives. It highlights items from the Bournville Village Trust’s meeting minutes such as notes on the making of lantern slides of the 1942 *When We Build Again* plates for lectures and friezes for schools, the circulation history of the pamphlets, and even the reception of a film titled after the 1942 publication. In placing printed material at the center of the investigation, Larkham’s reading comes closest among studies in the history of planning during the 1940s to a photography-focused approach. Larkham traces a constellation of projects related to the 1942 publication, and in so doing offers a far more nuanced reading of *When We Build Again* than would a consideration of its textual content, alone.

The most promising place to begin an investigation into the meaning of photographs in housing and planning exhibitions is in an area where housing’s exhibition history and photographic-historical studies of exhibitions overlap:
the travelling housing and planning shows of the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Planning-historical studies of these exhibitions such as Freestone and Amati’s position the Museum of Modern Art’s exhibitions as part of transnational exchanges among planners and architects and the postwar promotion among governments of planning as an essential component of a democratic world. Beginning with the 1932 Modern Architecture: International Exhibition, Carola Hein’s study of these shows describes how the Museum circulated modern planning ideas borrowed from Europe within the United States and showed the United States’ interpretation of these ideas to European audiences after the war. As Hein explains, especially the 1944 panel exhibition Look at Your Neighborhood marked a turning point in the Museum of Modern Art’s program (figs. 31, 32). Designed for the Museum’s Department of Circulating Exhibitions by houser and planner Clarence Stein and the architect and brother-in-law of Catherine Bauer, Rudolph Mock, the show featured thirteen panels arguing for neighborhood planning in the United States following the war. Speakers at the exhibition’s premier celebrated the planned communities as “democratic institutions.” Following this premier, the Museum created two hundred copies of these panels that schools and other organizations across the country could rent or purchase.

Comparing these planning-historical studies to those by historians of art and photography shows similar interests in exhibitions’ postwar functions for the United States government, as well. Historian of photography Olivier Lugon explains how the Museum of Modern Art and Life magazine under the aegis of UNESCO and the United States’ Marshall Plan simultaneously developed programs for reproducing and circulating exhibitions as part of the postwar “desire to foster reconciliation, to promote humanistic values and cultural exchange on a wide and democratic basis.” In looking specifically at travelling exhibitions produced in multiple copies like Look At Your Neighborhood, Lugon likewise shows how photography helped “blur the boundaries” between printed publications and exhibitions by “bringing closer layout and display, two- and three-dimensional design”—a practice which his research traces to the photographic exhibitions of the years of the Weimar Republic. As Lugon observes, starting in the 1920s, typographers applied book and other print design techniques to designing three-dimensional exhibition spaces. In the 1940s, the reproducibility of books defined the form of the Museum of Modern Art’s “multiple exhibitions,” as well. Printed using the photogravure process, the multiple panels, like books, were lightweight and mobile.

In both Hein’s and Lugon’s assessments, Look at Your Neighborhood was an innovation—one of the first exhibitions that the Museum circulated in a
multiple format. Bringing Hein’s and Lugon’s studies together underscores the role of housers and planners in the development of the multiple exhibition as well as the instrumentality of photography in housing and planning exhibition design. Specifically, collaborative projects involving museums and housers, as both studies imply, may have brought more to bear on the development of special exhibit and display techniques at midcentury than scholars have previously acknowledged. What one can learn from studying these photographically-laden housing exhibitions as they were wielded in political exercises of transnational cultural influence after the Second World War, then, is how ideas in affordable modern housing shaped the forms and civic roles of photographic exhibitions in a way that privileged their efficiency above all else.
LOS ANGELES AND
THE GERMAN BUILDING EXHIBITION OF 1931

Tracing the impetus for Los Angeles’s involvement in international housing exhibitions might begin seven years prior to the passage of the Housing Act with the desire of Los Angeles real estate groups to partake in an international exhibition organized by the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning and bring the IFHTP congress to Los Angeles to coincide with the 1932 Olympics. As one of the largest international bodies of housing and planning experts of the interwar years, the IFHTP was not necessarily dedicated to upholding public housing over private building, but nonetheless in the years immediately following the war became an important audience for the United States’ public housing movement in general—and, as will be shown, a threat to democracy in the eyes of the Los Angeles real estate lobby.41 Tracing the attempts of different Los Angeles-based groups to participate in the IFHTP’s exhibition program thus situates the public relations efforts of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles as part of a longer history that extends beyond public housing and the city’s limits, in turn providing a backdrop for the importance placed on report design and exhibit activity by the National Association of Housing Officials towards the Second World War’s end.

The International Federation for Housing and Town Planning, as historian Renzo Riboldazzi shows, was one of main organizations to develop out of the garden city movement.42 The congress brought together professionals from architectural and town planning disciplines, civic leaders, and social workers around the idea that cities and regions planned according to modern methods promoted better housing, better opportunities for recreation, and a better life.43 During the 1920s, these members of the soon-to-be-named IFHTP held multiple congresses in cities across Europe and a congress in New York in 1925.44 After several more congresses in Europe, the IFHTP again held its 1938 meeting on the American side of the Atlantic in Mexico City.45 This practice of holding congresses in different cities was characteristic of what Riboldazzi terms the “international approach” that defined this organization’s planning work.46

It was not so much the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning congress, but its accompanying exhibition that first attracted the attention of potential delegates from Los Angeles prior to the federal Housing Act of 1937. News articles indicate that a first attempt to organize such participation occurred in 1930, when Cecil B. Barker of C.C.C. Tatum Realtors proposed that Los Angeles submit “an exhibit depicting Los Angeles housing accommodations and the architecture of the Southland” to the IFHTP’s international exhibition
planned for the following year in Berlin. The exhibit, the Los Angeles Times reported, would include life-sized models of homes and portions of office buildings—all created with the sponsorship of the United States’ National Housing Association and the National Conference of City Planning.

Los Angeles’s initial interest in the IFHTP exhibitions offers a case in point for Carola Hein’s observation that exhibitions provided cities with the opportunity to promote their civic “brand.” For Los Angeles in 1930, the Berlin exhibition would demand a balancing act: paraphrasing Barker, the Times article noted that participation in the congress “would be of the greatest value to Los Angeles realtors, builders, architects, and to the community as a whole,” while also paradoxically confirming that the exhibition organizers wanted to avoid “commercialization of the enterprise.” A contribution by Los Angeles to the Berlin exhibition, in other words, promised to promote the city’s building activity abroad but should not strictly try to sell it.

Certainly aiming to honor the organizers’ wishes, Barker’s express goal that the IFHTP exhibit not appear “commercial” further hinted at a wish to turn away from the region’s “boosterism” of the 1920s that sought to attract the business of vacationers and new residents alike. This wish also likely indicated a sensitivity to some of the debates at the IFHTP surrounding private versus public management of planning projects. As Renzo Riboldazzi notes, although public housing was a topic of IFHTP congresses in the 1920s and 1930s, mainly delegates from European countries discussed public housing as the responsibility of civic and state governments. Representatives to the congress from the United States, on the other hand, saw in the IFHTP a forum to consider the possible contributions of private builders, organizations, and architectural offices to the design of the modern city. Los Angeles’s aim to avoid an exhibit that was too “commercialized” might well have stemmed from a desire to present the city’s building as less of a for-profit venture and more in-tune with progressive European discussions of housing as a public good. Still, however promising Barker’s proposal may have sounded to readers of the Los Angeles Times, records of the Berlin exhibition and the IFHTP congress leave unclear the extent of the city’s participation.

The IFHTP congress and the parallel exhibition, the Deutsche Bauausstellung (German Building Exhibition) presented alluring opportunities to be a part of housing and planning’s international networks. The thirteenth congress met in Berlin in the first week of June 1931. German architect Martin Wagner anticipated in an article on his and Hans Poelzig’s designs for the exhibition buildings and grounds that the exhibition would attract visitors from the meeting halls of no fewer than seventy congresses that would take place during that late spring and summer. Starting a month before the IFHTP congress and finishing
nearly two months later in August, the *German Building Exhibition* was in many ways a bigger event than the IFHTP congress, itself, and a main attraction for congress participants.\(^6\) After attending the congress’ “lantern lectures” and Regierungsbaumeister Werner von Walthuasen’s showing of the film, *Die Stadt von Morgen* (The City of Tomorrow), IFHTP delegates could board the city cars or underground rail at the Zoological Gardens and disembark at the Kaiserdamm station to visit the show at a reduced price of one Mark.\(^5\) There, within Poelzig and Wagner’s pavilions, they would find a seventeen-room hall featuring exhibits from over twenty countries, including the United States.\(^5\) One notable delegate from the United States to the IFHTP congress who likely visited the *German Building Exhibition* was Carol Aronovici, then working as a city planner in the Pacific Palisades neighborhood of Los Angeles.\(^6\) Neither Barker nor a representative from C.C.C. Tatum Realtors appears to have attended the IFHTP congress.\(^5\)

As the 1931 conference in Berlin approached, Los Angeles’s plans to participate in the *German Building Exhibition* soon turned to hopes to host the Federation for the fourteenth congress in 1932—the same year Los Angeles would host the Olympic Games. An article in the *Los Angeles Times* cited the city’s “unprecedented growth and significance in housing and city planning developments” as arguments for the IFHTP to host their next congress in Los Angeles. The preparation and gathering of endorsements for the official invitation to the IFHTP quickly followed, headed by the Chamber of Commerce’s civic development and real estate department.\(^6\) Perhaps through the influence of the former president of the American City Planning Institute in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and newly elected president of the Federation, John Nolen, the IFHTP’s council ultimately chose to hold the 1932 congress in Boston “with a possibility of an extension to Los Angeles before or after the Congress.”\(^5\) The plans for the 1932 congress in Boston, however, were never realized. First postponed to 1933, in the end, the fourteenth congress was not held until 1935 with London as the location, and a single recorded delegate from Los Angeles in attendance.\(^5\)

Despite this failed attempt to bring the IFHTP congress to the city as part of the events surrounding the 1932 Olympics, Los Angeles’s architects and planners continued to attend the international meetings. The 1938 IFHTP meeting in Mexico City welcomed a larger delegation from the Southland including architects Lloyd Wright and Paul R. Williams (both of whom would soon design housing projects for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles) along with representatives from the Los Angeles County Housing Authority, the City Planning Commission, and the Chamber of Commerce—all keen, the *Los Angeles Times* reported, on gaining a better understanding of how planners in other
countries solved their traffic problems. The 1939 congress in Stockholm again prompted Los Angeles to invite the IFHTP to come to the Southern California city in 1941. Colonel William H. Evans of the Federal Housing Administration led the delegation. Checked by the war in Europe, Evans began work on a Pan-American conference scheduled for late 1941 or 1942. But the next congress of the IFHTP would not be until 1946 in the seaside town of Hastings, England.

However minor these news stories, and however minor the representation of Los Angeles at the IFHTP’s events, looking through Robert Freestone’s “lens” of the 1931 German Building Exhibition begins to outline the largely unexplored transnational dimensions of this pre–World War II and pre–1937 Housing Act part of Los Angeles’s planning history. Although unsuccessful, much can be read in Los Angeles’s attempts to bring the IFHTP congress to the city. They hint at a desire to dampen the boosterism of the previous decade. They demonstrate an active effort to partake in an international dialogue on the public funding of planning at a time when the United States still did not have strong laws in place for this funding. Finally, they expose the will of Los Angeles’s planners, architects, politicians, and realtors to forge professional relationships with their fellow planning advocates abroad so that Los Angeles delegates may gather ideas from these international experts for solving planning problems at home.

These attempts at international engagement on housing and planning issues, spurred on by a landmark building exhibition abroad, likewise provide a compelling comparison to renewed efforts on behalf of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles following the Second World War. By the time of the 1946 congress in Hastings, the Housing Authority had eight years of experience to its name that included managing the city’s housing crisis through the war and into the first year of peacetime. The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles did not submit an exhibit to the IFHTP exhibition in 1946. Nor do records indicate that it sent a delegate. But when international housing expert Catherine Bauer contacted the Housing Authority’s Executive Director Howard Holtzendorff about sending some local pamphlets and films to the congress delegates abroad, Holtzendorff responded that either San Francisco or Los Angeles would be happy to host an upcoming IFHTP congress. In a near echo of Barker’s 1931 statement, the director added, “It would be a most valuable and enlightening experience for all housers in this region.”

Midcentury housers in California would never realize the chance to host the IFHTP. The changed interests of real estate groups along with opposition from the Los Angeles Times, as traced in Don Parson’s research, may be at least partly to blame. The same Los Angeles Times that followed the city’s engagement with the IFHTP in the 1930s with at least mild interest ran articles in 1951 denouncing...
the IFHTP's 1948 report on the United Nations' support of public housing. Although the main concern in these articles was the apparent failure of the United Nations to recognize the success of free building enterprise in cities like Los Angeles and uphold it as an international example to be followed, the role of the IFHTP in disseminating the United Nations' statements in print was cited as a similar threat to free enterprise in real estate—a prime example of “Socialist pleading” and “doctrine.” Added to the blacklist of the Los Angeles Times along with the United Nations and the local public housing program, the IFHTP no longer counted as a club which Los Angeles real estate wanted to join, but as a threat to the free market.

The lens of the 1931 German Building Exhibition thus opens up a history of planning aspirations in prewar Los Angeles marked by changing positions among housing's stakeholders and attempts at international engagement now long forgotten. The following review of the housing exhibitions that took place in and around Los Angeles in the 1930s as well as the public relations activities surrounding public housing in the decade that followed aims to bear this transnational history in mind as revelatory of not only the diverse motives and shifting alliances surrounding these events, but also the political pressures with which their sponsors contended.

PHOTOGRAPHIC TECHNIQUES IN REPORT AND EXHIBIT DESIGN

As shown in the Executive Director of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles Howard Holtzendorff's positive response to the possibility of hosting the second postwar IFHTP congress on the West Coast, housers and planners saw in international exhibitions unparalleled opportunities to promote their public images before a broad audience of experts from around the world. But in engaging in such public relations projects, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles also needed to walk a fine line. Exhibitions and exhibits required financial, creative, and material resources. While national housing groups encouraged these activities, this encouragement soon came with a caveat to keep costs low. The question the Authority faced was therefore how to call on exhibition techniques to promote public housing in a way that did not appear to be a waste of funds.

An overview of notable housing exhibitions in the Los Angeles area from the Depression years reveals a history of surprisingly costly displays. While Los Angeles failed to bring the IFHTP congress and its exhibition to the city, in 1932
it succeeded in bringing the Museum of Modern Art’s *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition* to the fifth floor of Bullock’s department store on Wilshire Boulevard. The exhibition brought together a collection of models and enlarged photographs of the work of modernist architects from both Europe and the United States, including that of Los Angeles’s Richard Neutra. Neutra was instrumental in organizing the show’s visit, while the President of the University of Southern California reportedly organized fifteen hundred dollars to pay for it. Whereas other cities opted for the less costly option of renting only the exhibition’s photographs, Los Angeles ordered the pricier package that included architectural models, thereby affording visitors to the gallery a more approximate experience of what would become one of the Museum of Modern Art’s landmark shows of architecture and housing.

Arthur Millier, the contemporary art critic for the *Los Angeles Times*, was quick to point out that *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition* offered lessons in low-cost and public housing to which visitors should pay special heed. For many audiences, relegating the formal tendencies of these examples of modern architecture to an “International Style” tended to depoliticize especially the exhibition’s socially-minded section on affordable mass housing. Possibly quoting material from the exhibition, itself, Millier aimed to correct this misreading by likening the “style” to an approach or strategy:

”[...] the really important thing the exhibit accomplishes is to demonstrate the international style is not in its intention, just a ‘style,’—as in hats or shoes, but an attempt to solve a problem which the nineteenth century neglected—the problem of minimum cost housing for low incomes.”

For Millier, the show’s housing section organized by Lewis Mumford and featuring photographs supplied by Catherine Bauer contained some of the “most significant things” in the show.

World’s fairs provided additional venues for housing exhibitions. Richard Neutra along with several other Southern California-based architects who would go on to design public housing for the Housing Authority soon became involved in the design of *Modeltown—USA*, an exhibit sponsored by the newly-formed Federal Housing Administration for the Better Housing Pavilion at the 1935 California-Pacific International Exposition in San Diego. Opening in May of 1935, the exhibit included fifty-six miniature houses of various architectural styles arranged in a garden city layout. Following the passage of the 1937 Housing Act, Catherine Bauer also advised on a *Modern American Village* exhibit for the 1939 New York World’s Fair. In keeping with the fair’s theme,
“Building the World of Tomorrow,” the purpose of this exhibit was, in Bauer’s view, to “really show the public what great progress could be made in house design, architecture and neighborhood planning” (emphasis in original).  

Finally, in 1940 one group of architects on the West Coast took Bauer’s concept to heart. Calling themselves “Telesis,” this group formed in the late 1930s under the leadership of San Francisco housing reformer Dorothy Erskine and through the efforts of several figures connected with the architecture program at the University of California, Berkeley. As historian of architecture Peter Allen explains, the group’s first major project, an exhibit titled *A Space for Living* held at the San Francisco Museum of Art (now the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art) in 1940, played a significant role in bringing centralized, environmentally-conscious planning to the local area through “citizen education.” As Allen also points out, the San Francisco Telesis soon inspired the formation of a Southern California Telesis group when landscape architect Geraldine Scott and writer Mel Scott—both founders of one of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s greatest proponents, the Citizens’ Housing Council—saw *A Space for Living* under construction in San Francisco and brought the idea of organizing an exhibition back to their fellow housing and planning proponents at home. Centered in Los Angeles, this group that organized the resultant show, *Now We Plan*, receives precious few mentions in the vast body of scholarship on the region. Yet, in 1941, *Now We Plan* constituted possibly the largest planning exhibition Southern California had ever seen.  

The point of the exhibition was to illustrate a modern approach to planning. Citing Webster’s dictionary, the “Telesis for the Los Angeles Region” group defined Telesis in the exhibition's catalogues as “progress intelligently planned and directed; the attainment of desired ends by the application of intelligent human effort to the means.” This “end,” as a review of the exhibition in *California Arts and Architecture* magazine defined it, was the progressive ideal of a “neighborhood atmosphere conducive to the complete development of each member of the community.” Planning, or the application of “an intelligent approach to the ideal community life, providing a maximum of safety, recreational space, facility of communication,” was the means.  

These broadly formulated goals were ostensibly shared by the group’s forty-nine members, including architects Gregory Ain, Robert E. Alexander, Raphael S. Soriano, John Lautner, and Richard Neutra, the city planner and designer Simon Eisner, the bookstore owner Jake Zeitlin, Arthur Millier, and Frank Wilkinson, who soon became the Housing Authority’s assistant to the director. The Housing Authority also appears to have contributed to the 1941 Telesis show by providing data from the 1940 *Housing Survey* about automobile accidents, the per capita
availability of recreation space, and current housing conditions. While the Now We Plan show was the first and only concerted effort realized by the Los Angeles group, many of the members and contributors spent the greater part of the decade pursuing the Telesis group’s goals through their individual work. In addition to the young Frank Wilkinson, the architect Robert E. Alexander would go on to work for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles when he collaborated with architect Richard Neutra on the Elysian Park Heights development. Other contributors to the show, such as the photographer Julius Shulman, California Arts and Architecture magazine, and the Haynes Foundation would prove valuable contacts to the Housing Authority in respectively growing, circulating, and preserving parts of its photography collection.

The show that resulted from this concerted effort, Now We Plan, opened on October 23, 1941, in the Los Angeles County Museum of History, Science and Art in Exhibition Park. Organized into a series of seven spaces, the exhibition began with “a 12-foot golden sun” and “a large relief map of the region in its primitive state,” to quote Millier’s extensive review of the show for the Los Angeles Times. The visitor then proceeded to view a series of “peep-show miniatures” showing scenes of Los Angeles County in the years 1820, 1880, 1890, 1910, and 1920. Features of the show that captured visitors’ attention included an “electric eye” that clicked like a time clock as visitors passed and “mural blow-ups of ballots, marked with an ‘X’ in a space labelled ‘better planning.’” Most spectacular of all, however, was the presence in one of the galleries of a house that, according to the review in Time, had been “transported whole from a Los Angeles slum” to be displayed “accusingly before a backdrop of Los Angeles’s skyscraping city hall” in a spatial arrangement not unlike that of the photographs juxtaposed in the montage in the 1940 Housing Survey (fig. 7).

California Arts and Architecture published several views of Now We Plan in its November 1941 issue. The photograph on the first page of the article shows a scene to match Millier’s description of the first room: peeking out from between a pillar and a gallery wall, a large, light-colored circle appears to hang from the gallery’s ceiling surrounded by abstract clouds while “rays” of light bear down upon cut-out mountains that rise from the floor below (fig. 33). A second, smaller photograph appears on the same page, cropped to accentuate the curve of a wall of barely discernible photographs arranged side-by-side. Views of the exhibition on the following pages show an arrangement of photographs pinned at varying angles on a fence-like wall next to a sign reading “Circulation must be planned” (fig. 34), while others on the final page of the article show the exhibit’s models and maps—one from a bird’s eye view (fig. 35). Reproduced slightly smaller on the article’s second page is a photograph of the recontextualized
house (fig. 34). Separated from the room by a leaning fence and demarcated by a sign whose message remains obscured by the graininess of the photograph’s reproduction, the house appears to be actually two structures—a larger building or part thereof on the left, with a smaller building bearing a strong resemblance in size and construction to an outdoor toilet on the right.\(^{100}\)

The two catalogues that were printed to accompany the exhibition interpreted the role of visitors thus: “if we vote for good planning measures, and officials who know the need for planning, we can have a regional community that serves our needs.”\(^{101}\) Among the reported visitors to the show were the Civic Development and Construction Industries committees of the Chamber of Commerce, who met at the museum for lunch and a tour of the exhibit just three days after the bombing of Pearl Harbor.\(^{102}\) But the immediate effect of this visit on housing legislation remains unclear. The articles in *Time* and *California Arts and Architecture* set aside, little in the record details the impact of *Now We Plan* on Los Angeles’s public housing program.\(^{103}\)

Far clearer is the opinion of one influential houser about the *Now We Plan* show’s design. Catherine Bauer wrote to her sister, the curator Elizabeth Mock...
at the Museum of Modern Art, regarding one of Mock’s recent shows. “The more I think of that exhibit the more I feel it’s the best thing of the kind that’s been done,” Bauer lauded Mock’s unspecified exhibition. She then offered up the recent Telesis shows in San Francisco and Los Angeles as foils:

“The Telesis shows were too fancy and involved—particularly in presentation technique—and the others have been generally too statistical and wordy, or just visually dreary. Yours seems to me simple and direct and fresh, and without that smarty Modernite that makes people say How Cute or How Amazing without bothering to notice what it’s about.”

Reminding her sister at the Museum of Modern Art of the stakes in housing and planning exhibition design, Bauer’s criticism, quite simply, was that the Telesis exhibitions’ complex forms obscured their message. This challenge of defining the forms and aims of housing exhibits was one with which the local Los Angeles Housing Authority and others across the country would continue to grapple well into the postwar years.
CIRCULATING EXHIBIT PHOTOGRAPHS

In the first few years of its operation, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles organized several exhibits in addition to its contribution to the Telesis show. Displayed in contexts ranging from a junior high school to the University of Southern California's Annual Institute of Government summer conference to the Southern California Home Show of 1940, the Authority's exhibits aimed to reach a broad audience in the local community. The exhibit forms and techniques the Authority called on to do this, however, differed markedly from those deployed by Telesis for Now We Plan.

One photograph printed in Progress, the Housing Authority's second annual report, shows a 1940 display consisting of several chairs arranged theater-style before a screen (fig. 36). Along the top of the wall and running the length of the chairs are unidentified printed panels arranged side by side. Below the panels, an architectural drawing presents a barely discernible landscape—perhaps a plan for one of the many public housing projects that the Housing Authority would soon build. Another photograph printed in the third annual report shows the Housing Authority's exhibit at the 1941 county fair in Pomona (fig. 37). Grainy and dark, the photograph offers a rare view of an exhibit in action: a woman in a hat looks back over her left shoulder as she exits a darkened room, her attention arrested by a bright image of an outdoor scene projected in the dark space on a side wall.

The Housing Authority published these photographs in its second and third annual reports as a testament to its yearly activity in "public relations," as the Authority headed the section of the second annual report in which the empty exhibit photograph was shown. These activities also included speeches, radio broadcasts, articles in local periodicals, as well as the inauguration of the Housing Authority's own Housing and Slum Clearance News (later titled simply Los Angeles Housing News). But the inclusion of the photographs of exhibits deserves closer scrutiny as an especially efficient form of reporting—a form that presented a public image of the Housing Authority and its work.Coming together in these tiny, grainy pictures are multiple forms of "all-encompassing' media" (to deploy an apt phrase devised by Olivier Lugon and Laurent Guido to describe the shared capacity of books, projection media, and exhibitions to "make the circulation of images possible"). And in this condensed presentation, one begins to see how the housing movement’s ideals translated into the very structure and materiality of its publicity program. Next to a caption claiming "'Housing in Our Time' Shown 10 Times Daily for 18 Days,” for example, the compilers of the third annual report included a short description of the depicted event:
“Eight thousand five hundred visitors attended the City Authority’s exhibit at the Los Angeles County Fair, Pomona, most of whom saw ‘Housing in Our Time,’ USHA motion picture. Models of proposed projects were on display, and much informational material was distributed. There was no charge for space utilized by the Authority in this exhibit.”

36] Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Progress: The Second Annual Report of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, California, July 1, 1939 through June 30, 1940 ([Los Angeles]: [The Authority], 1940), 16–17, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

37] Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Third Annual Report, July 1, 1940–June 30, 1941 ([Los Angeles]: [The Authority], 1941), n.p., The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
In telegraphic language, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles relays the details of the exhibit with an efficiency to underscore that of its design and operation. The exhibit, like the housing it promoted, was affordable to make. It drew a crowd the size of a town. The film issued by the United States Housing Authority, as the photograph suggests, stole the show.

A review of these records also shows that the 1941 county fair exhibit recycled numerous materials from among those shown the previous year. The USHA's film made another appearance. The almost unintelligible poster display along the top of the wall in the 1940 exhibit at the Southern California Home Show also appeared in the 1941 display, this time placed high over the entrance to the alcove. Like the photographs and models in the Museum of Modern Art's travelling show, these panels travelled to different exhibition sites, as well. In examining these practices, it is tempting to think that the Authority designed or purchased these panels with their reuse in mind—and for a good reason. The reuse of the exhibit itself was a display of adaptability similar to the Housing Authority's approach to housing construction. In the second annual report, for instance, the Housing Authority included a note that “all projects of this Authority are so designed [that, N.K.O.] they may be built on any site of more or less prescribed size.” Like poster panels and films, housing designs could be easily adapted to new spaces, sparing the Authority the costs of entirely new architectural plans.

One of the key agents in the promotion of exhibits as housing work following the war was the National Association of Housing Officials’ monthly publication, the *Journal of Housing*. Inaugurated in October 1944, the *Journal of Housing* replaced NAHO News and the *Housing Management Bulletin* as the “official publication of the Association's Management Division” and soon embarked on a mission to provide a forum for housing officials from across the country. Auspiciously for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Director Howard L. Holtzendorff was also the president of NAHO at the time, and penned a few goals for the new journal that were printed inside the cover of the first issue. “The publication of The Journal of HOUSING signalizes the program—its unity, its comprehensiveness, and its appreciation for the problems which are before us,” he wrote, interpreting the publication as a self-portrait of the Association in the scope and nature of its work. But for Holtzendorff, this self-portrait also needed to be a critical one. Housing’s administrative work “must be evaluated,” he wrote,

“A strong voice must speak out for ever-improving administration, for ever more effective standards, for ever-increasing efficiency. It is not NAHO’s
responsibility to educate the public or to wage the battle of housing in the press, on the platform, or in legislative halls. It is NAHO's responsibility to aid in seeing that housing administration performs the best possible job with the means available. We dedicate The Journal of HOUSING to that task.” (emphasis in original)

In this dedication, Holtzendorff conceived of the journal as an administrative tool—as a resource to which public housing officials at local authorities and managers of housing projects could look for help in improving their own local administrative practices. And as subsequent issues of the Journal of Housing soon showed, the singular “strong voice” Holtzendorff demanded expressed many different views about how best to operate a national program.

Under the editorship of houser Dorothy Gazzolo, the Journal of Housing presented representatives of housing authorities with a variety of opportunities to showcase and view each other’s administrative work. Month after month, readers of the journal could find in its pages such pertinent information as news on the status of national housing legislation, reports of the goings-on at the various regional NAHO chapters, biographies and interviews with individual housing professionals (kicked off in the second issue with an article on Catherine Bauer), and practical tips for the maintenance of buildings and grounds in public housing projects. Starting in 1946, one could also find photographs of housing exhibits produced by local authorities and other public housing proponents from across the country.

On the level of their content, the exhibit photographs reproduced in the Journal of Housing offer a rare view of the array of postwar exhibits and displays on subjects ranging from the broader benefits of neighborhood planning to the more specific needs for public housing. For instance, a photograph in the January 1946 issue depicting the wall of a 1945 planning exhibition in San José, California, takes a large map as its subject (fig. 38). To its left is a photograph and drawing of “Good Housing.” Enclosed in a square, this drawing overlaps with a circle inscribed with words denoting some of good housing’s amenities: “privacy,” “convenience,” “safety,” “space,” and “air.” Photographs of uniform size flank the map and this arrangement in orderly columns. “Do the homes in your neighborhood invite Better Living?!” the display asks, encouraging viewers to reflect on whether the homes they know exhibit the qualities of good housing the display invites them to see.

A photograph of an exhibit by the Citizens Planning and Housing Association of Baltimore printed in the May 1946 issue of the Journal of Housing invites a similar reflection by placing photographs and numerical data at the forefront
of its argument (fig. 39). The exhibit consists of three standing panels that form a niche for the display of leaflets and a title plaque. On the center panel in large letters is the name of the city followed by “Your city is what you make it. You can help shape it. Join the fight for slum clearance, master plan for Baltimore [...]” and the list of initiatives goes on. Additional text offers such unsettling data as “6,000 homes, no electricity” and “49,000 homes without a private flush toilet.” Following these data points are arrows pointing to an outline of the Baltimore city limits. Again enjoining the viewer to envision a better city, the left and right panels show two montages beneath the words “This?” on the left panel and “or This?” on the right one. The choice, the photographs seem to suggest, is clear. On the left, a photograph of a crowded yard is set above a photograph of a group of children in the doorway of a house that appears much too small to accommodate them all. The house’s windows are broken. Its thin roof sags. By contrast, the top photograph on the exhibit’s right panel shows children playing in the sparkling water of a fountain in a spacious yard surrounded by apartment buildings. This photograph is set right above another one of houses
surrounded by large lawns and trees. In front of this panel, the exhibit's creators set up a paper-doll-like cutout of a woman and man to gaze upon the pleasant scene.

Probably a mistake in the printing or reproduction of this photograph in the journal, text stamped across the portion of the photograph showing this right panel draws the viewer's attention away from the photographs in the exhibit to the photograph of the exhibit. The photograph of the three panels in the Baltimore exhibit shows the display from the front and closely framed, offering few hints as to the scale of the construction or the spatial context. A separate photograph published in the Journal of Housing two years later also shows an exhibit from Baltimore in much the same way. The exhibit, again consisting of three panels forming a small alcove, yet again addresses the viewer directly, but this time with a message that is perhaps more unsettling: "You are standing in the midst of blight—right here." A rod affixed to a point following this final word at the top of the exhibit's back panel draws the viewer's eye down and forward to a point on a map on a fourth panel facing upward (fig. 40). The point, the caption
to the exhibit photograph explains, indicates the location of the building in which this exhibit was displayed.\textsuperscript{119}

Frustrating as some of these small, grainy photographs may be for historians of exhibit design, the \textit{Journal of Housing} invariably presents them as proud evidence of local achievements. The captions underscore notable exhibit features and often credit individual designers, as in the case of the first Baltimore exhibit. If the exhibit received favorable responses from viewers, the editors of the \textit{Journal of Housing} included these details, as well. In the caption to the photograph of a booth in Texas, they noted the remarks of one visitor, “‘Why that means everybody can live decent,’” while also highlighting that models of developments in San Antonio and Dallas “attracted particular attention” (fig. 41).\textsuperscript{120} In the case of the 1946 “Baltimore: Your City is What You Make It” exhibit, the editors explained that the exhibit won an award “in ‘recognition of outstanding service…and in furtherance of a greater spirit of public appreciation and cooperation in achieving needed civic improvements.’”\textsuperscript{121} In this citation, the \textit{Journal of Housing} seemed to suggest that the exhibit itself won a public service award, thereby ascribing agency to the exhibit while conflating the display with the civic work it showed.

Taken together, these photographs of housing exhibits from the immediate postwar years reveal practices that applied simple materials of boards and paper with succinct pro-housing messages. While direct connections between exhibits and voting remain difficult to trace, as the latter case showed, these materials and techniques were effective in at least winning recognition for housing officials and their work. A win for an exhibit was a win for the people who made it and the social and political endeavor of public housing they furthered. Still, despite its advocacy for a comparative and evaluative approach to all aspects of housing work, the \textit{Journal of Housing} did not sponsor its own exhibit competitions during these early postwar years—at least not directly. Instead, it encouraged competition in a far more fundamental area of local housing authority activity: the design of annual reports. The following section now examines the defining of the annual report in the early to mid-1940s and the effect this effort had on housing exhibition activities after the war.
THE LOS ANGELES ANNUAL REPORT AS EXHIBIT, 1946–1948

Required by the California Housing Authorities Law of 1938, the annual report was a presentation by each local authority to the State Clerk of their activity in the previous year. It was also more than simply a way for the state government to monitor local housing authorities: the State Clerk required California housing authorities to include “recommendations with reference to such additional legislation or other action” to improve the effectiveness of the State Housing Authorities Law. The question of the form such a report should take was largely left open to local interpretations—an openness which soon gave way to brilliant works in photography, typography, and layout design. By 1945, the status of the report as a designed object could no longer be ignored. That year, the American Institute of Graphic Arts in New York held a competition and a Town and City Reports Exhibition to which they invited local housing authorities to submit their best work.

Then entering its thirty-first year as a professional association for designers across the country, the American Institute of Graphic Arts already sponsored an annual “Fifty Books of the Year” design competition. The 1945 Town and City Reports Exhibition, however, was “the first of its kind,” as the Journal of Housing reported. The express goal of the competition’s exhibition was “to promote more effective local government through stimulating the widespread publication of well-designed reports—for the better education of the citizen,” the journal quoted in words not unlike NAHO President Howard Holtzendorff’s own mission statement for the Journal of Housing, itself. Seizing upon this opportunity to win national recognition, thirty-two local housing authorities submitted their wartime reports to the American Institute of Graphic Arts for judging by the Institute’s members and a panel of “authorities on municipal affairs.”

The Town and City Reports Exhibition ran from September 25 until October 28, 1945, at the New York Public Library. Of the roughly sixty reports on display, eleven represented the work of local public housing authorities. Selected based on “(1) size of communities; (2) general appearance and workmanship of reports; (3) number and quality of charts, maps, and illustrations; (4) color and variety of presentation; (5) inclusion of financial statements;” and “(6) success in meeting intended purpose of presenting a clear and accurate report to the public,” the winning reports represented an array of designs from the war years as developed by authorities across the country. Some of the exhibited reports, such as the reports by the New York City Housing Authority, the Housing Authority of Vancouver, and the Municipal Housing Authority of the City of Schenectady, were simple annual reports covering the year 1944. Others,
such as the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority’s Ten Years of Progress—1934–1944 or The First Seven Years by the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh, consolidated several years of reporting into histories of local housing movements.131

In presenting these reports as works of graphic design, the Institute’s exhibition challenged contemporary perceptions of government publications. Writing in the Bulletin of the New York Public Library, Astor Lenox and Tilden Foundations, the library’s director, Franklin F. Hopper, offered the backhanded compliment that the reports “looked interesting enough to read.”132 A closer look at one particularly innovative report by the Housing Authority of the City of Vallejo shows how the reports in the exhibition might have moved the library director to his statement. Titled These Are the Houses Sam Built; Vallejo, July 1942–January 1944, the report turns public housing activity in the Northern California city into the content of a storybook-like presentation.133 The title plays with the title and first line of a British nursery rhyme, “The House that Jack Built,” by replacing “Jack” with “Sam,” a shortened reference to the United States’ uncle who called it to action in the First World War.134 Subsequent pages tell the story of these houses with repeating and rhyming titles: “These are the people who came to live in the houses...” (fig. 42), “This is the reason the people came” (fig. 43), “This is the town the people found,” the story begins (fig. 44). The “these” and “this” referenced in the titles are quickly explained by text, diagrams, and drawings by the book’s layout designer, Pat Dunleavy, as well as photographs of subjects ranging from shipyard workers to housing units taken by a host of now utterly obscure photographers, but also by the star of Los Angeles’s architectural press, Julius Shulman.135 Adopting these verbal and visual characteristics of a children’s book, the annual report clearly and cleverly explained the “who,” “what,” “where,” and “why” of Vallejo’s housing for the workers at the nearby Mare Island shipyards while presenting war housing in an accessible and indeed “interesting” format.

The Journal of Housing did not reprint exemplary pages from these winning reports for its readers to study and emulate, but in listing these reports exhibited in New York, it almost certainly encouraged other local authorities to obtain copies and study their award-winning designs. Working at maximum capacity to manage Los Angeles’s wartime housing crisis, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles had not created a report since Homes for Heroes, nor did it submit this report on its activities from July 1941 through June 1942 to the competition in New York.136 Instead, in 1945 the Authority was in the process of completing what Chairman of the NAHO Reports Subcommittee Marion Massen would later call a “glamour number”—a heavily illustrated report covering the local authority’s work for the years from 1942 to 1945.137 Borrowing words


from one of President Roosevelt’s speeches, the Housing Authority titled this report *A Decent Home, an American Right* (fig. 45).  

*A Decent Home, an American Right* does not have the same nursery-rhyme innocence of the report of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s neighbors to the north in Vallejo. The Housing Authority of the City of Vallejo was established mainly to manage the emergency wartime housing in the largely undeveloped areas surrounding Vallejo. The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, on the other hand, was established to build public housing to replace the city’s substandard housing. Only as the United States began mobilizing for war did the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles re-designate its projects as housing for the workers coming from across the country to take jobs in Los Angeles’s defense industries. The Housing Authority’s report of 1945, thus, tells a story of a double-war on the slums at home and the Axis powers abroad much like that in *Homes for Heroes*, only this time with forceful photographs of children sitting in the dirt, apparently unattended in the yards of
the city’s substandard housing (fig. 46), planes soaring through the clouds (fig. 47), and workers on their way to a factory (fig. 48).

In terms of design, a closer look at a common feature underscores the formal differences between *A Decent Home, an American Right* and the reports of neighboring housing authorities. By 1945, many annual reports issued by housing authorities contained a “letter of transmittal” written by the chairperson or commissioner of the housing authority to the city’s mayor. While some local authorities like the Housing Authority of the City of Vallejo did not always integrate this letter into the pages of their reports, others took the opportunity to incorporate the letter into more complex layouts. For instance, the uncredited designers of the San Francisco Housing Authority’s report reproduced their commissioner’s letter on a full page opposite a photograph of the city’s mayor standing behind a display of ship models and public housing photographs (fig. 49). The mayor holds a sign bearing the words “San Francisco’s Arms Around War Housing” with arms outstretched as though embracing the exhibit. The

---

46] Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, *A Decent Home, an American Right: 5th, 6th and 7th Consolidated Report*, ed. Frank Wilkinson ([Los Angeles]: s.n., 1945), 8–9, Esther Lewittes Mipaas Collection.


close cropping of Mayor Lapham’s portrait and the exhibit further adds to the strangeness of the pose by removing all spatial context, leaving him looking like a paper doll pasted on the page.

In contrast, city planner Simon Eisner’s design for the Los Angeles report takes a far more dynamic approach to the reproduction of Commissioner Nicola Giulii’s letter. Rotated at a forty-five-degree angle and reduced in size to the point where the text is almost illegible, the letter in *A Decent Home, an American Right* follows the tilt of a set of parallel lines crossing the two-page spread from the lower left of the layout to the upper right (fig. 50). On the right page, a drawing shows three servicemen and a war worker marching toward the page’s right edge. A small map of the city fills the upper corner. Eisner’s layout thus turns the letter into a shape away from which the war heroes march, following a bright red line to Los Angeles and the words “In Decent Homes.”

The rest of the Los Angeles report exhibits a similar hierarchy of small text, larger titles, and—larger than both—images. Looking at the titles, one sees that like Dunleavy’s design for Vallejo, Eisner’s design for the later Los Angeles report not only made these titles large, but also included ellipses within several of them. As scholar of literature Anne Toner explains, in the twentieth century, writers and publishers turned increasingly to three dots ("...") over asterisks and dashes as a preferred notation to indicate omission or the obscure as well as “rupture, fragmentation, and formlessness.” Dunleavy’s design for the Vallejo
report follows this trend of using three dots, but Eisner’s design for the Los Angeles report uses far more.

Tempting as it may be to associate this profusion of dots with the scale of the housing crisis in Los Angeles during and after the Second World War, the dots were more likely an example of what Toner terms “experimental typography.” The omission traditionally associated with these dots is seldom clear. In one layout, the title reads “36,283 people……………were housed”—a sentence
which without the mark of omission would still make sense and sound complete (fig. 51). But from a design point of view, the dots serve the practical function of expanding shorter titles to fit to the entire width of the layout. These dots occur most prominently between phrases in the titles along the bottom of the report’s pages, connecting them across the gutter. In this application, the dots underscore the spatial and syntactical connection between the text on the facing pages while also slowly drawing the reader’s eye from one part of the phrase to the next and from one page to the next, much like the long lines of dots that lead a reader’s eyes from chapter titles to page numbers in a table of contents.

Taking the spatial relationship of these titles to the overall visual and textual content of the pages into consideration, one sees how the dots also slow the reading of the text by introducing pauses: “On the battlefields...we fought and died...for” reads one of these titles across pages four and five, leaving the sentence evidently unfinished (fig. 47). Looking up from this text along the bottom of the page reveals a montage of black and white photographs of planes in flight, tanks and men in helmets in a destroyed forest of palm trees, a ship aflame on the water, and a field of white crosses and Stars of David before an American flag flying at half-mast. The “for” at the end of the phrase is the same red as the giant V—a “V for Victory” that cuts across the montage, delineating the different photographic elements with the shape of a letter that dominated US wartime culture. The V completes the sentence. Still, the next pages take the meaning of the sentence further. With the words “the American way of...living...for all people,” the layout on pages six and seven offers a more nuanced ending to the text on the previous two pages (fig. 48). Photographs above captions reading “Religion,” “Free speech,” “Work,” “School,” “Recreation,” and “Culture” illustrate these various aspects of American living that victory allegedly protects. Finally, in the same red as the “for” and the V of the previous layout, the words “for this” appear along with a circle around a photograph of children playing on the grass in front of a public housing unit. The compilers of the report labelled this photograph “Home.” In inserting ellipses into the text that runs along the bottom of these visually dense pages, Eisner may well have intended the reader to look up from the words to the report’s complex photographic montages and discover the subtleties they and their captions introduced to the meanings of the phrases below.

To say that Eisner’s design aimed at a cinematic effect in crafting this temporal relationship between text and image would not have been a stretch of the imagination. As the photographs of the Southern California Home Show and county fair exhibits in Los Angeles’s prewar annual reports show, films such as
the United States Housing Authority’s *Housing in Our Time* were centerpieces in public housing’s early public relations efforts. A few years after the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles published *A Decent Home, an American Right*, it also began to enjoy the benefit of films specifically about housing in Los Angeles. In 1948, University of Southern California student Chester Kessler created *What We Can Do for Joe.* In 1951, with Frank Wilkinson of the Housing Authority credited as a “technical advisor,” two more University of Southern California film students, Algernon G. Walker and Gene Petersen, produced and directed the twelve-minute 16-millimeter film *And Ten Thousand More* (ellipses in original) as a testament to the need for ten thousand more public housing units with the passage of the Housing Act of 1949. Still, prior to the Housing Authority’s involvement in the student work of the nearby film school, prior to Eisner’s design for the postwar “glamour number,” and prior to the exhibition of local annual reports by the American Institute of Graphic Arts, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s work in print appears to have realized the promotional potential of film in surprising ways.

Writing in 1943 in the journal of the National Municipal League (a professional organization of city employees), one M.R., likely one of the journal’s contributing editors on research, Miriam Roher, deemed the Housing Authority’s earlier publication, *Homes for Heroes*, “the best piece of local government reporting” that had crossed her desk. She then proceeded to construct a string of comparisons starting with a reference to the cover, which

“sets the pace for so dramatic a production that the unrelieved black and white of the interior has a chromatic effect and the reader would probably swear, after reading the book, that it was done in reds, greens, and yellows. Movement as well as color is suggested. Not only because there is a generous use of stunning photography throughout, but also because of skillful makeup, the total effect is that of a well done documentary movie. Not for nothing, apparently, does the Los Angeles Housing Authority operate in Hollywood.”

By “skillful makeup,” Roher likely meant the report designer Alvin Lustig’s dynamic layouts. With cut out and tilted photographs, such as one of soldiers forming the silhouette of a dove carrying an olive branch (fig. 52), as well as text-filled arrows pointing on diagonals to more text and photos (fig. 14), the report adheres to a modern grid filled with visual stimuli. Roher further credited these photographs and their cropping and arrangement with producing a viewing experience not unlike that of viewing a filmic production—a “well
done documentary." This acrobatic chain of associations—from still photography and book design, to color and motion, to documentary film, to Hollywood, the capital of the United States’ entertainment industry—blurs distinctions “between still and moving images,” monochrome and color, housing reporting and the claims to realism in film.\textsuperscript{152}

Miriam Roher’s perceptive evaluation of the *Homes for Heroes* annual report set aside, her access to a copy prompts a far more fundamental investigation into the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s strategies for distributing its publications to a diverse and geographically far-reaching readership. Although failing to submit a report to the American Institute of Graphic Arts’ 1945 design competition, the Authority’s scant records show careful consideration of the production and placement of its printed materials. As mentioned in the Authority’s second annual report, copies of the 1940 *Housing Survey* were readily accessible at local public and university libraries, while the Housing Authority’s newsletter was “available for reading at every library and school in Los Angeles.”\textsuperscript{153} In a memo in Frank Wilkinson’s files outlining a "Public Relations Program" for 1946, the Housing Authority stated its aim to increase the mailing list for its smaller publication, the monthly *Los Angeles Housing News*, to at least five thousand in 1946.\textsuperscript{154} Further examination of the 1945 publications reveals that however many of *A Decent Home, an American Right* the Housing Authority printed, it quickly exhausted this supply. In the same Public Relations Program memo, the first to-do item listed under “Annual Report” was a
Perhaps to help with the shortage of reports, but also to offer a different reading experience, the Housing Authority included in the 1946 Public Relations Program special provisions to transform *A Decent Home, an American Right* into a larger, yet still portable and circulating display. The next line-item in the program for the annual report was the "Reproduction of certain pages for exhibits"—and indeed, further records from 1946 indicate that the pages of *A Decent Home, an American Right* formed the basis for several exhibits shown across the country. In April 1946, *Housing News* relayed that the report "has been gathering encomiums everywhere," but most recently in New York City at the fifteenth annual National Public Housing Conference. With more than seven hundred fifty attendees "from all over the country, representing Housing Authorities and Agencies and Labor and Civic Organizations," and boasting a program with speeches by Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. and Wilson Wyatt, President Truman's recently appointed National Housing Administrator, the conference provided *Los Angeles's A Decent Home, an American Right* with a vast readership of notable members. "The conception, the editorial content, and the photographic artistry, all came in for their share of the general admiration," *Housing News* reported, deeming the exhibit a public relations success.

The *Los Angeles Housing News* article further hinted at how photography was integral to the report’s promotion of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s work. The man behind the project, the article claimed, was the Authority’s own Frank Wilkinson, the editor of *A Decent Home, an American Right* and by 1946 Executive Director Holtzendorff’s “Informational Assistant.” Under Wilkinson’s direction, the Housing Authority “enlarged” approximately forty of the seventy-three pages in the consolidated annual report to the size of “30 × 40 panels.” The two photographs printed with the *Housing News* article show the effect of this selection and scaling. The first closely cropped image depicts the housing activities chairman for the American Veterans Committee, Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., standing alongside the retiring president of the conference, Bryn J. Hovde (fig. 53). Roosevelt Jr. peers intently and points at a panel displaying an enlargement of the consolidated annual report’s cover, while Hovde looks on. The panel is propped to the right of a title panel on an easel. A line of panels on similar easels continues to the right, further backed by a slightly warped stretch of light-colored paper. Taken by an unknown photographer from a mezzanine or balcony, the second photograph in the *Housing News* article gives readers an idea of the size and spatial positioning of the Housing Authority’s exhibit at the National Public Housing Conference in New...
York. “Circling the walls, the Los Angeles exhibit dominates the room,” the photograph’s caption begins. The shot shows a seated audience before a panel of men at a table. One of the men stands as though to deliver a speech. To the left of the man is the American flag, and to the left of the flag is the final panel of the long line that makes up the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s display—a display so long that it turns the corner of the large ballroom.

Photographic negatives of two of the report’s pages in the Housing Authority Photograph Collection at the Southern California Library suggest that rather than send the pages to a photo lab for enlargement and editing, the Authority likely performed many steps in these processes, itself (figs. 54, 55). The negatives reveal entire layouts of pages forty and forty-three from A Decent Home, an American Right that could have been used for not only reproduction, but enlargement. Editing, moreover, is evident in the masking of all but the tabular parts of the negatives with thick paper. Taken together, these negatives and the newsletter articles about the exhibits leave open the possibility that the Housing Authority created multiple copies of the panels and used photography to extract specific content from them.

A return to Olivier Lugon’s research shows that the concept of circulating multiple exhibitions was nothing new in 1946. Not only was the Museum of Modern Art actively circulating such multiple exhibitions as Look at Your Neigh-
borhood, but already in the 1920s such institutions as Otto Neurath’s Social and Economic Museum turned to reproducible exhibits as ways to reach broader publics. The US public housing movement of the 1930s likewise turned to photography as a means of reproducing and circulating graphic elements which themselves may not have been originally photographic. Consider, for instance, one letter written by Housing Study Guild member Catherine Bauer to fellow member Clarence Stein in 1934: “I don’t have any of the photographs of the whole Charts, if that was what you wanted,” she stated.

“And most of my originals were loaned to the Museum of Modern Art, from which they have only just now come back. I’ll send you the picture of new houses in Welwyn (which headed the chart England I) just as soon as I get back to Philadelphia. Also the whole bunch of photographs that I borrowed from your files some months ago.”
Bauer also wrote to Carol Aronovici while she was working for the Labor Housing Conference to ask for “copies” of “any extra charts laying around your office,” especially in the way of “cost-and-rent analyses like the one which compared private, limited dividend and municipal set-ups” for a “Housing Report” she was writing.\textsuperscript{167}

The exchange of photographic “copies” of graphic presentations of textual and numerical data was early on part and parcel of the exchange of photographs in the processes of housing research, exhibition-building, and publication. Still, as Lugon notes, these early twentieth-century practices of photographing pages of text might be traced back further in photographic history in their realization of one of the functions William Henry Fox Talbot ascribed to photography as early as the mid-1840s in \textit{The Pencil of Nature}.\textsuperscript{168} The result was not innovation but a meaningful efficiency, as again Lugon recognizes in his study of the Museum of Modern Art’s efforts to bring modern art to the world’s masses by circulating multiple exhibitions.\textsuperscript{169}

Although not technically inventive, the Housing Authority’s photographic editing and enlargement of its annual report’s pages into a multi-panel exhibit was nonetheless strategic. Reading between the two line-items in the 1946 Public Relations Program memo, the enlarged panels first and foremost posed a solution to the problem of the need for reprints of the publication, itself. By creating one or more exhibits and sending them to the meetings and congresses of key public-housing audiences, the Authority placed a customized version of its report before large gatherings of readers. As the photograph of Bryn Hovde and Roosevelt Jr. in \textit{Housing News} showed, the display of \textit{A Decent Home, an American Right} at this national event made reading the report a social experience, presenting opportunities for conversations that ideally went beyond remarks of “How Cute” or “How Amazing” to understand what the exhibit “was about.”\textsuperscript{170}

True to Lugon’s notion of the exhibition as an event, a modest amount of fanfare accompanied the Housing Authority’s exhibit at its respective showings.\textsuperscript{171} Following the New York conference, the National Automobile Workers displayed the exhibit version of \textit{A Decent Home, an American Right} at their convention in Atlantic City.\textsuperscript{172} Later in 1946, the Los Angeles County Museum in Exposition Park also showed “An Exhibit Depicting the History and Nature of the Problem of Sub-standard Housing in Los Angeles,” as the invitation to the event in Catherine Bauer’s files reads, with the title “A Decent Home...An American Right.”\textsuperscript{173} Although records of this Los Angeles exhibit are scant, its timing, title, and the presence of the report’s designer Simon Eisner at the opening strongly suggest that the exhibit consisted of panels similar to those shown in New York and Atlantic City that depicted pages from the recent annual report.
Following the development and deployment of the Housing Authority’s travelling exhibit made from its annual report leads to a question raised by Olivier Lugon regarding how the multiple, travelling exhibition put pressure on the definition of an exhibition, itself. In drawing on simple photographic and display techniques, the Housing Authority went beyond “blur[ing, N.K.O.] the boundaries” between the circulating book and the exhibition, as Lugon writes, to combine exhibits into larger and more complex multi-media presentations involving multiple authorities, printed invitations, and museum sponsorship.

In April 1948, NAHO’s Journal of Housing finally printed photographs of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s annual report exhibit that “stole the show” two years earlier in New York. But unlike photographs of exhibits previously published in the journal, these photographs do not show the Housing Authority’s exhibit alone, nor do they show it at a civic event dedicated primarily to housing or health. Presented at the 1948 National Orange Show, an annual fair-like event in the Southern California city of San Bernardino, this exhibit titled “Look! At Your Neighborhood” stayed true to the national dimensions of the fair (fig. 56). Organized by the local Housing Authority of the County
of San Bernardino together with the Housing Authority of the city of Needles, as the caption explains, the exhibit featured films, a model of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s Avalon Gardens, as well as photographs and other printed materials from housing authorities across the country. The photographs of the exhibit printed in the Journal of Housing show two sections of the sixty-foot long display. Like bricks placed layer upon layer, photographs and materials fill the wall from just above the floor, where various reports hang by their corners from a table of glass-covered photographs, to high overhead, where the enlarged pages of Los Angeles’s annual report are mounted side by side in a long line. Between these two registers, according to the caption, were “40-inch by 30-inch panels telling the story of a good neighborhood.” Although not credited in the Journal of Housing, a quick comparison reveals these panels to be at least part of one of the two hundred copies of the Museum of Modern Art’s Look at Your Neighborhood multiple exhibition from 1944, designed by Rudolph Mock and the same Clarence Stein who requested charts from Catherine Bauer ten years earlier.

Like the panels that reappeared in the Housing Authority’s photographs of its exhibits from 1939 and 1940, the panels of the first consolidated postwar report proved an efficient means of both circulating the report and producing a versatile exhibit for audiences of union leaders, museum-goers, and fairgoers, alike. In this final showing, the placement of the Housing Authority’s exhibit and the Museum of Modern Art’s together above rows of photographs and reports and behind an architectural model offers both a record of this versatility and a visualization of the allied efforts in making public housing a topic in public education. In these early postwar years, it was just the kind of image of local achievement and inter-agency cooperation that housing leaders aimed to send abroad.

THE LOS ANGELES ANNUAL REPORT ABROAD

When the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles created A Decent Home, an American Right in 1945 and enlarged its pages for a series of exhibitions starting in 1946, it was unlikely that the Authority anticipated that this report would be viewed on the other side of the Atlantic. The Journal of Housing had established a national audience and encouraged nation-wide competition in report design while actively enabling the circulation of exhibits in the form of photographic documentation and brief textual commentaries. It also, however, reported more broadly on housing issues with the help of housing correspon-
dents abroad. In February 1945, editor Dorothy Gazzolo included notes on a Nazi housing project in a coal-producing region of the Netherlands from Lieutenant Robert Merriam, a former National Housing Agency employee. Less scathing than one might expect of an American article at this time, Merriam offered numerous technical details and went so far as to describe the houses as “reasonably attractive” in his letter. Other correspondence was highly reflective of a US sense of world leadership following the war. Jacob Crane, then Director of the National Housing Agency’s Urban Development Division, spent November and December of 1944 with the British Ministry of Town and Country Planning and the Ministry of Health and toured “war-torn areas of France and Italy” in January of 1945. Upon his return, he appealed to US audiences in a speech, “Why the Nation’s Capital Should Lead the Way in Planning and Housing,” published as a supplement to the March issue of the Journal of Housing. The world will watch the housing program of the United States as it emerges,” Crane prophesized. In rallying words, he urged his audience to see housing as the United States’ presentation of itself to the world as a united nation: “[...] we must give full expression to American ideals in building homes and in building communities. Here, above all, we must reconcile differences, and submerge our prejudices and our individual interests. Here, above all, we have the opportunity and the obligation to create a great American city.”

An opportunity to show the United States’ housing program to the world presented itself with the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning’s 1946 congress in England. It was the first postwar meeting of the same congress that Los Angeles failed to bring to the city in the years before the war. Convening at the White Rock Pavilion in Hastings from October 7 to 12, 1946, the delegates to the eighteenth congress represented twenty-three countries including England, India, the Dutch East Indies, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, as well as three South American countries and fifteen European countries.

As articulated in a typescript for an article to be published in Architectural Forum, US delegate Catherine Bauer was less than impressed by the federal sponsorship of participants from the United States. None of the representatives’ travel expenses, Bauer was keen to note, were compensated by the United States government despite numerous telegrams from the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations requesting this financial support for the delegation. This lack of support for housers in their professional travels went hand in hand for Bauer with an overall weak public housing program. In an acrid assessment, she wrote, “Does it seem ironic...I hope so...that one of our veterans would be more likely to get a roof over his family’s head,
this year or next, and eventually live in a better, more attractive, and convenient community, if he could transfer his citizenship to poor England or little Sweden, perhaps even devastated Holland, than here in the richest and most powerful nation on earth."¹⁸⁷

Such critical, comparative readings that centered on the notion of the congress as a showcasing of nations extended to the congress’s accompanying exhibition. One commentator in the Architect and Building News lauded the Polish, Dutch, and Swiss work on display, but was less pleased with the London County Council’s presentation of “new house types,” claiming rather cryptically that “[t]he rendering of the perspectives” had “struck a false note.”¹⁸⁸ Catherine Bauer, on the other hand, single out the contributions from Britain and Denmark, in addition to Holland, Poland, and Switzerland as “very impressive both in content and presentation.”¹⁸⁹ But Bauer was less pleased with the exhibit brought by US delegates. This exhibit, prepared by the Planning Commission of Contra Costa County in Northern California, contained “just about everything they had in their files in the way of zoning maps, street-sections, and traffic-flow diagrams...the usual thing, of no particular distinction,” she wrote in her summary of the conference.¹⁹⁰ She openly stated her concerns to the IFHTP delegates about “the lack of information on our housing and planning experience,” even going so far as the call the exhibit an “inadequate presentation.”¹⁹¹

Catherine Bauer followed up on her sense of the United States’ inadequacy with an aggressive publicity campaign. When the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning initiated a collection of housing materials, Bauer responded by urging the Federal Public Housing Authority to send copies of its book, Public Housing Design, to the twelve hundred Congress delegates “to make up in part for the execrable showing we made in exhibition and report material” (emphasis her own).¹⁹² As part of this same initiative, Bauer also afforded the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles what might well have been the international debut for it report, A Decent Home, an American Right. Writing to Howard Holtzendorff in the summer of 1947, Bauer asked the Los Angeles director to send “materials” on housing in Los Angeles to forty delegates she had met at the recent congress in Hastings.¹⁹³ Holtzendorff, who had read Bauer’s report from the congress in the Journal of Housing, promptly complied with Bauer’s request with the caveat that he was running low on copies of the consolidated annual report and could send only two or three.¹⁹⁴

Bauer’s copies of her subsequent letters to architects and urban planners, especially those in England and Denmark, hint that the Los Angeles materials may have landed on the desks of experts at the London County Council or the offices of Hans Erling Langkilde and Kay Fisker, as illuminated in this study’s
next chapter. In addition to clues as to who Bauer may have targeted in her broadcast, records also give clues to the contents of the packets that these architects and planners received. In a thoughtful move, Holtzendorff provided Bauer with copies of the Los Angeles materials he sent abroad.195 Objects in Bauer’s files such as a promotional brochure for Ramona Gardens or the Housing Authority’s informational pamphlet, “The Truth About Public Housing,” therefore may well have been among the printed housing materials transmitted in the forty packets sent in the summer of 1947.196

This broadcast of housing materials that Catherine Bauer orchestrated furthermore sought to “counteract” international perceptions of politics in the United States in general. A letter from Bauer to John Entenza, the Los Angeles-based editor of Arts and Architecture who launched the soon famous Case Study House program in 1945, attested to this wish. Explaining to the editor how she combined her 1946 participation in the IFHTP congress with tours of France, England, and Scandinavia, Bauer observed a rift in expert exchange caused by the war: “Due to the war-time blank they have no idea what goes on here and want to renew contacts once more,” she wrote. But as Bauer quickly admitted, filling the “blank” left by this attenuation of travel and communication during the war years was only part of her goal:

“I’ve been so busy this spring that only now am I finally galvanized to do something about this...partly stimulated by the desire to do my bit toward counteracting the picture of America as symbol of pure unadulterated Reaction which is now becoming practically universal. At least they ought to know that there are some of us who would still like to be progressive!”197

As historian Daniel T. Rodgers argues, Bauer was one of the few US progressives following the war to continue to look to Europe for “lessons” in policy.198 In this letter to Entenza, however, Bauer appears more immediately concerned with keeping up appearances than with receiving any lessons in return. Sending copies of John Entenza’s wartime issues of California Arts and Architecture to housers in Europe was her strategic maneuver in this regard. Bauer asked Entenza, “.... would you by any chance be able to send sample copies of CAA to some Europeans if I send you a list?” She added, “I’d still like to send samples of any of your recent issues—Case Study Houses or whatnot—to about a dozen foreign architects. Perhaps if you included a subscription blank you might get a couple out of it.”199

Returning to the role of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles in this exchange, one sees how Bauer’s campaign to both fill a “war-time blank”
and counteract the United States’ “inadequate presentation” at Hastings registered with the Authority as an opportunity to likewise present a positive public image of its office before an international audience.\textsuperscript{200} Rather than emphasize the progressive nature of its work, however, the Housing Authority chose to foreground it, above all, as collaborative. In its initial response to Bauer’s call for materials, the Housing Authority offered to assemble the packets of its own pamphlets as well as (according to what one may gather from remaining letters) those from an additional, presumably housing-minded agency.\textsuperscript{201} The response expressly hoped to elicit one in kind. When the Authority forwarded these materials to Bauer’s contacts abroad, it included the following statements:

“[..] it is Miss Bauer’s hope that we may impart the information through the medium of sharing, and be able to break down the tremendous wall of distance which separates us in our common endeavor.
In addition, we are adding your name to our regular mailing list and will forward you current materials.
May we ask that you send us information of a similar nature regarding the work you are doing.”\textsuperscript{202}

Here addressed to the office of the Minister of Health in London, the invitation to exchange is implied in the unsolicited addition of the recipients to the Housing Authority’s mailing list and the polite request to be included in the London office’s future broadcasts. Most poignant, however, is the foregrounding of the act of exchange, itself. Probably drafted by Barbara Rosien, the Housing Authority’s official secretary, the letter characterizes not the printed materials, but the act of sharing as a "medium" symbolically connecting the office of the Minister of Health and the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles as they worked for their similar causes.

Clues as to the reception of these materials and the whereabouts of the precious few copies of \textit{A Decent Home, an American Right} sent abroad remain obscure. The library of the Royal Institute of British Architects, for instance, bears possible traces of Bauer’s campaign in its possession of examples of the wartime housing coverage in \textit{California Arts and Architecture} that Bauer mentioned in her letter to Entenza.\textsuperscript{203} Several issues of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s \textit{Housing News} from 1949 and 1950 can be found in the collection of the architect Werner Moser at the gta Archive in Zurich bearing his address on Zurich’s Limmatquai.\textsuperscript{204} These tenuous cross-archival connections, moreover, leave open several questions about the campaign’s effects. Did Entenza’s magazine successfully counteract the image of a politically conservative United
States? Did the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, in its hopes of fostering a relationship based on sharing with such agencies as the British Ministry of Health, receive any materials in return?

Other letters in Bauer’s archive reveal wishes to keep the exchange moving in both directions. The main office of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning in London contacted Bauer in 1947 to ask for her thoughts on the possibility of sending the International Exhibition at Hastings on a tour of the United States. Arranging for the transport of the exhibit was not as simple as mailing an annual report. Bauer’s letter to a contact at the National Housing Administration weighed in the challenges and possible rewards of bringing the Hastings exhibition across the ocean: “Re the IFHTP exhibit...it is awfully vast to tote around, but it is also exceedingly interesting and stimulating, and would do a lot of good here in this moment of doldrum or worse,” she wrote, adding,

"Is there any chance that the State Department might itself bring it across the Atlantic, at least? It’s all from respectable countries, except Poland, and might even fit in with promoting the Marshall Plan. It should be possible to at least get it set up in Washington, New York and Chicago if they didn’t have to pay to bring it over too.”

In her rapid-fire of ideas, Bauer brainstormed ways to secure funds and arguments for the transport of the exhibit so that it could set the United States’ housing movement in motion once again. Nothing in her files suggests that she was successful in this endeavor. But the exchange of housing materials she orchestrated, especially between the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles and the forty European delegates to the IFHTP congress, revealed local authorities’ work to international audiences, and, more fundamentally, alerted local authorities to the postwar opportunities for exchange beyond national borders.

EVALUATING HOUSING REPORT DESIGN, 1949–1951

For local housing authorities who missed Catherine Bauer’s campaign for exchange prompted by the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning congress in Hastings, in 1949 the National Association of Housing Officials kicked off a campaign of its own with an annual reports competition. Rather than seek to expand the horizons of local housing authorities’ public relations work beyond national borders, however, NAHO started small with an
object lesson in the political import of good design. Offering a condensed presentation of NAHO’s experience gathered in the past decade, this object lesson reflected the increasing pressure of a growing opposition to public housing policy.

Among the winners of NAHO’s 1949 annual reports competition was the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, which received an “Award of Special Merit” for its consolidated annual report of 1948, *There’s Nothing Sentimental…about Your Cash Register* (fig. 57).208 Anonymized comments from the jury printed in the *Journal of Housing* revealed the complex demands that the report successfully met. The winning reports needed to be “organized” and “tell a story,” noted the judges. The “layout and choice of photos” needed to show “a little more imagination,” but the “presentation” should not be “wasteful.”209 Printed in black and white with a single green “X” across Leonard Nadel’s photograph of an old porch on its paper cover, Los Angeles’s winning entry was a prime example of the kind of report NAHO encouraged.

The “public housing is good for your cash register” argument, as historian Don Parson argues, was a maneuver on behalf of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles to adapt to the prosperous postwar United States’ concerns with public spending and favor of broader redevelopment initiatives.210 NAHO was well aware that the production of printed materials and reports was subject to scrutiny, as well.211 Suspecting “the real estate lobby” to be behind a recent initiative of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee to collect “copies of all local authority annual reports and other publications” in order to audit production and printing expenses, the NAHO Public Relations Committee warned readers of the *Journal of Housing* that housing authorities should avoid “extravagance of presentation in any form.”212 The result of this audit was thus a mandate for local authorities to produce reports that were “very modest, though attractive.”213

The Public Relations Committee was keen to show local housing authorities how to comply with this mandate. In evaluating the winners of a 1950 annual reports competition, the Reports Subcommittee chairperson Marion Massen noted that the use of “a second color of ink” and “a photograph or a chart on practically every page to attract the eye” helped one smaller report score high in the presentation category.214 But for one of the contest judges, Frederick Gutheim, photography was key. Gutheim’s background in housing was not unlike Catherine Bauer’s.215 He boasted political experience in housing at home and abroad and had worked with the Museum of Modern Art, serving on the advisory committee for Elizabeth Mock’s *Built in USA*.216 He moreover favored exhibitions and competitions as effective ways of determining the distribution
of public funds in creative endeavors.217 Bauer’s approach to photographs in public housing work resonated with Gutheim’s own. Gutheim warned readers of the perils of “poorly chosen photos” that were “poorly used, many of little interest being blown up for arbitrary effect, producing an impression chiefly of emptiness.” He suggested including more photographs of “interesting people,” as well as giving credit to the photographers who took them: “We need more photos that inform, that tell stories, that remain etched in the memory and start the imagination working,” he advised. “‘The thing we need least of is politicians’ faces.’”218

Gutheim’s desideratum underscored the importance of photography and photographers to public housing’s postwar ranks despite pressures on housing authorities to mind their publications’ costs. As Marion Massen also reminded readers, local housing authorities were capable of producing good reports without calling on “outside professional assistance.”219 In the end, hers was a call for a “do-it-yourself” photographic practice that at least one internationally-active houser had engaged in all along.
Though keen on circulating exhibits and reports, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles remained surprisingly silent regarding the promotional and educational possibilities of another contemporary photographic medium: Kodak’s Kodachrome, a 35-millimeter color film for producing transparencies. Introduced to the market in 1936, 35-millimeter Kodachrome became an important technology in the United States’ foreign cultural relations after the Second World War. Still, despite efforts on behalf of housers like Catherine Bauer to place public housing prominently within these postwar programs, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles appears to have not publicized its housing work during this time—either at home or abroad—by projecting color photographic transparencies onto screens.

The collection of Catherine Bauer and her husband, the architect William Wurster, in the Environmental Design Archives at the University of California, Berkeley, contains a small number of Kodachrome slides of Los Angeles’s public housing projects labelled in Bauer’s handwriting with the years 1942 and 1950. While public housing residents likely made their own Kodachrome slides of life in their Los Angeles homes during these years, these slides in the Bauer and Wurster collection constitute the only known publicly accessible color photographs of Los Angeles’s public housing from this early period. Almost certainly shot by Catherine Bauer, the slides offer intimate views of early public housing that were never published, but likely brought before the eyes of the public as projections on a screen in Bauer’s classroom and public university lectures to provide images of techniques in modern housing design.

Bauer’s Kodachrome slides take three completed projects and one potential site as their subjects. In one slide labelled “LA Hsg. Tour ’42, Children playing in gutter. + H.M., A-75,” a man in a tweed jacket stands amidst a group of children
occupied with a large puddle of water in the street outside Pueblo del Rio, the
four-hundred-unit housing project designed by a group of architects under the
leadership of Paul R. Williams and completed in May of 1942 (fig. 58).1 The lawns
leading up to the cement stoops of the units glisten a bright green that contrasts
with the pink of a young girl’s dress. In another Kodachrome labelled “Aliso—
LA, 1950,” a small boy sits atop a giant gray sculpture of a fish, his white shirt
shining brightly beneath a cloudless blue sky (fig. 59). Surrounding him, gray
cement gutters direct brown rivulets of water between swaths of dry yellow
ground. Behind him, a green lawn yellows in patches beneath the light blue-
gray of the Aliso Village housing project’s buildings. Another Kodachrome of
Aliso Village shows children in the shadows of one of the project’s bridged
walkways or “ramadas,” a verdant lawn glaring in the sunlight of the interior
courtyard (fig. 60).2 Finally, two Kodachrome slides in a grouping of different
views of Chávez Ravine reveal hillside houses as gray-blue and surrounded by
green trees and stone walls (figs. 61, 62). Dated in Bauer’s hand “1950”—the same
year Catherine Bauer and William Wurster left their academic posts at Harvard
and MIT, respectively, to return to the University of California, Berkeley—these
slides depict a neighborhood slated for demolition to make way for Richard
Neutra and Robert Alexander’s never-realized Elysian Park Heights develop-
ment for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles.3

These color transparencies comprise only a tiny portion of the photographic
activity surrounding the Housing Authority’s projects, but one that raises sev-
eral questions about the meaning of color in housing, the meaning of color in
photographs of this housing, and specifically the function of these color trans-
parencies during the Second World War and immediate postwar years. In pur-
suing these questions, this chapter takes as its point of departure Catherine
Bauer’s work as an advisor to the Museum of Modern Art on its wartime exhibi-
tions, where she first suggested that the Museum show West Coast housing
using color transparencies. By contextualizing Bauer’s suggestion within writ-
ings about color in housing in the architectural press, it argues that color in
photography for Bauer constituted a form of instructive technical data. Follow-
ing this understanding of color’s didactic function, the analysis then considers
Kodachrome’s projection technology by situating Bauer’s slides within her work
as an educator. Paying particular attention to similarities between Bauer’s work
in Kodachrome, the personal Kodachrome collection of the Farm Security
Administration architect Vernon DeMars, as well as records of international
initiatives such as the Office of Inter-American Affairs’ building and circulation
of a collection of Kodachrome slides, this chapter ultimately questions whether
photographic presentations using color transparencies remained a unique


requirement of West Coast housing for Bauer, or whether she saw it as particularly suited to a comparative study and the furthering of an international modern housing movement.

In pursuing these questions, this chapter brings together and builds on research in the histories of photography, architecture, exhibition design, and pedagogy. It is especially indebted to historian of art and photography Kim Beil’s study of the politics of color photography in print with a focus on the articulation of rival architectural modernisms in California magazines at the start of the Red Scare. Beil’s investigation into the connections between color and a “regional” or “nativist” California residential architecture in the early postwar era serves as a springboard into this chapter’s look at the political meaning of color transparencies of older, humbler West Coast housing for figures such as Catherine Bauer and Vernon DeMars. With the further aid of primary texts from the garden city movement, architectural examples from interwar Germany, and photohistorian Sally Stein’s research on the earlier Farm Security Administration’s use of Kodachrome, a closer look at these slightly older housing initiatives aims to historicize color’s midcentury connotation of Americanness.

With this focus on the cultural meaning of color, the following investigation furthermore partakes in a recent surge in research on color photography. Kim Timby’s review of two publications accompanying recent exhibitions of color photography and Sylvie Pénichon’s guide to the conservation of color photography credit this increased research to a combination of “public enthusiasm” for color photographs, the possibilities of digital printing, as well as color photography’s “firm establishment on the art market and in museum collections and activities.” The outcome of these combined forces, in Timby’s assessment, is a move of research “in the direction of a more critical history better synthesizing technical, aesthetic, and cultural issues.” Photohistorian Sally Stein’s essay complements Timby’s study by placing this recent move in a long history of critical writings about color photography. Upholding the approach pioneered by Stein in a 1991 study that places the FSA’s Kodachrome slides against a backdrop of the history of dyes, picture magazines, and consumerism in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s, both Timby and Stein celebrate a tendency toward more contextualized readings of color photography in print as opposed to histories focused solely on color photography’s aspirations to placement on the gallery wall.

The following reading of Bauer’s Kodachrome slides thus aims to contextualize them with applications in advertising, but also art and science. As Sally Stein’s history of color in the first half of the century in the United States illustrates, the advertising industry took great interest in color photography’s
ability to render the colors of consumer goods that promised to fulfill a “desire for pleasure and change”—a desire which surely the Housing Authority architects catered to with the variations of color they introduced into West Coast housing projects. For reasons related to this success in advertising, by the 1940s, color photography had not fully arrived in the museum as art. But as historian of photography and science Kelley Wilder explains, starting in the 1930s both artists (she refers specifically to the color work of László Moholy-Nagy at the Bauhaus and the New Bauhaus) and scientists were using color photography in their work. Aside from the application of photographic technologies as a research tool, photography and notably color photography allowed scientists and lay publics alike to “appreciate certain scientific subjects under study as being both appealing to the eye and elegant as illustrations of phenomena.” Peter Geimer also explores historical shifts in the role of color as a determinant of photography’s status as a documenting medium. This history of color in photography, in short, is a history of business, the sciences, and art.

Although a broadening area of study, much work on the history of color photography remains to be done. Kim Timby specifically calls for research into both the historical “availability” and the actual practice of different color photographic processes so that scholars may better understand why, given the choice, photographers elected one technology or brand over another at a specific historical moment. As Sylvie Pénichon outlines, the German firm Agfa (a prewar competitor of Kodak) introduced Ansco Color Film in the United States in 1938. Depending on the needs of the photographer, Agfa’s film possibly offered an advantage over Kodachrome in that photographers could develop Ansco Color Film themselves. These choices available to photographers changed after the war when the United States government granted the US firm, Kodak, a monopoly on film production and sales in West Germany and Japan. Further ground-laying research into these transnational histories of photographic technologies promises to place case studies such as the following of Bauer’s work into a more meaningful context, in turn bringing about the better “synthesis” that Timby calls for and Stein’s study of the color photographs of the Depression era exemplifies.

Looking beyond this growing area of photographic history, this chapter likewise contributes to recent scholarship in the history of the pedagogical use of photographic visual aids by showing the parallels between Bauer’s work with Kodachrome and the advocacy of artist and Latin American studies scholar Florence Arquin, among others, for the building and circulation of Kodachrome collections in fostering the education of students as world citizens. As photohistorian Olivier Lugon explains, the use of photographic slides and books in
the education of young children and adults alike garnered supporters in the 1920s, when the photography of the New Objectivity was negotiating a place between that of art and the "documentary mode" in Germany at the same time that the "New Pedagogy" was encouraging the study of photography by teachers and pupils as a way of bringing students into closer yet still mediated contact with "the world."20 Bauer’s approach to university-level teaching in 1940s, which incorporated films and slides and introduced housing students to field research, illustrates the sustainability of these approaches. The observation of communication scholar Katie Day Good that actual practices among educators during these decades did not always deploy the newest media on the market, but rather reflected acts that might be compared to Michel de Certeau’s notion of *bricolage* or "making do" further informs this chapter’s closer look at Bauer’s adaptive and pragmatic practice.21 Adopting both these perspectives on the history of media in pedagogy, this chapter aims to go a step further by showing the practical and political dimensions of Kodachrome as a tool of public housing education. With respect to architecture and urban planning, Bauer’s collecting and showing of color slides of modern housing demonstrates the instrumentality of color slides in a discipline built on finding ways to provide the best with minimal resources and the help of international networks.

**COLOR IN WESTERN WARTIME HOUSING**

In 1942, while Director of the Department of Industrial Design Eliot Noyes was planning the show *Wartime Housing* at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, Catherine Bauer wrote to him to ask whether he had "considered using color transparencies at all?" Her only explanation for her question was that "Much of the stuff out here—FSA, Bremerton Housing Authority, Bill’s [William Wurster’s, N.K.O.] Vallejo project, and above all [Ernest J., N.K.O.] Kump’s school—really should be shown that way.”22 Voiced in a private letter now long forgotten, Bauer’s casual suggestion might seem a personal preference hardly indicative of a broader historical practice of viewing photographs of West Coast wartime housing in color. But Bauer had some expertise on housing in the region. She also had some more ideas for how the Museum of Modern Art could exhibit this housing as part of its wartime exhibition program.

Catherine Bauer saw the Museum in a favorable position for the promotion of local housing designs. As she congratulated Director Alfred Barr in the spring of 1941, the Museum was a national leader in encouraging "a healthy, indigenous development in the movement for modern architecture.” Here, Bauer clarified
that she not only meant modern architecture in the sense of “facades and indi-

gual buildings,” but also “large-scale housing and community planning,” or
modern housing for the masses. For Bauer, this modern housing, with its prom-
ise of mass appeal, was an essential component of a modern museum program:
in “presenting them [the arts, N.K.O.] as a vital concern to everyone instead of
the plaything of a few aesthetes and collectors,” she argued, the Museum of
Modern Art was “a truly ‘modern museum.’”

The urgency for the Museum of Modern Art in fulfills its institutional
“function,” in Bauer’s terms, heightened in less than a year with the bombing of
Pearl Harbor. With the United States’ full entry into the war, the Museum
embarked on a series of war-themed shows that would include the landmark
Road to Victory (May–October 1942) and Power in the Pacific (January–March 1945)
exhibitions presented by the Museum’s Department of Photography as well as
curator Eliot Noyes’s Wartime Housing (April–June 1942) presented by the Depart-
ment of Industrial Design. Bauer saw Noyes’s show first and foremost as a polit-
cal opportunity for housing—as a chance to encourage popular support of local
housing initiatives by positioning them as vital to the strengthening of a broader
national defense program. This aim likewise fits well within the modern Muse-
um’s program for attracting diverse audiences. In a follow-up letter to Noyes,
Bauer suggested that the Museum bring the exhibition to local agencies in the
form of a travelling show.

Part of the Museum’s prescribed mission was to get the local vote on hous-
ing. However, as an art museum, Bauer also saw it in a position “to encourage
better quality in defense housing production” (emphasis her own). To achieve
this goal, Bauer envisioned displays of “ABC-labeled examples of good architec-
tural design and community planning, and worth-while technical experiment,”
as she explained to Noyes. She followed this description with several suggested
sources for such “examples,” including the Architects Advisory Committee of
the United States Housing Authority and the editor of Architectural Forum, Howard
Myers. For examples of West Coast War housing, specifically, Bauer advised
Noyes that he “may well find that the architectural magazines have better mate-
rial in their files than Washington […] Ernie Kump’s school at Vallejo and Bill’s
experimental houses, just finished, have just been photographed.”

In her reference to recent photographs, Bauer was almost certainly referring
to those by photographer Roger Sturtevant as published in John Entenza’s mag-
azine, California Arts and Architecture. In 1941, Entenza inaugurated a series
of articles on California war housing, complete with extensive photographic
coverage. Among the first articles was one by William Wurster on his latest
project, Carquinez Heights—a demountable war housing project of 1,677 units
constructed at break-neck speed between July and December 1941. Continuing with the focus on the projects near Vallejo, the following month Entenza published architect Vernon DeMars’s article on demountable units not far from Carquinez Heights. Finally, in February 1942, Entenza shifted the magazine’s focus to the Southern California area with the presentation of a Federal Works Agency project at Long Beach, complete with photographs by the now utterly
forgotten photographer Margaret Lowe. Additional photographs credited to Lowe showing construction at the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s permanent development of Avalon Gardens appeared in the April issue, followed the next month by her shots of Pueblo del Rio (fig. 63).

Taking these current projects as subject, the war housing articles published in California Arts and Architecture furthermore offered comprehensive technical data on modern housing construction with their profusion of illustrations and detailed explanations. Consider William Wurster’s article on Carquinez. Carquinez Heights was one of the temporary Federal Works Agency housing developments built under the Lanham Act of 1940. It occupied a site near the Mare Island Naval Shipyard just north of Berkeley, California, where the Napa River meets the San Pablo Bay. As Wurster’s article explains, this site and the view of the bay that it offered were two important factors in his development of an appealing design: “Don’t ask that it be familiar or cozy,” Wurster writes in the final paragraph of the article, acknowledging some of the public criticisms of recent government-sponsored housing projects, “But do ask if it fits the site—uses the view—is gay—is economical—was done on schedule. And do this after it is complete…and I hope you can say, as I do, ‘I’d like to live there.’”

Roger Sturtevant’s photograph of “there” on the page facing Wurster’s article echoes the architect’s invitation to readers to see the attractiveness of modern architecture’s efficiency and correspondence with the surrounding nature (fig. 64). Taken from the top of the Carquinez hills facing south, the photograph shows the houses conforming to the natural terrain of the heights as the units descend step-like towards the water below. If Sturtevant’s photograph offers an excellent “ABC” illustration of the Carquinez Heights project, however, it is missing one important technical detail: the houses’ “gaiety.” In his article on the facing page, Wurster describes the variety of colors of materials and paint characterizing the houses’ exteriors. Of the 1,677 houses, “50 per cent of the houses are sand color or natural plywood, with colored doors; 25 per cent are barn red; 9 per cent are green; 8 per cent are blue; 8 per cent are yellow,” he writes. But in Sturtevant’s photograph, all these buildings appear gray. If West Coast wartime housing should be shown in color, in Bauer’s view, why would she direct Noyes to the black and white photographs in the architectural press? Was Bauer’s suggestion to the Museum to show West Coast wartime housing in color indeed a new idea? What motivated it?
“DON’T BE AFRAID TO USE COLOR”

Historian of art and photography Kim Beil’s research on the divergent photographic practices of two California magazines of the 1940s and early 1950s offers a helpful framework for approaching questions surrounding the motivations to show color photographs of wartime housing. As Beil observes, similar to contemporary art magazines, John Entenza’s Arts and Architecture adhered to a practice of publishing photographs in black and white. The magazine House Beautiful, on the other hand, published color photographs. Its most famous application of color photography was in “The Threat to the Next America,” a divisive article written by the editor Elizabeth Gordon in 1953 in which she used color photographs to depict a “good” and “American” form of modernism and black and white photographs to depict a “foreign” modernism of the Bauhaus and the Congrès internationaux d’architecture moderne. Beil does not mention Catherine Bauer’s letter to the Museum of Modern Art regarding an “indigenous” modern architecture. Still, she nonetheless sets Gordon’s famous editorial treatment of color photography against the backdrop of an effort to define and locate an “American” modernism in architecture starting as early as 1942 among a group of writers and theorists that included Bauer’s former colleague, Lewis Mumford. For this group, the recent work of California-based architects Richard Neutra and Bauer’s husband, William Wurster, epitomized this architecture’s “good” and “human” qualities in their applications of design elements such as texture and color. Color photography not only emphasized this color in architecture, but, as Beil argues, set the architecture in contrast to black and white photographs of European modernism as a way of underscoring the severity of the International Style.

Although Catherine Bauer was a reader of Arts and Architecture, a closer look at the contemporary wartime issues of House Beautiful as modeled by Beil forms a more nuanced cultural backdrop for Bauer’s 1942 suggestion to the Museum. Gordon became the editor of House Beautiful in the fall of 1941, just about a month before Entenza published Wurster’s article on the war housing at Carquinez Heights. As historian Monica Penick observes, in her first months as the magazine’s editor, Gordon began to develop a concept of “better living” that encompassed everything from architecture and art to cooking and gardening. House Beautiful aimed to educate its readers on these topics and encourage practices and the purchase of products that reflected “taste.” Addressing homeowners and apartment renters alike, the wartime issues of House Beautiful contained articles on topics ranging from how to create rentable spaces in houses in defense areas to how one military family, despite the possibility of having to
move away at a moment’s notice, decorated their housing unit at Colonial Village in Arlington, Virginia. Businesses marketed in the pages of *House Beautiful* to these new lifestyles created by the war: “The war is making nomads of many home-loving Americans,” read a brief article highlighting rooms designed and furnished by Marshall Field’s. The department store advised Americans to furnish their homes with such demountable items as sectional sofas and director chairs, but also to take risks with color: “Be sure to use color brightly and brashly. You’ll be gone before you can tire of it.”

If readers could not visualize the color in the black and white photographs included with this small article, they needed only to turn to a feature article in the same issue. Titled “How to Live Well on What You Make,” the article reproduced color photographs by Maynard L. Parker of rooms at the Marshall Field’s store in Chicago (fig. 65). “When you haven’t got riches, make up for it with gaiety,” one of the captions to Parker’s color photographs touted:

“This painted Welsh dresser is what we mean. So are the framed white glass plates. It takes courage to place white furniture against dark walls, but how nice! Gives that impression of chin up, eyes ahead that spells personality.”
Looking at the photograph of the white furniture painted with red flowers, green foliage, and figures in colorful clothing, one sees “personality” in the form of an interpretation of European folk culture set against a swath of dark green wall. A plush chair gives the room an air of comfort. The reflections in the polished wood floor lend an appearance of tidiness. Nothing in the photograph hints at the grit or sparseness of war. Only a month before, an article in *House Beautiful* advised that the war’s demands for metals had contributed to a shortage of aluminum paint specifically in the colors yellow, red, and green. Readers would hardly guess from this green wall in the room at the Marshall Field’s store that the shortage was still in effect. Nor would subsequent advertising let on that tasteful living was on hold for the duration. Later that spring, an April 1942 layout advising “Don’t Be Afraid to Use Color” reproduced thirteen Kodachrome images of multicolor home exteriors “courtesy Sherwin Williams,” the paint manufacturer (fig. 66). The largest photograph shows a house painted barn red, while in the lower center portion of the layout a paintbrush with pink wings flies playfully across the gutter, a trail of green paint in its wake.

Bauer understood the appeal to the consumer of color in housing design. In a 1940 letter to Jacob Crane at the United States Housing Authority, she expressed immense dissatisfaction with a recent choice of materials for the construction of a public housing project in Pittsburgh: “Of one thing I am convinced: for long straight rows with flat roofs, dark brick is visually the worst possible material,” she wrote. A far better treatment, she posited, would be “concrete and stucco, or any flat, smooth material particularly if it has possibilities for variegated color [...]. They dramatize geometry somehow, and look lighter and gayer.” To illustrate her point, Bauer described row housing in California recently constructed for migrant farm workers by the Farm Security Administration. Far more modest than the housing built by the younger United States Housing Authority, the Farm Security Administration’s units nonetheless exhibited many formal qualities that Bauer championed in modern architecture. She described the exteriors of the FSA houses as “redwood horizontal boards on the first floor, with smooth doors and frames in flat, bright colors.” “Rather a shock to the local peasantry, I imagine,” she glossed, “but as gay and stimulating modern architecture as has been done in this country.” Plus, the housing was “swell to look at.”

Catherine Bauer put her convictions to the test when she furnished one of the interiors of a “model” unit at Vallejo. “For all the basic stuff in the Vallejo House I used ordinary local unfinished pine items, with blonde varnish, dark green enamel, or gray-green stain to match the woodwork,” she wrote in response to an inquiry into furniture design in wartime. Like the photographs of the rooms in Gordon’s magazine, Bauer’s choice of furnishings for the model
unit at Vallejo aimed to show visitors how they could make wartime housing colorful and livable. Bauer likewise saw these war worker households that Gordon targeted as hardly different from the middle class in their aspirations but perhaps more attuned to the “chin up, eyes ahead” attitude that the magazine celebrated. In reference to a recent issue of the magazine, Retailing, Bauer wrote to a colleague in confidence,

“I do agree with them that the genus ‘war worker’ is no different from anybody else and includes about the same range of taste and tastelessness as our own personal friends. They are more flexible and informal, though, than the average settled small-town-middle-class family: fewer of them would feel a religious compulsion to buy ‘suites’... if the stores had anything else in stock.”

Despite her sensitivity to the demands of wartime living, House Beautiful editor Elizabeth Gordon did not publish articles specifically on wartime housing in Los Angeles. Rather, California Arts and Architecture, with its black and white photographs and appeal to a readership of architects, quickly became one of the more prominent publications for the circulation of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s and other West Coast housing authorities’ project designs. As in Bauer’s furnishing of the Vallejo war housing unit, housing design for war
workers in Los Angeles showed a remarkable attention to color. Articles in California Arts and Architecture included tips on how to thriftily use color in housing while avoiding the faults Bauer saw in the Pittsburgh project. As one scholar notes, only half the units at Carquinez Heights were painted with the colorful facades Wurster describes in his article for California Arts and Architecture. Many were not painted at all, but instead sported colorful doors that required less paint yet still contributed to the overall colorfulness of the project. Indeed, this carefully planned variation also emerged as a cost-conscious practice in Los Angeles during this period. The designers of the Housing Authority’s hundred units at Rose Hill Courts adopted a two-color scheme, according to another feature in California Arts and Architecture accompanied by black and white reproductions of photographs by Julius Shulman (fig. 67). At Rose Hill Courts, exterior wall color and trim color alternated from building to building, thereby requiring more paint per unit than at Carquinez Heights but requiring the purchase of fewer colors and still, according to California Arts and Architecture, “avoiding monotony.” The Housing Authority’s architects also chose color stucco for the 164 units at Avalon Gardens. Manufactured by the Velvatone Stucco Products Company of Los Angeles, the cement-based “attractive pastel shades,” as California Arts and Architecture reported, “solved the problem of providing a surfacing job encompassing not only beauty and permanence but economy as well” thanks to its fade-resistant mineral oxide colors.
The benefits of enduring beauty and economical color in housing were part of Catherine Bauer’s case. As Bauer advised in a private letter to a fellow houser, housing’s supporters had to keep in mind “the long-term housing needs” of the different defense centers, “since this is almost the only branch of emergency defense expenditure which can add to permanent civic wealth and welfare, emergency or not emergency.”64 Public housing that made low-income families say, in architect William Wurster’s words, “I’d like to live there,” indeed promised far-reaching benefits of civic wealth in the form of what Catherine Bauer casually referred to as “swell to look at” architecture. As the Housing Authority’s efforts to rally community members to the public housing cause showed, presenting government-sponsored housing as a benefit to everyone was an argument to which the movement, especially at a local level, often turned. At a time when stylish home magazines posited painting interior and exterior walls as a low-cost way to exhibit one’s “personality,” housing in color fit this bill.

CATHARINE BAUER’S KODACHROME SLIDES

If color was critical to making West Coast housing appeal to its inhabitants, the question remains whether color in the presentation of these designs was also critical for related reasons. Did Catherine Bauer suggest that the Museum of Modern Art display photographs of war housing in color so that the homes appeared happy as opposed to dull, interesting as opposed to monotonous, and livable as opposed to unwelcoming, just as the architects intended them to be seen when residents approached them from the street? The problem with this question is that it fails to also consider why Bauer saw color transparencies specifically as the best technology for exhibiting West Coast war housing work. Bauer’s demand for color might indeed be better understood by situating it within the discourse on color in private correspondence and the appearance of colorful photographs of housing interiors in House Beautiful, but color slide technology, best suited for projection, not print, provided different experiences for practitioners and audiences, and had a following in the 1940s that was much its own.65

By the early 1940s, the technology of color transparencies was widely available in the form of Kodachrome. Designed by Kodak to be processed only in a lab, the film produced not negatives, but 35-millimeter color photographs on film that one could place in protective cardboard mounts and view over a light table, with the aid of a slide viewer, or projected onto a wall or screen.66 This combination of color and projection technology formed two of Kodachrome’s selling points, and nowhere did they receive a grander debut than at the 1939
New York World’s Fair. While Bauer was organizing the housing exhibits for the same event, Eastman Kodak was building its now legendary Hall of Color (alternately called the “Great Hall of Color”) as home to the company’s Cavalcade of Color—a showcase of Kodachrome technology and a sales pitch to Kodak’s audiences of amateurs, hobbyists, and enthusiasts who did not make photographs for money, but for fun.67 In its report on the different exhibition designs at the fair, the New York Museum of Science and Industry described the projection of 17-by-22-foot images from tiny Kodachrome slides attached to ring gears that rotated them before the twin lenses of eleven custom-made projectors. The result was “a changing panorama of colored pictures” of subjects common in amateur photography—people, pets, flowers—projected on a 187-foot-long, semicircular screen. The exhibit “played to the emotions of the audiences,” the New York Museum of Science and Industry reported of the rotating slideshows of images of everyday life, in color.68

The Second World War provided new opportunities for applications of Kodachrome. One photography manual issued by the United States Navy included chapters on Kodachrome as well as Kodacolor Aero Reversal Film—a Kodak film designed for taking color photographs from airplanes.69 The Navy manual extolled these color photographic technologies as triumphs in the “successful reproduction of Nature’s glow”—as “magic,” and “ultra-modern” but above all suited to “practical use.”70 The term “glow” may have alluded to Kodachrome’s reliance on projection technology while “magic” may have invited a comparison of this technology to older forms of the popular magic lantern show. Still, the terms “ultra-modern” and “practical” quickly diffused any associations with the past, fantasy, and entertainment. Among the “practical” merits of color photography’s realism was its applicability to the “study” of war’s reality.71 From discerning types of terrain in color aerial photographs to differentiating between this terrain and camouflage, the correct exposure and interpretation of color photography was a critical skill of modern warfare.72 As the same manual also attested, color photography’s war work further extended to matters of both education and promotion. “Color enhances realism and attractiveness in training and publicity pictures,” the manual explained, alluding to applications off the battlefield that were nonetheless pertinent to proper preparation for it.73 Kodachrome’s reliance on a combination of color and projection technology, in other words, promised a modern, educational, and attractive form of display.

Although printed at the end of the war, these wartime claims reveal a breadth of Kodachrome’s applications which fit well to the aspirations Bauer outlined for the Museum of Modern Art’s Wartime Housing show. If the museum’s role was to promote good war housing, in Bauer’s view, then Kodachrome’s
realism and attractiveness could not only “sell” the colorful wartime housing to the Museum’s visitors, but also allow for a technical study of the facades of colorful housing such as William Wurster’s units at Carquinez Heights while providing the Museum of Modern Art with a visually pleasing, modern exhibit.

In March of 1942, Catherine Bauer may well have been the first person to suggest to the Museum that it display Kodachrome to promote public housing for workers in the United States’ factories and shipyards. This support of showing public housing by using color slides followed closely on initial work in Kodachrome by the photographers of the Farm Security Administration’s Historical Section under the leadership of Roy Stryker. As Sally Stein’s archival research of the FSA’s foray into Kodachrome shows, starting in the spring of 1941, Stryker’s shooting scripts included requests from his photographers for shots of FSA housing for migrant workers on color transparencies. Stein positions these color slides as a “compromise” between regional offices’ demands for Kodak’s popular 16-millimeter color motion film (introduced to the market in 1935) and the FSA’s previous experience in black and white still photography, but also situates them within a rise in the popularity of color slides among clubs, businesses, schools, as well as such government agencies as the National Youth Administration. As Stein further notes, many of the color film strips that the FSA produced are now lost. Still, extant Kodachrome transparencies show that Stryker’s call for color slides of FSA housing was in fact heeded. In addition to Kodachrome views of Japanese internment buildings and housing projects in Puerto Rico, the digitized items in the FSA collection of the Library of Congress include a small group of Kodachrome slides shot by Arthur Rothstein in January 1942 of the migrant farm-worker housing units at Robstown, Texas (fig. 68). Western region FSA architect Vernon DeMars, moreover,
retained a collection of unattributed and undated Kodachrome slides showing FSA housing projects at Yuba City, California (fig. 69). Housed in a plastic page together with a slide showing a black and white aerial view of the project, another 35-millimeter color slide on a blank mount, and a pair of slides that could be almost identical were it not for the different markings on the slide mounts and the fact that one shows slightly more contrast, DeMars’s collection offers a comparison to Bauer’s own in the variety of technologies and techniques it exhibits and in the subjects where the holdings overlap. Indeed, DeMars later recalled making a copy of one of Catherine Bauer’s Kodachrome slides of a particularly poor example of a development in Texas that consisted of “3,000 units of public housing, brick, lined up like barracks.” He had never seen the project with his own eyes, he recalled, but thanks to Bauer’s Kodachrome he was able to assess the architect’s error in the placement of the front doors.
Hundreds of Kodachrome slides in Catherine Bauer’s and William Wurster’s files attest to an interest in this projectable color photographic technology that was intense and lasting. Slides of the Los Angeles public housing projects of Channel Heights and Rancho San Pedro were likely taken by Bauer on one of her visits to the projects operated by the Housing Authority (figs. 70, 71). As in the case of such slides as “FSA Ceres, Mills trip ’42,” or “Aliso—LA, 1950,” dates inscribed in Bauer’s handwriting on the slides’ paper mounts indicate when the shots were taken, not when the depicted housing was built (figs. 72, 59, 60). Other slides indicate that Bauer’s Kodachrome collecting extended beyond her housing work. She divided a slide index into a section for listing “Personal” Kodachrome slides and a section for listing slides that showed “Buildings, Country, etc.” Some of the slides blur this divide: in addition to snapshots of the Wursters’ friends in the fields of housing and architecture, one transparency labelled in Bauer’s hand “FSA early years (+C.B.), V de M” shows Bauer with a camera hanging from a strap around her neck as she walks through the brush outside the trailers and tents of another Farm Security Administration project designed by Vernon DeMars (fig. 73). Filed on the same page of the shot of Bauer with her camera in the field are several other Kodachrome slides of FSA projects, including one labelled “FSA camp, Calif., Sun. A.M. Barber-Shop” and another, “FSA Camp, Calif. ’40, Sun. A.M.—shooting crap” (figs. 74, 75).

Catherine Bauer understood from experience the advantages and disadvantages of different photographic technologies. On a 1939 research trip to the USSR, portability was of particular consequence. Bauer wrote to an American colleague,

"I was consistently irritated by not being allowed to photograph anything. It really is a little disturbing to ask a milizi in sign language if it’s okay to snap a perfectly harmless new apartment house, and have him scream hysterically and shoo you away, threatening to take your camera away. The net result was that I took a fiendish pleasure in standing on the roof of the Embassy, taking pictures of a Youth Day parade, the Kremlin, Red Square, and the Moscow Hotel (each individually forbidden) all at once, having Morrison develop them, and taking them out of the country around my waist."

Her photographs of the parade and local landmarks, as she explained, were contraband. Only through their concealment was she able to bring them back to the United States.

For a housing researcher who travelled and understood these challenges of field photography, Kodachrome offered several advantages. It required that the
photographer have at her disposal only a 35-millimeter roll film camera—one of the most affordable cameras in the United States in the 1940s. The film itself was smaller and easier to use than glass plate negatives, just as the processed transparencies were small and, unlike glass lantern slides, held up relatively well in transit. The drawbacks of Kodachrome for the field researcher came when it was time to produce the transparencies. In short, only Kodak could process Kodachrome by using a technology so complex that even the Navy’s photography manual did not fully explain it. Clients brought their exposed film rolls to a Kodak processing station, Kodak processed the rolls, then clients received their color transparencies along with small cardboard mounts for preparing two-by-two-inch slides (a service processing stations sometimes performed for the client, as well). For a field researcher like Bauer, this meant being at the mercy of Kodak’s geographic reach, but also being freed from the drudgery of the darkroom. This freedom came with a price of about fifteen cents per transparency and sixty cents per print, according to one account from 1948, but it also saved busy professionals like Bauer valuable time. “[T]o make transparencies the amateur need to know only how to focus his camera and how to measure exposures,” one manual advised, hinting at the ease with which Kodachrome offered a viewable product for practitioners uninitiated in the processes of developing and printing.

After the war, Catherine Bauer wrote briefly about her preference for Kodachrome to the Danish architect Hans Erling Langkilde. She showed Kodachrome slides in her lectures, she explained, plus she personally found using Kodachrome film simpler and more befitting her housing work than making black and white photographs. Bauer’s attestation to the ease of Kodachrome aligned with Kodak’s marketing message for their film. Kodak sold each roll of Kodachrome with a table of exposure data designed to help photographers judge which stop to set under different conditions. Manuals directed at amateurs warned of the shortcomings of these tables, as they neither took all combinations of conditions into account nor guaranteed that a photographer would get visually compelling results. Still, Bauer managed to avoid these hazards, as she later attested, with ease.

Bauer extended her application of Kodachrome to her work in the classroom when she returned from the USSR in the fall of 1939 to find an invitation to teach at the University of California, Berkeley. She looked upon this invitation as a chance to prepare a revised second edition of her book, Modern Housing, while also lecturing and taking students to perform “field-work” in the neighboring cities of Oakland and San Francisco. Following her first semesters at Berkeley, an additional opportunity to lead students in field work opened up for


Bauer at Mills College, a women’s school in Oakland. The “Mills Trip” Kodachrome in her slide collection shows housing at Ceres that Bauer visited with her summer session students at Mills in 1942 (fig. 72). In a rigorous five weeks from the end of June to the beginning of August, Bauer taught a course on “Housing in War and Peace.” An outline of the course in her files indicates that six of the course meetings on subjects ranging from “European housing between the wars” to “the local housing authority” to “wartime housing” were accompanied by slides. Taken at the end of the course, Bauer quite possibly intended the Kodachrome slide of Ceres for future research and classroom use. She certainly was encouraged. In a personal letter following the completion of the summer session, Alfred Neumeyer, the professor of art at Mills College who invited Bauer to teach there and visited her class meetings, himself, wrote approvingly, “There was variety and clarity in your presentation and a sound exchange of visual facts and of theoretical analysis.”

The ease with which these color slides could be created and shown formed part of Kodachrome’s value proposition for educators. The viewing method most commonly used in the classroom or lecture hall involved the projection of the slide “on a screen, like a movie,” wrote one contemporary color photography author, alluding to the technology’s entertainment value. With this scaling of the photograph, Olivier Lugon reminds us, more people could partake simultaneously and directly in the viewing experience.

The second selling point for Kodachrome was nearly always that “color has been shown to have greater effectiveness in teaching than black-and-white pictures,” according to another contemporary author on audio-visual education. However, not all educators shared this experience. In a 1943 issue of its magazine, the College Art Association published a pair of articles debating the pros and cons of color slides in teaching art history. In his argument in favor of color slides, an art historian from Bowdoin College in Maine pointed to the importance that students not only hear lecturers describe the colors of paintings, but also have the opportunity to see them as they hear this description in order for the “lecture system” to work at all. Acknowledging that “[t]here is [...] no such thing as a truthful lantern slide,” he added that “the decision should favor the slide which distorts the least.” In teaching the history of painting, color slides, and especially well-made slides such as those available through the Carnegie Corporation’s Color Slides Company, surpassed black and white slides, the professor argued. In short, the reasons to adopt color slides outweighed the reasons to continue to show art in black and white. Presenting the rebuttal was an art historian from Harvard University. If all slides presented “abstractions” of paintings, he surmised, then it would be best to pick the obvious abstraction of
a black and white slide rather than confuse students, or worse, offer empty
tainment. “Such slides,” he wrote of color transparencies, “might help to keep a class awake but would not be of help in giving any idea about color in paint.”

This concern with the deceptiveness of color transparencies extended beyond the field of art history to general discussions of visual education, as well. For many lecturers outside of art history, however, Kodachrome technology presented far too many positive attributes to continue lecturing with slides in only black and white. An example from the natural sciences illustrated the possibilities that Kodachrome presented in all aspects of lecturing, from preparation to the facilitation of the lesson in the classroom. In a 1946 article, one college instructor described his preference for Kodachrome in teaching the identification of local plants. Color transparencies are more “lifelike,” the biology teacher explained. He could make the slides himself with Kodachrome film bought at the local biology supply and take photographs in a way that gave him control over the content and emphasis of his own visual teaching aids: “Before I take a picture I decide exactly what I want to show—details of flowers or fruits, floral or leaf arrangement, the plant as a whole, or the relation of the plant to its surroundings—and then compose the picture to bring out my idea adequately,” he wrote. In composing his Kodachrome slide to highlight these different visual characteristics of plants, he could in turn focus classroom activities on a memorization of these identifying traits. “My procedure in teaching spring flora,” he explained,

“is to flash a picture of a plant on the screen and ask for its identification. If the student is able to give the common name, I verify it and ask the students to write the name in their notebooks. Then I point out one or more of its characteristics. These are written in the notebooks also. The teacher should point out the characteristics rather than elicit them from the students. Students frequently give characteristics which are really not diagnostic and tend to confuse the whole group. Mentioning characteristics tends to bring about closer observation and writing them down fixes them in the minds of the students. After all the pictures have been shown I change the order of the pictures and show them again.”

The biology lecturer’s method was much akin to paper flashcards. Talk through a deck of slides. Pause. Take notes. Shuffle. Then repeat.

Research on the history of audio-visual education corroborates these claims to the freedoms of the slide lecture, especially in contrast to motion pictures.
As Olivier Lugon writes, the “stillness, reflexive pauses, and concentration” afforded by slideshows gave them pedagogical value that was more difficult to emulate in film.\textsuperscript{105} And as Christel Taillibert observes in her study of the use of still and moving images in American, French, and Italian education in the 1930s, not only “habit,” but the prices of motion picture film kept many earlier classrooms focused on slides.\textsuperscript{106} Even as motion picture technologies became more widely available, the slideshow maintained a strong presence in the classroom well through the 1960s—a testament to its conduciveness to lesson formats, cost-effectiveness, and deep-seated integration into personal teaching practices.\textsuperscript{107}

Although directed primarily at developing a rote knowledge, the botany instructor’s procedures for preparing and conducting Kodachrome-centered lessons reveal how Catherine Bauer might have applied the color transparency technology in her own lectures for college students and for the many audiences of housing professionals and civic groups she spoke to during the war and immediate postwar years. By using Kodachrome, Bauer quickly had at hand transparencies that focused on the details that made housing architecture exemplary and illustrative of the quality she advised the Museum of Modern Art to promote. These specifics of subject matter and composition as well as photographic images in general mattered to Bauer on a political level. As historians Daniel T. Rodgers and Gail Radford each note, it was Bauer’s political acumen that set her work apart from that of her fellow regional planners in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{108} Bauer brought this political perspective on housing into the classroom in courses with such titles as “The Housing Movement” and “Problems of Housing Policy.”\textsuperscript{109} But in order to maintain the voter demand that started the housing movement, Bauer knew, like Wurster, that housing also had to look like a place people would want to live. In 1942, Bauer asked at one gathering of housers in San Francisco whether the latest housing was too “dull” in appearance to make the movement truly popular.\textsuperscript{110} The hypothesis inherent in her question suggested that appealing designs factored into winning popular support for housing policy. No lecture or classroom instruction on housing, then, was complete without slides that visually underscored good housing’s exemplary attributes.

One of the Kodachrome slides that Bauer made on the Mills trip to the Farm Security Administration’s housing projects at Ceres during the summer after the Museum of Modern Art’s show reveals modern housing’s small but significant formal details. Bauer, or perhaps even a student, composed the shot to capture the Mills students in summer garb in an array of light colors as they walk up a driveway to one of Ceres’s rowhouses in the distance (fig. 72). Clearly
visible, the windows in the shadows of the building’s second floor are propped open—not on hinges swinging to the side, but upward to let air into the upper story from below. This visibility defied the common criticism that Kodachrome did not show “details in the shadows.” Closer on the right, another building casts a long shadow across a bright green lawn to counterbalance the bright group of students on the left. Finally, in the foreground a row of low shrubs borders the green lawn with small red and white flowers, likewise providing a framing edge for the composition.

To viewers seeking to learn the ABCs of FSA architecture, such images of the housing set in its landscape were important to understanding what made this FSA project exemplary. At Ceres, the FSA architects adopted a window design similar to that developed for the housing in Yuba City, a California town north of Ceres in Sutter County. Bauer had visited the Yuba City project two years earlier and remarked on the practicality of the houses’ “high windows with a panel below which can be pushed out on hinges for easy ventilation.” Comprised of only a few parts and easy to operate, the Yuba City windows were a simple solution to regulating the temperature inside the house. In looking back on his FSA work, this was exactly how the Yuba City architect Vernon DeMars defined his job: “Just solving this most basic, immediate problem.” DeMars commented specifically on the struggle among the FSA architects to develop inexpensive architectural features that kept housing ventilated and cool. This was especially challenging in Arizona and New Mexico, according to his account, but also arguably in California. In another FSA housing project designed by DeMars together with Burton Cairns in Chandler, Arizona, the architects oriented the building so that the windowed facade faced away from the northwest sun in the late afternoon. Plywood and celloglass “flaps,” as DeMars termed them, allowed occupants to regulate airflow to upper stories by propping open sections of these lightweight exterior “windows” and “walls.” Bauer’s Kodachrome of Ceres, with the sun hitting the building’s “blank” wall and the window “flaps” propped open in the shade, illustrated this FSA concept developed in the earlier project at Chandler for the audiences of her subsequent lectures.

While Bauer’s Kodachrome masterfully captures this detail despite the challenge, its technology is truly harnessed in its rendering of the modest but colorful garden in the foreground. Landscaping, as the FSA architects later attested, was crucial to fulfilling the functions of housing for migrant farm workers. Although the trees shown planted in the lawn in Bauer’s Kodachrome of Ceres were still saplings, the architects intended this landscaping to (eventually) provide necessary shade from the heat of California’s agricultural regions,
as FSA landscape architect Garrett Eckbo later explained to historian Greg Hise. For DeMars, trees were a simple gesture towards people who had until then been treated as “peons.” Recalling a visit to a rural housing community built by California’s Associated Farmers, DeMars remarked that although the Associated Farmers could afford proper planting, “[…] there was not one tree, blade of grass, or anything. It was absolutely barren. It depressed anyone who came in who had to stay there.” Trees, like the decent housing they cooled, were as assertion of the humanity of the migrant farm workers for whom they were planted, making these trees in turn a crucial technical aspect of modern housing as a product of the New Deal and the progressivism that shaped it.

Returning to the example of William Wurster’s colorful war worker housing at Carquinez Heights, one sees that Kodachrome brought more than color to a historical visual understanding of the architect’s design. The Kodachrome slides of Wurster’s housing at Carquinez, labelled in Bauer’s handwriting and most likely made by her as part of her involvement in the project, draw attention to the structures in the foreground in ways that the black and white photograph by Roger Sturtevant published with Wurster’s article in *California Arts and Architecture* does not. Quickly apparent from one Kodachrome in the Bauer and Wurster collection is that it was taken when construction on this section of units was still underway (fig. 76). The unit in the foreground appears finished, but a pile of timber in the dirt as well as two foundations behind the foremost unit hint that more building remains to be done. Close cropping in the Kodachrome cuts out part of the steps leading up to the entirely cropped-out door of the nearest unit, whereas Sturtevant’s black and white photograph captures two sets of steps and doors in the row of housing facing the camera in addition to those of a row receding more directly down the hill on the right (fig. 64). Taken closer to morning, the Kodachrome renders the facade of the unit in shadow, whereas Sturtevant’s photograph, composed closer to sunset, captures the facades in full light that also rakes across the uneven texture of the cliffs across the bay. Still, other details appear in the Kodachrome that Sturtevant’s photograph does not fully capture. The hills in the background appear covered in a mix of gray-blue rock, brown grass, and dark green shrubs. The different angle exposes the buildings and docks along the shoreline below. The fresh construction in the foreground boasts unfinished wood panels in yellows, browns, and reds. In another Kodachrome of the Carquinez housing, this bare wood harmonizes with the blues and browns of painted doors standing closed in the partial shade provided by the units’ flat roofs (fig. 77).

As these examples of photographs and comments surrounding early 1940s housing show, color was an essential element in the design of an attractive and
modern regional housing development. While it would be erroneous to conclude that West Coast housing was exceptionally colorful and therefore should be shown in color, as will be made clear in the section below, it is worth considering how Kodachrome captured chromatic information with a technology that allowed scientists, researchers, and educators to create these slides themselves in a practical and controlled way conducive to the didactic functions of college housing courses and, quite possibly, those of the Museum of Modern Art. What one encounters with Bauer’s Kodachrome slides therefore is not necessarily a practice that privileged Kodachrome’s color-rendering capabilities, but one which begs an understanding of these capabilities as part of a broader, political effort to teach and learn modern housing design.

KODACHROME MAKES GOOD NEIGHBORS

Taking a longer view of West Coast housing’s history, it is difficult to argue that Catherine Bauer recognized Kodachrome’s ability to render color in architecture as an opportunity to underscore an ideological or formal distinction of West Coast projects. Still surrounded by California’s agricultural land, but with a landscaped “community recreation space” for fifty-one families, homes in the FSA settlements like Ceres, as historian Greg Hise indicates, were at their roots garden homes akin to (and in the case of DeMars’s designs directly based on) the housing and planning projects of East Coast-based garden city proponents Clarence Stein and Henry Wright. Bauer’s Kodachrome of Ceres, with its row of flowers framing the lawn, likewise bears formal echoes of the German garden city ideas that she sought to describe for the readers of Modern Housing in 1934.
Looking beyond the similarities in settlement layouts and landscaping, Bauer’s work with Kodachrome helped make a transnational tradition of specifically color in housing design available for viewing and study by new audiences. By 1942, Bauer was aware of the meaning of color in modern housing overseas. In the prize-winning essay for *Fortune* magazine that kick-started her career in 1931, Bauer was sure to mention color in her argument for the “art in industry” as she saw it in the economic designs for housing and municipal buildings in the new neighborhoods around Frankfurt, Germany. She described Praunheim:

> “From Frankfort proper, a view of dazzling whiteness and the satisfactory geometry of clean lines, well-defined, largely conceived forms, and simple surfaces occasionally curved to conform to the topography. The Praunheim streets, well-balanced harmony of red and blue concrete planes, broken only by windows and doors and occasional mass variations to meet different plan requirements. No monotony of standardization here. Far from it.”

Elsewhere in the article, Bauer described a method of making color stucco for the houses’ exteriors similar to that later adopted in the construction of public housing in Los Angeles. Regarding interior color, Bauer singled-out Mart Stam’s designs for a home for the elderly as an excellent example with its color linoleum floors, plaster, and doors. All these applications of color, Bauer implied, were economical, structurally functional, aesthetically pleasing, and evidence of the “Americanization” she argued was inherent in recent German city planning.

Bauer attested in her 1931 article that she did not aim for “bodily acceptance of the current German idiom in modern architecture” by her American readers. But in showing how color might fit into this idiom and arguing for the Americaness of this idiom’s efficiency and economy, she posed color as also cultural and political. Bauer was doubtlessly aware of one of the most famous examples of the political ramifications of color in modern housing: the color facades of housing units in German architect Bruno Taut’s garden cities first at Falkenberg (1913–1914) and Reform (1912–1915), then in Zehlendorf (1926–1932). Taut’s use of color was at first derided by general audiences, then singled-out as an object of the Nazi-era criticism that eventually caused the architect to flee to Turkey. Against this political backdrop, color in the modern housing movement took on new and complex connotations. Nowhere were these more manifest than in Catherine Bauer’s work with Kodachrome following the Second World War.
Bauer’s interest in Kodachrome as a means of collecting and researching modern housing increased after the war. She brought Kodachrome with her on her trip to the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning congress in Hastings in the fall of 1946 so that she could make slides to use in her lectures.127 On this trip, Bauer took photographs with Kodak’s Kodachrome film in Paris, London, Copenhagen, and Amsterdam. She continued to add to her color slide file of modern European housing after she returned to the United States. As Bauer explained in a subsequent letter to the architect Hans Erling Langkilde, bad weather and a faulty camera on her trip to Copenhagen resulted in Kodachrome slides that “were not good enough” for her lectures.128 She sent his office a list of ten requested shots along with some Kodachrome film and the promise of payment. Her only justification for her preference for Kodachrome was that she showed Kodachrome slides in her lectures and, as mentioned, that she personally found using Kodachrome easier than making photographs in black and white (despite the evidence that bad luck could befall her, after all).129 When Langkilde’s office sent Bauer her requested shots a few months later, she wrote a letter thanking them for filling the hole in her slide collection to the benefit of audiences in the United States: “All I can say is that this work, which is almost unknown in the USA, is I think the most fresh and interesting housing design done recently anywhere, and I shall do my best to show it to people.”130

Bauer’s letter to Langkilde was one among several she sent in the spring and summer of 1947 to solicit photographs for use in her housing work in the United States. The reason for this copious correspondence was that the Kodachrome film that Bauer found easy to use in some areas of her work posed challenges in others. She wrote to Arthur King, planner for the London County Council, to say that she was writing an article for the magazine Survey Graphic and faced a small technical problem: “I have some good Kodachromes of new construction in London but alas, they are not transformable into equally good black and white photos for reproduction.”131 Bauer specifically asked King for “an overall view of an area under reconstruction; (preferably the Poplar area…of which I have excellent Kodachromes…of which I’d be delighted to send you copies or color prints in exchange if you’d like them).”132 She explained a similar problem in a letter sent that same day to the architect Kay Fisker in Copenhagen. Bauer needed a photograph of a certain set of row houses, “including if possible a view inside the little ‘patio’? It just happens to illustrate perfectly a point I must make in an article I’m just starting on,” she wrote.133
For helping her obtain photographs to replace her Kodachrome slides, Bauer sent her correspondents packets of printed pamphlets and books on housing in the United States. She offered to send such a packet to Fisker’s office. Quite probably as an attempt to counteract the “inadequate presentation” of the United States’ housing at the 1946 International Federation for Housing and Town Planning congress in Hastings, Bauer furthermore offered to send US materials to anyone at the London County Council who might be interested in them. She forwarded “a miscellaneous assortment of American material on housing and town planning” to Dr. Langkilde. She also sent the Danish architect a copy of her sister Elizabeth Mock’s book, *If you Want to Build a House*. Forming the foundation of the Museum of Modern Art’s circulating shows of the past year, the book “includes pictures of many recent modern homes in America,” Bauer wrote.

With her long lists of contacts in both Europe and the United States, Catherine Bauer’s orchestration of a postwar transatlantic exchange of Kodachrome, black and white prints, and housing publications positioned her to promote a picture of US housing work abroad that was defined by select publications and institutions. By sending Mock’s *If you Want to Build a House* together with copies of Mock’s *Built in USA* to her contacts, Bauer doubtlessly raised interest in the Museum of Modern Art’s wartime and postwar exhibitions in the Department of Architecture. Yet, despite her praise for many of these publications sent in exchange for shots on Kodachrome film or replacement black and white prints, Bauer sent many of these materials along with her criticism of recent housing work in the United States. She wrote to the Dutch architect Cornelis van Eesteren to say that she sent US materials to the City Planning Office in Amsterdam, “so you will be seeing it, for whatever it may be worth. Very little of it is really distinguished, as we are in a bad period politically as you in Europe know all too well.” Just a few days earlier, Bauer had written to the Dutch politician Jan Bommer in Amsterdam to send him a Kodachrome print, but also to briefly share her concern regarding the “political crises on housing in Washington” and a recent “reactionary wave.”

Spirited and hopeful as Bauer’s postwar exchange of photographs sounded, her practices responded to the same pressures faced by the National Association of Housing Officials in their production of annual reports and exhibitions. On a local level, housing authorities such as the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles and others greatly impacted by the war struggled with creating a peacetime housing program amidst a persistent housing shortage and an environment of rampant racism and red-baiting. In Washington, housers and legislators were caught in what would be a four year struggle to turn the Taft-Ellender-
Wagner Bill into the Housing Act of 1949—a “logjam” that “would finally break
with Harry Truman’s successful 1948 presidential campaign,” according to his-
torian Don Parson. The logjam was symptomatic of a larger “reactionary wave.”
As Parson points out, none other than the Republican Senator from Wisconsin,
Joseph McCarthy, introduced a “parallel housing bill” that omitted public hous-
ing completely.

As historian Daniel T. Rodgers’s research further illustrates, Bauer’s contin-
ued positive regard for European housing programs went against a changing
tide of US progressives’ attitude toward their European counterparts. Starting
in 1942 with reactions to Britain’s first postwar plan for a welfare state, progres-
sives writing in US journals began adopting “a new tone of critical superiority”
toward progressive policy across the Atlantic. The war left the United States
with the strongest economy in the world, as Rodgers writes, and Britain’s post-
war plan for a welfare state “smelled too much of limits and poverty” for adap-
tation and adoption in a country aiming above all for economic growth. The
United States’ schemes to “Americanize” Europe through the Marshall Plan’s sale
of manufactured goods reflected these attitudes and economic aspirations.

Despite persistent international exchange among experts, Rodgers observes,
European examples did not figure prominently in the footnotes of lasting post-
war policies in the United States.

Although Bauer’s comparative, critical methods for the study and promo-
tion of modern housing in the United States were ultimately overwhelmed by
US attitudes of exceptionalism following the war, it is worth investigating how
she hoped for color slides to help make them work. In the summer of 1947, Bauer
began planning “a little book on some of the issues which are more and more
universally recognized, whether in Warsaw or Chicago,” as she wrote to Cornelis
van Eesteren. She likewise told John Entenza about a book she was writing “on
some of the issues that seem to be increasingly recognized all over the world”
and noted that she might send a related article.

Bauer never wrote the book she planned, but still gave numerous lectures
on housing issues at home and abroad in the spring of 1948, complete with color
slides. The first was a guest presentation at the New School in New York for
Charles Abrams’s class on “Housing and Planning Abroad,” where Bauer acci-
dentally left “a color slide of a sketch for a town center for ‘Ongar,’ a hypothetical
New Town suggested in the Greater London Plan,” in the classroom’s projector
(fig. 78). Bauer wrote to the New School to say that she needed the slide
returned so that she could show it in her upcoming lectures at Cornell University.
These presentations at Cornell were a milestone in Bauer’s postwar
career. Part of the Messenger lecture series, they formed a chapter in an over
twenty-year history of intellectual exchange between the university and a host of historians, humanists, philosophers, and scientists. In a first draft, Bauer gave her series of three lectures the title “Housing Progress and Democracy.” She later revised this title to “Key Issues in Housing and Community Planning,” but the manuscripts in her files show that this question of modern housing's function for all modern democracies, not just the United States, indeed remained key.

Bauer opened the first of the lectures on May 17, 1948, with the thesis that the housing crisis in the United States was “actually part of a worldwide situation”—a situation which many democratic nations in Western Europe were facing with methods developed out of a “valuable history” of housing policy based in the Enlightenment idea of housing as a basic human right. Bauer did not mention color in housing in her script, although she mentioned the dangers of “dull and unlovely” houses and the need in the United States for “some quality of the creative imagination” similar to that of the post–Second World War “Garden City movement” in England. She followed twenty-seven typed pages in this first lecture with nearly four pages of notes for slides. Bauer wrote to Cornell several times in advance of the talks, asking “to make sure that the slide projector has a 750-watt bulb in it,” for anything less powerful would not be enough for showing slides in color. The slides she listed in her notes correspond not to Kodachrome slides, but glass slides, several of which are still extant in her collection at the University of California, Berkeley. Among these glass slides were ones showing the council housing of Becontree in England, Kay Fisker's row-houses in Denmark, and Farm Security Administration housing in California. Bauer’s notes regarded the FSA housing as an “effort to set modern standards for farm labor homes” and one that was “still pretty lonely.” Finally, towards the end of this list of slides Bauer included the war housing at Vallejo. A cross archival reading of this list with Bauer's glass slide collection suggests that of all these slides noted, at least the Becontree slide was possibly one from her collection that showed the development in color (fig. 79).

Why did Bauer request photographs made using Kodachrome from her European colleagues for exhibiting in the Messenger lectures, only in the end to show glass lantern slides? Her collections show that she made both slide formats work for her, again, with the relative ease she required of her professional photographic practice. Although Bauer’s writings and the current state of her Kodachrome collection suggest that she began using Kodachrome as part of her housing work in the early 1940s, she had been collecting photographs since she wrote Modern Housing in the early 1930s. Many of these photographs by 1940 offered historical examples of the housing movement’s most celebrated achieve-
ments in building. As Bauer’s outlines for her courses and the typescript for the first of her lectures for the Messenger series at Cornell show, Bauer regularly spoke about housing as both a current concern and a historical problem. In maintaining a personal file consisting of both Kodachrome transparencies and standard 3 ¼ × 4-inch glass slides, Bauer did not see any obstacles or contradictions. The example of one standard-sized glass lantern slide showing the Poplar area of East London—the same area that Bauer wrote to Arthur King about, extending an offer to send him her “excellent kodachromes”—hints that she likely used one technique for reconciling the two technologies. Not a 35-millimeter Kodachrome, but a glass slide in color, the transparency shows the white frames of the new development rising up as a promising outline of better homes amidst the brown-gray brick of the surrounding buildings that survived
the war (fig. 80). Clues such as the image’s rounded corners and dimensions suggest that the maker of the lantern slide possibly created it by enlarging a Kodachrome.\(^{160}\) Such an enlargement, although not as quick as placing a Kodachrome in a larger slide mount, would not have resulted in any loss of resolution in the projected image and would have allowed Bauer to project her Kodachrome slides in the same machine as her glass slides.\(^{161}\)

As the correspondence on these postwar lectures further suggests, color slides in general stood at the center of Bauer’s transnational approach to housing reform. Far from promoting a colorful picture of West Coast war housing, slides such as those of Ongar, Becontree, and a prewar project built by the Housing Authority of New Haven, Connecticut (fig. 81), reveal that color mattered to Bauer in presenting housing examples that were both real and hypothetical,
from abroad and from across the United States. Not all of these housing examples were tried and true, nor were they all examples to which US plans should aspire: Becontree upon its completion in 1934 was the largest of Britain’s council housing projects, but by 1947 also the subject of criticism for its failure to solve the problems of the slums. Still, Bauer gave a place to these slides in her collection from which she composed visual accompaniment to the lectures which, against the postwar tide, brought housing ideas from abroad into critical dialogue with the United States’ postwar housing problems.

KODACHROME IN INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS

In choosing to use color slides, Catherine Bauer elected to use a popular medium. After the war, educators in the United States increasingly championed the use of audio-visual teaching materials and Kodachrome, in particular, as especially egalitarian. For educators inexperienced with audio-visual media, handbooks explained their proper handling, projection, and storage. Kodachrome required little technological transition for teachers already using glass lantern slides, for they could use adapters to show Kodachrome in the same projectors. For educators looking to build slide libraries, opportunities abounded. If schools did not make their own slides, companies such as the Society for Visual Education in Chicago sold Kodachrome slides “covering many courses, ranging from social studies and national parks to sciences such as entomology, zoology, embryology, botany, and geology.” Educators looking for enrichment of their curriculum or guidance could also turn to established institutions participating in audio-visual education, including the Los Angeles County Museum of History, Science and Art in Exposition Park and the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Finally, slideshow making allowed students to take the lesson, so to speak, into their own hands. Although various agencies continued to advertise pre-made slides for classroom use, proponents of visual education upheld teaching students how to research images, outline a presentation, and prepare their own slides. In allowing students to take command of lessons, Kodachrome doubtlessly appealed to postwar US educators looking to distance their classrooms from older models involving authoritarian teachers and limited opportunities for student leadership.

Like the advocates for the New Pedagogy in Germany in the 1920s, educators in the United States saw in slides and other audio-visual classroom technologies a means of making students more connected citizens of the world. In his introduction to Anna Curtis Chandler and Irene F. Cypher’s 1948 publication, Audio-Visual Techniques for Enrichment of the Curriculum, member of the American
Psychological Association Paul R. Radosavljevich claimed that the methods presented in the book “point the way to the best possible means of education for World Citizenship.”

For Radosavljevich and his like-minded contemporaries, achieving world citizenship required educating students on topics that were foreign to them. Businesses that sold slides were quick to cater to this demand with claims to “the wide variety of material from all over the world that they [the slides, N.K.O.] bring to the classroom.” On another level, however, creating world citizens also fulfilled a national postwar aspiration: “This book should be in the hands not only of good teachers in all grades from kindergarten to university,” Radosavljevich wrote, “but also should be consulted by all others who are interested in helping to develop a modern, ideal and useful American culture and civilization.

The notion of a “modern, ideal and useful American culture and civilization” smacked of Marshall Plan politics and postwar paternalism. But the authors of Audio-visual Techniques for Enrichment of the Curriculum appeared to have had another program in mind. In a section of the book titled “Aids in War and Peace,” Chandler and Cypher discussed the recent development in audio-visual techniques in the wartime training of the United States’ armed forces. These techniques, they argued, could be carried over into the peacetime classroom, replacing the ubiquitous “‘Americana Series,’ fostering Americanism alone” with “‘The World of Today Series,’ furthering world unity.” “Like a magic carpet,” the authors explained,

“audio-visual aids can take our boys and girls to remote corners of the earth—or bring the world to the classroom. They can make possible a visit to the very homes of our near and far neighbors, and cover more ground in a shorter period of time than can be traversed by any other kind of transportation, even our swiftest airplanes. The better our boys and girls, for whose happiness in the world of tomorrow hosts of soldiers have fought and died, understand the people of other countries, their culture and ideals, the more likely it is that they will be able to live together in peace.”

The education of future citizens was not only crucial to creating Radosavljevich’s “modern, ideal and useful American culture,” but a promising step towards the prevention of additional wars.

The conviction that audio-visual learning fostered world citizenship found its most elaborate articulation in the Office of Inter-American Affairs’ support for Kodak’s color transparencies. Established in August 1940, the Office of Inter-American Affairs (called the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs
from 1941 to 1945) operated only until May of 1946, but still long enough, as several scholars show, to have brought new attention to fostering inter-American air travel, radio communication, and exchange in the arts. These efforts were all part of the United States’ “Good Neighbor Policy” with the nations of the Western Hemisphere—a policy that ostensibly strove to maintain peaceful relations among these nations (especially during the Second World War) while serving the United States’ interests in economic and cultural trade. Among the Office’s arts initiatives was the Inter-American Office at the National Gallery of Art that it set up with a Department of State grant in 1944 to continue the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs’ “art exchange program.” Kodachrome slides formed the foundation of this program as well as the Inter-American Office’s efforts to promote general education on Latin American cultures. Following a 1944 “survey of the existing sources in Latin America of color reproductions, slides, and books pertaining to art in the United States,” the Inter-American Office identified institutions to which it could send boxes of labelled Kodachrome slides showing both American paintings and European paintings in US museums “[a]s indication of our cultural appreciation and the tradition from which our contemporary art has developed,” the Office declared. Kodachrome at the Inter-American Office thus acted largely as a US export and as a symbol of the United States’ cosmopolitanism that highlighted the nation’s ties to Europe by providing institutions abroad with a glimpse into the United States’ collections of international art.

In confining this collection to slides of paintings in US museums, the Inter-American Office overlooked some of the most important and more recent projects in the arts in the United States such as the murals of the 1930s or the journal Camera Work, which served as a truly international (and not simply transatlantic) hub for creative photography. Yet, the presence in the United States of the arts of the countries that the Office grouped under the term “Latin America” nonetheless formed the foundation of a second part of this initiative, this time for the benefit of US viewers. Together with the American Council on Education, the Office of Inter-American Affairs made available a selection of “Kodachrome Slides of Latin America” as copies or for loan from such distributors as the Pan American Union, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and regional Councils on Inter-American Affairs in Denver and Los Angeles. Not collected directly from foreign cultural institutions, the file instead contained a number of Kodachrome slides supplied by Pan American World Airways, TACA Airways, the Chicago Museum of Natural History, and the Museum of Modern Art. With such thematic sequences as “Popular Arts in Mexico,” “Bolivian Highland Costumes,” and a set of forty-four slides called “Brazil Builds,” the collection...
promised to bring the arts and design of these countries into the classrooms of
the United States in color.180

The titles of some of these slide sequences would have sounded familiar to
visitors to the Museum of Modern Art. Brazil Builds was also the title of an exhibition that opened at the Museum in January 1943 to showcase the research that trustee Philip Goodwin and photographer G.E. Kidder Smith conducted on their trip to Brazil the previous summer. As the press release for the show attested, "The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs assisted the project in every way possible."181 The forty-four slides available through the Office, thus, were probably contributed by the Museum from the forty-eight color slides presented at the entrance to the exhibition in New York as a "continuous screen projection."182 The Museum worked closely with the Inter-American Office during the war period, especially in the circulation of the Museum’s multiple exhibits abroad. In one of its first major collaborative efforts with the Museum, the Office translated Look at Your Neighborhood (1944) into Spanish and Portuguese. The Office furthermore sent copies to contact institutions in Lima and São Paulo “to answer their respective demands for practical information on large and small-scale community planning.”183

In his study of the history of the Museum of Modern Art’s travelling exhibitions, Olivier Lugon notes how Look at Your Neighborhood was one of the first “multiple exhibitions” developed by the head of the Department of Circulating Exhibitions, Elodie Courter.184 Like the other multiple exhibitions from the years 1943 to 1945, Look at Your Neighborhood was printed in photogravure on panels (figs. 31, 32).185 Subsequent exhibits, however, indicate that the department’s multiple exhibitions became increasingly technically involved. The circulating exhibit designed for Elizabeth Mock’s If You Want to Build a House (1946) came with “nineteen colored panels” as well as “thirty-two kodachrome slides (2 × 2 inches), showing various houses illustrated in the exhibition.”186 Certainly a reference to the photogravure prints on the panels, but quite possibly a reference to the Kodachrome slides, as well, the Museum promoted the exhibit in words that reverberated with the vocabulary of the garden city movement and Catherine Bauer: “The photographs which make up the exhibition were chosen to indicate the endless variety of form possible in modern architecture,” the Museum’s description of the exhibit read, “as well as to illustrate the particular points under discussion.”187
COSMOPOLITAN ASPIRATIONS IN COLOR

Research on the Museum of Modern Art’s 1942 Wartime Housing exhibition leaves open the question of whether Noyes took Bauer’s advice and showed West Coast housing in color.188 The press release for the exhibition promised “movie shorts, blown up photographs and architectural models,” but did not mention specifically color photographs or slideshows.189 Among the projects featured in these media, the Museum included William Wurster’s housing units for war workers at Carquinez Heights, but none of the multi-color stucco projects operated by the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles appear to have made the cut.190

Looking beyond the Wartime Housing exhibition uncovers a complex history of color in housing and photographic slides. Color in modern housing long formed one of the ideals that sprang from the transatlantic garden city movement, but a new reason to show this housing in color, and specifically Kodachrome, emerged in this postwar environment that promoted international understanding through visual education. By 1947, when the Museum of Modern Art published the description of Elizabeth Mock’s multiple exhibition, If You Want to Build a House, Kodachrome was established as a didactic tool wrapped in the cosmopolitan aspirations of postwar educators and government employees. Bauer’s transatlantic trade in Kodachrome and preference for lecturing with color slides aligned with these broader pedagogical practices that aspired “to a better intercultural understanding.”191 As historian Daniel T. Rodgers argues, Bauer still wanted to learn something from Europe’s progressive policies—to hold them in critical comparison with the United States’ own so that US policy could be improved.192 As part of this endeavor, Bauer made her own slides in color—a choice she saw as appropriate for representing West Coast architecture, but also for representing housing in London and Copenhagen in 1946. She traded these slides with her colleagues across the Atlantic for black and white photographs for print publication. According to her lecture notes, she showed examples of modern housing projects near and far, in color, to crowds of students, municipal officials, and members of the community. What began as a suggestion to the Museum to show West Coast housing in color, then, became a personal Kodachrome collection of the latest European and US housing in shots snapped by housers and architects as technical illustrations for a project which, especially following the war, needed to appear as American and democratic as possible in order to win popular support.193 At a time when modern housing in the United States already seemed to Bauer to be mired in old ways, color in Bauer’s slides not only distinguished these homes from historical
European precedents as “American” and current (in a case study further supporting Kim Beil’s argument), but also as teachable models for a better future for public housing design.

Catherine Bauer’s writings and slides along with architect Vernon DeMars’s oral history help situate color slides in relation to a housing effort that was at once educational and commercial, technically informative and emotionally appealing, local and transnational. Bauer’s color slides were both small portable objects of personal study and objects that with a projector could be scaled for public display to quickly and easily convert her research into an educational exhibition for her audiences at Mills College and Cornell University. The display of Bauer’s Kodachrome slides and color glass slides, in short, functioned to bring private research before an educated public in a visual language that was commercially popular and evocative of Good Neighbor rhetoric.

In its pursuit of this close reading of Bauer’s work, this chapter leaves open the question of why the photographers directly employed by the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles did not leave similar Kodachrome collections to posterity. Aside from a few undated color slides of the “Temple area” in Leonard Nadel’s collection of photographs for the later Community Redevelopment Agency projects, little in the scattered collection of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles suggests that its photographers worked in Kodachrome to complete assignments. Was Kodachrome simply too expensive to print? Or might the Housing Authority’s photographers have viewed Kodachrome’s commercialism and amateurism as an inappropriate fit in their respective approaches to photographing low-income neighborhoods and modern public housing? Indeed, might such photographers as Lou Stoumen, who applied to receive the Guggenheim Foundation’s prestigious fellowship in 1948, have avoided Kodachrome because it was not yet elevated to the status of art? Not just the presence of Bauer’s Kodachrome slides, but the almost complete absence of color slides from the remainder of the Housing Authority’s scattered collection frames the Authority’s photographic work in a broad set of questions. As future scholarship looks closer at photography’s technical, aesthetic, and cultural histories, further investigation into public housing in color prior to the digital turn promises a better understanding of an effort that was at once research-based and creative, a public good but also one that needed to advertise and “sell” itself in images directed at potential consumers.

Finally, further investigation into Kodachrome in housing history promises to provide a much-needed background for later showings of Kodachrome slides not of architecture or art, but as art. As historian of color photography Nathalie Boulouch observes, many commercial photographers looking to break into the
museum and art market shied away from Kodachrome’s small format and relinquishment of darkroom processes until the 1960s, when artists such as Robert Smithson and Dan Graham began viewing Kodachrome’s accessibility with interest and introduced slideshows into their exhibitions. Audiences first saw the photographs of New Jersey suburbs from Dan Graham’s now famous *Homes for America* conceptual art piece (published in the December 1966–January 1967 issue of *Arts Magazine*) as projected color slides at the Finch College Museum of Art in New York in 1966, Boulouch notes. “Using slides as a simple and economical technology,” she weighs, 

“Graham was trying to make art with minimal means. The modular coloured forms of tract housing were reinforced by the saturation of Kodachrome slide film. By using projected transparencies, he explained, he was trying to get close to the luminescence of the neon of Dan Flavin and the minimal colored forms produced by Donald Judd [...]. The sequential display of the slideshow was the best way to emphasize the serial logic in the organization of the suburban houses he registered in his snapshots.”197

Here, Boulouch’s analysis of Graham’s use of the readily available and popular medium of the color slide poses it as fit for depicting the minimalism of not necessarily public housing, but the 1960s suburban landscape. As Boulouch, citing Graham, also observes, Kodachrome in both its color and seriality further spoke the language of contemporary minimal and conceptual art made with electric lights. In other words, Kodachrome in *Homes for America* became art’s metaphorical low-income housing unit—its “minimal house,” to quote the architect of the Farm Security Administration’s migrant farmworker housing in California and Arizona, Vernon DeMars.198

But Dan Graham’s “minimal house” of Kodachrome was not home to the picture of modern housing that Catherine Bauer envisioned. As Graham’s work published in *Arts Magazine* in its December 1966–January 1967 issue made clear, the ubiquitous monotony of America’s postwar suburbs was owed to the profit-grabbing building practices that first manifested themselves in the construction of housing for World War II defense workers in Los Angeles.199 This was bad housing twenty years later—housing which Graham, as art historian Gwen Allen explains, presented with a “deadpan” appropriate to these homes with their dearth of emotional appeal.200 Whereas Kodachrome practices like Bauer’s promised to easily capture and display the colorful variety of public wartime housing to further the housing movement at a critical moment in the immediate postwar years, in the mid-1960s, Graham’s showing of Kodachrome
slides in an art museum turned a critical eye on the postwar era’s private developments and made them the stuff of a new conceptual art. 201

Many changes in housing policy, the arts, and creative approaches to photography happened in between these two moments that helped photographs of housing into the museum as art. The next chapter turns now to the work of two Los Angeles-based photographers to explain how photographing for the housing movement in the immediate postwar years fit broader notions about photography as art and the role it played in a divided world.
“Race and class relations seem to me infinitely more important than improved housing techniques at this point in history. But, even so, I know that one can’t solve everything all at once and would not drag it in here except for one disturbing thing that becomes more and more apparent. Namely, that large-scale housing and planning techniques, however enlightened in a physical sense, not only do not automatically improve the social structure: they can (and do, in the absence of a determined conscious effort to prevent it) actually promote and crystallize segregation in a much more blatant, official and efficient form that we’ve ever known it in the past outside the deep South.”

Catherine Bauer Wurster to Reginald Johnson, July 20, 1944.¹

During the Second World War, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles both abolished racial segregation in its unfilled housing projects and discontinued the use of racial quotas in tenant selection. At a time when many housing authorities across the United States still enforced segregation in public housing, this change of policy in Los Angeles was controversial, but timely. As many Americans around the time of the Second World War increasingly associated racism with fascism, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles and other public housing proponents found a new way of winning the support of a broader taxpaying public by positioning public housing’s policies against racial or religious discrimination in tenant selection as American and democratic.²

Photography figured prominently and problematically in the positioning of non-discrimination in public housing as “the New Deal in a microcosm,” as historian Sophie Spalding has observed of Leonard Nadel’s never-published photobook, Aliso Village U.S.A.³ But as this chapter further aims to show, this
The notion of public housing projects as ideal, democratic microcosms had currency in relation to the politics of the late wartime and immediate postwar years, as well. So too did photographers see in public housing’s postwar image a possible means of furthering their photographic practices before audiences that included other photographers, government officials, museums, and the Guggenheim Foundation. For them, to photograph this ideal “microcosm” was to undertake pressing and prestigious cultural work. Looking closer at the place of public housing in the practices of the Los Angeles-based photographers, this chapter explains how public housing and specifically images of its residents functioned within the portfolios of photographers both during the 1940s and early 1950s and later in their respective creative careers.

Although race forms only one of the themes of this chapter, it is worth noting that several approaches to this theme follow the current photohistorical concern with narratives outlined in the introduction to this study. Kate Sampsell-Willmann identifies this tendency as a “retreat from racial essentialism” and a turning to “the photographer’s intentions as an additional text.” One of the books Sampsell-Willmann reviews, Erina Duganne’s *The Self in Black and White: Race and Subjectivity in Postwar American Photography*, shows how this approach might help scholarship “move beyond evaluating representations of race, both in isolation from their broader historical and cultural significance within the United States and as the product of a unified and cohesive group of individuals,” and more immediately offer a useful lens for viewing the work of photographers “who share an interest in depicting black subjects.” Art historian Abigail Solomon-Godeau likewise offers a framework for approaching such inequities between artist and subject as that between college-educated photographers and low-income public housing residents by understanding the role of the subject in artists’ navigation of their contemporary markets. In addition to recognizing the disjunct between these idealizing photographs and the social and political problems of public housing, these approaches urge the historian to more closely study the ways in which figures such as the housing resident functioned as part of a history of photography.

In adopting this approach, it is important to recognize that the identities of many of the photographers who worked for the Housing Authority remain unknown. Those who received some acclaim are either of European heritage, or their identity goes unmentioned. If the Housing Authority showed photographs in their newsletters, reports, or exhibitions made by photographers who identified as Black, Indigenous, or of Asian heritage, urgent work remains to be done to understand and celebrate these photographers’ contributions to the public housing movement and the greater social history of Los Angeles.
The urgency of this task becomes clear when one considers this period as the prologue to the Civil Rights era. As Blake Stimson shows in *The Pivot of the World: Photography and Its Nation*, at the center of photography’s postwar work was the question of political “belonging”—specifically, the idea of a “new global subject.” Looking at such photographic projects from the 1950s as the Museum of Modern Art’s landmark 1955 exhibition, *The Family of Man*, Stimson identifies “a peculiar and distinctive form of late modernism”—one which held “the possibility of a new political identification, the possibility of a civic-minded collective self-understanding that would generate a new postwar, postmodern citizen of the world.” The global popularity of such exhibitions as the Museum of Modern Art’s depended on a widely-held notion of photography as capable of “doing the same sort of ideological work that spirituals, sarongs, homespun, and the like performed” during the Civil Rights era, Stimson explains. But as he also acknowledges, this work was “symbolic”—the hold of this notion, brief. Looking to the formats of the photoessay and the photographic exhibition, Stimson examines closely the “embodied” and “affective” experience of looking at photography during this period. “How,” he asks, “did the exhibition [*The Family of Man, N.K.O.*] translate political motivations into emotional experience?”

Not least for the fact that the work of one of the Housing Authority’s photographers was later included in this landmark postwar show is Stimson’s question worth modifying and testing against earlier commercial photographic practices surrounding the Housing Authority’s program. In the absence of adequate records, this chapter does not try to grapple with the complex emotional experiences created by housing photographs. Rather, it looks to the writings of housing officials and photographers on the political and social motivations of public housing and its photographs in this period of political and social change. The ideas surrounding housing in Los Angeles especially, as Don Parson explains, changed from the “community modernism” of the New Deal practices of “social democratic reform” to a postwar “corporate modernism,” or “the monumental glorification of the commercial urban economy.” In postwar Los Angeles, the pro-private-building *Los Angeles Times*, as Parson shows, played a large part in this shift through their sharp criticism of the public housing program. International initiatives such as the one to make housing a topic at the United Nations also suffered scathing review, as mentioned in chapter 3 of this study. These events form a backdrop for postwar photographic practices from 1945 to 1948. In which ways might photography have proffered its promise of belonging during this tumultuous period? How did this promise resonate with the postwar housing program’s positioning of itself and especially its racially diverse
communities as a democratic ideal? Moving away from Stimson’s focus on the blockbuster, *The Family of Man*, this chapter brings together anti-racist messages from popular culture with under-researched records including the correspondence of the Housing Authority’s Frank Wilkinson in his collection at the Southern California Library, the recently released FBI file of the photographer, art historian, and designer Esther Lewittes Mipaas, and the never-published Guggenheim Fellowship application of photographer and filmmaker Louis Clyde Stoumen. These records explain how photographers interpreted and responded to these two promises with projects that offered profound reflections on their medium and roles in the postwar world.

PICTURING CIVIC UNITY

In January 1942, with defense housing projects well underway and one eye trained on the end of the war, the California Housing and Planning Association gathered with representatives from the United States Housing Authority in the conference rooms of the Clift Hotel in San Francisco. There, they called several tenets of existing housing legislation into question. International housing leader Catherine Bauer most clearly articulated the current problems in her upbeat but cautionary speech, titled “Post-War Housing Can Save the West.” She asked a series of provocative questions: “Is the public housing atmosphere too paternalistic for wide popular enthusiasm? Should we find a way to enlist responsible participation from the people we are trying to serve, right from the start? Are the projects too dull and ‘regimented’ in appearance to strike a popular spark?” These questions went to the heart of some of the greatest public criticisms of public housing. But one of the most pressing issues for Bauer was the matter of tenant qualification, especially in Los Angeles. The problem, she explained, was that the people who the housing authorities were uprooting in slum-clearance efforts were not always eligible to move into the new public housing projects under the current rules. In framing the successful resolution of this problem as a benefit for all the Western states, Bauer called for legislative changes that would allow groups currently barred from the existing housing program, such as single persons, people without US citizenship, and people who owned their “slum” homes, to qualify for the new government-sponsored units.

As several historians have ably shown, prejudice prevailed in the newly built units among selected residents, as well. A closer look at the Housing Authority collections reveals a familiar story, but in as-yet unpublished words worth considering here. Ten months after Catherine Bauer gave her speech,
Catherine Henck of the Housing Authority of the City of Vallejo wrote to Frank Wilkinson in Los Angeles regarding a conversation she had with him at a conference the previous weekend on what she termed “the racial problem in projects.” “We have quite a large minority group—Negroes and Filipinos—in our project,” she wrote; “I would like to find out the actual experiences of other managers in drawing them into the community life, best methods of doing this, best ways to overcome prejudice etc.”¹⁷

Henck wrote this letter at a time when the Great Migration of hundreds of thousands of African Americans from the rural South to urban centers was gathering momentum.¹⁸ Over the course of the 1940s, upwards of two hundred thousand African Americans came to Los Angeles, many in search of work.¹⁹ These workers encountered prejudice in many places, and public housing, as implied in Henck’s request to Wilkinson to share his experience in this area, was one of them. Most provocative about Henck’s letter is the responsibility she assigned to herself and the housing managers in addressing this problem. Their job was to find and use the “best ways to overcome prejudice,” but they were also culpable of a lack of “training or realization of the scope of the job.”²⁰ Evocative of the paternalism which Catherine Bauer just a few months earlier had warned against, Henck’s letter also touches on an unsettling view of Black people and Filipino Americans as public housing “others” in 1942 Vallejo who must be somehow made to be a part of a contemporary notion of “community life.”

In response to Henck’s inquiry, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s Frank Wilkinson suggested that the Vallejo Housing Authority offer ideas for community activities which the residents could organize and implement themselves.²¹ Just a year later, he would take his own advice to a new level: in 1943, Los Angeles ceased admitting public housing residents to new public housing projects according to racial quotas that maintained the ratios in the surrounding area (and hence maintained segregation), opting instead to give the units to those who were the first to submit qualifying applications.²² However, the Housing Authority’s ultimate failure along with that of the rest of the national program to operate without racial prejudice is well-documented.²³ One place where segregation persisted was not far from Vallejo in Richmond, where both the Richmond Housing Authority and the Farm Security Administration built units in 1942 (six thousand and eight thousand, respectively) to accommodate many of the African American workers arriving from the South to work in the Kaiser shipyards.²⁴

Studies of housing in Los Angeles further underscore the social engineering inherent in the City’s housing policies. Dana Cuff describes how housers saw Los Angeles’s public housing communities as places where “better citizens”
were “produced.”25 The idea was that families with low incomes would move into public housing, stay for only a short time as they worked their ways to higher salaries, and then would leave to rent in privately-owned buildings or buy homes.26 But as historian of architecture Dianne Harris explains, buying a home was where many families faced serious challenges. In Los Angeles, homeownership in the postwar era meant buying a single-family detached house in the suburbs. Harris demonstrates the ways in which these houses and the suburban neighborhoods they comprised constituted sites where certain identities and lifestyles found reinforcement, while others were shaped or shunned. The dwellings as well as their representations in home and garden magazines and later in television shows, she writes, exhibited “a pervasive iconography of white, middle-class domesticity” and acted as “poignant ciphers for whiteness, affluence, belonging, and sense of permanent stability.”27

Considering further what these “ciphers” meant especially for house-hunting families, African American and African Studies scholar Andrew W. Kahrl poses a challenge to Harris’s thesis by positing a difference between “aspiring towards whiteness” in postwar suburbia and “seeking to become unmarked.”28 In postwar Los Angeles and prior, being “marked” or categorized according to racist concepts meant facing racist housing covenants. These covenants barred many Black people from buying or renting homes in certain neighborhoods well into the postwar years.29 Moreover, the Federal Housing Administration encouraged such restrictions by underwriting loans almost exclusively for segregated housing.30 Many neighborhoods complied out of financial interest, but others balked at the restrictions as essentially un-American. Groups such as Community Homes, Inc., a cooperative formed with the aim of buying and building on land in the San Fernando Valley in 1947, struggled to get a mortgage for their project without FHA insurance. The financial advisor to the group fumed in a letter to Catherine Bauer in 1947: “The fact of the matter is that the local FHA had shut the door in our faces completely, and solely on the basis of the inter-racial character of our development [...].”31 To this representative, the problem with the FHA’s refusal to underwrite loans for his cooperative’s planned neighborhood was that it threatened the very “American way of democratic life” which such neighborhoods upheld.32 As historian Josh Sides aptly summarizes the situation, the racially-restrictive housing covenants in Los Angeles made public housing for many low-income families, and especially Black families already strained by unequal work opportunities, an “only alternative” well into the postwar years.33
“NON-DISCRIMINATION IS DEMOCRACY AT WORK”

As the Community Homes representative’s correspondence with Catherine Bauer shows, by 1947 the stakes for successful non-discrimination in housing were formulated in terms not of a triumph over racism, but a triumph of democracy. Housing groups in Los Angeles as well as groups from Washington State to Washington, DC, sought to solidify the connection between public housing’s non-discrimination policies and democratic ideals. As demonstrated in images circulated by several local housing authorities, photographs paired with captions or short articles emerged in these early postwar years as a popular form of evidence of a non-discriminatory public housing policy’s far-reaching advantages.

In the November 1946 issue of the *Journal of Housing*, for instance, the Seattle Housing Authority published a photograph of a group of five small children standing behind the fence of one of the local housing projects’ preschools (fig. 82). Lined up, the children hold on to the fence in a group gesture of laying claim to the structure and the basic “American right” to housing that it symbolized. Although all the children are protected by the same fence, they still look over it in the directions that interest each of them most. Public housing is for everyone, the image seems to suggest, but living in it need not eradicate individuality. The caption, however, calls on terms with different connotations: “Non-Discrimination is Democracy at Work.”

According to the *Journal of Housing*, the Seattle Housing Authority understood the connection between the reproduced photograph and the caption as to-the-point: “We think the above picture succinctly tells one of the basic stories of public housing in Seattle,” the caption quoted the Seattle Authority’s public relations director, Ruth Howells. But the rest of the caption hardly clarified this connection between non-discrimination and democracy. Rather, it touted non-discrimination’s promotion of efficiency in public housing management. Quoting the Authority’s annual report, the caption claimed that “never at any time during the war period did the Authority have any serious racial difficulty in its family projects....It was therefore possible to locate racial minority groups on all projects without setting off any part or neighborhood on the development for any one group or class. This proved not only feasible but administratively most practical.”

Speaking to an audience of housing employees, the *Journal of Housing* offered an ideal and ideologically-charged image and subtitle while simultaneously underscoring the administrative pragmatism of having one fewer tenant placement criterium. Eradicating race as a criterium allowed for more flexible placement of families based on other criteria, like housing need. In this way, non-discrimination was not just (perhaps also not yet) democracy at work—it was better management.

While social workers may have appreciated arguments for non-discrimination as a policy that was easy to implement and maintain, it was the caption’s first association of non-discrimination with a democratic ideal that spoke to the broadest audience. Groups of children and young families formed a motif through the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s photography from this period. The Authority often paired these photographs with captions alluding to non-discrimination policies or related civic ideals of unity. For example, in Los Angeles’s 1945 annual report, *A Decent Home, an American Right*, Simon Eisner and Frank Wilkinson included Esther Lewittes Mipaas’s photograph showing three children playing in a splash pool at one of the Housing Authority’s developments (fig. 83). The youngest child holds a hand to his mouth in apprehension, but the older boy and girl smile. Although a black and white photograph, the tones of the image reveal that the children look different—that they have different skin colors. Still, the layout invites the reader to see in this image of diversity also one of community and oneness. Reprinted to fill the top half of a page of the annual report above the words “Civic Unity,” the editors posit the playing children as citizens—as residents of the same housing project and
members of one community in which living and playing together is “democracy at work.”

This figure of children playing in their neighborhood as a symbol of a democratic ideal carried special weight at a time in which the threat of fascism was still a fresh memory. Nowhere was this symbol more intoned than in the 1945 Oscar-winning short film, *The House I Live In*. The film was a parade of Hollywood talent. The title of the film came from the lyrics of its main song, written by Abel Meeropol (credited under his pseudonym, Lewis Allan) and set to music composed by Earl Robinson. The young singer, actor, and teen heartthrob Frank Sinatra sang the song as he played himself in the starring role, according to historian Art Simon, for free. Screenwriter Albert Maltz, soon to be blacklisted as one of the infamous Hollywood Ten, wrote the script—also for no compensation. Just over ten minutes long, the film tells the story of Sinatra encountering a group of boys chasing another boy in the alley behind his recording studio. Sinatra intervenes and questions the boys to find out why they are chasing the other one. “We don’t like his religion,” one small boy declares. “Now hold on,” Sinatra replies, “I see what you mean. You must be a bunch of those Nazi werewolves I’ve been reading about.” This comment confuses the boys: “Mister, are you screwy?” one asks. “Not me, I’m an American,” Sinatra answers.

Sinatra then beckons the boys to gather around him while he tells them a story of how two World War II soldiers, one Jewish and one Presbyterian, worked together to bomb a Japanese battleship. With Sinatra’s voice narrating, the film cuts to a sequence of aerial action before returning to the singer’s youthful face.
Asking the boys whether their parents participated in wartime blood drives, he then launches into an argument that the same blood runs through all people’s veins. If the blood argument does not link the moralizing story of cooperation between the Jewish and Presbyterian soldiers with a broader argument for a democratic America free of prejudice for Sinatra’s audience, then the lyrics of the song that he sings next do. Abel Meeropol’s lyrics for *The House I Live In* describe America as a neighborhood complete with a playground filled with children. When Sinatra comes to the words “All races and religions,” the film cuts to a shot of the Jewish boy as he steps closer to the group to listen. The camera then pans the faces of the other children as Sinatra finishes the song. The transformative lesson is complete: one boy picks the Jewish boy’s bag up from the ground and hands it back to him. The small boy who questioned Sinatra lingers in the alley as the rest of the group disappears around the corner. He looks toward the camera and the direction in which Sinatra departs and smiles as the final bars of *America the Beautiful* play and the film fades to black.

Just as the children in public housing’s swimming pools and daycares provided public housing with a figure of a better future world, so also the youthful cast of *The House I Live In* offered the hope that future generations would not repeat past errors. The closing to the short film suggests that the children begin to change their prejudiced ways. The outspoken boy’s glance in the direction of the recording studio door places the source of this inspiration in Sinatra, a young man who spoke with the boys like he was “one of them.” The shared youthfulness between the anonymous boys and the celebrity comes to the fore when the outspoken gang member innocently asks what Sinatra does for a living. “I sing,” Sinatra replies. “Aww, you’re a kid,” the boy responds, hinting at his doubt but also underscoring Sinatra’s youth.

Cultural historian Art Simon observes how contemporary audiences took the film’s equation of anti-Semitism with “anti-Americanism” to symbolize the anti-Americanness of all forms of prejudice. But further research shows that the effectiveness of the film as a tool of social reform remained debated. At issue for contemporary critics was Sinatra’s “public persona;” as a young, endearing, musically talented, and commercially successful son of Italian immigrants, Sinatra helped popularize the film’s message. Still, one contemporary viewer was wary of whether popularity could lead to lasting change. “When big names are cited (such as Frank Sinatra) there is again the danger of sloppy thinking—‘I am against prejudice because Frank Sinatra says it is wrong,’ etc.,” the critic wrote in 1946. Other commentators, however, saw in the film a means of raising public awareness upon which “more effective local organization” might take action.
The imperative of a civic body free of prejudice resonated with the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles. The Authority had taken care to not discriminate in the selection of tenants for its housing projects starting in 1943. Still, it recognized that these efforts would not achieve sweeping reforms if national policy allowed discrimination to exist in other local authorities. Under the editorship of Frank Wilkinson, the Housing Authority's annual report for the war years included a direct call for the amendment of the 1937 Federal Housing Act “to the end that all persons, regardless of race, color, creed, citizenship or national origin be eligible to occupy low-rent public housing developments assisted by said Act.” It was a move on behalf of a local authority to change national policy. The national celebrity figure of Frank Sinatra and Earl Robinson's song about America as a democratic neighborhood soon aided the effort.

Starting in 1946, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles called on photographs not of small children, but of young people and none other than the young celebrity Frank Sinatra to position its policy of non-discrimination at local public housing projects as a solution to the far-reaching problems of racism. In March, Aliso Village resident Harry Johns made headlines with other members of a group of high school-aged dancers in the California Eagle, a newspaper written, edited, and read by Black Angelenos. The dancers, who called themselves the Pan-American Dance Group, had recently received the Brotherhood Award from the Los Angeles Youth Council “for their outstanding leadership and initiative in dedicating the program of their youth group to the fundamental principles of Brotherhood, and for setting the best example of inter-faith, inter-racial cooperation among the youth of Los Angeles.” Included with the article was a photograph of the members of the group, a copy of which was also printed in the Housing Authority’s Los Angeles Housing News (fig. 84). Harry Johns stands tall on the left, looking on as the president of the dance group, Fred Martinez, receives the award from Frank Sinatra. Sinatra, centered in the composition with the stripes and fringe of an American flag barely visible behind him, flashes a smile as he shakes Martinez's hand.

A comparison of this presentation with that of the same photograph in the April issue of Housing News shows a slightly different interpretation of the image. This time, the article begins by naming Frank Sinatra, then Fred Martinez, resident of the Housing Authority's housing project, Pico Gardens, then Harry Johns of Aliso Village. Under the title “As One Good Guy to Another,” the photograph of Sinatra handing the award to Martinez positions the young public housing resident as Sinatra's equal in his effort to further the message of cooperation in The House I Live In. This award, the article also makes clear, is an
award for public housing as a place where good citizens and young leaders live and promote “interracial group understanding.” The article offers the resounding conclusion: “Thus is concrete proof adduced to back up the claim of the City Housing Authority that ‘public housing promotes civic unity.’”

The management assistant at Aliso Village, Sidney Green, wasted little time in sending the photograph along with an article to the National Association of Housing Officials’ monthly publication, the *Journal of Housing*. In July of 1946, the *Journal of Housing* published Green’s story, titled “Public Housing Promotes Civic Unity,” along with the same photograph. The focus of the article, however, was less on the dancers than it was on the Housing Authority’s experience with non-discrimination in its projects. In echoes of Frank Wilkinson’s letter to Catherine Henck, Green presented professional readers with a “how-to” for making non-discrimination in public housing a step towards ending racial and religious prejudice by stressing such measures as cooperating with other community agencies, forming active residents councils, and “sharing in integrated
activities” with the surrounding community.50 These measures, Green advised, would not immediately eliminate conflicts in housing projects, but rather allow for swifter resolutions. He illustrated this point by recounting a dispute “between some youthful members of a racial group living in a development and others of another group living outside the development.” Green wrote, “Because of the experience in inter-racial cooperation that the resident youths had had on the development,” the Housing Authority was “able to convince” the group from the housing project to “take the lead in settling the dispute before it grew worse.”51 While the teenage dance group surrounding Sinatra gave faces to Green’s message about successful “sharing in integrated activities,” the hero of the story was clearly public housing and, more specifically, its management in their commitment to fostering “inter-racial cooperation” in the broadest sense. Green took care to cite the open-mindedness of public housing’s young residents in the handling of the cited dispute, but this advantage, so the story goes, was a result of living in the Housing Authority’s projects.

Following the different publications of this photograph of the Pan-American Dance Group, one sees the multiple meanings the photograph carried for its interpreters. For the California Eagle, the photograph highlighted the achievements of Harry Johns, a member of its community of Black readers. For Los Angeles Housing News, the photograph celebrated the public housing residents in the group while offering “concrete proof” of housing achievement. In the Journal of Housing, the photograph portrayed housing’s postwar poster youth while positioning the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles among national colleagues as experienced in enacting a policy of no discrimination. The photograph, these republications seemed to suggest, was cogent and versatile. It was just one of many more images against discrimination that the Housing Authority would circulate in the postwar years.

LOS ANGELES HOUSING NEWS

One of the most important means of circulating photographs of housing as a place of interracial understanding was the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s monthly newsletter, Los Angeles Housing News. Inaugurated in 1943, the news reported on a variety of events in Los Angeles’s public housing communities, from Halloween parties to Cinco de Mayo festivals, basketball games, and flower shows. Other articles reported from Washington, DC, and local low-income neighborhoods of privately owned housing, offering readers a look into the public housing machinery and keeping them current on housing achievements that might otherwise not be visible in the cityscape for months or years.
Photographs reproduced as grainy black and white halftones regularly accompanied these articles and seldom counted fewer than five to an issue. 

Los Angeles Housing News and its photographs were certainly instruments of propaganda and control; editors selected stories and presented them as achievements so that these actions might be emulated among housing residents and reflect positively on the Housing Authority as a public agency. But outside the photograph of the Brotherhood Award ceremony, seldom is the racial diversity of residents or workers verbally underscored in a direct way. A set of photographs published in 1948, for example, consists of three portraits of families gathered in front of their Quonset huts at the temporary veteran housing project, Rodger Young Village. These portraits, all the same height and width, span the page in a row under the title, “Honorable Discharge and Actual Housing Need Are the only Qualifications” (fig. 85). The suggestion, as a reader in 1948 might interpret it, is that just like in the pages of Housing News, there is a place in public housing for every veteran, and the Housing Authority will work for the inclusion of each.

This work of the Housing Authority is underscored in other photographs in the same layout. On the page facing the veterans’ family portraits, a photograph shows Commissioner Nicola Giulii holding the second smallest of a veteran’s five children while he hands the veteran a “referral” to the Housing Authority for help with relocation. “How they have been living shows in the picture,” the caption reads, drawing the viewer’s attention to the barn-like door of the family’s home. In another picture, veterans sit around a table at a meeting with the Housing Authority’s officials and other resident leaders. Executive Director Howard Holtzendorff cuts a commanding figure at the table’s head, his shirtsleeves rolled-up as he speaks to the gathering of representatives.

Returning to the photographs of the veterans with their families, one might see what artist and writer Coco Fusco in 2003 called “a taxonomic display of recognizably distinct and attractive ethnic faces” and cited as “the convention that now dominates corporate advertising.” But did the 1948 readers of Los Angeles Housing News recognize (or want to recognize) the distinctions in the faces and in the black and white photographic reproductions’ registry of the skin tones as ones of race or ethnicity? And was such recognition the Housing Authority’s intention? Celebrated by peers in the Journal of Housing for its efficiency, a policy prohibiting discrimination, illustrated using the corporate conventions outlined by Fusco, might indeed have signaled the Housing Authority’s successful operation in this early postwar period of “corporate modernism.”

The important question of whether these photographs attracted applications from potential public housing residents remains difficult to trace. In 1945,
the circulation of Los Angeles Housing News was under five thousand. Extant copies suggest that the readership of the newsletter extended to some of the most active and celebrated agents of housing reform of the 1940s and early 1950s. The socially progressive Haynes Foundation kept a run of Los Angeles Housing News from the years 1947 until 1951. Copies also remain accessible in archives around the world, from architect Lloyd Wright’s and political figure Reuben W. Borough’s in Los Angeles, to Swiss architect Werner Moser’s in Zurich. Although utterly forgotten in the history of housing outside studies specific to the Housing Authority’s work, in its day Los Angeles Housing News brought the Authority’s self-portrait and message to a broad and sympathetic readership. Like the annual report, it was just the kind of publication progressively-minded photographers might seek out in a search for meaningful, gainful work.

HOUSING AND BELONGING IN THE PHOTOGRAPHY OF ESTHER LEWITTES MIPAAS

Following the new approaches to women in history as outlined in the introduction to this study, the biography and archive of the photographer Esther Lewittes Mipaas are here worth considering for their grounding of the Housing Authority’s photographic practice in the “micro’ realities of everyday lives,” to cite again the incisive words of Clare Midgley, Alison Twells, and Julie Carlier. As these authors further note, this return to photographic history’s smaller narrative...
units also offers a much-needed nod to “the role of human agency in affecting change.”64 A closer look at Esther Lewittes Mipaas’s photography from right before “the last moment for a long while in which art presumed to have a say in the future,” to quote again Blake Stimson, promises significant insight into the photography of the Housing Authority from this integrated, “everyday” level.65

Esther Lewittes Mipaas is not the most prominently represented photographer in the collections of the Housing Authority in terms of the quantity of photographs attributed to her.66 But in her contributions to the widely circulating and exhibited A Decent Home, an American Right, her photographs counted among the most seen by a broader public. The photograph of the children in the splash pool was just one of several images in the report with a corresponding print in her personal collection (fig. 1). In another of her photographs published in the report, a group of war workers line up to pay for their lunches (figs. 86, 51). Others of Esther Lewittes Mipaas’s photographs portray the problems of the slums. In one photograph visible in the report panels as displayed at the National Orange Show (fig. 56), two small children, their clothes and faces soiled, sit in the dirt. Behind them, the door to an outhouse stands open, the soiled porcelain of a toilet bowl clearly visible as a symbol of the insanitary conditions of the children’s playground (fig. 87). "Pacoima in beautiful San Fernando Valley—the
outside toilet,” the photographer wrote on the back of the print. “Bad housing breeds disease,” read the title of the page of the Housing Authority’s annual report (fig. 46).67

No scholarship to date details Esther Lewittes Mipaas’s (hereafter Esther’s) lifelong practice stretching from the New Deal in New York to wartime Los Angeles to postmodern Berkeley and Oakland.68 Yet, a comparison of her published photographs with others in her personal collection offers a new understanding of the “micro reality” of photography in the service of public housing in 1940s Los Angeles. Many of Esther’s photographs of what appear to be the same neighborhoods pictured in A Decent Home, an American Right were never published. Among these photographs was one of a neatly dressed boy standing in front of a modest, weather-worn house (fig. 88).69 He clasps his hands behind his back and cocks his head as he squints at the photographer and smiles faintly. Leaning against the house, he appears at ease and at home. A patterned blanket hanging from a nearby line billows outward toward him, its shadow on the house’s facade mimicking his posture. Not the dirty child on the ground near the toilet, the boy appears to be posing for the camera with a confidence and coolness beyond his years. Esther made the following note on the back of the print:
"Home near Watts
print submitted 6/30/45
[not purchased as yet]."

One can hypothesize as to why the Housing Authority did not promptly purchase the photograph. Perhaps the boy and his living conditions simply did not look bad enough. His hair is well kept. His light trousers are spotless. The patterned blankets hanging in the yard show that someone nearby cares about good housekeeping. The yard, free of mud and neatly swept save for two small pieces of paper visible in the photograph’s foreground, appears perhaps too safe and clean. Indeed, as Dana Cuff suggests in reference to other photographs in the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s scattered collection, the photograph might offer evidence to challenge the Housing Authority’s justifications for the removal of the “slums.” Here was not a house near Watts, but a home.

Other photographs in Esther’s collection further this challenge. In one photograph, again evidently unpublished, four small boys stand in a row, facing the camera situated not far from the end of a large, shiny automobile (fig. 89). Looking out over the fender of the car, the boys’ expressions show mixtures of curiosity, surprise, and coolness. One boy with a particularly stoic expression hangs his arm around the shoulders of the smaller boy next to him in a gesture of camaraderie. Their attention on the camera and its operator, the boys pay little mind to the group of men assembled behind them. Two of these men stand with their backs turned to the camera and heads bent, looking at something in their hands. Another man faces them, the shadow of his fedora partially obscuring his face. At his left hand, a large instrument stands on a heavy tripod, partially hiding another man from view. These two gatherings have caught a neighbor’s attention: apart from the scene stands a fifth man, his bare head visible over a wood fence. He looks out over his shoulder in the direction of the same camera that has captured the attention of the group of young boys—Esther’s camera.

Esther likely took this photograph in the same summer or fall of 1945 when she made “Home near Watts.” Whether she intended this photograph for the Housing Authority’s use, however, is doubtful. The scene it captures appears too spontaneous with the stark contrast between the smiling boys and the grim, official-looking man in the fedora—too unflattering for the Housing Authority, if indeed it captured a confrontation between a housing surveyor and residents whose home he scrutinized. Uneasy meetings between public housing employees and residents of older housing in low-income neighborhoods, as Dana Cuff explains, were part of the Housing Authority’s appraisal work of
1940. But the photograph of the scene at this house leaves the reason for the gathering unexplained. The unpainted yet solid fence, the neatly swept yard, the clean and well-fitting clothes and neat haircuts of the alert and evidently healthy children at play, although not signs of affluence, all add up in the iconography of the day to the kind of home celebrated by housing reformers and residents alike. Indeed, the photograph seems to beg, why would the Housing Authority need to send photographers here? In eschewing a portrayal of the house to focus on the gathering in the yard, Esther takes the camera—an instrument that figured prominently in the Housing Authority’s project of measuring and judging—and recasts it as a device for capturing housing’s often invisible pals, neighbors, and gatherings. The house, like the house in Watts, forms a backdrop to a performance of belonging—of leaning against a house as though laying claim to it, of palling around in the yard.

This photograph is just one among many that suggest the possibilities that Esther saw for her practice during the Second World War. Born and raised in New York City, Esther took up a career in the arts during the years of the New Deal. Much of her work, like Catherine Bauer’s, was marked by an interest in regional styles in the arts and design and the outcomes of transnational exchange. In 1938, Esther received her Master of Arts from the Institute of Fine Arts at New York University with a thesis that proposed a stylistic connection
between the frescoes of a Catalonian chapter house with initials in the twelfth-century Winchester Bible. Because Franco’s troops destroyed large portions of the convent and chapter house just a few years earlier in the Spanish Civil War, Esther researched the frescoes with the help of a group of black and white photographs at the Frick Art Reference Library in New York.

The rise of fascism in Germany also made Esther witness to an influx of European scholarship to the United States. Esther’s thesis supervisor and chairman of the Graduate Fine Arts Group at New York University, Walter W.S. Cook, for instance, played a crucial role in helping refugee art historians find new teaching positions. One of these scholars was Erwin Panofsky, a man “generally regarded as the most brilliant art historian of his generation in Germany,” as Cook wrote in 1934. Esther was a student in Panofsky’s course on “German Painting and Graphic Arts of the Fifteenth Century” in the fall semester of 1935, where one of the topics he addressed was “the interrelationship of German art with that of the Netherlands.”

Esther pursued her career in the arts into the late 1930s, when she found work as a textile renderer on the Index of American Design project sponsored by the Works Progress Administration. The Index’s attention to the crafts of different American regions in turn resonated with Esther’s subsequent research. In 1955, for instance, she published an article in Antiques magazine on “A Mexican eighteenth-century wool rug” in which she offered a compelling comparison: while the rug’s motifs included plants and animals “native to Mexico” and an embroidery on wool technique found in other Spanish colonial rugs, the “design,” including the “flowering tree growing from knolls of earth” and flower baskets, more closely resembled New England adaptations of English and Continental themes.

Like many Americans who moved to Los Angeles around 1942, Esther found a job at Lockheed. There, she applied her knowledge of art as a draftswoman. Her arts background followed her through this period finally to the summer of 1945, when she made her photographs for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles’s first postwar consolidated annual report. The photographs in Esther’s collection from the 1940s reflect her knowledge of design. One eight-by-ten-inch print, for example, shows another scene from one of Los Angeles’s low-income neighborhoods (fig. 90). The yards and streets are of dirt. The houses are exceedingly small and appear to be made from any materials at hand, but lovingly. A vine grows on one structure in the foreground, protected by a fence made of wood from a packing crate. The words “this side up” on one of the fence boards are turned on their side, offering a symbol for the city’s carelessness in providing housing for the people who possibly packed up their lives to come to
this house court, which, as Sophie Spaulding and Dana Cuff explain, was one of the few places migrant workers could afford to live. Beyond this fence is a view of the court. Neighbors gather on the stoop of another modest home. A woman leans against the wood siding of the building, one hand on her hip, the other held up to her chin as though listening to the others sitting on the ground in the sliver of shadow next to the house. “Near Culver City—Shacks, shades,” Esther alliteratively labelled the back of the print.

Much as Esther appears to have looked for compelling forms in Los Angeles’s low-income neighborhoods, never far from these aesthetic considerations or her notes on the Housing Authority’s payments was a sense of political urgency. A year after the Housing Authority published *A Decent Home, an American Right*, Esther published her own small selection of housing photographs for an audience of photographers, urging them to consider how their art might “have a say in the future.”
“THEY CALL THIS HOME”

In August 1946, Esther Lewittes Mipaas published six of her Los Angeles photographs in *Minicam* magazine. She titled the article “They Call This Home” (fig. 91).83 The “they” to which this titled referred were the residents of the city’s low-income neighborhoods. One of the photographs shows a group of four girls sitting in the grass of Belvedere Gardens, the hillside homes visible in the background (fig. 92). The girls smile into the camera, their bright dresses and hair-bows reflecting in the sunlight as they appear to enjoy each other’s company. In another photograph published with the article, a young woman sits in the shade with a baby on her knee while two other women do laundry. Like the girls in the grass, the young woman smiles into the camera. These portraits, like many others by Esther, picture Los Angeles’s low-income neighborhoods in ambiguous terms—as places where older, perhaps “substandard” forms of housing are home.

Still, Esther’s article clearly adopted the anti-slum arguments of the day in noting “the relation between bad housing, illiteracy, disease and crime” and the problems of unplanned development.84 Not once mentioning the Housing Authority, the article focused on photography as a forceful solution to this problem: “Photography can help awaken Chambers of Commerce, and ‘leading citizens’ when they see, big as life, housing conditions in their city which perhaps they have never seen before in their whole lives, despite the years they may have lived in their home town.”85 The subtitle to the article offered another interpretation of this position: “The camera is a social tool in the hands of Esther Lewittes.”86

The social functions of photography were important to Esther Lewittes Mipaas on a personal level. The medium’s greater postwar “promise of a world citizen” as recognized by Blake Stimson was a promise to both the residents Esther photographed and herself.87 Esther’s biography again offers a micro-historical perspective on this promise—a way of understanding this new subjectivity Stimson describes in the “everyday” terms and from the level of a personal “reality” as advocated by scholars of feminist history.88 In 1943, shortly after joining Lockheed, Esther joined the Communist Party. Her affiliation prompted the creation of a file on her at the Federal Bureau of Investigation that would grow to over four hundred pages over the next twenty-nine years. The file, released in 2017 in redacted form, contains no notes from the 1940s on her freelance work that connected her to the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, though her name appears along with that of Sidney Green, the *Journal of Housing* contributor and former manager of the Housing Authority’s Basilone
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COURSES are great to some things. Esther Lewittes studied photography with a few of her own, and returned to her roots in the early 1940s. In her book “They Call This Home,” published by Minnesota Press in 1946, the author captures the essence of life in Los Angeles during World War II. Lewittes, who was born in the city in 1920, documented the daily lives of the city’s inhabitants, focusing on the experiences of families living in the Boyle Heights neighborhood.

Lewittes’s photographs depict the harsh realities of life in the wartime city, highlighting the struggles of working-class families, particularly those in the Asian-American community. The images reflect the photographer’s commitment to social justice and her desire to shed light on the conditions faced by marginalized communities.

In her essay, Lewittes writes, “They call this Home,” reflecting on the challenges and resilience of the people who called Boyle Heights home. Through her lens, she captures the beauty and vitality of the community, documenting the everyday lives of its residents.

91] Esther Lewittes, “They Call This Home,” Minicam, August 1946, 24–25, Esther Lewittes Mipaas Collection.

92] Esther Lewittes, “They Call This Home,” Minicam, August 1946, 26–27, Esther Lewittes Mipaas Collection.
Homes, in a 1950 memo regarding an investigation into communist activity in Pacoima.88 Instead, Esther’s interest in better communities as expressed in “They Call This Home” most clearly appears in an FBI memo from 1951 in which an informant links Esther with an effort to share the communist newspaper, People’s World, with residents of Los Angeles’s Maravilla neighborhood. Of Maravilla, in the words of the FBI’s Special Agent Timothy L. Donovan, Esther reportedly shared at her group meeting

“that the rents are being raised to 450.00 a month which is beyond the reach of most of the Negro families there, and consequently they are moving out. There are 17 Negro families remaining, and the quarter vacated by those who have moved are not being replaced by Negroes which the party feels is discriminatory and [redacted under the Freedom of Information Act] has reported the matter to [redacted, FOIA].”89

Many of the concerns of the Housing Authority for safe and non-discriminatory neighborhoods thus found voice in Esther and prompted her actions in other social and political circles several years after the Housing Authority printed Esther’s photographs in its annual report.

Esther’s affiliations with these circles and attendance at meetings during which the topics of housing discrimination were discussed followed her long after she left Los Angeles. After moving back to New York in 1955, she applied for a passport to travel with her mother to the grave of her brother who died in the Second World War in France and to visit another brother in Israel. Her history with the Communist Party ultimately delayed the issue of her passport and forced Esther in 1956 to recount her wartime and early postwar years in Los Angeles.90 The words in her signed affidavit expressed a multi-layered desire for belonging in the midst of a tumultuous decade: “I was in the party because it was active on domestic issues and active in furthering the War effort. [...] When I reassociated I did so for personal reasons, that is, just to reassociate with people, just people, on a social basis.”91

In January 1957, the passport office called Esther to a hearing. Statements recorded in the meeting transcript outline the intricacies of this belonging Esther sought:

“Mrs. Mipaas: [...] I was never interested in the Communist Party as a Russian Party. I am not interested in Russia. Russia is a country on the other side of the world that is definitely opposed to our policies; in fact, is opposed to our life. Not only our way of life but our life.
Mr. Franzmathes: Did you feel that way when you were a member of the Communist Party?
Mrs. Mipaas: I began to feel that way and dropped out. When I first joined I didn’t feel that way. I felt the Communist Party was an American party that was interested in winning the war and seeing certain social legislation enacted. I was never in sympathy with Russia. It was always with American aims.”

Esther again argued for her loyalty to the United States as she had in her affidavit, this time more strongly situating her actions in a political moment long part of the wartime past. Her concise statements bring to the fore the preoccupation of Cold War America with distinguishing what was “American” from what was not. Well aware of the dangers of affiliation with the Communist Party, Esther urged her interrogator to recall not the history of political parties in the previous decade, but a longer history of association and belonging as practiced by heroes from America’s past.

These heroes were not the social reformers or political leaders one might expect to be mentioned in testimonies from the Cold War. Instead, Esther referred to more personally meaningful heroes—to American artists. Her words recorded in the transcript reveal her caution in presenting an argument that would have been esoteric at best, or utterly incomprehensible, at worst, to anyone who was less than mildly interested in the longer history of the United States or its art:

"I don’t know whether you are convinced of this but I have been studying old history. My secondary interest is history. I have read a great deal on American history. I just finished doing a lot of work on American art. I read the prerevolutionary sources—the original sources of Paul Revere and Peter Hurd and various other early American painters. There was Charles Willson Peale who was a great American painter—ornithological painter, etc. If we can go back to that I think you can understand my enthusiasm for joining an organization which is out of character with me but I felt that the early Americans had joined organizations to see certain domestic policies carried through and it was an American inspiration that brought me to it.”

In this string of references to American artists from vastly different eras, Esther asked her interrogators to “understand” her “American inspiration.” American artists, some of whom might be deemed the first patriots, organized to help make change happen at home. Narrowing her argument to American examples...
doubtlessly aimed to appeal to a Bureau looking for anything un-American. Still, that Esther counted herself as part of this history—as someone for whom art, and here one might add artists, “had a say in the future”—offered a resounding statement about the artist’s role at this turning point in the housing movement and the complex political situation of the postwar world. The photographs Esther made for the Housing Authority never entered this conversation. But it is tempting to think that in making them, the art historian and designer counted each print as important political, social, and historical work. When Esther Lewittes Mipaas at long last received her passport in 1957, the FBI followed her to the European art capitals of Rome and Florence. They did not close her file until 1972.

LOUIS CLYDE STOUMEN’S GRIFFINS

While Esther Lewittes Mipaas sought social contacts in political organizations, like other Housing Authority photographers, she practiced photography mainly alone. The photographer Louis Clyde Stoumen also worked in this capacity and had similar notions about photography, political agency, and art. As revealed in his writings and especially in his application for funding from the Guggenheim Foundation in 1948, Stoumen’s professional goals ran parallel to those of the photographers working in the postwar moment described by historian of photography Blake Stimson: Stoumen sought new photographic “forms” for a new global “subjectivity.” In this vein, Stoumen’s work for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is pertinent to this study not least because it counted among his activities in the years directly preceding curator Edward Steichen’s inclusion of one of his photographs in The Family of Man in 1955. But the form and scope of the project that Stoumen proposed to the Guggenheim Foundation in 1948 differed significantly from the later exhibition organized by the Museum of Modern Art. This final section of this study presents Stoumen’s practice from the years 1946 to 1948 as a facet of a prologue to the Museum of Modern Art’s blockbuster exhibition and one in which Los Angeles’s public housing program, as both Stoumen’s client and subject, played no small role.

The promotion of non-discrimination in housing policies became an attractive source of work in the postwar years. In a letter to Frank Wilkinson dated 1947, one job-seeking houser, Hal Dunleavy, offered to produce “an annual report or a special report on your racial minority housing policy and practices,” adding that “the latter could get excellent publicity in the progressive and negro press especially.” Although nothing in the archive suggests that the Housing
Authority produced a special report on this theme, it was not for a shortage of social scientists, writers, or designers who could make one. The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, located in a defense center, near Hollywood, and in a city filled with colleges and technical schools, was in a particularly auspicious situation in this regard. After the war, many veterans returned home through the Port of Los Angeles and decided to stay in the city. Under the provisions of the G.I. Bill, veterans enjoyed paid college tuition. The Art Center College, then located on Third Street in Los Angeles, attracted veterans seeking to study photography.

The G.I. Bill fostered a generation of artists—mostly men—by providing them with access to education that several otherwise might not have had. Future photographer for the Housing Authority Leonard Nadel, for instance, received training in photography and served overseas as part of the Army Signal Corps. After returning to civilian life, Nadel moved to Los Angeles and continued this training at the Art Center College, graduating in 1949 as a member of the first class to complete the school’s newly accredited program in photography. Louis Clyde Stoumen followed a similar path. Before the war, Stoumen obtained a degree from Lehigh University in his home state of Pennsylvania, then moved to New York where he took classes from members of the Photo League. During the Second World War, he worked as a filmmaker and photographer for the National Youth Administration and the United States Army. Following the war, Stoumen settled in Los Angeles and, starting in 1948, enrolled in the film courses of Slavko Vorkapich at the University of Southern California. From the East Coast to the West, from Army camps to the art schools of Los Angeles, the paths of both Stoumen and Nadel find an appropriate summary in the words of curator and historian of photography Anne Wilkes Tucker: “Lou Stoumen’s evolution follows an archetypal pattern, familiar to many of the men in his generation. They sought broader, more sophisticated spheres and art provided an access route out of their childhood situations.” Offered on the occasion of a solo exhibition of Stoumen’s work in 1995, four years after his death from cancer, these words celebrated the trajectory of Stoumen’s life from that of the small-town boy to world-renown photographer and filmmaker. But they also point to a generational pattern—perhaps even a strategy—of striving not for sophistication, but world citizenship through the practice of photography as art.

The small body of research on Stoumen’s work offers similar biographical readings of his photographs. Some of Stoumen’s earliest projects involved the photographing of Times Square in 1940, a stint as the editor of the Photo League’s Photo Notes newsletter, and following his wartime work for the Army and
National Youth Administration, projects for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles along with the inclusion of his work in *The Family of Man.*\(^{108}\) Stoumen then rose in the public eye with numerous successful endeavors in film. His 1956 production, *The Naked Eye,* included a reverent portrayal of the work of West Coast-based photographer Edward Weston.\(^{109}\) *The True Story of the Civil War* won Stoumen his first Academy Award in 1957 and first prize at the Venice Film Festival.\(^{110}\) *Black Fox,* a story about Adolf Hitler narrated by Marlene Dietrich, won him a second Oscar in 1962.\(^{111}\) Much of the research on his work in still photography focuses on his exhibitions and book projects from the years following these successes in film. As Anne Wilkes Tucker further observes, Stoumen did not sell a photograph in a gallery until he was nearly sixty years old, but experienced greater success with selling his photographs in books.\(^{112}\) Stoumen’s books, or “paper movies” as both he and his commentators called them, included five titles published from 1975 to 1992, all combining Stoumen’s photographs with his own prose, and some with additional essays by photographers and art historians.\(^{113}\)

Commenting on the format of the photobook in comparison with the gallery exhibition, art historian James R. Hugunin offers a practical explanation for Stoumen’s turn to this format in his claim that “The bookworks signify a historical moment of dissatisfaction with art’s traditional audience as well as an attempt to bypass the art market system.”\(^{114}\) This historical and biographical approach to understanding Stoumen’s turn to the photobook format holds in readings of the books’ contents, as well. Several commentators view the books as autobiographical—as composed in large part of photographs Stoumen created throughout his life.\(^{115}\) “Stoumen heightened the implications of the scenes by voicing his own memories and insights,” adds photographer Arthur Ollman.\(^{116}\) The result is a grand story of the self: “Stoumen was drawn to life, to people of power, as well as to strong social situations.”\(^{117}\) These “people of power” included some of the most celebrated artists of Stoumen’s day: “West Coast legends Edward Weston and Ansel Adams,” Aldous Huxley, Slavko Vorkapich, and Alfred Stieglitz.\(^{118}\) But this list also included Stoumen’s “characters” of “the ‘everyman,’” as Ollman furthers, acknowledging Stoumen’s sympathy for the Left and his affiliations with the blacklisted Photo League.\(^{119}\)

James Hugunin likewise remarks on Stoumen’s work’s attempt “at regaining a social ‘embeddedness’ of earlier eras” as perhaps a point of view that was in many circles no longer current when Hugunin wrote his essay in 1992.\(^{120}\) The art historian cites one *New York Times* critic’s comment on Stoumen’s 1983 exhibition at the International Center of Photography as containing photographs that were “ill-fitting” in the contemporary art world.\(^{121}\) This review, titled “The
Power to Convince Has Faded,” placed Stoumen’s exhibition (which included his 1940 photographs of Times Square together with his photographs of New York shot in the 1980s) alongside two other contemporary exhibitions of what the critic called “social documentary” or “humanistic” photography. The problem with these photographs, according to the critic, was their want of “urgency.” Comparing Stoumen’s photographs of Times Square shot in the early 1940s with those shot in the 1980s, he commented on the later photographs’ lack of “immediacy.” The problem with Stoumen’s later work extended to the social documentary on display in the other two exhibitions, as well: “Their [the photographs’, N.K.O.] power to convince us, to outrage us, to move us to act, has faded,” the critic proclaimed. But for Hugunin writing about Stoumen’s work in 1992, the urgency of this criticism was beginning to fade, as well. This study now returns to the moment following Stoumen’s Times Square project of 1940, when he returned from the war and in 1945 began photographing Los Angeles.

THE PAN-AMERICAN DANCE GROUP

When Louis Clyde Stoumen arrived in Los Angeles in 1945, he had not only the Times Square project and his work for the Army in his portfolio, but also, as historian of photography William Ewing notes, the beginnings of a photobook. James Hugunin traces the start of Stoumen’s production of “paper movies” to the first to which Stoumen applied this term: Can’t Argue with Sunrise: A Paper Movie, from 1975. Ewing, however, extends the term to include two of Stoumen’s earlier photobooks, as well: a student project, Speech for the Young (1939), and a United States Army publication, Yank’s Magic Carpet (1945), to which Stoumen contributed twenty photographs and editorial work. Stoumen’s archive, moreover, suggests that during this time he also worked privately on a third book he called The Magic Carpet. Most likely a further development of Yank’s Magic Carpet, Stoumen referred to the project in 1948 as a “photographic book of international content and a ‘one-world’ theme” and “my serious work,” admitting that freelance jobs and obligations to his family had kept him from finishing it.

Stoumen indeed juggled his “serious work” with freelance jobs during these years. The “international content” and “‘one-world’ theme” extended to both. One of these projects was none other than an article with photographs of the Pan-American Dance Group, published in the August 1946 issue of John Entenza’s Arts and Architecture magazine with the title, “Harmony in ‘A’ Flat.” Stoumen’s photographs consist of individual headshots of twelve dancers taken from dramatic angles (fig. 93). Arranged into a three-by-four grid, these images form an array of youthful faces. All the dancers smile. Some squint into the bright
sunlight. On the opposite page, two smaller photographs show the dancers in action. They raise their arms and bend their knees. A girl’s skirt billows as the photographer captures her mid-twirl. This is the “more effective local organization” social commentators of the period wanted to result from *The House I Live In*: young people dancing to not only send a message about a more tolerant world, but realize it in their work as a creative team comprised of individuals of “all races and religions.”

To redeploy Blake Stimson’s description of the later exhibition, *The Family of Man*, the dance of the Pan-American troupe was at once real and presented “an ideal against which lived reality could be critiqued.”

In his article, Stoumen recounted the history of the group, setting its formation in 1943 at the Housing Authority project, Aliso Village. As Stoumen noted, this was a time shortly after the Zoot Suit Riots, in the midst of the Second World War, and in the midst of numerous altercations between Los Angeles’s Eastside gangs. He charted the group’s growth from a small coterie that performed before a tiny audience at Aliso Village’s Community Hall through performances at City Hall and the University of California, Los Angeles, to their hit “interracial musical review” featuring Earl Robinson’s song, *The House I Live In*, and their receipt of the Brotherhood Award. Their newest performance, Stoumen explained, “involves much music and dancing, a mythical fairy god-father, and a story revolving around the building of a house for a boy and girl who can’t get married till they get a house.” But the story was not exclusively one of postwar housing shortage, Stoumen advised readers of *Arts and Architecture*: “This architectural motif is both literal and figurative in that also being built is
Louis Clyde Stoumen's Griffins a harmony house for young people of all races and cultures.” Stoumen thus presented not only public housing policy, but also the arts in the form of architecture, dance, and music, as vital tools in the fight against racial injustice.

Stoumen's article was not the first to address readers of Arts and Architecture on this subject. In the December 1943 issue, editorial associate Peter Yates published a cautionary essay under the title “Bigotry and the Color of the Skin.” In this essay, he recounted the numerous strands of prejudice running through United States history up to the present wartime internment of Japanese Americans under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s Executive Order 9066, which Yates deemed “a blot upon our democratic history and pretensions.” He concluded this history with hope for the recent “presidential directive against discrimination” in war production and a call to “Enlightened Americans” to heed “its liberating promise.” Inherent in this appeal to the reason of the magazine's readership, a large portion of which worked in architecture or the arts and design industries, was indeed a hope that artists might take up the banner against this pressing postwar problem.

Louis Clyde Stoumen aligned his commercial work for the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles with a pursuit of the ideal of one world. Nowhere is this effort more evident than in Stoumen’s application to the Guggenheim Foundation's Fellowship award, drafted in 1948. By 1948, the Guggenheim Foundation Fellowship had become a highly coveted award for photographers. Edward Weston was the first photographer to receive the award in 1937, followed by several other photographers in the early and mid-1940s including Walker Evans, Dorothea Lange, Wright Morris, and Ansel Adams. The year prior to Stoumen’s drafting of his application, Beaumont Newhall received the award to write a history of photography. The diversity of these winning practices found resonance in Stoumen’s own 1948 application in the section “An Account of My Work,” where he positioned his commercial photography for the Housing Authority prominently among his activities since the Second World War. Among the tasks fulfilled for the Authority, Stoumen listed the production of “1000 negatives of city slums, public housing projects, health and recreation problems, etc.,” a “redesign of fittings, paint scheme and photographic display in [the, N.K.O.] Housing Authority’s commission room,” the “design and execution of an 18-foot long photographic mural on veterans’ housing problems,” as well as the “preparation of Authority photographic exhibits.” He also mentioned the production of “architectural and other photographs,” for the Housing Authority’s Los Angeles Housing News, the L.A. Daily News, and the Los Angeles Times.

Of all this work completed for the Housing Authority, the “one-world theme” is most evident in Stoumen’s portraits of veteran families for the Los Angeles
Photography and Housing for One World

Housing News article, “Honorable Discharge and Actual Housing Need Are the only Qualifications” (fig. 85). In these portraits, Stoumen framed each of the diverse families within the arching front porches of their temporary Quonset hut housing units at the Housing Authority’s Rodger Young Village. In the first two portraits, parents share adoring glances while holding their children in their arms. In the third portrait, the parents gaze off to the right of the camera. The father wears a gentle expression of determination as he holds a healthy infant in his lap, while a little girl smiles directly into the camera from the arms of her mother. Aside from the unusual shape of the Quonset huts’ roofs, the photographs appear to be conventional family portraits—indeed, portraits the families might hang on the sloping interior walls of their Rodger Young Village homes. Placed side by side in Los Angeles Housing News, together they offer a portrait of a veterans’ community open to all. Perhaps hopeful that the readers of his application for the Guggenheim Fellowship were attuned to the public housing movement’s position on contemporary race relations, Stoumen almost certainly detailed this work to further align his practice with the current cosmopolitanism in the arts.

THE LOS ANGELES PROJECT

The project that Louis Clyde Stoumen proposed to the Guggenheim Foundation in 1948 was an extensive study of Los Angeles that would culminate in a book with text and photographs both by him. He referred to these fourteen months of work as simply “the Los Angeles project.” The words with which Stoumen described the project present a litany of Los Angeles’ people and places. “I should like to explore and to study this adopted city of mine in its present mid-passage,” he wrote,

“to learn the look, the texture and the smell of the sprawling city, in sunshine, in smog, in rain, at night, in all seasons; to get to know the hearts of the fishermen of San Pedro, the righteous orators of Pershing Square, the airplane builders of Burbank, the proprietors of ten thousand real estate developments and used car lots, the maimed and mindless veterans in the white beds at Sawtelle, the artists, artisans and businessmen of the film studios, the bartenders, publicity men, housewives, call girls, juicers, grips, physicists, oil drillers, psychiatrists, all the native-born and all the uprooted transplanted Iowans, Pennsylvanians, Mexicans, Negroes, Europeans and Orientals,”
Knowledge of the hearts of these diverse inhabitants of the city, Stoumen proposed, would form the raw material for his book, a “rich brew” from which he would aim

“to distill [...] the significant forms and meanings of the city, its origins and directions, and to determine their inter-relationship with the social and cultural ferment of our nation and our world; to fix these insights and root images in as few simple words and straightforward photographs as possible; and in the end to assemble this writing and camerawork in the form of an integrated book which will be readable by a wide audience and will have historical, social and esthetic values beyond those of regional reportage—a book of words and pictures which will freshly reveal Los Angeles to its own inhabitants, which will in some small way reveal modern man to his own surprised inspection.”\textsuperscript{145}

Outlining with conviction the Los Angeles project’s potential to form connections between city and nation and world as well as between “modern man” and himself, Stoumen’s poetic description resonates profoundly with Stimson’s and later also Robin Kelsey’s descriptions of photography’s formation of a new subjectivity and a “nation” or “republic.”\textsuperscript{146} For Stoumen, however, this nation-building and belonging took place not in the bodily “pivot” from one image to the next in the exhibition, as Stimson argues in his study of \textit{The Family of Man}, but in the “inspection” of the photographic book.\textsuperscript{147}

The photographic book was by no means a new form for art that took Los Angeles as its subject. The photographer Leonard Nadel, for instance, produced mock-ups of two photobooks around this time. One presented the public housing development of Pueblo del Rio, while the other exhibited photographs of Aliso Village. Scholars remark on Nadel’s message of interracial “harmony” especially in the second publication, titled \textit{Aliso Village U.S.A.}\textsuperscript{148} The international aspirations for this message, however, are largely overlooked. On the final page of the main part of the book, Nadel’s concern for the world context of his work is clear in his citation of none other than the United Nations Charter: “...that people...without distinction as to race, can live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.”\textsuperscript{149} The form of the photobook, Nadel further hoped, would stir its readers in much the same way as photographer, curator, and veteran Edward Steichen’s later exhibition, \textit{The Family of Man}. The photobook provided an alternative to “graphs and charts and reports” which, Nadel claimed, “have a way of becoming ponderous and dull and clinical.”\textsuperscript{150} In a 1950 letter, one of the contemporary readers of Nadel’s mockups commented on the “easy-
to-grasp-quick book form” while suggesting that an exhibition of the photographs be considered, as well.151

For Stoumen, on the other hand, a Los Angeles “book of words and pictures” was more than “interesting”—it was particularly suited to taking Los Angeles as subject. “It is in the light of such considerations of media and form that I should like to make a photographic book about an area of America which even in the days of its Spanish colonists was found to be ‘infested with many griffins,’” Stoumen wrote in his prospectus.152 Stoumen left the reference to griffins unexplained, but almost certainly intended it to allude to the Spanish myth about the “Black Amazon Queen” Calafia and her army riding into battle to defend their island of California on man-eating creatures that were part eagle, part lion.153 A part textual, part photographic art form, in Stoumen’s view, was Los Angeles’s modern griffin—the medium most appropriate “to distil[ling, N.K.O.] the significant forms and meanings of the city, its origins and directions.” Following Stoumen’s associative logic, the figure of the griffin might also have symbolized for him the city’s heterogenous civic body (“all the native-born and all the uprooted transplanted Iowans, Pennsylvanians, Mexicans, Negroes, Europeans and Orientals [...]”). Thus tying historical legend to the present and the forms of art to identity (and perhaps even comparing humans to animals like birds and lions), Stoumen proposed a combining of media for representing a city that was witnessing only the latest in a long history of migrations to the region.

By 1948, the notion of combining media as an appropriate means of representing America’s heterogenous population was far from new. As art historian Lauren Kroiz shows, early twentieth-century modernists, especially those with ties to the photographer Alfred Stieglitz’s New York galleries, developed “composite” art forms that they theorized using “racial metaphors” at the same time that the United States was experiencing a significant influx of immigrants.154 Decades later, Stoumen saw the photobook as a remarkably current form. He cited two trends as “symptomatic of the readiness and hunger of vast audiences for new visual-verbal forms.”155 The first was the popularity of Life magazine.156 The second was the success of the film industry.157 Still, the photobook would need to be further developed to achieve similar levels of popular appeal. As Stoumen explained, the popularity of the photographic book was contingent upon “how sensitively the makers of such books exploit the powers of the new medium” and “how rapidly they and workers in other graphic media teach the audiences the language [sic] of the camera eye.”158 Previous attempts, such as Land of the Free, by Archibald MacLeish, Naked City, by Weegee, and The Inhabitants, by Wright Morris, came near to what Stoumen aimed to achieve in the late 1940s, with The Inhabitants in Stoumen’s view coming “closest to the true nature
The problem for Stoumen was that *The Inhabitants* was "marred [...] by its seemingly purposeful obscurity."\(^{160}\)

Aiming to avoid this pitfall, Stoumen had already researched his proposed area of investigation. He enrolled as a part-time graduate student at the University of Southern California’s Department of Cinema.\(^{161}\) His plans for his Master’s thesis, titled *The Camera, the Brush and the Photographic Book*, included the study of similarities between what he called the “photographic book” and film as well as their common forerunner, the illuminated manuscript.\(^{162}\) "My interest in scholarship is slight;" he wrote, "mostly I want through an examination of the mutual influences of the camera and the brush to isolate and understand the art element in photography, as well as to establish standards and functions for the photographic book."\(^{163}\) This historical research came to the fore in Stoumen’s proposal for the Los Angeles project. The photographic book, Stoumen argued, had the potential to surpass both *Life* magazine and Hollywood films with “exact, emotional, and sensuous statements” and its ability to “tell great truths with compelling force and beauty, and make reality manifest.”\(^{164}\) Stoumen was undeterred by what he deemed was an abysmal performance of related media in telling these truths: "The fact that the gargantuan output of our press, the canned dreams of ten thousand films, and the snapshots of 20 million American amateurs seldom reveal these potentialities," he wrote, "does not negate them."\(^{165}\)

The key for Stoumen to achieving the potential of the photographic book lay in the maker’s process. The fourteen-month project timeline he proposed would begin with a month-long period of research of available textual and "graphic work" on Southern California “with special reference to old Spanish documents and to modern sociological, anthropological (the Indian), political and cultural studies.”\(^{166}\) Following this initial library and archival work, Stoumen then intended to tour the city via multiple means of transportation, including air travel, to prepare an outline and "shooting script.”\(^{167}\) This period would extend into the second part of the project, which Stoumen titled "Writing and Camerawork.”\(^{168}\) Citing his experience of shooting Times Square in the early 1940s, Stoumen recalled one “technical problem” he encountered in his attempt to try to shoot a hefty camera in a "'candid' manner."\(^{169}\) He expounded on this challenge, claiming that for the Los Angeles project he “would try to combine in the same negative those qualities of sharpness and texture associated with the larger camera, and the unposed, naturally-lighted, revealing qualities common to the so-called ‘candid’ miniature.”\(^{170}\) His adaptation of this method for the Los Angeles project, he further noted, would involve modifying his car through "the construction of [...] camera vents.”\(^{171}\)
Still, much as camera work formed a critical component of the Los Angeles project, the innovation Stoumen hoped would win him the Guggenheim Fellowship was the technique of combining these photographs with words. Stoumen saw the combination of text and image in the photographic book as a way to “raise the component paragraphs and pictures in a creative new whole qualitatively greater than the sum of its parts.” His choice of term to describe this technique is striking: long before Edward Said applied the musical term “counterpoint” to shift readers’ attention to the “other histories” of colonialism’s “cultural archive,” Stoumen applied it to his griffin medium with the aim of exposing “modern man” to “modern man.”

Taking the analogy of sound further, Stoumen described the photographic book as “an integrated whole in which words and pictures speak eloquently in one chorused voice.” Visually, this chorus amounted to a highly complex layout:

“Generally, text and pictures would be on facing pages. There might be two or more continuities of both verbal and visual images on the same pages; thus, aside from the main sequence of the photographs, a strip of smaller photographs of news clippings or advertising signs might run through the book at top and bottom of the pages; and aside from the main text, a running series of overheard folk quotations might be used.”

The montage here, much like the modernist montage of the prewar decades, was made with pieces of the everyday. As in the Housing Authority’s annual reports, the reader would be led from page to page by these “continuities of both verbal and visual images” running along the length of the layouts. The regional and vernacular language would appear along with Stoumen’s own to make one multivocal work of art.

The Guggenheim Foundation never granted Stoumen the fellowship. Decades passed before Stoumen realized many of the plans he set out in the application. In the meantime, *The Family of Man* opened at the Museum of Modern Art in 1955. In the exhibition section titled “Aloneness and Compassion,” curator Edward Steichen included a photograph by Stoumen of a barefoot girl, leaning forlornly on a pole against the background of Venice’s sandy beach. In light of Stimson’s reading of the show as one vested in a promise of world citizenship and belonging, Steichen’s inclusion of Stoumen’s work under this banner is particularly poignant. The artist who photographed the veteran families of Rodger Young Village and the smiling faces of the Housing Authority’s famed Pan-American Dance Group, so Steichen’s title seemed to suggest, knew something
about the other side of Brotherhood and One World. Following Stimson’s argument, one can picture the hopeful world citizens crowded around Stoumen’s photograph of the lonely girl. Had Stoumen finally realized his hope to “in some small way reveal modern man to his own surprised inspection”? 

By the time Louis Clyde Stoumen realized his plans for the Los Angeles project, it had grown in scope to extend to all places where Stoumen had lived in his life thus far. He called the book *Can’t Argue with Sunrise: A Paper Movie* and published it in 1975. Credited in the colophon for the book’s design is Michael Glen. Along with several other photographs of Los Angeles from the late 1940s and early 1950s published in the book, Stoumen included the 1953 photograph of the girl at Venice Beach (fig. 94). But instead of framing her in terms of “Aloneness and Compassion” as Steichen had, he titled the work *Pensive Child.* On the opposite page, the first stanza of Stoumen’s text reflected not on aloneness, but on loss:

“One’s own childhood
is the strangest island
so magically far
that once you’ve left it
you can never return.”
Was Stoumen’s island—his nation, his One World—gone?

The New York Times review of Stoumen’s show at the International Center for Photography offers a reminder that in 1983, for at least one viewer, Stoumen’s photography along with a host of other “humanistic” photographs seemed less “immediate”: “their power to convince us, to outrage us, to move us to act, has faded.” But as recent studies in the history of photography encourage, looking at the long life of photographic endeavors like the Los Angeles project shows that this is what photography does. As photohistorians turn to archives for new narratives from photography’s past, the projects that some critics considered failures—projects like public housing or photography for “One World”—promise currency once more. The “fading” of a “power to convince” seems no longer a loss, but a history, and photographs long forgotten all the more immediate for it.
The narratives presented in this study reveal the complex ways in which photography sought to further the public housing movement in Los Angeles in the 1940s. They also reveal that the public housing program was a vital impetus for photographic activity. Public housing proponents both in front of and behind the camera affirmed photography’s social and political value in their private writings, annual reports, and the creation of collections. The material output of these practices was much like public housing itself—modest in form, but meaningful in the functions it performed.

Focusing on photography as meaningful work, this study took on the challenge of investigating a scattered institutional collection. It found that the photographs of public housing and low-income neighborhoods in Los Angeles were part of a history of collection building that included the famous work of the United States’ Farm Security Administration and connected Los Angeles with international housing reform efforts of the 1930s and 1940s. Private letters and news articles alike chart the movements and currency of housing photographs from the 1930s to the present day. The Housing Authority’s photographs still circulate beyond library reading rooms in both new digital forms and, in the exceptional case of one remarkably preserved copy of a fragile wartime annual report, via interlibrary loan. Following Elizabeth Edwards and Janice Hart’s assertion that “an object cannot be fully understood at any single point in its existence but should be understood as belonging in a continuing process of production, exchange, usage and meaning,” this book shows that the photographic objects that the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles acquired in its earliest years continue to inspire art and scholarship and in turn activate other objects, like the photographs of Esther Lewittes Mipaas, that long remained out of circulation.
The second finding of this study is that local housing photography in Los Angeles was part of a global conflict. Photographs of public housing in Los Angeles illuminate ties between the First and Second World Wars in both their formal similarities and in the figure of the World War I veteran, businessman, and photographer Arthur Luckhaus. As Robin Kelsey argues in Archive Style: Photographs and Illustrations for U.S. Surveys, 1850–1890, nineteenth-century survey photographers and illustrators “left evidence not only of their ingenious accommodation of vague institutional directives but also of their recalcitrance.”

A similar understanding of the complex motivations behind the formal choices Luckhaus Studio made in producing photographs of sites of slum clearance and public housing construction in 1941 and 1942 shows how this approach to photography applies to survey images made almost a century later. It also illustrates how past photographic practices complicate these readings. During the Second World War, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles compared photographers to legionnaires and deemed the public housing movement a “housing front.” Shaped by this metaphor, this new reading of Arthur Luckhaus’s wartime photography for the Housing Authority advances scholarship on the histories of both housing and photography in Los Angeles by bringing into sharper relief the lessons learned from World War I in both these disciplines.

The third finding is that Catherine Bauer and the contributors to the Journal of Housing developed a cogent concept of housing photography during World War II and the early postwar years in their writings on housing reports and exhibits. Reports and exhibits were integral tools of political and cultural work for many public institutions. The National Association of Housing Officials and the American Institute of Graphic Arts held report competitions to encourage better designs by local authorities. As evidenced in the short-run housing reports and exhibits produced by the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles in its first decade, photography was an important material and tool in creating thrifty displays. A comparison of surviving reports with written commentary and grainy halftone installation views reveals strategies of enlarging report pages to create exhibit panels, the circulation of these panels, and practices of combining multiple exhibits into larger ones. By the 1940s, these adaptive methods were nothing new, but responded to new imperatives in an understudied context.

Looking to but also away from the research on the Museum of Modern Art’s innovations in exhibit design affords a far more nuanced understanding of photographs and exhibits in their broad circulation at events like the National Orange Show in San Bernardino or the Los Angeles County Fair in Pomona. These cases proffer for study instances of design for a general public—popular exhibits that remain largely overlooked by historians of photography, but from
which we can nonetheless learn much about popular applications of the medium by a large number of anonymous designers.

The fourth conclusion is that color slides and specifically Kodachrome slides of housing for migrant workers, war workers, and low-income families played a distinctive educational role starting in the early 1940s. Previously associated by scholars with postwar instruction in global citizenship, Kodachrome and color slides figured prominently in the efforts of the internationally-recognized housing expert, Catherine Bauer. Although historian Daniel T. Rodgers’s landmark research on transatlantic progressivism recognizes Bauer as a collector of housing photographs that were important for the establishment of a public housing program in the United States, Bauer’s collection of color slides, and her status as a photographer, are new subjects in the study of her work. Starting in the early 1940s, Bauer adopted Kodak’s still relatively new 35-millimeter color slide technology in taking and exchanging photographs for her research and teaching of housing topics at the university. After the war, she also turned to color slide technologies as efficient media for addressing broader US audiences on housing’s transnational history and democratic promise. This campaign at home coincided with one to collect and send US housing reports to her colleagues abroad. Physically light and small, easy to make and use, and capable of clearly reproducing and conveying visual information, photography, in short, allowed Bauer to create and manage a public housing image in a decade defined by national borders and dreams of a better life—of living as One World.

These “micro” histories of photographic and housing practices certainly unfolded against the background of a greater historical narrative we already know. But a closer look at the strategies that photographers employed and the hopes they voiced offer new facets to this history. The fifth finding of this book is that the housing movement’s promise of belonging carried personal meaning for local photographers as they pursued their professional and social aims. The film student Louis Clyde Stoumen saw in a combination of his photography and writing a form of art for representing postwar Los Angeles to the world. The draftsawoman, art historian, and photographer Esther Lewittes Mipaas extolled the social function of photography while revealing intimate views of the social life of Los Angeles’s low-income neighborhoods. Her FBI dossier offers a painful reminder of the material and political challenges she faced and the persistence of art as a reference for her in confronting these challenges. A closer study of the photographs she made, even if it cannot fill the gaping void between the ideals of public housing and the historical facts of its injustices and failures, holds viewers accountable, to borrow this apt phrase from Blake Stimson and Robin Kelsey, to the people who lost their homes to slum clearance and to the
photographers who found their actions stifled by McCarthyism or prejudice and whose collections await the attention they deserve.6

Housing, citizenship, and the role of photography in responding to questions about each remain pressing issues in the present day. The recent work to house people who have migrated to Hannover, Germany, is just one local manifestation that awaits further theoretically rigorous historical contextualization. How far back in the nineteenth century this pursuit may go promises a challenge and a better understanding of the overlaps between the histories of housing and those of medicine or labor. More pressing and directly related to specifically the history of housing in Los Angeles, however, is indeed a broader investigation of housing photography’s geography in the tumultuous decade of the 1940s.

In taking Los Angeles as a point of departure, this study brought the photographic practices of the local housing authority into dialogue with those in nearby defense centers and traced the circulation of Los Angeles’s housing photographs abroad. Still needed here, however, is a more even-handed comparison. How might housing groups outside the United States have looked to photography in undertaking their local efforts? What processes defined their photographic programs? What concepts of photography guided their practices? How did these photographs resonate with the viewers they reached? A closer look at local initiatives in housing and city planning and the photography that formed around them indeed promises to continue the current photohistorical task of investigating processes, networks, and narratives that remain mired in the gaps between disciplines. But more importantly, it promises to show the subtle ways in which photography worked to provide everyone with one of the most basic human needs—a place to call home.
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In the 1940s, Los Angeles faced an acute housing crisis. The local housing authority responded with a controversial program of slum clearance and public housing construction along with photography that presented the crisis in innovative ways. This book brings these photographs together with hitherto unavailable sources to reveal a largely uninvestigated concept of housing photography. Case studies from Los Angeles, New York, and Berlin together with FBI records and nearly forgotten bulletins invite a new understanding of the history of housing and photography as one in which women scholars and commercial photographers played pivotal roles.