INTRODUCTION

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

Published in: Nicole Krup Oest, Photography and Modern Public Housing in Los Angeles (Art & Photography 2, ed. by B. Gockel), Heidelberg: arthistoricum.net 2021, https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.671

1] Esther Mipaas, untitled, ca. 1945, gelatin silver print, 10 in. × 8 in. (25.4 cm × 20.32 cm), Esther Lewittes Mipaas Collection.

upper floors of modern high-rises, what ultimately thwarted the project, as several historians have shown, were the politics of the Red Scare.[3] 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.[4] Chávez Ravine ultimately became a site not of affordable modern housing, but a baseball stadium for the Dodgers.[5]

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.[6] 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.[7] 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."[8]

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.[9] 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.[10]

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.[11] 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."[12]

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.[13] 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.[14]

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.[15] 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.[16] Historian Don Parson offers an excellent study of the political history of the Los Angeles public program from its establishment through the McCarthy era.[17] 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.[18] 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."[19]

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.[20] More recently, Robin Kelsey considered the demands of the archive as a similar impetus for creativity in making images for surveys.[21] 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.[22] 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.[23] 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.[24] 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.[25] 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.[26] And as architectural historian Peter S. Reed notes, the FSA was a vital agency in providing wartime

housing.[27] 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.[28]

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."[29] 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?'"[30] 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.[31] 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."[32] 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."[33]

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"/"idealist" 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."[34] 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.[49] Early in her housing career, Bauer's two research trips to Europe resulted in the book, *Modern Housing*, published in 1934.[50] *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.[51] 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.[52]

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.[53] 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 "performative construction of expertise" not least through its organization of exhibitions and slideshows.[54] 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.[55]

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."[56] 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.[57] 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

2] Jörg Friedrich, Simon Takasaki, Peter Haslinger, Oliver Thiedmann, and Christoph Borchers, Flüchtlingsunterkunft, Container, Hannover, in *Refugees Welcome: Konzepte für eine menschenwürdige Architektur*, eds. Jörg Friedrich, Simon Takasaki, Peter Haslinger, Oliver Thiedmann, and Christoph Borchers (Berlin: JOVIS, 2015), 8–9.

their designs.[66] 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).[67] 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 Rio housing project, it analyzes the contribtions 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 photohistorian Blake Stimson's and historian Don Parson's observations on the period

as a point of departure, it examines the practices of Esther Lewittes Mipaas and Louis Clyde Stoumen alongside histories of postwar race relations and “One Worldism” to ask how housing’s photographers pictured housing as “home.”[69]