

Chapter Title: NOTES

Book Title: White Diaspora

Book Subtitle: The Suburb and the Twentieth-Century American Novel

Book Author(s): CATHERINE JURCA

Published by: Princeton University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7sp44.11>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Princeton University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *White Diaspora*

JSTOR

## NOTES

### INTRODUCTION

1. Edith Wharton, "The Great American Novel," *Yale Review* 16 (July 1927), 653.

2. The book that put the study of American urban literature on the map is Blanche Gelfant, *The American City Novel* (Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1954). Recent book-length studies that attest to the vigor of urban literary criticism include Dana Brand, *The Spectator and the City in Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Charles Scruggs, *Sweet Home: Invisible Cities in the Afro-American Novel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); Ann Douglas, *Terrible Honesty: Mongrel Manhattan in the 1920s* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995); and Carlo Rotella, *October Cities: The Redevelopment of American Literature* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998). William Sharpe, *Unreal Cities: Urban Figuration in Wordsworth, Baudelaire, Whitman, Eliot, and Williams* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990); Hana Wirth-Nesher, *City Codes: Reading the Modern Urban Novel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); and Richard Lehan, *The City in Literature* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998) analyze the tradition of urban writing in the United States and Europe. The wilderness, of course, has long been a crucial location in American literary studies. And when Richard Brodhead remarks that feminist critics have retrieved women regionalist writers from "a lesser suburb of the literary domain," he finds the appropriate spatial metaphor to contrast these writers' former marginalization with the flood of books and articles on regionalism that have appeared in recent years (*Cultures of Letters: Scenes of Reading and Writing in Nineteenth-Century America* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993], 143). On the topic of the suburb in American literature I have located one unpublished dissertation (Kathryn Louise Riley, "The Use of Suburbia as a Setting in the Fiction of John O'Hara, John Cheever, and John Updike," University of Maryland, 1981) and a scant handful of articles, all of which deal exclusively with post-World War II authors.

3. In *Home: A Short History of an Idea* (New York: Penguin, 1987), Witold Rybczynski presents the "idea" of home as inseparable from the interior of the house. In an essay on the value and meaning of home in American literature and culture, John Hollander deplores "[t]he common—and, unlike many common expressions, vulgar—use of 'home' as a euphemism for 'house,' " a euphemism rendered all the more objectionable by its source: it "is by and large the linguistic waste product of the American real-estate industry" ("It All Depends," in *Home: A Place in the World*, ed. Arien Mack [New York: New York University Press, 1993], 37). But the conflation of house and home isn't quite reducible to the commercial interests it serves. Hollander himself refers to examples of it in early-nine-

teenth-century poetry and an 1882 article from *Harper's Magazine* that predates by seven years the real-estate advertisement he goes on to cite. He also ignores the moral force of the nineteenth-century connection between the single-family house and the home as a sphere of family comfort, privacy, and affectional ties in domestic treatises such as Catharine Beecher, *Treatise on Domestic Economy: For the Use of Young Ladies at Home and at School* (Boston: Marsh, Capen, Lyon, and Webb, 1841) or in the spiritual guidance of minister John F. W. Ware, *Home Life: What It Is, and What It Needs* (Boston: Spencer, 1864). The conflation of house and home does pervade the real estate sections of American newspapers, but the ambition to sell houses as something more than shelters speaks to, rather than simply creates, a more widely diffused belief that houses really are more than shelters.

4. Sinclair Lewis, *Babbitt* (1922; rpt., New York: Signet, 1991), 16.

5. David Gates, *Jernigan* (New York: Vintage, 1992), 29.

6. Constance Perin, *Belonging in America: Reading between the Lines* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988), 5. See also Perin, *Everything in Its Place: Social Order and Land Use in America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977). Perin, a sociologist, analyzes American attitudes toward house ownership, which is associated with full citizenship and its responsibilities, and toward renting, which bears the taint of second-class or dysfunctional citizenship: "Renters, Americans believe, are by nature morally deficient, unstable, and dangerous" (*Everything in Its Place*, 99). Her findings bear out the arguments of historians who have linked the evolution of the American suburban ideal from the mid-nineteenth century to an anti-urban Jeffersonian tradition that equates small property ownership and democracy. See Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); and Margaret Marsh, *Suburban Lives* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990).

7. Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America* (New York: Pantheon, 1981), 107; Tamara K. Hareven, "The Home and the Family in Historical Perspective," in Mack, *Home: A Place in the World*, 238.

8. Mary Corbin Sies, "The City Transformed: Nature, Technology, and the Suburban Ideal, 1877–1917," *Journal of Urban History* 14 (November 1987), 83, 86. Local studies such as Michael H. Ebner, *Creating Chicago's North Shore: A Suburban History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988) and Carol A. O'Connor, *A Sort of Utopia: Scarsdale, 1891–1981* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983) also address the residents' self-conscious construction of upper-middle-class communities based on shared assumptions and values. Advances in transportation and construction made it feasible for people to translate the suburban ideal into reality. The classic study of the mechanics and motives of middle-class suburbanization in the late-nineteenth century is Sam Bass Warner, Jr., *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870–1900*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978). On the impact of transportation technologies, see also Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 87–124, 157–89.

9. Richard Ohmann, *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century* (London: Verso, 1996), 140, 135, 148. See pp. 118–74 for a fine account of the development of the suburb and its relation to the formation

and self-conception of a professional and managerial class (PMC) that comprised middle- and upper-level corporate managers, officials, mental workers such as writers and people in advertising, highly skilled technical workers, professionals, and their families. Stuart Blumin also addresses the importance of suburbanization to the “class awareness” of the middle class: “By the end of the century the attractive detached suburban house, set within a homogeneous neighborhood of commuting businessmen, professionals, officials, and senior clerical workers, had become one of the principal molders of middle-class life, and one of its most powerful symbols” (*The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760–1900* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989], 276). Blumin borrows the concept of *class awareness* from Anthony Giddens to describe “a common awareness and acceptance of similar attitudes and beliefs, linked to a common style of life, among the members of the class” (cited in Blumin, *Emergence of the Middle Class*, 10) that exists in the absence of anything as coherent and dependent upon notions of conflict as class consciousness, and pertains even when the reality of classes is itself denied. Ohmann argues persuasively that the suburb fostered rather more of a sense of “common purpose” and conscious class identity than Giddens and Blumin allow for, but that the PMC “did think more in terms of mobility and merit than in terms of fixed lines and antagonisms” (*Selling Culture*, 171–72). *Class awareness* is also useful in thinking about middle-classness as an identity (that exists in relation to other factors such as race and gender), because of the inevitable problems of defining the middle class, given what Burton J. Bledstein has called “its lack of structure in sociological terms and its lack of exclusiveness in financial terms” (*The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* [New York: Norton, 1978], 3).

10. On rates of population growth, see Mark Foster, *From Streetcar to Superhighway: American City Planners and Urban Transportation, 1900–1940* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981), 47. On the advertisers’ promotion of the suburban home, see Roland Marchand, *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920–1940* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985). According to Sies, by World War I a “broad consensus” (“The City Transformed,” 108) had been reached about the basic principles of suburban design, especially the primacy of the single-family house on its own lot, within a relatively homogeneous community. On the commodification of the suburban ideal in the 1920s, see Marsh, *Suburban Lives*, 129–81. Marsh combines general analysis of suburban trends with community studies that indicate the satisfaction residents found in their homes and neighborhoods. Community newspapers such as the *Roland Park Review*, which I look at in chapter 1, are a useful resource for gauging the attitudes of residents toward where they live.

11. Christopher Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged* (New York: Basic, 1977); Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 24. See also Dolores Hayden, *Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life* (New York: Norton, 1984); Clifford Edward Clark Jr., *The American Family Home, 1800–1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986); and Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia*

*Trap* (New York: Basic, 1992). Some feminist historians such as Tyler May qualify the focus on suburban placement by emphasizing an at times profound tension between post-1945 domestic desires and fulfillment, for women in particular. Ready-made postwar suburban communities were frequently denounced by contemporaries as bastions of conformity. Barbara M. Kelly's study of the original Levittown analyzes the efforts of both upwardly mobile working- and lower-middle-class residents to lay claim to the houses and landscape by personalizing them in line with the needs of individual families. See *Expanding the American Dream: Building and Rebuilding Levittown* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993). In a study of the primarily lower-middle-class Levittown in New Jersey, Herbert J. Gans argued that residents associated living there with freedom and opportunities, not constraints. See *The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a New Suburban Community* (New York: Pantheon, 1967).

12. George Lipsitz argues that racist selling and lending practices in housing have had tremendous long-term financial consequences for African Americans and other minority groups. Most of the net worth of white people and the greater opportunities that their larger share of the financial pie makes available to them have come through property acquired in a discriminatory housing market. See *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988). On the social costs of suburbanization, see also Michael N. Danielson, *The Politics of Exclusion* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976); and Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993).

13. John R. Stilgoe, *Borderlands: Origins of the American Suburb, 1820–1939* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 2. The new optimism of academics regarding the suburbs and their forthcoming work are the subjects of a recent *New York Times* article: Iver Peterson, "Some Perched in Ivory Tower Gain Rosier View of Suburbs," December 5, 1999, sec. 1, p. 1, 43. Public opinion polls do sometimes indicate the residents' dissatisfaction with suburban life, but as discussed in American newspapers, the residents' unhappiness seems most often the result of their sense that the suburbs in which they live aren't suburban enough. Problems such as crime and congestion—traffic and the loss of open spaces—mark the undesirable encroachment of the city on places that were selected in part as a refuge from it. See Keith Erwin, "Has the Glow Worn Off Suburbia?" *Seattle Times*, June 10, 1996, A1; John Wildermuth, "Long Haul to American Dream," *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 18, 1997, A1; Don Melvin, "Growth Spoiling Suburbs," *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, July 10, 1997, 1G; Daryl Kelley, "Suburbia Lost," *Los Angeles Times*, Valley edition, October 24, 1999, B1. (Articles were tracked through the Lexis-Nexis database, which lists the first page only).

14. Gillian Brown, *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990). See pp. 45–47 for a discussion of "sentimental possession" in relation to Stowe. On Stowe's vision of the nineteenth-century housekeeper who sympathetically identifies with her goods as the forebear of the modern consumer, see Lori Merish, "Sentimental Consumption: Harriet Beecher Stowe and the Aesthetics of Middle-

Class Ownership,” *American Literary History* 8 (Spring 1996), 1–33. When the prototypical consumer of the mid-nineteenth century becomes the typical consumer of the twentieth, the self threatens to become indistinguishable from the commodities it consumes. See Jean-Christophe Agnew, “A House of Fiction: Domestic Interiors and the Commodity Aesthetic,” in *Consuming Visions: Accumulation and Display of Goods in America, 1880–1920*, ed. Simon J. Bronner (New York: Norton, 1989), 135–55. For the definitive hostile analysis of the conflation of self and things in relation to advertising, see Stuart Ewen, *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).

15. Edgar Rice Burroughs, *Tarzan of the Apes* (serialized 1912; rpt., New York: Ballantine, 1963), 95. Recent scholars have protested that suburbs have never been as white and middle class as they have been represented to be by academics. There have been ethnic, industrial, and African American suburbs, and white working-class people have lived in some suburbs that have been misidentified as exclusively middle class. See, for example, James L. Wunsch, “The Suburban Cliché,” *Journal of Social History* 28 (Spring 1995), 644–58; Robert Breugmann, “The Twenty-Three Percent Solution,” *American Quarterly* 46 (March 1994), 31–34; and James Andrew Wiese, “Struggle for the Suburban Dream: African American Suburbanization since 1916” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1993). The issue is less one of historical inaccuracy, it seems to me, than of terminological nuance; that is, no historian who studies white middle-class suburbanization suggests that only this population has lived on the outskirts of cities, but the meaning of the term *suburb* has largely evolved in association with a particular way of life and opportunities that have traditionally been limited on the basis of race and class. Exclusion, as Robert Fishman reminds us in *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia* (New York: Basic, 1987), is crucial to understanding the meaning of the suburb. My use of the term *suburb* to describe a low-density residential environment of largely middle-class and upper-middle-class people who live in single-family houses that they own, and from which the labor force commutes, is indebted to Jackson and Fishman.

16. Richard Wright, *Native Son* (1940; rpt., New York: Harper, 1966), 45.

17. Kenneth Warren raises a striking alternative to the primacy of placement in an essay on the diasporic imagination of Langston Hughes, which concludes by suggesting that Hughes may have been more invested in cultivating rather than resolving a crisis of identity; he did not seek to come home psychically but expressed “a desire to speak” multiple and contradictory identifications “in a single voice” (“Appeals for (Mis)recognition: Theorizing the Diaspora,” in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease [Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1993], 405).

18. See Nina Baym, *Women’s Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and about Women in America, 1820–1870* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978); and Jane Tompkins, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985). Ann Douglas argues explicitly for the insignificance of domestic culture to 1920s New York in *Terrible Honesty*, which describes the banishment of the Victorian home and its grasping matriarch

(see Douglas's *The Feminization of American Culture* [New York: Knopf, 1977]) in the evolution of modernity's complex and contradictory public urban spaces.

19. See Cathy N. Davidson, "Preface: No More Separate Spheres!" *American Literature* 70 (September 1998), 4443–63; and *The Culture of Sentiment: Race, Gender, and Sentimentality in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Shirley Samuels (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). In "Manifest Domesticity," one of the *American Literature* articles, Amy Kaplan observes the dual meanings of the word *domestic* to argue that when understood with reference to the nation, it makes sense to think of it as a concept that unites white men and women as "allies against the alien" (582). The argument that follows focuses on white middle-class women, however, to implicate them in the imperial project of envisioning the nation as home through their central role as care-takers of the nation's homes. The place of men in sentimental culture generally has attracted more scholarly attention of late. See especially the essays in *Sentimental Men: Masculinity and the Politics of Affect in American Culture*, ed. Mary Chapman and Glenn Hendler (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999). The introduction is a superb analysis of the vast criticism on sentimentalism and domesticity with an emphasis on its gender biases. Two of three essays in the section "Domestic Men" focus on bachelors; the third examines through nineteenth-century photography the affective ties between fathers and their children who have died. With an essay on Frank Norris's *The Octopus* (1901), the collection barely crosses the threshold of the twentieth century. Katherine V. Snyder offers a fine reading of the bachelor's disruptive sexuality and domesticity at the turn of the century in *Bachelors, Manhood, and the Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). Brown's discussion of domestic men and male novelists similarly concentrates on bachelor characters in Hawthorne and Melville. Douglas Anderson's *A House Divided: Domesticity and Community in American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) considers the place of sentimental domesticity in canonical texts of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century male writers, but his analysis is for the most part decontextualized and divorced from particular domestic spaces, to the point where, for example, community and domesticity are treated as unproblematically coextensive, almost synonymous.

20. Upton Sinclair, *The Jungle* (1906; rpt., Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 172; John Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939; rpt., New York: Bantam, 1955), 79; Pietro di Donato, *Christ in Concrete* (1939; rpt., New York: Signet, 1993); Ann Petry, *The Street* (1946; rpt., New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1991).

21. *The Street* is a featured text in the only essay of the *American Literature* special issue to focus on the twentieth century. You-me Park and Gayle Wald are concerned to demonstrate that "the subjective *value* of public and private is radically contingent upon gender, race, ethnicity, and citizenship," and they argue of *The Street* in particular that it "makes obsolete conventional distinctions between outside and inside, street and home, sacred and profane" ("Native Daughters in the Promised Land: Gender, Race, and the Question of Separate Spheres," *American Literature* 70 [September 1998], 614, 619). With respect to *The Street* the essay confuses, I think, the fact of housing with the felt requirements of the home. Park and Wald usefully point out that the putative separation of home and workplace, private and public, has been fraught for immigrant and African American



domestic workers whose labors made possible middle-class white women's domesticity. But Lutie's ideal of a home is virtually indistinguishable from its middle-class associations—privacy, security, emotional comfort, independence—and is no less real for being unrealized. However fragile in her actual experience, the old and still vital distinctions between outside and in, public and private remain anything but obsolete so far as “subjective value” is concerned. Despite the novel's own skepticism about Lutie's faith in the power of self-making in a racist and sexist world, it comes rather closer to reifying the boundaries that differentiate streets from homes than dissolving them, and also reveals that her valuation of home cannot simply be written off as a “bourgeois” (617) value, a term that begs the question it claims to be resolving.

In *Urban Intersections: Meetings of Life and Literature in United States Cities* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), Sidney Bremer contrasts the depictions of a community-minded “urban home” (133) that infuse the writings of white middle-class women, working-class, and minority writers with the alienated, “anticommunal” (4) tradition of city writing by middle-class white men. Bremer deliberately moves beyond a conception of home that is limited to the domestic interior and is thus uninterested in the enduring value placed on private houses and homes by those who also embrace the virtues of community or in a domestic tradition of male writing.

22. Lora Romero, *Home Fronts: Domesticity and Its Critics in the Antebellum United States* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1997), 97. Romero specifically challenges the critical tendency to privilege nineteenth-century literary texts' own constructions of alienation as a uniquely male prerogative, even among critics who are unwilling to privilege the aesthetics associated with it. On the relation of the alienated and besieged male to canon formation, see Nina Baym, “Melodramas of Beset Manhood: How Theories of American Literature Exclude Women,” in Baym, *Feminism and American Literary History: Essays* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 3–18. Among historians, Marsh describes the temporary emergence of a suburban “masculine domesticity” in the Progressive era, which brought men into the home, as it were, as companionable husbands and nurturing fathers, roles they would not fulfill again to the same extent until the “togetherness” craze of the 1950s. Marsh's account distinguishes itself from the more typical insistence of historians on hypermasculine identifications at the turn of the century. See *Suburban Lives*, esp. chap. 3.

23. June Howard has recently pointed out that sentiment and domestic ideology are not simply interchangeable; however, as it describes and inscribes the profoundly self-conscious emotional connections that bind individuals to material places and to the people associated with them, “the home” is only ever meaningful with reference to sentiment and is probably the most powerful of American sentimental conventions. See “What Is Sentimentality?” *American Literary History* 11 (Spring 1999), 63–81.

24. Harriet Beecher Stowe, “The Ravages of the Carpet,” in *House and Home Papers* (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1865), 17. Brown discusses “Ravages” as a parable of “sentimental possession,” the decommunitization of household objects (*Domestic Individualism*, 46). Lynn Wardley demonstrates that Stowe's vision of the home accommodated mass-produced domestic objects; when well-



chosen and neatly arranged by the housewife, they could weigh in on the side of sentiment and aesthetics as against the market. See “Relic, Fetish, Femmage: The Aesthetics of Sentiment in the Work of Stowe,” in Samuels, *The Culture of Sentiment*, 203–20. Wardley’s account of Stowe squares nicely with Gwendolyn Wright’s reading of the place of mass-produced objects in the middle-class home after the 1870s, when women who had individualized domestic space through handicrafts and other personal artifacts increasingly personalized rooms by filling them with commodities that they arranged in “fashionable, educational, and individualistic” ways (*Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873–1913* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980], 19).

25. The main problem with one full-length treatment of the home in twentieth-century American literature is its failure to rethink the home/market dichotomy. Helen Fiddymment Levy’s *Fictions of the Home Place: Jewett, Cather, Glasgow, Porter, Welty, and Naylor* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1992) allows for no significant changes in the meaning or value of domesticity from the mid-nineteenth century through the twentieth century. Indebted to Baym and Tompkins, Levy valorizes feminine domesticity as an antithesis and alternative to the competitive values of the marketplace and public life; however, she does not seriously engage the questions raised by women’s increasing participation in these arenas, which challenge the viability and desirability of domesticity as an alternative to women’s active role in public life.

On the middle-class home as principal site of consumer address and appeal, see Marchand, *Advertising and the American Dream*, and Ohmann, *Selling Culture*. Jennifer Scanlon discusses the ways in which *Ladies’ Home Journal* helped to shape and define the role of the white middle-class suburban housewife as a consumer. See *Inarticulate Longings: The “Ladies’ Home Journal,” Gender, and the Promises of Consumer Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

26. Warren I. Susman, “‘Personality’ and the Making of Twentieth-Century Culture,” in Susman, *Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 277.

27. Gary Cross, “The Suburban Weekend: Perspectives on a Vanishing Twentieth-Century Dream,” in *Visions of Suburbia*, ed. Roger Silverstone (London: Routledge, 1997), 119. The “trade-off” Cross refers to addresses both middle- and working-class people, although he notes that in the United States, few working-class families were able to cash in on the promise of house ownership until after World War II. On the transition from a primarily entrepreneurial to a largely bureaucratic business structure, see Alfred D. Chandler Jr., *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press, 1977); on its beginnings, see Blumin, *The Emergence of the Middle Class*.

28. Advertising trade journals in the 1920s stated that women transacted 85 percent of all consumer purchases. According to *Printer’s Ink*, “[T]he proper study of mankind is MAN . . . but the proper study of markets is WOMAN” (cited in Michael Schudson, *Advertising, the Uneasy Persuasion: Its Dubious Impact on American Society* [New York: Basic, 1984], 173). On feminization and consumer culture, see Rachel Bowlby, *Just Looking: Consumer Culture in Dreiser, Gissing,*

and Zola (New York: Methuen, 1985); Merish, "Sentimental Consumption"; and Scanlon, *Inarticulate Longings*. See also the introduction to Christopher Breward, *The Hidden Consumer: Masculinities, Fashion, and City Life, 1860–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), for a recent critique of the marginalization of men in historical and theoretical scholarship on consumer culture.

29. Stilgoe in *Borderlands* is most emphatic about the split; although his study is mainly concerned with changes in landscape through the 1920s, it nominally extends to 1939, and he proposes another volume to deal with subsequent transformations. The 1920s also function as the natural termination point of Marsh's *Suburban Lives* and Alan Gowans, *The Comfortable House: North American Suburban Architecture, 1890–1930* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986). "Edge City" describes the commercial and residential sprawl that characterizes newer cities in particular, especially in the Sun Belt. See Joel Garreau, *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier* (New York: Doubleday, 1991). Robert Fishman coined the term "technoburb" to describe a similar trend toward a new form of decentralized city in *Bourgeois Utopias*.

30. The Rodriguez citation is from the *Newshour with Jim Lehrer*, PBS, December 10, 1999.

31. Christopher P. Wilson, *White Collar Fictions: Class and Social Representation in American Literature, 1885–1925* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 16, 17.

32. Review of *Mildred Pierce*, *Time* 38 (September 29, 1941), 93.

33. Harlan Paul Douglass, *The Suburban Trend* (1925; rpt., New York: Arno, 1970), 229; Stilgoe, *Borderlands*, 285.

34. Wilson, *White Collar Fictions*, 21.

35. Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 196; Richard Dyer, *White* (London: Routledge, 1997), 78. The ambition of making whiteness visible, and thereby attempting to disable the ordinary processes by which white identity and privilege are co-constructed, is a preoccupation as well of the essays in *Whiteness: A Critical Reader*, ed. Mike Hill (New York: New York University Press, 1997); *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, ed. Ruth Frankenberg (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1997); and *Race and the Subject of Masculinities*, ed. Harry Stecopoulos and Michael Uebel (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1997).

36. David Roediger, *Towards the Abolition of Whiteness* (London: Verso, 1994), 13.

37. Eric Lott, "White Like Me: Racial Cross-Dressing and the Construction of American Whiteness," in Kaplan and Pease, *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, 488. The essay explores the pleasures and perils of racial transgression for the white middle-class narrator of John Howard Griffin's *Black Like Me* (1961), which Lott addressed more extensively in relation to white working-class men in *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). In *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness*, George Lipsitz's analysis of the concrete economic and social advantages that accrue to white people is an important reminder that when it comes to property rights, the relation of white to black is not primarily one of fascination and desire.

38. Lott, "All the King's Men: Elvis Impersonators and White Working-Class Masculinity," in Stecopoulos and Uebel, *Race and the Subject of Masculinities*, 208. In the introduction to *Race Traitor*, ed. Noel Ignatiev and John Garvey (New York: Routledge, 1996), the editors similarly hope that "widespread borrowing" of black culture by whites "hints at the possibility of something larger and more powerful than fashion decisions" (3).

39. See also David Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991); Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1997); and *White Trash*, ed. Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz (New York: Routledge, 1997).

40. On this point see Phil Cohen, "Subcultural Conflict and Working-Class Community," in *Culture, Media, Language*, ed. Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lane, and Paul Willis (London: Unwin Hyman, 1980), 78–87.

41. Another essay on whiteness similarly presents the entanglement of white and middle-class identities among young mixed-race women who grew up in predominantly suburban communities where they self-identified as white. The young women interviewed felt they had no cultural content until they began to identify themselves as nonwhite at college; at this point it is class that becomes invisible for both the students and the sociologist. See France Winddance Twine, "Brown-Skinned White Girls: Class, Culture, and the Construction of White Identity in Suburban Communities," in Frankenberg, *Displacing Whiteness*, 214–43.

42. Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness*, 123. Lott makes a related point in "White Like Me," 482.

43. Merish, "Sentimental Consumption," 16. For particularly thoughtful explorations of the historical relation between consumption as a hegemonic way of being in and seeing the world and working- and middle-class powerlessness in the public sphere, see *The Culture of Consumption: Critical Essays in American History, 1880–1980*, ed. Richard Wightman Fox and Jackson Lears (New York: Pantheon, 1983).

44. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880–1920* (New York: Pantheon, 1981), xv.

45. David Savran, *Taking It Like a Man: White Masculinity, Masochism, and Contemporary American Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 4.

46. Homi Bhabha, "Postscript," in Silverstone, *Visions of Suburbia*, 300.

## CHAPTER ONE

### TARZAN, LORD OF THE SUBURBS

1. Eric Cheyfitz, *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from "The Tempest" to "Tarzan"* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 3–21. Page numbers are from Edgar Rice Burroughs, *Tarzan of the Apes* (New York: Ballantine, 1963).

2. Marianna Torgovnick, *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 55.

3. See Patrick Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830–1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), 232–36, for a treatment

of British “invasion-scare” stories as expressions of late-Victorian and Edwardian anxieties about the political and cultural ramifications of imperialism.

4. Cheyfitz argues that domestic issues are central to *Tarzan of the Apes* in virtue of their absence. He identifies a structural similarity between American foreign policy, which directs attention away from domestic crises and toward unresolvable international problems—“The terrorist is the demonized specter of our own homeless people”—and the novel’s “politics of translation” (*Poetics of Imperialism*, 15). As Tarzan develops intellectually and becomes proficient in English, he finds it increasingly difficult to communicate in his first language, the language of the apes. Cheyfitz claims that while the problem of translation is produced by an internal division within English, it is treated as cultural superiority: “The failure of dialogue, figured as a genetic inability in the other, rather than as a problem of cultural difference, is the imperial alibi for domination” (16). Like the U.S. government, *Tarzan* manufactures conflicts between domestic/internal and foreign/other out of wholly domestic problems. I suggest that *Tarzan*’s domestic crisis is more directly linked to concerns about the security of white homes in the early-twentieth century than to the problems of the homeless in the 1980s.

5. John Higham, *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 195. During an era when differences in ethnicity were often construed as racial differences, “the great evil native white Americans associated with blacks . . . was essentially identical to what they discerned in immigrants. The evil in both cases was pollution” (195). Although the “tidal wave” of rural black migration to the cities did not begin in earnest until the First World War, “by 1900 a substantial flow had already begun” (Irwin Unger and Debi Unger, *The Vulnerable Years: The United States, 1896–1917* [New York: New York University Press, 1978], 65).

6. Adna Ferrin Weber, *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century* (1899; rpt., Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963), 307.

7. O. F. Cook, “Eugenics and Agriculture,” *Journal of Heredity* 7 (June 1916), 253. Daniel J. Kevles has linked the eugenics movement in the United States and Britain after 1900 to “industrialization, the growth of big business, the sprawl of cities and slums, the massive migrations from the countryside and (in the United States especially) from abroad” (*In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* [New York: Knopf, 1985], 76). Numerous articles warned of the fecundity of immigrants and the declining birthrate among native-born whites as tantamount to “race suicide.” Even Theodore Roosevelt famously weighed in on the issue. See “A Letter from President Roosevelt on Race Suicide,” *American Review of Reviews* 35 (May 1907), 550–51.

8. “Urban Sterilization,” *Journal of Heredity* 8 (June 1917), 269. Weber by contrast advocated suburban residence for the working classes and immigrants as well, but he further acknowledged the concerns of eugenicists when he indicated that “the modern combination of city business life and rural residence” for the “superior elements” meant that “the best blood of the race is not liable to extinction” (*The Growth of Cities*, 444).

9. Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993), 9. Although Said focuses on British literature in this context, he uses the term *Western metropolis* also to refer to the French and American imperial enterprises. In Fred-

ric Jameson's essay on the effects of imperialism on literary form, in which *metropolis* signifies "the imperial nation-state as such" ("Modernism and Imperialism," in *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*, by Terry Eagleton, Fredric Jameson, and Edward W. Said [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990], 65n), Said's "colonial actuality" manifests itself as colonial invisibility. Jameson suggests that only metropolitan literature counts as modernism, because it alone expresses the absence at the center of the city that defines the modernist project.

10. Alan Trachtenberg, *The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982), 114.

11. Amy Kaplan, *The Social Construction of American Realism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 45.

12. Frances A. Walker, "Restriction of Immigration," *Atlantic Monthly* 77 (June 1896), 824.

13. Jacob Riis, *How the Other Half Lives: Studies among the Tenements of New York* (1890; rpt., New York: Hill and Wang, 1957), 5, 6, 22–23, 14–15.

14. See Robert A. Woods, ed., *The City Wilderness: A Settlement Study* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1898), 33–57; Albert Benedict Wolfe, *The Lodging House Problem in Boston* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906), 11–19; Franklin Kline Fretz, *The Furnished Room Problem in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1910), 60–66; and Sophonisba Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, "Chicago's Housing Problem," *American Journal of Sociology* 16 (1910), 289–308. Tenement housing was sought not only by immigrants but also by poor native-born migrants who arrived in cities from rural areas within the United States. In chapter 4 I examine in greater detail related theories of urban deterioration within the Chicago school of sociology.

15. Everett N. Blanck, "The Cliff-Dwellers of New York," *Cosmopolitan* 15 (July 1893), 355. In addition to the primary references, I draw here from the following secondary sources on the history of apartment buildings in the United States: John Hancock, "The Apartment House in Urban America," in *Buildings and Society: Essays on the Social Development of the Built Environment*, ed. Anthony D. King (London: Routledge, 1980), 151–89; Wright, *Building the Dream*, 135–51; Elizabeth Hawes, *New York, New York: How the Apartment House Transformed the Life of the City, 1869–1930* (New York: Knopf, 1993); Elizabeth Cromley, *Alone Together: A History of New York's Early Apartments* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990); and Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981), 72–77, 189–95. See also David P. Handlin, *The American Home: Architecture and Society, 1815–1915* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1979), 214–31, 377–85, for a more detailed account of the range of arguments in favor of apartments than I have space for here. On the challenge that the apartment house poses to assumptions about the rigid separation of public and private spheres, urban and domestic life, in the French and British contexts, see Sharon Marcus, *Apartment Stories: City and Home in Nineteenth-Century London and Paris* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999).

16. S. B. Young, *European Modes of Living, or The Question of Apartment Houses (French Flats)* (New York: Putnam, 1881), 1.

17. J. P. Putnam, "The Apartment-House," *American Architect and Building News* 27 (January 4, 1890), 3, 5.

18. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, "The Passing of the Home in Great American Cities," *Cosmopolitan* 38 (December 1904), 138; Marsh, *Suburban Lives*, 73. The apartment hotel was conventionally distinguished from an apartment house by its provision of communal services as well as communal spaces, most scandalously a public kitchen and dining room. Individual apartments sometimes had private kitchens as well but were also constructed without them. According to Cromley, apartment hotels were most successful and least controversial as housing for bachelors.

Gilman's own, unrealized proposal for apartment hotels included a public nursery for mothers who did not wish to devote themselves to childcare as a full-time occupation. In an illuminating reading of Gilman's feminism, Gail Bederman argues that Gilman highlighted the differences between the races to shore up her attacks on gender discrimination. The Anglo-Saxon housewife was to be freed not only to pursue her own destiny, but to further the advancement of white civilization. In this light, the apartment was for Gilman a *boon* to the white middle class, and not just to women. See *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880–1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 121–69.

19. "Apartment Hotels in New York City," *Architectural Record* 13 (January 1903), 85.

20. "The Problem of Living in New York," *Harper's* 65 (November 1882), 924, 922, 923. In an exhaustive analysis of homeownership rates among working-class immigrants and native-born white Americans in and outside Detroit, Olivier Zunz has concluded that "homeownership at the turn of the century was neither particularly middle-class nor American" (*The Changing Face of Inequality: Urbanization, Industrial Development, and Immigrants in Detroit, 1880–1920* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982], 153).

21. Christine Terhune Herrick, "Their Experience in a Flat," *Harper's Weekly* (January 11, 1890), 30–1. The city is identified only as some place other than New York City, possibly to suggest the dangers of apartment life in urban areas generally and not simply in the most densely populated American city.

22. Wright also notes in *Building the Dream* that in 1878 a New York City court ruled that a tenement comprised "three or more families living independently under one roof," while "an apartment house contained collective services for all its residents" (140). While this created a legal distinction between apartment *hotels* and tenements, it also meant that apartment buildings that did not provide for communal services were technically defined as tenements.

23. "Apartment Life," *Independent* 54 (January 2, 1902), 11.

24. William Dean Howells, *A Hazard of New Fortunes* (1890; rpt., New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 55.

25. Kaplan, *Social Construction of American Realism*, 12, 44.

26. Henry Blake Fuller, *The Cliff-Dwellers* (1893; rpt., Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg Press, 1968), 244.



27. Frank Norris, *Vandover and the Brute* (1914; rpt., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978), 179. His first novel, *Vandover* was written between 1894 and 1895 but published posthumously.

28. The specter of degeneration has also been fruitfully linked to neurasthenia, a turn-of-the-century illness that gave the stressful conditions of modern urban life scientific credibility as the cause of mental and physical breakdowns among the white middle and upper classes. See Tom Lutz, *American Nervousness: 1903* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991). On the relation of neurasthenia to white masculinity, see Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 84–92.

29. Harlan Paul Douglass, *The Suburban Trend* (1925; rpt., New York: Arno, 1970), 312, 307, 308, 311.

30. “Suburban Cottages versus Flats,” *Independent* 62 (March 28, 1907), 748, 749.

31. Richard Harding Davis, “Our Suburban Friends,” *Harper’s* 89 (June 1894), 156, 157, 156.

32. William Dean Howells, “Mrs. Johnson,” in *Suburban Sketches* (1871; rpt., Salem, N.H.: Ayer, 1985), 13, 12. The stories were first published in the *Atlantic Monthly*.

33. Henry Cuyler Bunner, “The Newcomers,” in *The Suburban Sage: Stray Notes and Comments on His Simple Life* (1896; rpt., Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries, 1969), 139. The stories were published originally in *Puck*.

34. Bunner, “The First of It,” in *Suburban Sage*, 151, 147, 155.

35. Waldon Fawcett, “Suburban Life in America,” *Cosmopolitan* 35 (July 1903), 309. Writers still made efforts, however, to combat the comic stereotypes. See, for example, Francis E. Clark, “Why I Chose a Suburban Home,” *Suburban Life* 4 (April 1907), 187–89.

36. “Park Hill,” *Craftsman* 17 (February 1910), 575, 576.

37. Advertisement, *Chicago Tribune*, May 8, 1910, IX2.

38. “Among the Craftsmen: Suburban Houses,” *Craftsman* 20 (June 1911), 72; “A Craftsman House,” *Craftsman* 5 (March 1904), 584. By 1919 editor Edward Bok of the *Ladies’ Home Journal*, which began offering five-dollar house plans in 1895, advocated strict architectural, hygienic, and spiritual standards for the home to a largely white middle-class female suburban readership of over 2 million. See Wright, *Building the Dream*, 164–66. Arts and Crafts describes both a style, albeit one characterized by regional and personal variations, and an attitude toward the design and creation of aesthetic objects. It involved social as well as aesthetic reform. Following Morris and Ruskin, American Arts and Crafts architects and artists wanted to make labor in the age of industrialism meaningful again and to democratize art by making it a part of everyday life. They rebelled against the cluttered ugliness of Victorianism and propounded an aesthetics based on simplicity, honesty, and utility that was perceived to be more masculine than its fussy predecessor. Historians have emphasized that Arts and Crafts had a difficult time living up to its rhetoric of democracy and individualism. The clean lines lent themselves extremely well to mass production, and the finest, handcrafted work was limited primarily to the affluent. Its widespread commercial possibilities through mass production meant that the regard for regionalism was inconsistent at best. For example, the first two houses featured in the *Craftsman* were designed for



particular localities but declared suitable for “almost any section of the United States” (“A Craftsman House,” *Craftsman* 5 [February 1904], 500). Arts and Crafts eventually became “a style of life associated with the middle class” that was more oriented toward consumption than production (Eileen Boris, *Art and Labor: Ruskin, Morris, and the Craftsman Ideal in America* [Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986], 54). See also Elizabeth Cumming and Wendy Kaplan, *The Arts and Craft Movement* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991); “*The Art That Is Life*”: *The Arts and Craft Movement in America, 1875–1920*, ed. Wendy Kaplan (Boston: Little, Brown, 1987). In *No Place of Grace*, Lears focuses on the movement’s hypocrisy with regard to its original social and political ambitions, which reduced it to a primarily therapeutic exercise for a demoralized middle class. See chap. 2.

39. Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (1910; rpt., Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 56, 59.

40. In 1874 New York City annexed parts of Westchester County, now the Bronx; in 1898 it increased its area more than sixfold by adding more territory from Westchester County, as well as from Brooklyn (then the fourth largest city in the United States), Staten Island, and most of Queens, in what Jackson describes as “the most important municipal boundary adjustment in American history” (*Crabgrass Frontier*, 142). According to Jackson, the governor and the state legislature encouraged the expansion of New York City’s boundaries to increase its base of middle-class voters and so dilute the power of Tammany Hall.

41. Theodore Roosevelt, “The Strenuous Life” (1899), in *The Strenuous Life: Essays and Addresses* (New York: Century, 1900), 8; *Daly v. Morgan* (69 Maryland Reports 461), cited in *The Government of Metropolitan Areas in the United States*, ed. Paul Studenski (1930; rpt., New York: Arno, 1974), 76, emphasis in text.

42. Dallas Lore Sharp, “The Commuter and the ‘Modern Conveniences,’” *Atlantic* 106 (October 1910), 557.

43. “The Home, the Unit of the Community, and Its Surroundings,” *Roland Park Review*, May 1913, 10. Fishman’s description of “the middle-class suburb of privilege” (5) in *Bourgeois Utopias* informs my definition of the garden suburb, which I use to designate largely upper-middle-class residential communities designed primarily for single-family houses in an open, parklike setting.

44. Van Sweringen Co., *The Heritage of the Shakers* (Cleveland, 1923), 6. Incorporated communities could still be absorbed by neighboring cities because state governments traditionally had the authority to modify the governmental boundaries within their jurisdictions. During the early- and mid-nineteenth century, when suburbs had much to gain in terms of sewer and water services, schools, and streets, residents of outlying areas sometimes offered little or no objection to joining the city. As the middle-class movement to the suburbs gained momentum in the second half of the nineteenth century, the services that autonomous suburbs could provide for themselves began to seem better to many residents than those that the city could provide, while the emergence of something like a suburban identity also foiled efforts to merge city and suburb: “As suburban services and self-consciousness became stronger, the desire for absorption into the metropolis waned, and fewer annexations were unopposed: some took place over the objec-

tions of 90 percent of those concerned” (Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 147). Sam Bass Warner Jr. notes that after 1873 residents of Boston’s suburbs no longer required or wanted to pay higher taxes for the city’s basic residential services, and opponents to annexation “frankly stated that independent suburban towns could maintain native American life free from Boston’s waves of incoming poor immigrants” (*Streetcar Suburbs*, 164).

45. Douglass also noted that suburbs were inhabited primarily by economically middle-class people. The rich could maintain city and country residences, and the poor could not afford housing and transportation costs (*Suburban Trend*, 95). Douglass has recently been praised for his inclusiveness, that is, for recognizing the presence of the working class, the foreign born, and African Americans in suburbs, in contrast with the narrow focus of historians on middle-class residential suburbs. See Wunsch, “The Suburban Cliché.”

46. Jack London, *The Sea-Wolf* (1904; rpt., New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1906), 25, 294. In the novel the city is associated with Van Weyden’s effiteness and inadequacy—in short, with overcivilization; Wolf Larsen calls him a “’Frisco tanglefoot” (29). London’s influence on Burroughs as an adventure writer and a rancher is examined in Kevin Starr, *Material Dreams: Southern California through the 1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 74–76.

47. Brian V. Street points out that Tarzan’s jungle upbringing “is not enough to erase generations of hereditary good breeding”; “his British heritage,” not his humanity, marks his superiority to the apes (*The Savage in Literature: Representations of “Primitive” Society in English Fiction, 1858–1920* [London: Routledge, 1975], 108–9).

48. W. L. Pollard, “Outline of the Law of Zoning in the United States,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 155 (May 1931), 15. Although the first comprehensive zoning plan was not adopted until 1916, municipalities had passed zoning legislation since the nineteenth century. Modesto, California’s discriminatory ordinance of 1885 that segregated laundries, an almost exclusively Chinese industry in California, has generally been regarded as the first recorded zoning ordinance. In 1926 the suburb of Euclid, Ohio, won its Supreme Court case to establish single-family residential areas as the highest type of land use from which other types of housing might be banned.

49. Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race, or, The Racial Basis of European History* (New York: Scribner’s, 1916), 79.

50. *Ordinances and Resolutions of the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 1910–1911* (Baltimore: King, 1911), 204.

51. Clement E. Vose, *Caucasians Only: The Supreme Court, the NAACP, and the Restrictive Covenant Cases* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959), 4. In an interesting role reversal, the plaintiff in *Buchanan v. Warley* was a white realtor, while the defendant was the black president of the Louisville branch of the NAACP. Warley had contracted to purchase a lot in a white block so that he could back out of the arrangement on the grounds that the local ordinance forbade it. Buchanan then simply sought to enforce the contract. This strategy was adopted because the Court had shown itself only too willing since *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 to uphold Jim Crow laws, and the NAACP hoped that where the Court would not intervene to protect the rights of black citizens,

it would act to preserve the rights of white property owners. *Buchanan v. Warley* is described in detail in Garrett Power, "Apartheid Baltimore Style: The Residential Segregation Ordinances of 1910–1913," *Maryland Law Review* 42 (1983), 289–323.

52. Editorial, *Roland Park Review*, April 1911, 6.

53. Joy Wheeler Dow, *American Renaissance: A Review of Domestic Architecture* (New York: Comstock, 1904), 18.

54. F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby* (New York: Scribner's, 1925), 4, 107, 54.

55. David E. Tarn, "Co-operative Group Plannings," *Architectural Record* 34 (November 1913), 467–75.

56. Stilgoe, *Borderlands*, 223.

57. Olmsted Associates to Kirkland Land Company, 1906, Olmsted Associates Papers, no. 71, Library of Congress.

58. Francis H. Bulot, "Developing a Restricted Home Community," *American City* 15 (November 1916), 534.

59. Sage Foundation Homes Company, "Forest Hills Gardens," (New York, 1909), unpaginated. The "laboring man, whose wages are small" had to look elsewhere for housing outside the city.

60. Stilgoe draws an explicit contrast between uneven development of borderland areas, especially before 1916, and the controls exercised by planned residential communities, with an emphasis on the effects on the landscape. He observes that most restrictions were designed more to prevent anomalies than to exercise complete control; most house owners still wanted the freedom to shape their houses and properties to their own tastes. Stilgoe notes in passing the racial covenants at Forest Hills as part of the general project of establishing a uniform environment, but overall he has little to say about the efforts to enforce racial homogeneity in the suburbs. See *Borderlands*, 225–68.

61. Howells, "A Pedestrian Tour," in *Suburban Sketches*, 71.

62. See James F. Waesche, *Crowning the Gravelly Hill: A History of the Roland Park—Guilford—Homeland District* (Baltimore: Maclay, 1987). Warner notes that residential covenants came into "general suburban use" outside Boston toward the end of the nineteenth century. They "restricted purchasers to single-family houses, or forbade three-family or larger multiple structures. The minimum costs of houses to be erected were often established. Factories, saloons, and livery stables were almost always targets of residential covenants. . . . Set back and side yard lines limiting the placement of houses to certain positions on the lot, restrictions against fences or limits on their height, and rules governing the number and size of collateral structures were general" (*Streetcar Suburbs*, 122). The possibilities were endless. But Warner finds no evidence of covenants against racial, religious, or ethnic groups before 1900. By the 1920s restrictive covenants that applied to entire established neighborhoods in perpetuity were widespread, and not only in garden suburbs. As agreements between private parties, such covenants were held exempt from the 1917 ruling on civic segregation ordinances. In the spirit of *Buchanan v. Warley*, some state courts decided that while contracts prohibiting the occupancy of properties by nonwhites were valid, those forbidding the sale or rental of properties to them were not. In short, these courts protected

the right of white owners to profit from their real estate holdings while ensuring that white neighbors did not suffer any unpleasant consequences from the exercise of those rights. In theory, racial covenants might have been used to exclude whites from certain properties and neighborhoods; Vose demonstrates, however, that in practice they were inevitably used to protect white families and their property. Only in 1948, in *Shelley v. Kramer*, did the U.S. Supreme Court rule that racial covenants were legally unenforceable under the Fourteenth Amendment.

63. See Lott, *Love and Theft*; and Michael Rogin, *Black Face, White Noise: Jewish Immigrants in the Hollywood Melting Pot* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996).

64. Throughout *Tarzan* the American Porters reveal aristocratic natures through an obsession with defending their honor. The plot twists in the second half of the novel hinge on their determination to fulfill obligations despite the misery that will inevitably result. Jane's father, unable to repay a ten-thousand-dollar debt to Robert Canler, whom Jane despises, promises Canler her hand in marriage to save his honor. Even after Tarzan has recovered her father's treasure, enabling him to repay the debt, Jane intends to go through with the marriage to save her own. After Canler has withdrawn his proposal, Jane promises to marry John Clayton; she soon realizes her love for Tarzan but will not break her word because, again, it would be dishonorable. Well-born Americans in the novel are more honor-bound than the English; even though they are not aristocrats in the same way that the English may be, they are determined to live by ostensibly noble values.

65. See Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 219–32. Bederman's reading updates the response of an earlier generation of critics, who saw Tarzan's primitive masculinity as a pleasurable release for readers from the restrictions of civilized life. See Roderick Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 156; and James D. Hart, *The Popular Book: A History of America's Literary Taste* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963), 219–20.

66. Advertisement, *Los Angeles Times*, October 1, 1922, V14.

67. The clause was extracted from a 1926 property deed in Tarzana.

68. The racial covenants actually preexisted Burroughs's ownership of the land, but Danton Burroughs, the author's grandson, told me in March 1994 that his grandfather did not want black residents in Tarzana. Subsequent novels demonstrate Tarzan's willingness to live with the "magnificent" Waziri tribe, whom he first befriends in *The Return of Tarzan* (serialized 1913; rpt., New York: Ballantine, 1963). In a straightforward imperial fantasy, the Waziri make him their king and become loyal subjects and domestic servants on his vast African estate. In fact, their loyalty and willing service mark their superiority to "west coast blacks" (84), like those he battles in *Tarzan of the Apes*. On Tarzan's domestication of the Waziri, see Torgovnick, *Gone Primitive*, 55–57.

69. Advertisement, *Los Angeles Times*, October 1, 1922, V14.

70. Edgar Rice Burroughs, *Tarzan and the Golden Lion* (serialized 1922; rpt., New York: Ballantine, 1963), 111.

71. Advertisement, *Los Angeles Times*, October 8, 1922, V13. His success as a writer aside, Burroughs was remarkable for his business failures, and Tarzana

was initially a flop. Burroughs's efforts were more successful the following year when he hired a real estate professional, who lured prospective buyers to the property with gimmicks such as a "great jungle barbecue" served by Elmo Lincoln, the original movie Tarzan (Irwin Porges, *Edgar Rice Burroughs: The Man Who Created Tarzan* [Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1975], 382).

72. *Why Tarzana Lots Are the Best Buy on Ventura Boulevard* (Unpaginated pamphlet, 1920s).

## CHAPTER TWO

### SINCLAIR LEWIS AND THE REVOLT FROM THE SUBURB

1. Glen A. Love is particularly insistent on the "technological sublim[ity]" (75) of Zenith in *Babbitt: An American Life* (New York: Twayne, 1993). Page references to *Babbitt* are from Sinclair Lewis, *Babbitt* (New York: Signet, 1991).

2. On the architectural and ideological appeal of the Colonial revival in the suburbs, see Gowans, *The Comfortable House*, 101–65. Dutch Colonial designs feature prominently in house plan books of the period. See, for example, Sears, Roebuck and Company, *Honor-Bilt Modern Homes* (Chicago, 1922); and Architects' Small House Service Bureau, *Small Homes of Architectural Distinction* (Minneapolis, 1927). Several of the designs include sleeping porches, which Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd identified as a popular amenity among middle-class residents of Muncie, Indiana. See *Middletown: A Study in American Culture* (1929; rpt., New York: Harcourt, 1956), 96.

3. Lewis to Carl Van Doren (1920), in Lewis, *The Man from Main Street: Selected Essays and Other Writings, 1904–1950*, ed. Harry E. Maule and Melville H. Cane (1953; rpt., New York: Pocket Books, 1963), 135.

4. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 163; Sies, "The City Transformed," 106. On the pace of new house construction, see Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 175; on the impact of the car and the new road construction on suburbanization, see 157–77; and Foster, *From Streetcar to Superhighway*, which also discusses the population growth-rate differential. Foster links these statistics to the "virtually unanimous" agreement among demographers that American suburbanization "intensified in the 1920s" (47). On the "new suburban advocacy" in the 1920s and "the suburban domestic ideal" as "a mass-produced commodity" (137), see also Marsh, *Suburban Lives*, 129–81, who emphasizes the force of popular and government promotion in accelerating the rush to the suburbs; and Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream*, chap. 11. Advertising has been linked to suburbanization by Dolores Hayden, insofar as it "promoted the private suburban dwelling as a setting for all other purchases" (*Redesigning the American Dream*, 34). Roland Marchand similarly notes the prominence of the single-family house in periodical advertisements of the twenties; he suggests that the suburb molded advertising as much as advertising molded the suburb, in part because it shaped the advertisers, who identified the consumers for their products as people very much like themselves, a select group of affluent commuters and their wives. See *Advertising the American Dream*, 77–80. In 1917, one writer for a suburban periodical defended her decision to move to the suburbs by invoking the authority of the "most modern of all artists and all writers—the advertisers. It is not to the city-dweller that they make

their appeals. The radiators which bring warmth and happiness to father and mother and all the family are pictured as in the suburban home" ("Why Is a Suburb?" *Countryside* 24 [July 1917], 370). The writer, who touted the material and spiritual benefits of suburban life for all family members, all but directly responded to the question of her title with the answer "consumption."

5. The emphasis on the mutual exclusiveness of allegiance and rebellion is best captured in Frederick J. Hoffman's influential description of the "sensitive, humane" "anti-Babbitt" in *The Twenties: American Writing in a Postwar Decade* (New York: Viking, 1955), 367. See also Anthony Channell Hilfer, *The Revolt from the Village, 1915–1930* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969), 168–76; Mark Schorer, "Sinclair Lewis and the Method of Half-Truths," in *Sinclair Lewis: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Schorer (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962), 46–61; and Martin Light, *The Quixotic Vision of Sinclair Lewis* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1975). Among contemporaneous critics see Robert Littell, review, *New Republic* 32 (October 4, 1922), 152; and Edmund Wilson, "Wanted—A City of the Spirit," *Vanity Fair* 21 (January 1924), 63, 94. Schorer notes in his biography that most of the contemporary criticism of *Babbitt* came from those who sympathized with its ambitions but were disappointed at Lewis's failure to identify the positive values that might point the way to the salvation of Babbitt and his country. See *Sinclair Lewis: An American Life* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), 343–60. Clare Virginia Eby updates the conventional reading of the novel as a failed liberal rebellion by arguing that Babbitt specifically rejects "the duty of being manly," but is unable to resist the pressure to conform to conventional standards of masculinity ("Babbitt as Veblenian Critique of Manliness," *American Studies* 33–34 [1992–93], 6). In *Babbitt: An American Life*, Love locates Babbitt's humanity in the unstandardized particularity of his desires, which withstands his inability to be true to them.

6. Light, *Quixotic Vision*, 84.

7. Lewis, *Main Street* (1920; rpt., New York: Carroll and Graf, 1996), 286, 290, 390, 448. When the 1920 census revealed that for the first time a majority of Americans lived in cities, Lewis's claim in the foreword—"This is America"—was already obsolete.

8. Edith Wharton to Lewis, cited in R. W. B. Lewis, *Edith Wharton: A Biography* (1975; rpt., New York: Fromm, 1985), 435.

9. Carl Van Doren described recent literary criticisms of small town provincialism in "The Revolt from the Village: 1920," *Nation* 113 (October 12, 1921), 407–12.

10. Wilson, *White Collar Fictions*, 236.

11. Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York: Basic, 1994), 357, 352. Lears offers a more nuanced interpretation of Babbitt than do most historians, who have traditionally embraced him as the standard figure against which other people's rebellions during the rebellious 1920s were defined. As early as 1931, Frederick Allen represented Babbitt as "the arch enemy of the enlightened," the antithesis of the Jazz Age's disillusionment and iconoclasm (*Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the 1920s* [1931; rpt., New York: Harper, 1964], 161). See also Caroline F. Ware, *Greenwich Village, 1920–1930* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1935); John W. Aldridge, *After the*



*Lost Generation* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951); and, most pertinently, Elizabeth Stevenson, *Babbitts and Bohemians: The American 1920s* (New York: Macmillan, 1967). Babbitt continues to be invoked as the figure for the devotional consumer and materialist, in and out of the twenties. See, for example, Lynn Du-menil, *The Modern Temper: American Culture and Society in the 1920s* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), 76; and Don Slater, *Consumer Culture and Modernity* (London: Polity, 1997), 13.

12. Lears, *Fables of Abundance*, 357, my emphasis.

13. Lewis, "Self-Portrait," in *Man from Main Street*, 45.

14. H. L. Mencken, "Portrait of an American Citizen," rpt. in Schorer, *Sinclair Lewis: A Collection of Critical Essays*, 20; Lewis Mumford, "The America of Sinclair Lewis," *Current History* 33 (January 1931), 531. Joel Fischer observes that the pairing of *Babbitt* and *Middletown* became commonplace in the works of later critics, in which the novel is treated as the "fictional correlative" of the sociology, which in turn adopted its style of analysis from the novel ("Sinclair Lewis and the Diagnostic Novel: *Main Street* and *Babbitt*," *Journal of American Studies* 20 [1986], 422). David C. Pugh has argued even more strongly that since the Lynds, "social scientists have fashioned their prose techniques after ones that Lewis had already used, so that now he reads (more so than in 1922) 'just like a sociology book'" ("Baedekers, Babbitt, and Baudelaire," in *Critical Essays on Sinclair Lewis*, ed. Martin Bucco [Boston: G. K. Hall, 1986], 205). The absence of any reference to Lewis in *Middletown* is striking, especially since the Lynds discuss a few stories by Sherwood Anderson, who was far less culturally significant than Lewis, to Anderson's eternal chagrin. It is tempting to read the exclusion as deliberate. It may have to do with differences in tone, despite the similarity of the "findings." The Lynds expressed their commitment to giving an impersonal, impartial assessment of Muncie, Indiana, which could be a veiled reference to Lewis's own stridency. Also, the Lynds might have chafed at directing readers to a novelist who had, in many respects, scooped them.

15. Littell, review of *Babbitt*, 152.

16. Van Wyck Brooks, "The Culture of Industrialism" (1917), rpt. in *Van Wyck Brooks: The Early Years*, ed. Claire Sprague (New York: Harper, 1968), 195; Waldo Frank, *Our America* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1919), 23, 30.

17. Brooks, *The Wine of the Puritans* (1908), rpt. in Sprague, *Van Wyck Brooks*, 5, 6, 7.

18. See Casey Blake, "The Young Intellectuals and the Culture of Personality," *American Literary History* 1 (Fall 1989), 510–34.

19. Susan Hegeman, *Patterns for America: Modernism and the Concept of Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 105.

20. Mumford, "The Wilderness of Suburbia," *New Republic* 28 (September 7, 1921), 45. In the 1920s Mumford participated in the Regional Planning Association of America, which he cofounded in 1923. He was interested in combining the best features of urban and rural life, with the help of new technologies, in communities that eschewed the extremes of the skyscraper metropolis and the residential suburb. On Mumford's work with the association and his influence as a theorist of American architecture and culture, see Donald L. Miller, *Lewis Mumford, A Life* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989). Stilgoe mentions



the hostility of American intellectuals to the suburbs in the 1920s, but his analysis focuses more on their response to built environments in general, and although he addresses the hostility of intellectuals to the middle class, he does not discuss examples that pertain to the suburbanite. See *Borderlands*, 285–90.

21. Harold Stearns, preface, *Civilization in the United States: An Inquiry by Thirty Americans*, ed. Stearns (New York: Harcourt, 1922), vii.

22. Mumford, “The City,” in Stearns, *Civilization in the United States*, 16, 14, 16. He emphasized plumbing and heating because they also demonstrated the profound dependence of the so-called private house on infrastructure, relations, and networks that ordinarily remained hidden: “the modern house . . . has become the nucleus of communal and domestic services with connections and filaments throughout the rest of the community” (“The American Dwelling-House,” *American Mercury* 19 [April 1930], 474). See also “The Wilderness of Suburbia,” 44–45.

23. Stearns, “The Intellectual Life,” in *Civilization in the United States*, 145–46. Stearns comes closest in tone to the intellectuals that John Carey discusses in relation to the British suburb and suburban values in *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880–1939* (London: Faber and Faber, 1992), 46–70. The British suburb functioned as an opportunity for intellectuals to express unambiguous class superiority. In contrast with the United States, the British suburb was stereotyped as the home of underpaid clerks; it was associated with spiritual inadequacy because it also signified material insecurity.

24. Stearns, preface, iii, vii.

25. Janet Hutchison, “Building for Babbitt: The State and the Suburban Home Ideal,” *Journal of Policy History* 9 (1997), 184–210; Karen Dunn-Haley, “The House that Uncle Sam Built: The Political Culture of Federal Housing Policy, 1919–1932” (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1995), 95. See also Dunn-Haley, chap. 4. Hutchison documents the considerable impact of the “Own Your Own Home” agenda on middle-class suburbs and on consumption.

26. Marsh, *Suburban Lives*, 148. Marsh argues that homeownership was not a consistent suburban imperative; at the turn of the century location generally mattered more to white middle-class suburban families than ownership, although as both Sam Bass Warner Jr. (*Streetcar Suburbs*, 101) and Gwendolyn Wright (*Moralism and the Model Home*, 80) have pointed out, homeownership was nonetheless identified as an important middle-class value by the late-nineteenth century. It wasn’t until the 1920s, Marsh claims, that it was again widely touted as a foundation of good citizenship, as it had been in the mid-nineteenth century, and for the first time became a crucial sign of middle-class status, especially in the burgeoning suburbs. On anti-immigrant sentiment and the racialization of American citizenship in the 1920s, see Walter Benn Michaels, *Our America: Nativism, Modernism, and Pluralism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1995); and Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).

27. William Leach, *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power, and the Rise of a New American Culture* (New York: Pantheon, 1993), 354. See pp. 349–78 for a superb account of Hoover’s active role in fostering a new corporate economy of consump-

tion, which refutes the view of Hoover as reluctant to interfere in the economy. As Commerce secretary, Hoover preached not only the virtues of house ownership and consumerism but of standardization in production. In “Standardization—Bane or Blessing,” J. George Frederick called him, only partly in jest, “the Lord High Executioner of thousands of superfluous sizes, models, shapes, and kinds of American goods, and the Great Standardizer of the industrial era” (*Outlook* 145 [January 12, 1927], 50).

28. Herbert Hoover, “The Home as an Investment,” *Delineator* 101 (October 1922), 17. The magazine’s “Better Homes for America” program boasted the patronage of prominent government officials and business leaders, including Vice President Calvin Coolidge, who wrote the lead article. Until its demise in World War II, it sponsored model house exhibitions and contests across the country in conjunction with local chapters and chambers of commerce.

29. Hoover, foreword, John Gries, *How to Own Your Own Home* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1923), v. Although apartment house construction boomed in the 1920s, the apartment continued to be criticized for “fail[ing] to provide a home for its tenants,” because “the home is based on privacy and individuality” (Randolph W. Sexton, *American Apartment Houses of Today* [New York, 1926], iv). On rates of apartment construction in city and suburb, see Coleman Woodbury, *Apartment House Increases and Attitudes Toward Home Ownership* (Chicago, 1931), vii. Hoover criticized the impermanence of “tenements [and] apartments,” where a “man’s home” was not “his castle,” in his address in *The President’s Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership*, 11 vols. (Washington, D. C.: GPO, 1932), 11:2.

30. Lewis, *The Job: An American Novel* (1917; rpt., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994). The free enterpriser’s decline as a major middle-class social and economic force in the twentieth century is most famously articulated by C. Wright Mills in *White Collar: The American Middle Classes* (1951; rpt., New York: Oxford University Press, 1956). Olivier Zunz positions himself against Mills in arguing for the impact that white-collar managerial employees had on the corporate workplace in *Making America Corporate, 1870–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990). On the rise of the new bureaucracy from the late-nineteenth century through World War II, see also Chandler, *The Visible Hand*.

31. Jean-Christophe Agnew, “A House of Fiction: Domestic Interiors and the Commodity Aesthetic,” in Bonner, *Consuming Visions*, 135. In *Advertising the American Dream*, Marchand discusses the telling transition in the early 1920s from the product to “the potential consumer” as advertising’s “protagonist” (18).

32. Janice Radway, *A Feeling for Books: The Book-of-the-Month Club, Literary Taste, and Middle-Class Desire* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 242, 246, 244. Radway is drawing on articles about standardization in the popular press, which specifically cited Babbitt as the worst-case scenario. See, for example, Stuart Chase, “One Dead Level,” *New Republic* 48 (September 29, 1926), 137–39; and Earnest Elmo Calkins, “Twin Peas in a Pod,” *Atlantic Monthly* 136 (September 1925), 311–18.

33. See Cecelia Tichi, *Shifting Gears: Technology, Literature, Culture in Modernist America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987). Tichi of-

fers the best account of Lewis's clunky prose as "the stylistic nemesis of the efficient ideals of streamlining or verbal economy" (90). On the primacy of authenticity in relation to the modern aesthetic of the machine, see also Miles Orvell, *The Real Thing: Imitation and Authenticity in American Culture, 1880–1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989).

34. Mark Seltzer, *Bodies and Machines* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 83. See also Walter Benn Michaels, "An American Tragedy or the Promise of American Life?" *Representations* 25 (Winter 1989), 71–98.

35. Stuart Chase and F. J. Schink, "Consumers in Wonderland," *New Republic* 48 (September 1925), 14, 12.

36. Daniel Horowitz, *The Morality of Spending: Attitudes toward the Consumer Society in America, 1875–1940* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 118. Through an analysis of family budget studies, he suggests that middle-class consumers in the early-twentieth century associated a rising standard of living not primarily with narcissism or massification but with refinement, culture, and comfort. On the perpetually dissatisfied consumer, see Ewen, *Captains of Consciousness*. As depicted here, Babbitt's discontent has much in common with Emile Durkheim's concept of *anomie*, in which dissatisfaction must always be an effect of an ever temporary satisfaction, because individual desires in modern society are wholly unregulated, limitless, and inherently insatiable. See *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*, trans. John A. Spaulding and George Simpson (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951). In *Babbitt*, however, as I suggest below, dissatisfaction is also important as a mechanism of self-pitying satisfaction.

37. *Babbitt*'s cranky housewives fit the model of disaffected leisure described by Tom Lutz in "'Sweat or Die': The Hedonization of the Work Ethic in the 1920s," *American Literary History* 8 (Summer 1996), 259–83. In light of a wide range of texts that includes Lewis's *Main Street* and *Arrowsmith* (1925), Lutz makes the case that in the 1920s the work ethic was transformed rather than abandoned, as alienation and boredom were frequently associated with leisure and seen to be resolvable only through an enjoyable indulgence in meaningful hard work.

Ruth Schwartz Cohan argues that the time women spent on housework did not decrease with the introduction of labor-saving equipment; even in prosperous households, women in the 1920s and 1930s spent roughly as much time on housework as their mothers had. See *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave* (New York: Basic, 1983). In the early decades of the twentieth century, domestic scientists promoted hygienic, easy-to-clean interiors and greater efficiency for better family health and increased housewife and family satisfaction. Treating the labor of the household as a "trained profession" and a "business enterprise" might preempt discontent with the routine of housework, if the housewife could be made to feel more like a "manager" and "engineer" than an ordinary worker (C. W. Taber, *The Business of the Household* [Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1918], 1). For example, Christine Frederick, the household editor at *Ladies' Home Journal* and head of the Applecroft Home Experiment Station, argued that when managed according to Frederick Winslow Taylor's scientific principles, which had transformed labor in the factory, housework "was drudgery or degrading only if I allowed myself to

think so" (*Household Engineering* [1915; rpt., Chicago: American School of Home Economics, 1920], 15). On the domestic science movement, see Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon, 1982), chap. 11; and Annegret S. Ogden, *The Great American Housewife, from Helpmate to Wage Earner, 1776–1986* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1986), 141–62.

38. See Leslie Feidler, *Love and Death in the American Novel* (New York: Criterion, 1960).

39. Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Americans: The Democratic Experience* (New York: Random House, 1973), 89, 136.

40. See especially the essays in *The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*, ed. Robert Park, Ernest W. Burgess, and Robert D. McKenzie (1925; rpt., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967); and Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology* 44 (July 1938), 1–24. Park, the most famous and influential of the group, drew upon the seminal work of his mentor, the German philosopher Georg Simmel, who theorized extensively about urban alienation in "The Metropolis and Mental Life" (1903), in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, trans. and ed. Kurt H. Wolff (New York: Free Press, 1950), 409–24. Simmel argued that the intensity of psychical stimulation in the metropolis blunts discrimination; the metropolitan person responds intellectually rather than emotionally, and as the mind no longer distinguishes between and engages each image or contact, he or she becomes increasingly blasé. As urban life is structurally and psychologically more complex and impersonal than the village or small town, the result of its demand for extreme differentiation is indifference.

41. Wirth-Nesher, *City Codes*, 20.

42. For example, in 1922 Ethel Carpenter authored an eleven-part series called "The Complete Furnishing of the Little House," which described, among other things, her living room, where "[t]he woodwork was all white," the "serene beauty" of blue when used in combination with gray or cream-colored walls, and the virtues of mahogany ("Walls and Ceilings—The Background of Your Rooms," *Ladies' Home Journal* 39 [January 1922], 29; "Creating Color Schemes" [April 1922], 99).

43. See Marsh, *Suburban Lives*, 141–46; and Wright, *Moralism and the Model Home*, 244–46. The change from the numerous small, specialized rooms of Victorian houses to the greater openness of family living spaces was well underway in the early 1900s.

44. Richard Le Gallienne, "The Spirit of the House," *House and Garden* 41 (May 1922), 102. See also Alice Van Leer Carrick, "Housekeeping in the Little House," *Ladies' Home Journal* 39 (November 1922), 12; and Oscar Lewis, "To Buy or to Build?" *House Beautiful* 61 (January 1927), 45, 88–91. A 1945 housing survey in the *Saturday Evening Post* claimed that only 14 percent of Americans preferred to live in a "used" house or apartment. See Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 240–45; and Gwendolyn Wright, "Prescribing the Model Home," in Mack, *Home: A Place in the World*, 216–21. Until the post–World War II period, it was not unusual for prospective house owners to buy a lot from a subdivider and hire a builder or, less frequently, an architect to construct the house in which they

would live. In his own Glen Oriole development, Babbitt lays out and sells lots but seems to leave the house-building to the owners.

45. Schudson, *Advertising, the Uneasy Persuasion*, 145. On “buying [as] a form of belonging” (61), see also Christopher P. Wilson, “The Rhetoric of Consumption: Mass-Market Magazines and the Demise of the Gentle Reader, 1880–1920,” in Fox and Lears, *The Culture of Consumption*, 40–64. In *Babbitt*, masculine consumption is seldom “organized as a discourse with oneself” (Jean Baudrillard, “Consumer Society,” in *Selected Writings*, ed. Mark Poster [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988], 54). It “differentiates,” as Baudrillard continues, among categories of consumers, “if it no longer isolates,” without achieving “*collective solidarity*” (54–55) beyond the activity of consumption itself and its immediate psychological and social uses. On the role of goods in making and maintaining social relationships, see also Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood, *The World of Goods* (New York: Basic, 1979). On emulation and social competition, see Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899; rpt., New York: Mentor, 1953).

46. Lewis, *Dodsworth* (New York: Harcourt, 1929), 125. The postmodern is associated with “a world where locality seems to have lost its ontological moorings” (Arjun Appadurai, “The Production of Locality,” in *City at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996], 178), and functions as a synonym for the “consumption-based . . . city” (Ruth Fincher and Jane M. Jacobs, introduction, *Cities of Difference*, ed. Fincher and Jacobs [New York: Guilford, 1998], 13). On the constitutive dislocations of postmodernism, see also David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (London: Basil Blackwell, 1989); Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994); and Sara Blair, “Cultural Geography and the Place of the Literary,” *American Literary History* 10 (Fall 1998), 544–67. The dense materiality of Babbitt’s world, the ceaseless bombardment of images, slogans, and things, as well as the erosion of boundaries between places, bring to mind Fredric Jameson’s observation of postmodern space as involving both “the suppression of distance . . . and the relentless saturation of any remaining voids and empty places” (*Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* [Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991], 412).

47. Martha Banta, *Taylored Lives: Narrative Productions in the Age of Taylor, Veblen, and Ford* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 192.

48. Lewis, “Adventures in Auto-bumming—The Great American Frying Pan,” *Saturday Evening Post* 192 (January 3, 1920), 62. Lewis was an avid automobile traveler, and his experiences driving cross-country in the 1910s are fictionally recorded in *Free Air* (1919; rpt., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), which also describes the horrors of the small-town hotel.

49. On the paid vacation, see Daniel Rodgers, *The Work Ethic in Industrial America, 1850–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 106. On automobile tourism and accommodations, see Warren Belasco, *Americans on the Road: From Autocamp to Motel, 1910–1945* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979).

50. See Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 174–81.

51. For a history of the Covered Wagon and other forms of motorized housing in the United States, see Michael Aaron Rockland, *Homes on Wheels* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1980).

52. Wayne Franklin and Michael Steiner, introduction, *Mapping American Culture*, ed. Franklin and Steiner (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992), 4.

53. Lewis, *Work of Art* (New York: Doubleday, 1935), 451, 450, 452.

54. See, for example, "Exit Frontier Morality," *New Republic* 37 (January 2, 1924), 137–38; and Katherine Anthony, "The Family," in Stearns, *Civilization in the United States*, 319–36.

55. Although Lewis wrote five best-selling, and for the most part critically acclaimed, novels in the 1920s, the last of which, *Dodsworth*, actively defended Americans against cold Europeans, he was generally considered to have won the Nobel Prize for *Babbitt*, because it justified the European conception of the ugly American.

56. Steven Marcus, "Sinclair Lewis," in *Representations: Essays on Literature and Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), 44; Love, *Babbitt: An American Life*, 62.

57. Lewis, *The Man from Main Street*, 21, 22–23.

58. Christine Frederick, "Is Suburban Living a Delusion?" *Outlook* 148 (February 22, 1928), 240. On Frederick and domestic science, see n. 37.

59. Ethel Longworth Swift, "In Defense of Suburbia," *Outlook* 148 (April 4, 1928), 543.

60. Littell, review of *Babbitt*, 152; Edmund Wilson, "Wanted—A City of the Spirit," 63.

61. Cited in Schorer, *Sinclair Lewis: An American Life*, 298.

62. May Sinclair, review of *Babbitt*, *New York Times*, September 23, 1922, sec. 3, p. 1.

63. Mumford, *Sticks and Stones* (1925; rpt., New York: Dover, 1955), 87–88.

64. Susman, "Culture and Civilization: The Nineteen-Twenties," in *Culture as History*, 116.

65. See Wright, *Building the Dream*, 240; Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 193. Jackson writes that "the victims were often middle-class families who were experiencing impoverishment for the first time" (193).

66. Lewis Corey, *The Crisis of the Middle Class* (1935; rpt., New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 230.

67. Alfred M. Bingham, *Insurgent America: Revolt of the Middle-Classes* (New York: Harper, 1935), 117.

68. Lewis, *It Can't Happen Here* (1935; rpt., New York: Signet, 1993), 83, 79.

69. On Lewis's recuperation of the middle class in the thirties, see James T. Jones's quirky and clever essay, "A Middle-Class Utopia: Lewis's *It Can't Happen Here*," in *Sinclair Lewis at 100: Papers Presented at a Centennial Conference* (St. Cloud, Minn.: St. Cloud University Press, 1985), 213–25.

70. Lewis, *Kingsblood Royal* (New York: Random House, 1947), 43.

71. Langston Hughes, "The Negro Artist and the Racial Mountain," *Nation* 122 (June 28, 1926), 692, 693. Schorer notes in the biography that Lewis consulted with Hughes and Walter White, head of the NAACP, who made its files available to him for preliminary research. Zora Neale Hurston dubbed the white



people who were interested in black uplift “Negrotarians,” the kind of term that Lewis loved to coin. Among the Harlem Negrotarians, some “who were earnest humanitarians,” and some “who were merely fascinated,” David Levering Lewis identifies Sinclair Lewis as one who generated no “serious controversy about [his] loyalty” (*When Harlem Was in Vogue* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1982], 98, 99).

72. E. Franklin Frazier, “La Bourgeoisie Noire,” *Modern Quarterly* 5 (1928–30), 82. Frazier does not condemn the black middle class so much as analyze it to demonstrate the heterogeneity of a population often treated as a uniform mass. His response was far more hostile in the book-length study *Black Bourgeoisie* (1955; rpt., New York: Collier, 1962).

73. See Norman Mailer, “The White Negro” (1957), rpt. in *Advertisements for Myself* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 337–58.

74. Among Lewis’s papers at the Beinecke Library, Yale University, are some two dozen letters written in response to *Kingsblood Royal*. A remarkable few are written by white Southerners, who felt that it had opened their eyes for the first time to the reality and brutality of racial injustice and who vowed to amend their own practices and to teach their children about the equality of the races. While it is astonishing to think that Southerners needed a novel by Lewis to make racism manifest, and impossible to gauge its concrete political effects, we do know that some readers credited it with the possibility of productive social change.

75. In *Whiteness of a Different Color*, Jacobson is quite right to note that *Kingsblood Royal* both inscribes race as a black-white dichotomy and undermines such an inscription by exposing the kinds of biological confusions that permit a “white” man suddenly to discover that he is really “black.” He is wrong, however, to argue that the novel is more interested in the “messiness” of biology than in “the social conventions and acts of fabrication that go into the enforcement of the racial order” (270). The climaxes of the novel, the mass firing of all black people who work in the city and the attack on the Kingsblood house, emphasize the tremendous legal, social, economic, and political consequences of racial ascription rather than the nuances of racial identity per se.

### CHAPTER THREE

#### MILDRED PIERCE’S INTERIORS

1. James M. Cain, *Mildred Pierce* (1941; rpt., New York: Vintage, 1989), 3–4.

2. With the late-nineteenth-century Mission revival movement, white southern Californians embraced a romanticized Spanish past and tended to ignore the period of Mexican rule before the U.S. conquest. By the building boom of the 1920s Spanish Colonial had become a favorite style in residential, civic, and commercial architecture. Spanish-influenced house designs were especially popular in southern California and Florida, but ready-made house manufacturers such as Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward made them available nationwide. See Merry Ovnick, *Los Angeles: The End of the Rainbow* (Los Angeles: Balcony Press, 1994), 179–97; and David Gebhard, “The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California (1895–1930),” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 26



(May 1967), 131–47. In *Suburban Lives* Marsh discusses the example of Palos Verdes, an affluent planned suburb that excluded Mexican Americans but mandated Spanish or “California” architecture (172–73).

Glendale was well known as a “lily white,” lower-middle-class residential community, not only in the assessment of Carey McWilliams (*Southern California Country: An Island on the Land* [1946; rpt., Salt Lake City, Utah: Peregrine Smith, 1973], 328), certainly the shrewdest chronicler of California in the first half of the century, but also in its own promotional literature. See *Glendale, Your Home* (Glendale Merchants Association, 1928); and Eugene Hoy, *So This Is Glendale* (Glendale: 1939). Glendale’s hostility to African Americans was such that black servants were not allowed to spend the night in their houses of employment: “No Negro sleeps overnight in our town” (cited in Ovnick, *Los Angeles*, 244). Race is virtually invisible as a suburban subject in *Mildred Pierce*, in which threats to property ownership emerge exclusively in relation to the economic crisis of the Depression. It is manifested obliquely as a residual trace in the architecture, which is as much about degraded middle-class tastes as regional ethnic origins.

3. Bruce Bliven, “Los Angeles: The City That Is Bacchanalian—in a Nice Way,” *New Republic* 51 (July 13, 1927), 198; Robert M. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850–1930* (1967; rpt., Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), 144–45; *Los Angeles: A Guide to the City and Its Environs* (New York: Hastings House, 1941), 6. McWilliams also declared the region of Los Angeles to be “a collection of suburbs in search of a city” (*Southern California Country*, 235). *Fragmented Metropolis* is the classic study of regional development. It links the spatial and the sociopolitical disconnection of the city and region that famously lacked a dominant physical center and unifying civic life. See pp. 63–84 for a discussion of the salient census figures on the extraordinary population growth during these years. Mexicans, who were categorized as non-white by the 1930 census, were the largest minority group, and the city of Los Angeles also had a sizable African American population, especially after the boom of the twenties, and a smaller Japanese American population.

Both recent and earlier accounts of the Los Angeles region often conflate “streetcar suburbs” and incorporated cities such as Glendale and Pasadena, where much of *Mildred Pierce* is set (Starr, *Material Dreams*, 84). That is, separate cities are folded into discussions of the generally suburban character of the metropolitan area. Thus without a sense of contradiction one writer could describe Glendale as a “self-contained” city in its own right and also as “the bedroom of Los Angeles” (Mel Wharton, “Nothing Stands Still in Glendale,” *Southern California Business* 9 [October 1930], 12). Cain explicitly did not conceive of Glendale as a separate entity. It is described as “an endless suburb of Los Angeles, bearing the same relation to Los Angeles as Queens bears to New York” (9).

4. The reference to department store furniture is reminiscent as well of Theodore Dreiser’s description of the Hurstwood residence in *Sister Carrie* (1900; rpt., New York: Norton, 1970). *Sister Carrie* has been read by Philip Fisher as a testimony to the modern city’s embodiment of consumer desire: “far from being in any simple way estranged in the city, man is for the first time surrounded by himself” (*Hard Facts: Setting and Form in the American Novel* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1985], 132). Amy Kaplan identifies *Sister Carrie* and the turn-

of-the-century realist project in general with the ambition to make a disorienting urban landscape of apartments, lodging houses, and hotel rooms “inhabitable and representable” to a middle-class readership (*The Social Construction of American Realism*, 12). But Dreiser introduces an ancillary narrative of estrangement that directs the reader’s attention toward the distinctly alienating artifacts of metropolitan domestic culture. Dreiser offers a brief homage to “[a] lovely home atmosphere . . . than which there is nothing more tender, nothing more delicate” (63), and then deplores its utter absence at the Hurstwoods. Before the novel chronicles the strained relations between Hurstwood and his family, it immediately links the deficiency of the home to the house’s “fine” but anonymous furnishings: “There were soft rugs, rich, upholstered chairs and divans, a grand piano, a marble carving of some unknown Venus by some unknown artist, and a number of small bronzes gathered from heaven knows where, but generally sold by the large furniture houses along with everything else which goes to make the ‘perfectly appointed house’ ” (63). Rather than helping readers to cope with and feel at home in strange places, the passage emphasizes alienation from familiar places. The depiction of the interior as a product of “the large furniture houses” already points to the disintegration of the integrity of the isolated residence. Living in “the ‘perfectly appointed’ house,” the Hurstwoods occupy a category of dwelling that is marked by its fidelity to a shared standard, and it is, this passage suggests, in its absolute allegiance to the standard that its imperfection lies. *Sister Carrie* identifies this critique of middle-class culture with the explosive commercial and residential expansion of the metropolis, and in the following decades it is relocated in novels such as *Babbitt* and *Mildred Pierce* to the modern suburb, one of the products of such expansion, and to a broader, less refined middle-class population.

5. David Madden, introduction, *Tough Guy Writers of the Thirties*, ed. Madden (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1968), xvii. Literary criticism of the 1930s has tended to focus on working-class writings and experience. See most recently *Radical Revisions: Rereading 1930s Culture*, ed. Bill Mullen and Sherry Lee Linkon (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996). In a superb reassessment of Nathanael West’s career, Jonathan Veitch draws an instructive contrast between two anticapitalist positions in literature of the 1930s: the prevailing critique of a failing production-oriented economy and West’s own prescient and understudied protest against a more broadly based, superficially vibrant, consumption-oriented economy. See *American Superrealism: Nathanael West and the Politics of Representation in the 1930s* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997). Neither category of critique accommodates *Mildred Pierce* or Cain’s other important fiction of the Depression. In *The Postman Always Rings Twice* (1934) and *Double Indemnity* (1935), the vigor of capitalism is all too evident in the powerful insurance industry, which governs the novellas as impersonal and invincible legal, political, and economic agents. In the thirties, as Mike Davis has noted, literary L.A. was generally oriented around the struggles and indignation of the middle class, rather than the working class, which is perhaps why it has until recently received so little attention from literary critics interested primarily in working-class expression and experience of the Depression. See *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future of Los Angeles* (London: Verso, 1990), 36–40.

6. Siegfried Giedion, *Mechanization Takes Command* (1948; rpt., New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 41.

7. Historians of the middle-class American suburb typically pay little attention to the 1930s, with the notable exception of New Deal government housing policies, which decreased foreclosure rates and impacted suburbanization in the post-war period (see Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 190–230). Studies of housing in the thirties tend to focus on public and working-class housing. Wright's short section on the 1930s in *Building the Dream* (220–32) thus deals with slum clearance and government housing projects. In *Borderlands* John Stilgoe notes that real estate periodicals recommended against experimenting with architectural innovations during the Depression, but he focuses on the fear that consumers would find them faddish and thus poor economic investments (283–85), rather than on the sentimental objections that I explore below.

8. *Bennett Homes: Better-Built, Ready-Cut* (1920; rpt., New York: Dover, 1993), 4. The Aladdin Company of Bay City, Michigan, began selling fully precut houses by mail in 1904. Sears entered the mail-order house business in 1909 with plans and materials and began to offer completely precut houses in 1916. By 1934 it had sold 100,000 houses. On Sears's influence on American housing, see Katherine Cole Stevenson and H. Ward Jandl, *Houses by Mail: A Guide to Houses from Sears, Roebuck and Company* (Washington, D.C.: Preservation Press, 1986). On the influence of the mail-order business in general, see Gowans, *The Comfortable House*.

9. Banta, *Taylorized Lives*, 241. She argues that the placement of these factory houses signified "the continuing attempt to mediate between the machine and the garden" (241). See Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

10. See Robert Schweitzer and Michael W. R. Davis, *America's Favorite Homes: Mail-Order Catalogues as a Guide to Popular Early Twentieth-Century Houses* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990). On the impact of the machine as the organic basis for authentically American design in this period, see Orvell, *The Real Thing*, 157–97.

11. Phillip Smith, "Ready-Made Houses," *Scientific American* 153 (August 1935), 69. The "prefabrication movement" in housing during the Depression is discussed in Albert Bruce and Harold Sandbank, *A History of Prefabrication* (1943; rpt., New York: Arno, 1972).

12. "Machine for Living," *Business Week* (December 15, 1934), 8.

13. Le Corbusier, *Towards a New Architecture*, trans. Frederick Etchells (1923; rpt., New York: Praeger, 1974), 12. The "House-Machine" would be "beautiful in the same way that the working tools and instruments which accompany our existence are beautiful" (12). Orvell distinguishes between Le Corbusier's "colder homage to technology, this *imitation* of the machine," and Mumford's and Frank Lloyd Wright's refusal to embrace the machine as an architectural end in itself; they believed instead in "the adaptation and humanizing of it" (179), what Mumford also called the "machine-for-living" (Mumford, "Machines for Living," *Fortune* 7 [February 1933], 82).

14. On the layperson's conception of functionalism in the period, see Mumford, "Machines for Living," 78–88. David A. Hounshell discusses the American

housing entrepreneurs of the thirties in *From the American System to Mass Production, 1800–1932: The Development of Manufacturing Technology in the United States* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 311–15. Manufacturers of prefabricated housing in the United States were for the most part businessmen less interested in the larger social and aesthetic issues of architecture and housing than in turning out efficient, low-cost, and easily assembled models that would profitably satisfy a demand for affordable and decent housing.

15. Editors of *Fortune*, *Housing America* (New York: Harcourt, 1932), 52; Catherine Bauer, “Slums Aren’t Necessary,” *American Mercury* 31 (March 1934), 303.

16. John T. Flynn, “Be It Ever So Prefabricated,” *Colliers* 96 (July 13, 1935), 13; Mumford, “Mass Production and the Modern House (Part One),” *Architectural Record* 67 (January 1930), 16. Prefabricated housing was often hailed as a solution to the problem of low-income housing, but the houses of for-profit companies such as General Houses, Houses, Inc., and the Prefabricated Housing Corporation were designed both to accommodate all income levels and to grow with the family’s fortunes and size. They sold basic four-room units; several additional rooms might be purchased at once or added later. See “Machine for Living,” *Business Week*, 8–9.

17. Mumford, “Mass Production and the Modern House,” 18, 13, 16.

18. Mumford, “Mass Production and the Modern House” (Part Two), *Architectural Record* 67 (February 1930), 110.

19. *Ibid.*, 111.

20. Mumford, “The American Dwelling-House,” *American Mercury* 19 (April 1930), 469. He spoke most often of the single-family house in these articles in recognition that it represented the American ideal of shelter.

21. Smith, “Ready-Made Houses,” 69.

22. Karl Detzer, “Houses from the Factory,” *American Mercury* 50 (August 1940), 434; Carl Herter, “And These You Buy Ready Made,” *American Home* 15 (March 1936), 18. See also “The Ready-Made House Arrives,” *New Republic* 82 (March 13, 1935), 117–19.

23. Hounshell, *From the American System to Mass Production*, 314. He referred here particularly to the designs of Gunnison Magic Homes and the Gunnison Housing Corporation, one of the best-known manufacturers, but its designs were characteristic of the industry. Prefabricators of housing also never got the price low enough to overcome the resistance of people who could afford alternatives to house-machines or to make them feasible for those who could not. Factory prefabricated housing was built during World War II for defense-industry and military housing but faded into obscurity in the postwar period, when on-site developers such as Levitt and Sons realized that it was more efficient to bring the factory to the subdivision than to haul the subdivision out of the factory.

24. Richard J. Neutra, “Homes and Housing,” in *Los Angeles: Preface to a Master Plan* (Los Angeles: Pacific Southwest Academy, 1941), 196. On the “standardized ‘variety’ ” of traditional southern California residential architecture, and the trend toward “functional modern residences,” for which the Los Angeles area also became famous, see the WPA publication *Los Angeles: A Guide to the City and Its Environs*, 8. David Gebhard and Harriette von Breton, *L.A. in the 30s*:

1931–1941 (Salt Lake City, Utah: Peregrine Smith, 1975) is a superb history of the modernist architectural heritage.

25. Cain, *Double Indemnity* (1935; rpt., New York: Vintage, 1989), 3–4.

26. See especially the house of the homosexual pornographer and blackmailer Arthur Geiger in Chandler's *The Big Sleep* (1939; rpt., New York: Vintage, 1988).

27. Marchand, *Advertising the American Dream*, 125. For a clever gloss on Marchand's analysis that links the substitution of "objects for use" with "objects for art" in commodity culture and the British aestheticism of Ruskin, Morris, and Charles Eastlake, see Jonathan Freedman, *Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990), 109–10.

28. Cain, "Paradise" (1933), in *60 Years of Journalism*, ed. Roy Hoopes (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1985), 167.

29. See Gwendolyn Wright, *Moralism and the Model Home*, 236.

30. See Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Harcourt, 1968), 217–51.

31. Karen Halttunen, "From Parlor to Living Room: Domestic Space, Interior Decoration, and the Culture of Personality," in Bronner, *Consuming Visions*, 158. See also Katherine C. Grier, *Culture and Comfort: People, Parlors, and Upholstery, 1850–1930* (Rochester, N.Y.: Strong Museum, 1988), 290–91.

32. Emily Post, "The Personality of a House," *Ladies' Home Journal* 46 (May 1929), 14. The articles were expanded and republished as *The Personality of a House: The Blue Book of Home Design and Decoration* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1930) and reprinted into the 1940s.

33. Dorothy Dix, " 'Is Your Home Furnished as It Should Be?' " *Better Homes and Gardens* 9 (November 1930), 35.

34. Susman, " 'Personality' and Twentieth-Century Culture," in *Culture as History*, 277.

35. Ben Davis, "Individuality as the Decorator Sees It," *California Arts and Architecture* (March 1937), 19.

36. *Ibid.*, 40.

37. Post, "The Personality of a House," *Ladies' Home Journal* 46 (July 1929), 16.

38. Doris Suman, "Personality in the Small Home," *California Arts and Architecture* (July 1939), 17.

39. Isabel Hopkins, "Is There a Decorator in the House?" *House and Garden* 70 (October 1936), 58.

40. *Ibid.*, 58.

41. In American literature men's good taste and excessive interest in decoration had long signified a weak, suspicious character or foreshadowed downright villainy. Think, for example, of Gilbert Osmond's exquisite taste in Henry James's *The Portrait of a Lady* (1881). One trope of the hard-boiled genre is played out when detectives of the Hammett-Chandler school barely conceal their disgust at weak-chinned men in mauve dressing gowns, lounging amid the calculated clutter of art and bibelots. Most memorably, Arthur Geiger is engulfed by the excesses

of his interior in *The Big Sleep*. Monty is heterosexual, but he has a semi-incestuous affair with Veda, by now his stepdaughter, and eventually runs off with her. If Monty's social class were not enough to authenticate his good taste, then at least in the hard-boiled tradition, his perversion would be.

42. William Marling, *The American Roman Noir: Hammett, Cain, and Chandler* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), ix. The analysis of Cain includes *The Postman Always Rings Twice* and *Double Indemnity* but omits *Mildred Pierce*.

43. See Eli Zaretsky, *Capitalism, the Family, and Personal Life* (New York: Harper, 1976), 24.

44. Loss of status, embodied here in the transition from housewife to waitress, was a particular source of anxiety for the middle-class during the Depression. See Glen H. Elder, *Children of the Great Depression: Social Change in Life Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

45. In *The Woman Who Waits* (Boston: R.G. Badger, 1920), sociologist Frances Donovan discussed the identification of waitresses with loose women, which prevailed, according to Dorothy Sue Cobble, through much of the first half of the twentieth century. Cobble describes the efforts of state legislatures to ban tipping on democratic and moral grounds and relates assumptions about the waitress's sexual behavior to her significance as "part of the consumption exchange" (*Dishing It Out: Waitresses and Their Unions in the Twentieth Century* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991], 45).

46. See Susan Ware, *Holding Their Own: American Women in the 1930s* (Boston: Twayne, 1982), 21–53; Lynn Y. Weiner, *From Working Girl to Working Mother: The Female Labor Force in the United States, 1820–1980* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 100–110; and Peter G. Filene, *Him/Her/Self: Sex Roles in Modern America*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 148–61. In 1930 women made up 22 percent of the American workforce and 25 percent by 1940. Alice Kessler-Harris argues that despite various federal and state efforts to legislate against married women workers (particularly in the years 1931–32 and 1937–39) and more informal attempts to shame women in general back into the home, the 1930s accelerated the placement of women in the workforce but also affirmed their segregation into jobs according to sex. See *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 250–72. According to Nancy Cott, most apologists for working women in the Depression emphasized the difficult circumstances faced by many women and their families rather than a feminist agenda. See *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 180–211.

47. Margaret Collins, "Career, Limited," *Scribner's* 102 (October 1937), 45.

48. Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown in Transition* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937), 178.

49. Dorothy Sabin Butler, "Men against Women," *Forum* 94 (August 1935), 80, 82.

50. Charlotte Muret, "Marriage as a Career," *Harper's* 173 (August 1936), 253.



51. Butler, "Men against Women," 82. Butler argued that women had "emotional balance" that was destroyed when they found employment, but only because discrimination forced them to become like men to succeed. If men ceased to resist their presence in the workforce, women could function successfully both as workers and as "women." As consumers, women were also reputed to be hard, and the victims once again were men. Most famously, in Philip Wylie's hysterical attack, men as producers had "the ulcers and colitis," while women whose only worry was to spend the money men made had "the guts of a bear" (*Generation of Vipers* [1942; rpt., New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1946], 189).

52. Paula Rabinowitz, *Labor and Desire: Women's Revolutionary Fiction in Depression America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 37.

53. Review of *Mildred Pierce*, *Sacramento Bee* (November 22, 1941), from the *Mildred Pierce* clippings file, James M. Cain papers, Library of Congress.

54. On domestic science literature, see chap. 2, n. 37.

55. Leonard Reaume, "Fine Points about Subdividing," *Los Angeles Realtor* (May 1929), 10. A. K. Moore, "Subdividers to Sell Must Build," *National Real Estate Journal* (May 1929), 21–28, dates the first uses of model homes to 1921–22.

56. It might seem reasonable to assume that Cain wants to blame Veda's ambition and monstrous selfishness on Mildred. If she had never gone into business but had stayed home and taken care of her, Veda would have turned out all right. (This is the point that feminist film critics have made about the 1945 Warner Bros. movie.) But the novel refuses to blame Mildred for Veda's character and conduct. The genetic account of Veda's nasty disposition has to do with her career rather than with Mildred's. In a preposterous twist, Veda is discovered and becomes rich and famous as a coloratura soprano. Her Italian music teacher, Mr. Treviso, explains to Mildred that her daughter's nature is a function of her musical talent: "Dees girl, she is coloratura, inside, outside, all over, even a bones is coloratura. First, must know all a rich pipples. No rich, no good. . . . All coloratura, they got, 'ow you say?—da *gimmies*. Always take, never give. . . . I tell you, is snake, is bitch, is coloratura" (250, 253). Because Veda was a coloratura before she ever sang a note, her temperament is as natural as her voice. Mildred doesn't quite get it: "'She's a wonderful girl.' 'No—is a wonderful singer. . . . Da girl is lousy. She is a bitch'" (252). Even if this explanation is a bit thin, it is worth noting that of the dozens of reviews of *Mildred Pierce* in the James M. Cain papers at the Library of Congress, not one blames Mildred or her career for her daughter's nasty disposition.

57. See David Laidler, *Fabricating the Keynesian Revolution: Studies of the Inter-War Literature on Money, the Cycle, and Unemployment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), esp. 206–12; 225–28, for an overview of American and British economists' opinions on underconsumption as an explanatory model of economic crisis.

58. *Mildred Pierce* resembles *Imitation of Life* (1933), Fannie Hurst's tale of a widow who builds an international restaurant empire based in Manhattan, but really wants only to create a suburban home for her daughter. As Lauren Berlant has pointed out in an essay on Hurst's novel and the films it inspired, Bea Pullman's entrance into the labor market and success in business requires an evolving



process of white female disembodiment and abstraction. First, as B. Pullman, she hides behind her husband's ambiguous professional identity to carry on his work after he dies. Later, she exploits the profound overembodiment of the enormous Delilah Johnson, a Mammy figure who enters Bea's private service, but offers up a good waffle recipe and, more importantly, her powerful image to become "the prosthetic public body" of the Pullman corporation and the white woman who runs it ("National Brands/National Body: *Imitation of Life*," in *Comparative American Identities: Race, Sex, and Nationality in the Modern Text*, ed. Hortense J. Spillers [New York: Routledge, 1991], 119). Mildred Pierce, Inc., by contrast, insists upon an intimate link between female entrepreneur and capitalist public sphere. As Mildred Pierce, Inc., the woman who sells the consolations of home cannily exploits cultural assumptions about gender to authenticate her product.

59. Cited in Madden, *Tough Guy Writers of the Thirties*, xx.

60. Bethany Ogden, "Hard-Boiled Ideology," *Critical Quarterly* 34 (Spring 1992), 75.

61. Edmund Wilson, *The Boys in the Back Room: Notes on California Novelists* (San Francisco: Colt Press, 1941), 11.

62. Harold Strauss, "A Six-Minute Egg," *New York Times Book Review* (February 18, 1937), 8.

63. David Geherin, *The American Private Eye: The Image in Fiction* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1985), 22. Even when a masculine protagonist of hard-boiled fiction is seen to register the "temptations of what a patriarchal-oedipal culture encodes as the feminine—sensation, disorder, and play—" in Fred Pfeil's reading of Philip Marlowe in *The Big Sleep*, the character opens himself to everything *but* emotion: Chandler, like Dashiell Hammett, refuses "to ascribe any affective or emotional response directly to their heroes, who presumably both go on functioning without feeling" (*White Guys: Studies in Postmodern Domination and Difference* [London: Verso, 1995], 116).

64. Joyce Carol Oates makes a version of this point when she suggests that an overwritten passage of *Postman*, in which Frank describes kissing Cora as "like being in church," is an example of Cain's craftsmanship: "This is precisely what Frank Chambers would think and he would express it in just that way, knowing none of the uses of rhetoric or the ways by which conceits of passionate and spiritual love are devised" ("Man under Sentence of Death: The Novels of James M. Cain," in Madden, *Tough Guy Writers*, 118). In other words, the passage exemplifies Frank's faulty writing and sentiment, not Cain's.

65. The slogan comes from an advertisement for the novel that appeared in the *New York Times Book Review* (September 25, 1941), 23.

#### CHAPTER FOUR

##### NATIVE SON'S TRESPASSES

1. "Watching Jungle Gangsters Fight and Feast," *Literary Digest* 108 (March 7, 1931), 32. On the making of *Tarzan the Ape Man* and Burroughs's response to the Weissmuller series, see Glenn Essoe, *Tarzan of the Movies* (Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel, 1968). Page references to *Native Son* are from Richard Wright, *Native Son* (New York: Harper, 1966).

2. Mass culture represents for Bigger an idealized coordination of “self-abstraction and self-realization,” tendencies that Michael Warner has defined as the acute contradictions of the contemporary public sphere (“The Mass Public and the Mass Subject,” in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun [Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992], 399). At issue in most debates about the public sphere are the possibility and terms of equal access or “participatory parity,” and not the benefits of participation, which are typically interrogated in relation to mass culture (Nancy Fraser, “Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy,” in Calhoun, *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, 122). The term *mass culture* has fallen somewhat out of favor, in part because it implies, in the Frankfurt School tradition, something one does not participate in but is manipulated by, or it at the least posits undifferentiated consumers who passively respond to its products in the same way. *Popular culture* is imagined to describe a more productive relationship between product and consumer and among consumers; according to Thomas Strychacz, it “provides a real, lived, and shared sense of being-in-the-world” (*Modernism, Mass Culture, and Professionalism* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993], 10). For Bigger, movies, newspapers, and magazines identify only other people’s actual experience of “being-in-the-world” and never his own. Even when Bigger picks up the newspaper and reads all about himself, the effect is to provide further evidence of his isolation. For example, the phrase “sex crime” “excluded him utterly from the world” (228); its power to do so derives from his preexisting exclusion. Lauren Berlant has recently denounced the sentimental lure of mass culture, which binds citizens to the nation through “pain alliances” and tricks them into identifying public and political problems as private and personal traumas (“Poor Eliza,” *American Literature* 70 [September 1998], 636). In *Native Son*, mass culture does not appease or derail but rather stimulates Bigger’s desire for citizenship in a public world, while also dramatizing its own inevitable failure to fulfill that fantasy. As a newspaper headline, Bigger’s story underscores the political effects and possibilities behind what seem to be his private desires.

3. St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City* (1945; rpt., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 12, 602.

4. Bigger’s formulation implies the substitutability of the languages of geography and of race, as Samira Kawash recently argues about the logic of racial boundaries: the power of the color line not only to enforce but to create racial difference. See *Dislocating the Color Line: Identity, Hybridity, and Singularity in African-American Literature* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997), 1–22.

5. Wright, “How Bigger Was Born” (1940), rpt. in *Native Son*, xvi.

6. James Baldwin, “Many Thousands Gone,” in *Notes of a Native Son* (Boston: Beacon, 1955), 41. Ross Pudaloff argues that Bigger can understand himself and his world only through the lens of mass culture, but Pudaloff wrongly treats mass culture as an end in itself. See “Celebrity as Identity: Richard Wright, *Native Son*, and Mass Culture,” *Studies in American Fiction* 11 (Spring 1983), 3–18. Charles Scruggs claims that mass culture mediates and, in effect, distorts (rather than illuminates) Bigger’s desire for community and his conception of the “ideal city” (*Sweet Home*, 92). Critics have also seized upon Wright’s misogyny, which

is linked to the brutal rape and murder of Bigger's girlfriend, Bessie Mears, and the negative depiction of women as resigned and passive enforcers of the white status quo. See, for example, Trudier Harris, "Native Sons and Foreign Daughters," in *New Essays on "Native Son,"* ed. Kenneth Kinnamon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 63–84; and Alan France, "Misogyny and Appropriation in Wright's *Native Son*," *Modern Fiction Studies* 34 (Autumn 1988), 413–23. On the construction of Hurston as an alternative to Wright, see Carla Cappetti, *Writing Chicago: Modernism, Ethnography, and the Novel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), chap. 8.

7. Houston A. Baker Jr., *Long Black Song: Essays in Black American Literature and Culture* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972), 133; Baker, "Richard Wright and the Dynamics of Place in Afro-American Literature," in Kinnamon, *New Essays on "Native Son,"* 111. In the latter essay Baker draws upon the work of cultural geographer Yi-Fu Tuan to argue that the "security and stability" associated with the comforting boundaries of "place" are undone when segregation renders those boundaries meaningless with respect to the inhabitants' "human agency" (87). According to Baker, in Wright's *12 Million Black Voices* (1941) the fact of "placelessness" (92) generates "a distinctive folk culture" (93) in the South, but as in *Native Son*, the North gives rise only to an interracial network of class interests that excludes black women, who are dismissed as the "ahistorical remnant of folk culture" (101). Thus Wright's misogyny is also the vehicle for his devaluation of black culture. By contrast, Caren Irr argues that *Native Son* associates "confining spaces" in the city with folk culture, and that Wright "struggle[s] to reclaim" "the space of African American culture" by acting as a literary mediator between it and communism (*The Suburb of Dissent: Cultural Politics in the United States and Canada during the 1930s* [Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998], 131, 129). Like Baker, even when Irr deals with concrete places in the novel, the discussion of space is abstract and important primarily as a way of talking about culture, by which it is finally replaced: "urban culture . . . is a social formation more recognizable by its linguistic practice than its location" (132).

8. "How Bigger Was Born," xi, xxi, xix. The critique of structuralism is prevalent among more recent critics but not universal. Scruggs notes that to expect Wright to depict Bigger's girlfriend, Bessie Mears, "as an empowered black woman, or as a woman connected to a vital black community, is to ignore Wright's judgment about the effects of a racist social structure on relations between Afro-American women and men" (*Sweet Home*, 257n). George Kent acknowledges the limitations of Wright's position while crediting him with moving toward the end of pure structuralism; Wright's assaults on "white definitions" enabled "our growing ability to ignore them" (*Blackness and the Adventure of Western Culture* [Chicago: Third World Press, 1972], 80).

9. See Cappetti, *Writing Chicago*, esp. chap. 9.

10. Cappetti is especially interesting on the reciprocities between Chicago sociology and literature. Sociologists drew upon the work of such urban novelists as Theodore Dreiser and Emile Zola, as well as Wright; Wright, Nelson Algren, and James T. Farrell were influenced by sociological theories of urbanization and community studies. *Native Son* broadly established Wright's credentials as a sociologi-

cal writer. Bigger was soon invoked as a new “type” in studies of racism and its effects by sociologists and anthropologists such as Gunnar Myrdal (*An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem in Modern Democracy* [New York: Harper, 1944]) and Hortense Powdermaker (“The Channeling of Negro Aggression by the Cultural Process,” *American Journal of Sociology* 48 [May 1943], 750–58). Wright wrote the introduction to Drake and Cayton’s classic sociology of African Americans in Chicago, *Black Metropolis*, in which he illuminated the connections between his methodology and conclusions in *Native Son* and the sociologists’. Wright’s readings in sociology, his tutorial with Louis Wirth, a prominent sociologist at the University of Chicago, and his friendship with Cayton also contributed to his own impressionistic historical-sociological study, *12 Million Black Voices: A Folk History of the Negro in the United States* (1941; rpt., New York: Arno, 1969).

11. “Iron Ring in Housing,” *Crisis* (July 1940), 205.
12. Arnold R. Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940–1960* (1983; rpt., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 52.
13. Nelson Algren, “Remembering Richard Wright,” in *Twentieth-Century Interpretations of “Native Son”: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Houston A. Baker, Jr. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 115.
14. Robert Bone describes a black literary Renaissance in Chicago of the thirties, anchored by Wright, that rivaled the significance of Harlem’s in “Richard Wright and the Chicago Renaissance,” *Calalo* 9 (Fall–Winter 1986), 446–68.
15. Sidney H. Bremer, “Home in Harlem, New York: Lessons from the Harlem Renaissance Writers,” *PMLA* 105 (January 1990), 47; Ann Douglas, *Terrible Honesty*, 312. Baker stresses the international and transtemporal force of the Harlem community in *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989). See also Donald B. Gibson’s euphoric description in “The Harlem Renaissance City: It’s Multi-Illusionary Dimension,” in *The City in African-American Literature*, ed. Yoshinobu Hakutani and Robert Butler (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1995), 37–49.
16. Alain Locke, “The New Negro,” in *The New Negro*, ed. Locke (1925; rpt., New York: Atheneum, 1992), 4. See Scruggs, *Sweet Home*, 54–58.
17. E. Franklin Frazier, “La Bourgeoisie Noire,” 78. The title suggests how foreign the notion of a black middle class would be to many of his white readers. Frazier also contributed an article on the black middle class of Durham to *The New Negro*, and his sociologies of black family life likewise emphasize class differentiation. See *The Negro Family in Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932); and *The Negro Family in the United States* (1939; rpt., rev. and abridg., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966). Mary Esteve notes that African Americans have historically undergone “a sort of compulsory anonymity” as members of a race rather than individuals, and in the Harlem Renaissance it was specifically the undifferentiated (i.e., working-class) masses rather than the race per se that were unassimilable to the rhetoric of individuality (“Nella Larsen’s ‘Moving Mosaic’: Harlem, Crowds, and Anonymity,” *American Literary History* 9 [Summer 1997], 270). Citing Johnson’s “Harlem: The Culture Capital,” she observes that “the assertion of black individuality” was equated with “the emergence of a middle class” (271).

18. David Levering Lewis refers to statistics including the census and medical data to argue that “the evidence that Harlem was becoming a slum, even as Charles Johnson and Alain Locke arranged the coming-out party of the arts, is persuasive” (*When Harlem Was in Vogue*, 108). Whereas James Weldon Johnson claimed that “Negro Harlem is practically owned by Negroes” (308), Lewis notes that whites owned over 80 percent of its wealth (109).

19. Claude McKay, “‘Segregation’ in Harlem?” *Column Review* (December 1941), 5.

20. Barbara Johnson, “The Re[a]d and the Black,” in *Richard Wright’s “Native Son,”* ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea, 1988), 115. See Wright, “Blueprint for Negro Writing,” *New Challenge* 2 (Fall 1937), 53–65.

21. It is not the case, as Trudier Harris has argued, that Wright blames black women for Bigger’s problems. Although “the pressure of family life . . . is one of the motivating factors in Bigger’s later behavior” (65), Wright faults overcrowding and its toll upon natural bonds of affection rather than blaming the family. Harris is right to observe that Wright cannot envision black women actively protesting their oppression; whether through alcohol or the church, they simply resign themselves to it. Discontent, in the active, political sense, is the prerogative of men, as Baker likewise notes in “The Dynamics of Place.”

22. Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States*, 326–27. Five years later Gunnar Myrdal mobilized the metaphors of walls and prisons to describe the fact and effects of discrimination throughout *An American Dilemma*.

23. See “The Iron Ring in Housing,” 205, 210. Loren Miller, a celebrated Los Angeles attorney who argued cases against racial segregation, also invoked the “iron ring” (15) in Bernard Sheil and Miller, *Racial Restrictive Covenants* (Chicago, 1946). Drake and Cayton similarly used “iron bands” (*Black Metropolis*, 714) to describe the barriers around the Black Belt.

24. See Drake and Cayton, *Black Metropolis*, 576–77. Both sociologists and later historians note that there was less segregation in housing, public facilities, and business establishments in Chicago before World War I, but racial tensions and restrictions mounted as large numbers of black migrants from the South came to Chicago during and after the war. See William Tuttle, *Race Riot: Chicago in the Red Summer of 1919* (New York: Atheneum, 1972); and Allan H. Spear, *Black Chicago: The Making of the Negro Ghetto, 1890–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967). The African American population in Chicago more than doubled between 1910 and 1920, from 44,103 to 109,458, and again between 1920 and 1930, when it increased to 233,903. During the Depression the black population increased by another 20 percent. As boundaries hardened at the time of the race riots of 1919, according to Drake and Cayton, “[t]he sudden influx of Negroes into Chicago immediately resolved itself into a struggle for living space” (*Black Metropolis*, 61).

25. Ernest W. Burgess, “The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project,” in Park, Burgess, and McKenzie, *The City*, 47–62.

26. In effect, Burgess’s geographical narrative of race and ethnicity in the city mapped the social theory of race relations provided by his colleague Robert Park. Park posited a universal race relations cycle: two races (or ethnic groups) establish contact, through migration or colonization; contact produces conflict as they com-

pete for resources. Conflict yields to accommodation, or social equilibrium, in a stable, if unequal, social order. Finally there is assimilation, the cultural and physical merging of the races. See the essays collected in Park, *Race and Culture* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950). For a concise summary and critique of Park's theories and field studies of race relations, see Stanford M. Lyman, *The Black American in Sociological Thought: A Failure in Perspective* (New York: Capricorn, 1973), 27–70.

It is important to stress that disorganization was not intrinsically pathological for Chicago school sociologists. It signified a process of adjustment to new conditions that led many to reorganization—house ownership, financial security, a stable family structure—and individual, family, and collective health. See Anthony M. Platt, *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1991), esp. 137–44.

27. Ernest W. Burgess, “Residential Segregation in American Cities,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 140 (November 1928), 105.

28. See Louis Wirth, *The Ghetto* (1928; rpt., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956). Wirth noted that more than other white ethnics in Chicago, Jews who left the area of original Jewish settlement and moved into areas less defined by ethnic or religious ties continued to cherish it as a symbol of Jewish community life. Recent work suggests that suburban house ownership in the post–World War II period helped Jews and other Southern and Eastern Europeans to gain acceptance as “whites” within the American mainstream. See Karen Brodtkin, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1998). George Lipsitz writes in a similar vein: “The suburbs helped turn Euro-Americans into ‘whites’ who could live near each other and intermarry with relatively little difficulty” (*The Possessive Investment in Whiteness*, 7). In *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), Elizabeth Cohen implicitly argues against the Chicago school model when she points out that white ethnic workers in Chicago between the wars did not abandon their communities when they first moved from the old immigrant neighborhoods, but brought their institutions, shops, and services with them. In *The Changing Face of Inequality*, Olivier Zunz insists that Detroit did not follow the Chicago school's model of spatial assimilation. See 41–47. Their cases are convincing, but I am less interested in the accuracy of the sociological model than in its pervasiveness, and its influence on Wright's thinking about the racial geography of the modern metropolis.

29. See also Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States*, where he argues with Burgess that black housing patterns followed those of “other racial and cultural groups” (233).

30. Cayton, “Negro Housing in Chicago,” *Social Action* 6 (April 15, 1940), 6. In “Struggle for the Suburban Dream,” James Andrew Wiese examines the evolution of African American suburbs and their meaning for the people who lived there. Before World War II, northern black suburbs were not enclaves of the affluent but of working-class families, such as the section inhabited by domestic workers in Evanston, or the industrial suburbs outside Detroit, or the communi-



ties that developed on the periphery of cities where rural migrants could find small-scale farming opportunities. By 1955, black movement to the suburb became more like white, that is, a middle-class rather than a largely working-class phenomenon, but only in the 1960s did the income of black suburbanites equal the income of black city dwellers. Wiese persuasively argues that despite the poverty of most of these suburbs before World War II, the African Americans who moved there generally did so for the same reason that affluent white people moved to suburbs: to find a better life. Wiese notes that among historians these suburbs have traditionally not counted, and that to deny that black communities are suburban because they are not white and middle class “is to deny that poor and black residents of the United States are capable of creating something which is both fully their own and fully American” (50). This may be partly true, but he ignores that American historians of the last two decades have hardly celebrated the suburb’s self-determination and the equation between house ownership and American-ness. And given the hostility that the suburb has generated among intellectuals, not regarding these communities as suburban is also to do them a kind of service.

31. Drake and Cayton calculated that by 1930, 75 percent of all residential property in the city was covered by legal agreements between property owners not to sell or rent to African Americans in white neighborhoods. “Iron Ring of Housing” estimated the number at 80 percent in 1940.

32. See also Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto*, esp. chap. 1.

33. Wright, “The Negro and Parkway Community House” (Chicago, 1941), unpaginated. Cayton was the community center’s director. See also *12 Million Black Voices*, 100–104.

34. Theodore Dreiser, *Jennie Gerhardt* (1911; rpt., Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 257. The unexpurgated edition of the novel, from which the passage is taken, dwells far more on the pretensions and social climbing of Jennie’s neighbors than did the edition brought out by Harpers in 1911.

35. Henry Connor, “Your Neighborhood: Kenwood,” *Chicago Tribune*, December 24, 1939, 5-M. The Kenwood article is unique in a series called “Your Neighborhood” that ran in the *Tribune* during 1939–40. The articles touted the residential charms of a variety of Chicago communities, from exclusive suburbs such as Beverly to working- and lower-middle-class areas such as Auburn Park. Where communities experienced some form of white ethnic conflict, the articles inevitably applauded the ability of different groups to “live in harmony” (Carl W. Larsen, “Your Neighborhood: Lawndale,” July 30, 1939, 7-M). By contrast, the black-white racial tensions in Kenwood are represented as irresolvable unless the barriers that separate it from the Black Belt are maintained. Connor described the strategy of Alderman Abraham Cohen to persuade white owners of property across the line “to improve and modernize” it. By making “the Negro section itself a better place to live,” the landlords might keep black people from “moving into their community.” The purpose of these articles, to advertise the attractions of Chicago and keep people from moving out of the city, is evident when they are considered alongside another *Tribune* series in 1939 on towns and suburbs outside Chicago’s municipal boundaries, which were uniformly disparaged by the reporters. See the Western Suburbs clippings file, *Chicago Tribune*, Chicago Historical Society (CHS).

36. Eleanor Graff, "Hyde Park Once Rustic Retreat for City Elite" *Chicago Tribune*, July 7, 1929, unpaginated photocopy, Hyde Park clippings file, CHS. The now separate communities of Kenwood, Oakland, and Hyde Park formerly constituted the village of Hyde Park, which was annexed to Chicago in 1889 as part of a much larger territorial increase on the South Side that extended to the blue-collar communities of South Chicago and Pullman. According to an article written for the fiftieth anniversary of the annexation, a large majority of Hyde Park residents voted against joining Chicago, but the "sweating, beer-drinking immigrants" in the more densely populated, working-class townships voted so overwhelmingly in favor that an absolute majority for annexation was achieved among all residents in the disputed territory. See Elinor Shlifer, "The Annexation," *Hyde Park Herald*, July 27, 1939, 3.

37. Louis Wirth and Margaret Furez, eds., *Local Community Fact Book* (Chicago, 1939), Kenwood entry, unpaginated. By 1918, the Kenwood and Hyde Park Property Owners' Association had shifted its attention from civic improvements such as better streets and lighting to the mission to "make Hyde Park white" (Spear, *Black Chicago*, 210).

38. Robert Park, "The City," in Park, Burgess, and McKenzie, *The City*, 16–17. Park's mentor was Georg Simmel, who influentially theorized about the relation between money and the city in "The Metropolis and Mental Life."

39. See especially Park, "The City," 1–46; and Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology* 44 (July 1938), 1–24.

40. Wright, *American Hunger* (1977; rpt., New York: Harper, 1983), 3; Ralph Ellison, *Invisible Man* (1952; rpt., New York: Vintage, 1989), 158.

41. In *An American Dilemma* Myrdal was particularly struck by the willingness of white Americans to hold absolutely inconsistent beliefs to defend their advantages. He also remarked that he had "heard few comments made so frequently and with so much emphasis and so many illustrations as the one that 'Negroes are happiest among themselves' and that 'Negroes really don't want white company but prefer to be among their own race' " (575).

42. Robyn Wiegman, *American Anatomies: Theorizing Race and Gender* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1995), 103.

43. On the "debilitating" "protection" of the color line's "invisible walls," see Kenneth B. Clark, *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power* (New York: Harper, 1965), 19.

44. No Man's Land is aligned with what Paul Gilroy calls "the space between" national and racial identities, which racist thinking has declared to be mutually exclusive in relation to black Europeans (*The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993], 1). On Wright's own ambitious intellectual project to enlarge his identifications and "achieve the deracinated freedom of modernity," see Ross Posnock, *Color and Culture: Black Writers and the Making of the Modern Intellectual* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 64.

45. In one scene twelve people, including his family, friends, and the Daltons, impossibly meet in Bigger's cell, his privacy more compromised by overcrowding than ever before. But by the end of the novel, Bigger is more the master of his limited domain. For example, he tells his family to stay away, and they do. He

also stops the visits of a black preacher and makes a white priest “stand away from him” (382).

46. Barbara Foley’s reading of the end focuses on Bigger’s “I am” as an exclusive commitment to individual identity at the expense of a developed political consciousness. See *Radical Representations: Politics and Form in United States Proletarian Fiction, 1929–1941* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1993), 334. But Bigger’s actual commitments are more complex. He sees himself as an autonomous *and* integral part of the human community, an identification that may achieve productive political effects when we see him addressing Max and a rehabilitated Jan, but is intolerable when it lets Dalton off the hook.

47. Wright, “How Jim Crow Feels,” *Negro Digest* (January 1947), 53.

48. See Wright to Gertrude Stein (March 15, 1946), James Weldon Johnson Collection, Beinecke Library, Yale University. I have had to paraphrase the letter and the essay, “I Choose Exile,” below, because I was unable to get permission from the Wright estate to cite these materials.

49. See Michel Fabre, *The Unfinished Quest of Richard Wright*, 2nd ed. (1973; rpt., Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 275–76; Constance Webb, *Richard Wright: A Biography* (New York: Putnam’s, 1968), 239; and Gayle Addison, *Richard Wright: Ordeal of a Native Son* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980), 175–76. The substance of the story is the same in all three accounts, although details vary.

50. Lorraine Hansberry, *A Raisin in the Sun* (New York: Random House, 1959), 77. Not all kitchenette operators were white; the playwright’s father, Carl Hansberry, made a small fortune converting larger Black Belt flats into single-room units. In 1938 he tried to escape the overcrowding and deterioration that his housing practices had helped to bring about by moving to Washington Park, but the family was evicted by the State Supreme Court, who ruled that the property was covered by a restrictive covenant prohibiting nonwhite residence. The case, *Hansberry v. Lee*, went to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled in favor of Hansberry’s right to occupy the house but did not decide to ban restrictive covenants altogether. The “Iron Ring of Housing” article is about the Hansberry case. See Anne Cheney, *Lorraine Hansberry* (Boston: Twayne, 1984).

In the play, Lena Younger uses part of a \$10,000 insurance check she receives after her husband’s death to place a down payment on a house in Clybourne Park, a fictional neighborhood in or near Chicago. Walter Lee Younger, Lena’s son, is a chauffeur, like Bigger, but he has a concrete “dream” (80) of entrepreneurship, which is defeated after he steals what is left of Lena’s insurance money for a business venture and his partner runs off with it. The climax of the play comes when Walter decides to recover the down payment for the house plus the bonus offered by the neighborhood association, but at the last minute changes his mind, and the play ends with Lena’s proud reflection that Walter has “come into his manhood” (130). The “home” as such is important only to the Younger women; the house matters to Walter because it grounds a masculine identity that ultimately doesn’t differentiate between forms of property ownership, businesses or residences. Bigger’s actions are by contrast explicitly linked to his powerful desire to “feel at home” (329), which is gendered male, insofar as it is expressed through the direct

challenge to one's place that *Native Son* imagines black women to be incapable of making.

51. See Wright, "I Choose Exile," undated essay, James Weldon Johnson Collection, Beinecke Library, Yale University.

52. Fabre puts the house in Vermont, while "I Choose Exile" locates it in Connecticut, a state that suggests a more immediate commuting distance to New York.

53. *Conversations with James Baldwin*, ed. Fred L. Standley and Louis H. Pratt (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1989), 15.

54. Cited in Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 241.

55. Julia Abrahamson, *A Neighborhood Finds Itself* (New York: Harper, 1959), 246, 321. Abrahamson was on the board of directors of the Hyde Park–Kenwood Community Conference, which formed in the late forties to control deterioration and helped to plan the clearance and redevelopment of the area between 53rd and 57th, Woodlawn to Lake Park in the 1950s. Hyde Park–Kenwood was the first community in which the land clearance powers of a public agency were directed to a neighborhood that was still largely in good shape. Although one-third of the families displaced by the clearance program qualified for public housing, virtually all of the rebuilt housing was designed for middle-income families. Under pressure from a Catholic group, the plan was finally amended to include 120 scattered-site public housing units, but only twelve family units for the poor (excluding accommodations for the elderly) were ever built. Its interracial ambition meant that whites were strongly encouraged to move into blocks and particular apartment buildings that housed African Americans, but there was no effort to move black people into blocks that were inhabited mainly by whites. See also Devereux Bowly, Jr., *The Poorhouse: Subsidized Housing in Chicago, 1895–1976* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978), and Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto*, 135–70. Hirsch is particularly interesting on the role of the University of Chicago in the redevelopment. He argues that the part played by the Community Conference was in fact quite limited; the university was the power behind the plan and used urban renewal "to restructure and control its neighborhood" (137). On the changing social and economic landscape of the African American South Side and environs during the period, see also Nicholas Lemann, *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America* (New York: Knopf, 1991).

56. Ruth Moore, "New Kind of Urban Living Will Appear in Hyde Park," *Chicago Sun-Times*, January 27, 1957; Dale Pontins, letter to the editor, *Chicago Daily News*, March 22, 1958, both Hyde Park clippings file, CHS.

57. Keith Wheeler, *Peaceable Lane* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), 126.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SANCTIMONIOUS SUBURBANITES AND THE POSTWAR NOVEL

1. Sloan Wilson, *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), 3.

2. Steven M. Gelber describes house maintenance projects in the fifties, "a virtual obligation for the suburban homeowner," as an antidote to the erosion of

masculinity in the white-collar workplace (“Do-It-Yourself: Constructing, Repairing and Maintaining Domestic Masculinity,” *American Quarterly* 49 [March 1997], 89). In the passage, Betsy’s failure to fix it herself is almost as telling as Tom’s, and the emphasis on the lack of money as well as talent suggests that the problem is more one of the family’s social status than of Tom’s masculine identity. In the sixties Albert Roland examined the home improvement craze in light of David Riesman’s theory of “other-directed” social character and concluded that it was “predominantly a social phenomenon focusing on relationships among people, not between the craftsman and his materials” (“Do-It-Yourself: A Walden for the Millions?” in *The American Culture: Approaches to the Study of the United States*, ed. Hennig Cohen [New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1968], 277, 280). See David Riesman, with Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denney, *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character* (1950; rpt., New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961). Read together, these essays say as much about the interpretive frameworks of their times as they do about Do-It-Yourself.

3. “The costliness in time and money of movement to and from the city, the economy of the multifamily type of urban dwelling and the greater availability for the poor of low rental housing in the extensive deteriorated areas of cities put the advantages of suburban life beyond the economic reach of the majority. Choice of residence as between city and suburb is virtually limited to the most highly paid types of labor and to the upper middle classes” (H. Paul Douglass, “Suburbs,” *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* [New York: Macmillan, 1934], 434).

4. On Levitt and Sons and Levittown, see Herbert J. Gans, *The Levittowners*, 3–21. The Levitts ultimately built more than 140,000 houses in the United States and helped to transform the construction industry from small-scale enterprises to a mass manufacturing process. Part of their genius as developers was in depersonalizing the labor that went into the house, through a human assembly line of carpenters, electricians, and painters, who moved from lot to lot, rather than the houses themselves.

5. The increase in single-family house ownership from 1946 to 1956 surpassed the increase of the preceding 150 years; by 1960, 31 of 44 million American families owned their own house. In 1950, the suburban growth rate was ten times that of central cities, and by 1955, subdivisions accounted for more than 75 percent of new housing in metropolitan areas, the majority of which was constructed by only 10 percent of the firms. See Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Never Were*, 24–25; Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 238, 233; and Peter Rowe, *Making a Middle Landscape* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991), 3–4. The federal government underwrote suburbanization through the veterans’ mortgage guarantee program (created in 1944 as part of the GI Bill of Rights package) and the Housing Act of 1949, which offered builders and bankers substantial financial incentives to undertake large residential developments. Government lending practices meanwhile discouraged building and renovation in city neighborhoods, leaving even financially well off African Americans, who were still discriminated against in the suburbs, with a deteriorating housing stock. See Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 203–18, 231–45; and Wright, *Building the Dream*, 240–61, for analyses of postwar changes in house construction, housing policy, and ownership.

6. Lewis Mumford, *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (New York: Harcourt, 1961), 486; Scott Donaldson, *The Suburban Myth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), 60. In 1958 Gans moved to the New Jersey Levittown precisely to test the unexamined assumption among intellectuals and the media that the postwar suburb was creating “a new set of Americans, as mass produced as the houses they live in” (xv–xvi). He found that what critics called “conformity” was a way of coping with social heterogeneity and potential class conflict in a community whose residents ranged from skilled workers at the peak of earning power to young executives and professionals at the beginning of their careers.

7. William H. Whyte Jr., “The Transients,” *Fortune* 47 (May 1953), 113, first ellipses mine. Unless otherwise noted, further quotations of Whyte are from *The Organization Man* (New York: Anchor, 1957).

8. Frederick Allen, *The Big Change: America Transforms Itself, 1900–1950* (New York: Harper, 1952), 112, 213. George Lipsitz has found that “a well-integrated capitalism” indeed replaced “the primacy of production” with “the primacy of consumption” among postwar workers; class consciousness migrated from their identities as laborers to their identities as consumers, through which they appropriated, remade, and created a new social context for mass-marketed commodities (*Rainbow at Midnight: Labor and Culture in the 1940s* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994], 264, 265).

9. Nelson Algren, *Men in Boots* (1935; rpt., New York: Thunder’s Mouth, 1987), 103.

10. Max Shulman, *Rally Round the Flag, Boys!* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1954), 23; Charles Mergendahl, *It’s Only Temporary* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1950), 56. John and Mary Drone are the protagonists of John Keats, *The Crack in the Picture Window* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957), a satiric portrait of development life that combines sociological observations on community composition, statistics on the economics and politics of suburbanization, and a fictional portrait of the Drone family. David Karp, *Leave Me Alone* (New York: Knopf, 1957) begins each chapter with an epigraph from a clumsy, jargon-filled, fictional sociology about the new conformists of the suburbs, which the novel then dramatizes. The situation of more serious literary fiction is different; for example, John Cheever is so committed to not defining a typical suburbanite that the inhabitants become almost monotonous because each is so glaringly unique. See “*The Housebreaker of Shady Hill*” and *Other Stories* (New York: Harper, 1953). A. C. Spector’s *The Exurbanites* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1955) is a sociology that experiments with impressionistic prose, interspersing the examination of particular enclaves on the periphery of metropolitan areas with vignettes about fictional housewives and their husbands. It echoes *It’s Only Temporary*’s loose technique of recording a random number of people engaged in the same activity, such as a story that was told 190 times on a particular Friday night (192). Spector’s use of the word *exurban* to describe the postwar decentralization of affluent culture workers in New York suggests the extent to which the word *suburb* had been tainted by the rise of new developments and inhabitants. Gans noted in the preface to *The Levittowners* that sociology was a maligned discipline for being at once too technical and impersonal (in the Talcott Parsons tradition) and



for “usurping the novelist’s function” (xv). Women’s postwar literature about the suburb followed a different course. Popular “housewife writers” such as Jean Kerr, Shirley Jackson (when she was not tackling gothic fiction), and Margaret Halsey published humorous accounts of their own lives as homemakers. Whereas much of the fiction by men sought to create a typical portrait of suburban life, semi-autobiographical texts by women who were also paid writers of national renown were by definition strikingly anomalous. On women’s writing about the suburbs, see Nancy Walker, “Humor and Gender Roles: the ‘Funny’ Feminism of the Post–World War II Suburbs,” *American Quarterly* 37 (Spring 1985), 98–113.

11. C. Wright Mills, *White Collar*, 74.

12. There is a certain affinity between Whyte’s account of the organization man and Christopher Newfield’s reading of Emersonian liberalism, a creed that articulates the collapse of both individual autonomy and public (democratic) control and insists that one’s freedom is enhanced rather than sacrificed by their loss. See *The Emerson Effect: Individualism and Submission in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996). Newfield argues that Emerson’s particular contribution to a prevailing American liberal discourse was to generate the appropriate affective response; he “develops the political sensibility” that makes private and public submission to an abstract “law” of “unity and inclusion” (38) “feel OK” (4). *The Organization Man* similarly describes a level of organizational fealty that subsumes the individual to the group but simultaneously “converts what would seem in other times a bill of no rights into a restatement of individualism” (6). Whyte also asserts that his most important discovery about the organization is the emergence of a “Social Ethic,” which not only allows submission or “belonging” to “feel OK” but guides people with the force of a moral imperative: “it is right to be that way” (439). In contrast with Newfield, Whyte is concerned more about the fate of the individual than about the political effects of the new allegiances, but he imagines a quasi-political alternative to the organization in an ideal balance between “the individual’s rights against society” and “the individual’s obligations to society” (443).

13. Riesman, “The Suburban Dislocation,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 314 (Fall 1957), 142, 144. In *The Lonely Crowd*, Riesman argued for satisfying leisure as a solution to meaningless work but rejected that position in “The Suburban Dislocation” and in the preface to the 1961 edition of *Lonely Crowd*: “we soon realized that the burden put on leisure itself cannot rescue work, but fails with it, and can only be meaningful for most men if work is meaningful” (xlv).

14. Roy Lewis and Rosemary Stewart, *The Managers: A New Examination of the English, German, and American Executive* (1958; rpt., New York: Mentor, 1961), 122. Historians have commonly talked of the fifties suburb as a comparatively stable refuge for men and have generated forceful arguments about the political and personal ramifications of suburbanization and the gender inequities it has entailed. See Tyler May, *Homeward Bound*; Hayden, *Redesigning the American Dream*; and Clark, *The American Family Home*. Christopher Lasch argues that the American house as isolated refuge “came close to realization” only in the postwar suburb, which attempted to preserve it not only from the workplace but “from outside influences of any kind” (“The Sexual Division of Labor,” in *Women*

and the Common Life: Love, Marriage, and Feminism, ed. Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn [New York: Norton, 1997], 105). Gelber ("Do-It-Yourself") shows that men made a place for themselves in the fifties home by performing physical labor on the house, whereas Coontz discusses the father's more active presence in family life within a home that was otherwise gendered female.

15. Joel Foreman, introduction, *The Other Fifties: Interrogating Midcentury American Icons*, ed. Foreman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 1. See also the essays in *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Cold War*, ed. Lary May (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

16. See Barbara Ehrenreich and John Ehrenreich, "The Professional-Managerial Class," in *Between Labor and Capital*, ed. Pat Walker (Boston: South End Press, 1979), 5–45. In *Fear of Falling: The Inner Life of the Middle Class* (New York: Harper, 1989), Barbara Ehrenreich explores the relationship between the increasing anxiety of the PMC and its retreat from liberalism after the sixties. In her account, the PMC became fearful when it rediscovered poor people after the affluence and complacency of the fifties; that is, it was only after the PMC began to think of themselves "as an elite" (10) that it became particularly self-protective. I want to suggest that its defensiveness became intelligible earlier, when places such as the corporation and the suburb were perceived to threaten its status. Foreman notes that the stereotypical portraits of the fifties "appear as histories of victimization" (3), but he is referring to the situation of outsiders such as gays and lesbians, communists, ethnic and racial minorities, and women. The essays in *The Other Fifties* focus on popular culture's subversive attacks on the decade's white middle-class norms to produce new "histories of nascent rebellion and liberation" (3–4). Jackson Lears demystifies the monolithic conception of "a homogenized, asphyxiating[,] dominant," postwar white-collar and consumer culture and examines the role that intellectuals played in its development and circulation. Lears describes the PMC as a Gramscian "hegemonic historical bloc" that ascribed to a whole period and population its own interests, experiences, and perspectives, but he doesn't consider how and why this bloc explicitly cast itself as the losers in postwar economic and social transformations ("A Matter of Taste: Corporate Cultural Hegemony in a Mass-Consumption Society," in May, *Recasting America*, 47, 50).

17. Leo M. Cherne, "The Future of the Middle Class," *Atlantic Monthly* 173 (June 1944), 75, 76. Published before the war's end, it warned middle-class Americans about the anticipated postwar effects of the wartime concentration of industry, their increased dependence upon big business for employment, and the resultant decline in social status and psychological satisfaction. In *White Collar*, Mills amplified these arguments in his discussion of the shift from a society of "free enterprisers" who owned and actively managed the property with which they worked to a society of salaried employees, who did not and never would own that property. Although he was describing a process that had begun in the late-nineteenth century, and was a focus of business commentaries in the twenties, his study conveys a sense of the dramatic transformation of the American business landscape in the forties, when wartime industrial expansion disproportionately benefited the largest and wealthiest corporations. For details of corporate wartime growth, see John Blair et al., *Economic Concentration and World War II*, Report

of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to the U.S. Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1946). The consolidation of resources and assets among the largest American corporations continued in the postwar period, as noted in Alfred D. Chandler Jr., *The Visible Hand*, 482–83. Chandler argues that modern business practice, characterized by “many distinct operating units and management by a hierarchy of salaried executives” (1), “had reached . . . maturity in the United States by the 1920s” (483), but the years after World War II “mark[ed] its triumph” (477).

18. Mills, *White Collar*, xviii; Dorothy Thompson, “Our Fear-Ridden Middle Classes,” *Ladies’ Home Journal* 67 (February 1951), 12. Thompson began the article with the story of a magazine editor who was laid off twice in five years before deciding to enter “the workingmen’s end of the publication business” (11) as a printer, where he makes the same money and enjoys more job security and less stress. She considered the fate of democracy to be dependent upon improved conditions for the middle class; in words befitting the former wife of Sinclair Lewis, she warned her readers: “it can happen here” (12). See also C. Harley Grattan, “The Middle Class, Alas!” *Harper’s* 202 (February 1951), 39–47. Mary McCarthy demonstrated just how muddled the conception of class in the United States had become: “Class barriers disappear or become porous; the factory worker is an economic aristocrat in comparison to the middle-class clerk” (“Mlle Gulliver en Amérique,” *Reporter* [January 22, 1952], 36). A Hartford businessman assured *Business Week* in 1956, the year that nonmanual jobs first outnumbered manual jobs: “You talk about monotony on an assembly line, that’s nothing compared with the stultifying effect of these big insurance offices” (“Aiming at White-Collar Target,” *Business Week* [May 12, 1956], 170). The article was one of several that ran in *Business Week* and *Fortune* describing attempts to unionize white-collar workers whose salaries trailed those of skilled craftsmen and foremen. The difficulty, according to these journals, was that status as a white-collar worker seemed to depend upon not belonging to a union, and he or she was more likely to identify with management than with labor.

19. For Mills, alienation is a general trend in white-collar work that affects a range of different, and differently rewarded, occupations: lawyers, doctors, intellectuals, as well as executives, clerks, salespeople, and secretaries. As hard as it may be to swallow that executives and the office staff who do their bidding are victimized in quantitatively and qualitatively comparable ways, Riesman and Whyte asserted the *superior* suffering of the executive/managerial cadre. For Riesman, managers are the people rewarded for talent in their field with a promotion that “forced [them] to leave it” and who become “alienated from [their] craft” (129, 130). The targets of Whyte’s censure and sympathy are not the clerks who “only work for The Organization,” but those who “belong to it as well,” the new “elite” from which will come “most of the first and second echelons of our leadership” (3). In a shrewd dissent, John Kenneth Galbraith called the tendency in sociology to conflate very different kinds of work “one of the oldest and most effective obfuscations in the field of social science” and noted the incursion of this view into the workplace: “The president of the corporation is pleased to think that his handsomely appointed office is the scene of the same kind of toil as the assembly line” (*The Affluent Society* [New York: Mentor, 1958], 263, 264).

20. Review, *Time* 66 (July 18, 1955), 102; review, *New York Times*, July 17, 1955, sec. 7, p. 18; Gerald Weales, review, *Commonweal* 62 (August 26, 1955), 525. The average reader to whom Weales refers is of *Collier's*, where the novel was serialized.

21. Gerald Weales, review, 526.

22. Quotation from book jacket.

23. Richard Ohmann, *Politics of Letters* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), 82, 83. Ohmann focuses upon novels written between 1960 and 1975.

24. Although *housing project* has almost always signified multiple group housing, with a general implication of inferiority and often the taint of public funding, it also appears a few times as a synonym for *housing development* in popular postwar periodical and newspaper articles about the suburbs, when the writer was neutral (see Harry Henderson, "The Mass-Produced Suburbs," *Harper's* 207 [November 1953], 25–32, and [December 1953], 80–85), and also critical (see Sidonie M. Gruenberg, "Homogenized Children of the New Suburbia," *New York Times Magazine* [September 19, 1954], 14, 42, 47). *Housing project* is the term of choice to signify a housing development in *Man in Gray Flannel*, perhaps to endorse the view of the Rath's neighbor. Gruenberg at one point distinguishes between suburban development for the mass middle class and "publicly initiated housing projects" (14), as though to draw an unflattering comparison between private commercial development and government funded housing for the poor.

25. Robert Moses, "Build and Be Damned," *Atlantic Monthly* 186 (December 1950), 41.

26. William Zeckendorf, "Cities versus Suburbs," *Atlantic Monthly* 190 (July 1952), 24; William Laas, "The Suburbs Are Strangling the City," *New York Times Magazine* (June 18, 1950), 22.

27. Edgar Hanford, "Surprised in the Suburbs," *American Mercury* 81 (September 1955), 70.

28. J. P. Marquand, *Sincerely*, Willis Wayde (Boston: Little, Brown, 1955), 444.

29. Whyte, "The Transients," 113; Riesman, "The Suburban Dislocation," 134. Mergendahl also makes the fraternity comparison (*It's Only Temporary*, 122), which is distinguished from Keats's attack on the suburb as an unnatural matriarchy, with men present merely as "overnight lodgers or casual weekend guests" (60).

30. See Joel Pfister, "On Conceptualizing the Cultural History of Emotional and Psychological Life in America," in *Inventing the Psychological: Toward a Cultural History of Emotional Life in America*, ed. Pfister and Nancy Schnog (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 17–59.

31. Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (1963; rpt., New York: Dell, 1984), 15.

32. See Barbara Ehrenreich, *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment* (New York: Anchor, 1983). She claims that "‘conformity’ became the code word for male discontent" (30). Shulman's comic novel *Rally Round the Flag, Boys!* does assume that discontent is prototypically, indeed, universally, suburban and male. The protagonist is introduced as "a typical commuter of Putnam's Landing, Connecticut, which is to say that he was between 35

and 40 in age, married, the father of three children, the owner of a house, a first mortgage, a second mortgage, a gray-flannel suit, a bald spot, and a vague feeling of discontent" (23). His discontent is stimulated by his wife's passionate attachment to the round of community activities, through her absolute contentment with suburban life. I have come across one fifties novel in which the male protagonist is genuinely different from the other suburbanites he loathes. But the hero of Karp's *Leave Me Alone* hates everyone; the difference is that "those he had detested in New York he had managed to avoid" (186), while he is thrown together with undesirables more often in the suburb. He presumes his superiority to everyone in the novel, including his wife, who likewise resisted New Yorkers but has found a home in the suburbs.

33. Jack Finney, *The Body-Snatchers* (1955; rpt., Boston: Gregg Press, 1976), 105. In *Class in Suburbia* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963), sociologist William M. Dobriner used the term "sacked village" for an established town that becomes a "reluctant suburb" when it is "invaded by suburbanites" (127), who are more economically mobile than the older residents.

34. Richard Yates, *Revolutionary Road* (1961; rpt., New York: Vintage, 1989), 20.

35. Kevin K. Gaines observes that the "emphasis on class differentiation as race progress" led many black elites to distinguish themselves "as bourgeois agents of civilization, from the presumably undeveloped black majority" (*Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century* [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996], 2). In "Harlem on Our Minds," *Critical Inquiry* 24 (Autumn 1997), Henry Louis Gates Jr. argues that "[t]he black middle class defines itself by consumption" (6) and against the history of racism, and calls for an African American literature that is more sensitive to the dynamics of class: "one is forced to wonder where *this* generation's Bigger Thomas is" (12).

36. Chester Himes, *If He Hollers Let Him Go* (1945; rpt., New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1986), 49.

37. The quest for nonconformity among the white middle class had a racial component as well. In "The White Negro" (1957) Norman Mailer famously suggested that black men were intrinsically nonconformist and thus an attractive and liberating remedy for the boredom of being a white male. Andrew Hoberek argues that the fascination of white middle-class men with black men did not merely signify either a crisis of masculinity, resistance to the organization's seeming stranglehold on individuality, or attraction to the racial other. More importantly, it masked the organization man's fear of a postwar future as proletarianized as the black worker's: "Behind the white (-collar) desire to become black is the fear that one already is" ("Race Man, Organization Man, *Invisible Man*," *Modern Language Quarterly* 59 [March 1998], 116). Thus the white middle class's sense of itself is not threatened by the existence of a black middle class but by a homogenized and universal working-class blackness that seems, fantastically, to be in a position analogous to it.

38. Paul Goodman, review of *On the Road*, rpt. in *Growing Up Absurd* (New York: Vintage, 1960), 281. The mainstream co-optation of a nonconformist resistance to mass society reached an apotheosis in the 1960s, according to Thomas

Frank. In *The Conquest of Cool* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), he describes the rise of hip marketing strategies that mirrored, rather than rejected, the decade's countercultural tendencies, as Madison Avenue wooed all those alienated, gray-flannel consumers.

39. Irving Howe, "Mass Society and Postmodern Fiction," in *Decline of the New* (New York: Harcourt, 1970), 205. Subsequent scholarship on the fifties has sought to restore the context in which the Beat philosophy could be understood as a meaningful, if not wholly unproblematic, attack on mainstream American culture. See Andrew Ross, *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1989); and Thomas Schaub, *American Fiction in the Cold War* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991).

40. See Elizabeth Long, *The American Dream and the Popular Novel* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985), 82–88. Long's account is echoed in Tyler May, *Homeward Bound*; and David Halberstam, *The Fifties* (New York: Villard Books, 1993). Long's analysis of popular fiction after World War II demonstrates a shift from the old-fashioned, entrepreneurial hero, who conquered best-seller lists as the nation sought a return to normalcy in the midforties, to a "corporate-suburban" (82) hero that tried to integrate his activities in the business world with the requirements of home and family. *Man in Gray Flannel* is the only novel that she examines in detail (Long is trained as a sociologist rather than as a literary critic), because it exemplifies the later trend she describes.

41. Shirley Harrison, *Public Relations: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1995), 12. See also Stuart Ewen, *PR! A Social History of Spin* (New York: Basic, 1996); and Roland Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul: The Rise of Public Relations and Corporate Imagery in Big Business* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998). According to Marchand, American corporations took particular pride in "the healthy recuperation of their corporate images" (358) during World War II, when wartime service became a staple of national advertising, and public opinion polls revealed that national corporations were viewed quite favorably by the public, an advantage that American business eagerly pressed into the postwar period.

42. Geoffrey Gorer, *The Americans: A Study in National Character* (1948; rpt., London: Cresset Press, 1955), 104, 105.

43. Dale Carnegie, *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (1936; rpt., New York: Pocket Books, 1948), 45. Carnegie argued that only a lifetime of rigorous self-policing could prevent people from neglecting to consider the perspective of other people. He rejected the idea that he advocated techniques in manipulating others on the grounds that simple manipulation would fail. His "psychology" could not be applied "mechanically": some people "will try to boost the other man's ego, not through genuine, real appreciation, but through flattery and insincerity. And their technique won't work" (212). If one has trained oneself to be genuinely interested in other people, then one's interest is sincere.

44. Like the Chicago school sociologists, Mills drew upon the insights of German sociologist Georg Simmel, who theorized the effect of transient contacts and the replacement of personal relations with pecuniary relations on the modern metropolitan psyche in "The Metropolis and Mental Life." Mills similarly argued that face-to-face business contacts maintain the illusion of personal relationships



in the white-collar world; in reality, physical proximity masks social and psychological distance. By turning his analysis toward the new middle classes in particular, Mills gives Simmel's reflections on the modern psyche a class inflection that they originally lacked.

45. Arthur Heiserman and James E. Miller Jr., "J. D. Salinger: Some Crazy Cliff," in *Salinger's "Catcher in the Rye": Clamor vs. Criticism*, ed. Harold P. Simonson and Philip E. Hager (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1963), 76. The early criticism, which has been extensively analyzed by Carol and Richard Ohmann, often compares Holden to Huckleberry Finn, celebrating their shared commitment to "the right of the nonconformist to assert his nonconformity" (Charles Kaplan, "Holden and Huck: The Odysseys of Youth," in *If You Really Want to Know: A "Catcher" Casebook*, ed. Malcolm S. Marsden [Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1963], 132). See Ohmann and Ohmann, "Reviewers, Critics, and *The Catcher in the Rye*," *Critical Inquiry* 3 (Fall 1976), 15–37.

46. According to Leerom Medavoi, the word *phony* is Holden's and "the novel's master signifier for critique," of commodity culture in general, for Medavoi, and of class hierarchy and privilege, for the Ohmanns (Medavoi, "Democracy, Capitalism, and American Literature: The Cold War Construction of J. D. Salinger's Paperback Hero," in Foreman, *The Other Fifties*, 277). Medavoi makes a powerful case that the disenchanted youth in *Catcher* opens up a safe space for the representation and valorization of the immature, naive liberal, whose postwar demise Schaub traces in *American Fiction of the Cold War*. Medavoi offers his analysis of Holden's resistance to hierarchy, exchange, commodities, and capitalism as a "progressive reading" (278) of the novel. But surely, as social critique, a novel about a rich kid spending money with both hands as he complains about all the phonies sounds suspiciously complacent. *Catcher* is as dishonest in its fashion as *Man in Gray Flannel*; Tom at least entertains the idea of his own phoniness.

47. The words *honesty* and *sincerity*, which appear in the novel with incredible frequency, often appear to be used interchangeably but do not share precisely the same connotations. *Sincerity* suggests a slight remove from honesty, the recognition or representation, and possibly the exploitation (Hopkins might believe in mental health *and* in public relations) of one's honest beliefs or commitments and is thus the term more closely identified with public relations in the novel. Sincerity is directed outward, and while one can be honest with one's self, it makes no sense to say that one is sincere with one's self. Tom's concerns about his relation to the corporation are always cast in terms of honesty, which works to redeem public relations and the corporation. Note even here that Tom is honest, while Hopkins is only sincere. For an account of American naturalist literature and the tension between sincerity and "cynical commercialism" that *Man in Gray Flannel* specifically erodes, see Christopher P. Wilson, "American Literary Naturalism and the Problem of Sincerity," *American Literature* 54 (December 1982), 511–27.

48. See, for example, the largely skeptical essays in *Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America*, ed. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957); and "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception," in Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. John Cumming (New York: Continuum, 1988).

## EPILOGUE

## SAME AS IT EVER WAS (MORE OR LESS)

1. The census data are discussed in Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, and Jackson, "America's Rush to Suburbia," op-ed, *New York Times*, June 9, 1996, sec. 1, p. 15. In 1999, 240 antisprawl initiatives appeared on ballots nationwide. See Richard Lacayo, "The Brawl over Sprawl," *Time* 153 (March 22, 1999), 44–48. The term *postmodern suburb* has been proposed to describe the functional differences between more traditional residential suburbs and contemporary postindustrial suburbs, where most new nonresidential construction and job opportunities are located. See William Sharpe and Leonard Wallock, "Contextualizing Suburbia," *American Quarterly* 46 (March 1994), 55–61. See also Brian Jarvis, *Postmodern Cartographies* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); and Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias*, chap. 7. Joel Garreau speaks of the new "Edge City," which has "more jobs than bedrooms," with an enthusiasm that would make Babbitt blush (*Edge City*, 7). Critics of suburban sprawl attack its inefficiency and environmental costs as well as its ugliness. See Philip Langdon, *A Better Place to Live: Reshaping the American Suburb* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994); James Kunstler, *The Geography of Nowhere: The Rise and Fall of America's Man-Made Landscape* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993); and Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Jeff Speck, *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream* (New York: North Point Press, 2000).

2. The influence of suburbanization is felt not only by those who live in suburbs but also by those who have been excluded for economic reasons or because of discrimination. Suburban residents "are the most heavily subsidized of our citizens," and much of the cost of these subsidies is borne by the urban poor, who receive no tax breaks or only paltry deductions as renters, and who lose valuable tax revenues when higher-income families leave the city for the suburbs (Jackson, foreword, *Suburbia Re-examined*, ed. Barbara M. Kelly [Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1989], xil). Massey and Denton argue in *American Apartheid* that segregation is the most important "structural factor" in "the perpetuation of black poverty in the U.S." (9). While segregation is not merely an urban/suburban problem, the authors note that high rates of black suburbanization are deceiving because much of it is accounted for by poor, declining, largely black-inhabited cities just outside of central northern cities and by the South, where blacks have long been excluded from central cities.

3. Frederick Barthelme, *Two against One* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988); Joyce Carol Oates, *Expensive People* (1968; rpt., New York: Book-of-the-Month Club, 1992). See also Rick Moody, *Garden State* (1992; rpt., Boston: Little, Brown, 1997); Moody, *The Ice Storm* (New York: Warner, 1995); and Moody, *Purple America* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1997).

4. Readers of Ford, Moody, and Gates paperbacks are treated to glowing excerpts of reviews before they reach the title page. Updike's *Rabbit Is Rich* (1981) and *Rabbit at Rest* (1990) and Ford's *Independence Day* (1995) won Pulitzers, while Gates's first novel, *Jernigan* (1991), was nominated. *Expensive People* was a finalist for the National Book Award, as was *Rabbit at Rest*.

5. Richard Locke, review of *Couples* and *Rabbit Redux*, *New York Times Book Review*, November 14, 1971, 2.

6. Janet Burroway, review of *Purple America*, *New York Times Book Review*, April 27, 1997, 7; Gary Williams, review of *Purple America*, *Rocky Mountain News*, cited in *Purple America*. See also James Kaplan, *Two Guys from Verona* (New York: Grove, 1998); and David Gates, *Preston Falls* (New York: Vintage, 1998).

7. John Updike, *Rabbit, Run* (1960; rpt., New York: Fawcett Crest, 1991), 20.

8. Updike, *Rabbit Redux* (New York: Knopf, 1971), 223.

9. Updike, *Rabbit at Rest* (New York: Knopf, 1990), 32, 173.

10. Updike, *Rabbit Is Rich* (1981; rpt., New York: Ballantine, 1996), 339.

11. Kenneth Crawford, "Middle-Class Revolt," *Newsweek* 72 (November 18, 1968), 52. See also "The Forgotten?" *Nation* 207 (September 23, 1968), 259–60.

12. See, for example, "Squeeze on America's Middle Class," *U.S. News and World Report* 77 (October 14, 1974), 42–44; and "The Squeeze on the Middle Class," *Business Week* (March 10, 1975), 52–60.

13. Barbara Ehrenreich, "Is the Middle Class Doomed?" *New York Times Magazine* (September 7, 1986), 44. See also Robert Kuttner, "The Declining Middle," *Atlantic Monthly* 252 (July 1983), 60–64; George J. Church, "Are You Better Off?" *Time* 132 (October 10, 1988), 28–30; Mark Levinson, "Living on the Edge," *Newsweek* 118 (November 4, 1991), 22–25; Jack Beatty, "Who Speaks for the Middle Class?" *Atlantic Monthly* 273 (May 1994), 65–66; Jolie Solomon, "Are You Anxious? You're Not Alone," *Newsweek* 125 (January 30, 1995), 42; John Cassidy, "Who Killed the Middle Class?" *New Yorker* 71 (October 16, 1995), 113–14; and Andrew Hacker, "Meet the Median Family," *Time* 147 (January 29, 1996), 41–43.

14. See, for example, Katherine S. Newman, *Declining Fortunes: The Withering of the American Dream* (New York: Basic, 1993); and Wallace C. Peterson, *Silent Depression: The Fate of the American Dream* (New York: Norton, 1994).

15. In *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: Free Press, 1996), Michael S. Kimmel notes the erosion of many of "the structural foundations of traditional [American] manhood" (298) since the 1970s: economic independence, national autonomy, social and geographical mobility, and dominance within the family. Perceiving himself victimized on all counts, Benjamin Hood exemplifies Kimmel's theory that manhood "is less about the drive for domination and more about the fear of others dominating us" (6).

16. David Gates, *Jernigan* (New York: Vintage, 1992), 29.

17. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action* (1965); rpt. in *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*, ed. Lee Rainwater and William L. Yancey (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1967), 76.

18. William Ryan, "Savage Discovery: The Moynihan Report," *Nation* 201 (November 22, 1965), 382. Ryan's point was not that the American family was in fact crumbling, but rather that the report used statistics in misleading and irresponsible ways. He objected above all to its insistence that "the weaknesses and defects of the Negro" (380) accounted for inequality between the races. In "Negro Family: Reflections on the Moynihan Report," *Commonweal* 83 (October 15, 1965), Herbert J. Gans became the first sociologist to suggest that what looked

like family instability was really “the most positive adaptations to the economic conditions which negroes must endure” (49). See also the accounts of the controversy in Rainwater and Yancey, *Moynihan Report*.

19. Peter Wyden, “Suburbia’s Coddled Kids,” *Saturday Evening Post* 233 (October 8, 1960), 44; John Keats, “Compulsive Suburbia,” *Atlantic Monthly* 205 (April 1960), 47.

20. Richard E. Gordon, Katherine K. Gordon, and Max Gunther, *The Split-Level Trap* (New York: Bernard Geis, 1960), 7.

21. Leo Tolstoy, *Anna Karenina*, trans. Constance Garnett (1877; rpt., New York: Modern Library, 1993), 3.

22. John Updike, *Picked-Up Pieces* (New York: Knopf, 1975), 504. These remarks are made with reference to the putative contentment of Piet Hanema at the end of *Couples* (New York: Knopf, 1968). Piet has married his mistress, left Tarbox, and gone to work as a federal construction inspector. But the final sentence—“The Hanemas live in Lexington, where, gradually, among people like themselves, they have been accepted, as another couple” (458)—suggests circularity rather than progress, and the endurance of “the couple” as the primary social unit does not bode well for marital or family satisfaction.

23. Philip Roth, *Goodbye, Columbus* (1959; rpt., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1989), 94.

24. Gloria Naylor, *Linden Hills* (New York: Penguin, 1985), back cover.

25. Richard Ford, *The Sportswriter* (1986; rpt., New York: Vintage, 1995), 3. See also Ford, *Independence Day* (New York: Vintage, 1996).

26. Evan McKenzie, *Privatopia: Homeowner Associations and the Rise of Residential Private Government* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 14. Edward J. Blakely and Mary Gail Snyder estimate that in 1997 there were as many as 20,000 gated communities with over three million units, and their popularity is growing in all regions and price ranges. See *Fortress America* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1997). Found in urban as well as suburban areas, they “enhance and harden the suburbanness of the suburbs, and they attempt to suburbanize the city” (11).

