

Park Forest, Illinois, and Levittown, Pennsylvania: Reconsidering Suburbanization in the 1950s

David Schuyler

Shadek Professor of the Humanities, Franklin & Marshall College, USA

This paper analyzes two of the archetypal suburban developments of the postwar period, Park Forest, Illinois the suburban community William H. Whyte described so vividly in *The Organization Man*, and the second Levittown, a comprehensively designed community in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. A reconsideration of these two communities fifty years after they welcomed their first residents leads to two important conclusions. First, it challenges the stereotypical characterizations of suburban life in the 1950s: the transformation of houses into homes and the remarkable ethnic diversity of these two communities suggest that the cultural critics' emphasis on conformity was significantly flawed. The evidence instead points to a persistent pattern of individualism within a landscape that bore the outward signs of sameness. Second, analysis of these communities demonstrates that race was a major though largely unstated and unstudied component of the nation's suburban dream during the 1950s. Restrictive covenants may have been declared unenforceable in *Shelley v. Kraemer*, but the federal government did little if anything to force developers who were benefiting from generous governmental subsidies to make housing available to African Americans. The people of the United States are still living with the consequences of that policy.

One of the most important developments that occurred in the United States after World War II was suburbanization on a vast, unprecedented scale. This was a conscious policy of the federal government, an attempt both to address the tremendous shortage of housing after seventeen years of depression and war and also to make homeownership a hallmark of middle-class life. Historian Kenneth T. Jackson has demonstrated that “suburbanization was not an historical inevitability created by geography, technology, and culture, but rather the conscious product of governmental policies.”¹ The most widely recognized and influential experiments in community building after World War II were the construction of Park Forest, Illinois, and the development of the three Levittowns, in Hempstead, Long Island, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, and Willingboro, New Jersey. Journalist Harry Henderson, who studied six of the new postwar communities, described them as having “neither history, tradition, nor established structure—no inherited customs, institutions, ‘socially important’ families, or ‘big houses.’” There he found a new generation’s search for the American dream unfolding.² The history of Levittown, Pennsylvania and Park Forest also demonstrates the impact of public policies on the physical shape of the community and also, alas, on their demographic complexion.

Park Forest was one of those instant communities that attracted enormous media attention in the 1950s. It had its origins in the immediate aftermath of World War II, when legislators and planners attempted to address the critical shortage of housing the nation faced in the transition from war to peace. Philip Klutznick, a former commissioner of the Public Housing Authority, headed a corporation that acquired a site of almost 2,400 acres twenty-eight miles south of the Loop.³

The developer, American Community Builders, hired landscape architect Elbert Peets to plan the new community. Peets, who had designed the greenbelt town Greendale, Wisconsin, for the Resettlement Administration during the Great Depression, incorporated in the plan of Park Forest a number of features that were introduced by Clarence Stein and Henry Wright at Radburn, New Jersey: superblocs, cul-de-sacs, a mixture of housing types including apartment buildings and duplexes as well as whole tracts of single-family homes, and the reorientation of the house that placed service areas facing the street and the principal rooms facing the landscaped park at the center of the superbloc. A fundamental precept of Park Forest’s design was the Neighborhood Unit, an idea first clearly articulated by Clarence Perry in the volume, *Neighborhood and Community Planning* (1929), which was published as part of the Regional Plan of New York and its Environs (1921-1931). Perry believed that small, homogeneous residential areas, no more than a quarter mile in diameter and organized around an elementary school, would overcome the impersonality of the large city and “re-create . . . that kind of face-to-face association which characterized the old village community.” In its design Park Forest incorporated the best features of community planning then currently practiced in the United States.⁴

The same was true of construction. American Community Builders at first erected garden apartment buildings for returning servicemen and their families, and within two years the company had built 3,010 units (which were sold, many to occupants, in 1962). The first families moved into their new dwellings in the summer of 1948, and a year later there were approximately 1,800 families living in Park Forest. Recognizing the subsidies available for single-family homes, as well as the demand for Levittown houses, beginning in 1950 Klutznick began building houses instead of apartments. On February 1, 1951, the first family moved into its new single-family home in Park Forest. The first generation of dwellings in Park Forest had identical floor plans and enclosed 828 feet of space. The Bachmann dwelling cost \$12,725, considerably more than the first Levittown houses, which were about 10 percent smaller. In succeeding years American Home Builders offered different house designs and erected almost 5,500 single-family dwellings in Park Forest. Klutznick clearly was influenced by the first

Levittown, as he constructed an entire streetscape of knockoffs of Levitt's Cape Cod classics. Population soared from 8,136 in 1950 to 29,993 in 1960. So successful was the community that it was honored with the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute of Architects' Award of Merit for community planning and architectural design, in 1951, and three years later was selected as an All American City.⁵

On June 23, 1952, the first family moved into what was then the largest comprehensively planned subdivision in the United States, Levittown, Pennsylvania. Park Forest and Levittown have now achieved landmark status. A decade ago the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission certified the second Levittown, in Bucks County, as significant in the history of the commonwealth by placing a blue and yellow marker along Levittown Parkway. Now, both beyond age 50, Levittown and Park Forest are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The United States has become the first suburban nation, as historian Kenneth T. Jackson has pointed out,⁶ and critics such as Jeff Speck and Steven Conn have laid the blame squarely on the Levitts—father Abraham and sons William and Alfred—and the world they created. Conn, for example, recently dismissed Levittown as “a social failure and an environmental disaster.”⁷

Levittown and Park Forest represent two different approaches to the rapid production of suburban housing. The Great Depression and World War II changed the housing industry: planners anticipated a housing crisis of enormous proportions after the war, a situation worse than that which had occurred after the Great War because of more than a decade of economic depression before the economy rebounded under the stimulus of wartime spending. Meeting the challenge would require innovation: the building industry was wallowing in traditional methods of constructing houses at a time when mass production had brought consumer goods such as cars and refrigerators into the lives of middle- and working-class Americans.⁸ Klutznick rejected a factory-line type of production and centralized management. Instead, he took advantage of economies of scale by hiring multiple builders and subcontractors, and then giving them incentives to perform the work quickly and properly. He also had materials delivered directly to each building site rather than to a centralized location, thereby eliminating the costs incurred by the multiple handling of building products.⁹ By contrast, the Levitts revolutionized the homebuilding industry: applying many of the lessons in community development pioneered by builders in California who during World War II,¹⁰ the company divided construction into twenty-seven different operations, from bulldozing the site and laying a concrete slab foundation to framing the walls and roof to plumbing and electrical work. Precut lumber and other materials arrived at each construction site as needed, and crews of specialized workers moved from site to site repeating the same task, a variation on the assembly line Henry Ford introduced in the production of the Model T. Contemporary critics noted the parallel: Eric Larrabee, for example, described the typical Levitt house as the “Model-T equivalent of the rose-covered cottage”; *Time* described William Levitt as the “Henry Ford of Housing”; and a writer in *Fortune* marveled at the efficient, factory-like precision of the production process.¹¹ The Levitts economized not only by building in vast numbers but also through a vertical integration of the industry: their mills produced the lumber, they made their own nails, and they bought fixtures and appliances in such incredible numbers that they were able to eliminate markups and reflect those savings in the prices of the houses they sold.

Sell houses they did. At the first Levittown, in Island Trees, Long Island, the Levitts built 17,500 houses between 1947 and 1951. As was the case in Park Forest, the initial residents of Levittown were veterans who rented, but within two years the Levitts were selling houses as fast as they could produce them and garnering national publicity. For example, William J. Levitt appeared on the cover of *Time* in 1950, an indication of how important suburban development was at the time. As historian Barbara Kelly has observed, “the Levitt house was the reduction

of the American Dream to an affordable reality, made possible in large part by the cooperative efforts of the government, the builders, and the banks."¹² As the Island Trees community was nearing completion, the Levitts began assembling approximately nine square miles of land in southern Bucks County, Pennsylvania. What made Bucks County especially attractive to the developers was twofold: the construction of U. S. Steel's Fairless Works near the site and its proximity to important population centers Philadelphia and Trenton. "Levittown, Pa. will be the least monotonous mass housing group ever planned in America," Bill Levitt promised in announcing the plans for the project.¹³

As was true of Park Forest, Levittown, Pennsylvania fully merits its claim to being a comprehensively designed community. Alfred Levitt's plan incorporates a hierarchical street system, with parkways or boulevards that provide for major traffic, smaller streets that extend from the parkways around each of the forty neighborhoods, which are called drives, and still narrower, gently curving roads within the neighborhoods called lanes. The neighborhoods, mile in diameter and home of 1,400 dwellings, have clearly defined boundaries and are organized around an elementary school, a precept in American town planning that extends back to Perry's Neighborhood Unit, which was also the centerpiece of Peets's plan for Park Forest.¹⁴ Levitt's design included community swimming pools, neighborhood parks, baseball fields, churches, a town hall, and a Shop-a-Rama shopping center that is now closed and, in a metaphor for the evolution of suburban retail in recent years, is being converted into a Home Depot.

The development of these instant communities in the aftermath of World War II was a major event that attracted widespread media coverage and critical scrutiny. They quickly became the target of sociological studies and cultural criticism for promoting conformity. During the 1950s social scientists, cultural critics, and journalists identified Park Forest and Levittown as icons for a strikingly homogeneous suburban landscape that seemed to mark a new and worrisome departure from the mythic American individualism of the past. In the early 1950s a young Princeton graduate and journalist, William H. Whyte, Jr., began investigating the new structures of corporate America and focused on Park Forest to examine the domestic and communal rituals of the Organization Man. With its affordable housing and ample recreational opportunities for children, Park Forest attracted parents of the baby boom generation, especially young men who worked for large corporations. Whyte described it as an example of the "new package suburbs" that were becoming ubiquitous features of the American landscape. Residents were transients, interchangeable cogs in the engine of corporate America, and in these new suburbs Organization Men and their families put down roots – not the strong, deep tap roots of an oak but numerous smaller roots, characteristic of trees that had been transplanted several times – through membership in numerous communal groups. But Whyte and other cultural critics found that what dominated life in Park Forest and similar communities was an overwhelming pattern of social conformity. Residents wanted to belong, and to get along tended to go along.¹⁵

Other critics of suburbia triumphant included the urbanist and social critic Lewis Mumford, who described the Bucks County Levittown as a social failure, a vast yet homogeneous community, "too congested for effective variety and too spread out for social relationships." John Keats, author of the best-selling critique of suburbia, *The Crack in the Picture Window* (1956), vilified the identical housing developments that were "spreading like gangrene" across the American landscape and described the new suburbs as "fresh-air slums." In a place such as Levittown, he asserted, "you can be certain all other houses will be precisely like yours, inhabited by people whose age, income, number of children, problems, habits, conversation, dress, possessions, and perhaps even blood type are precisely like yours." Architectural critic Mary Mix Foley described the instant communities as consisting of "row on row of identical small boxes marching across a denuded landscape" and suggested that "never in history . . . has

a culture equaled ours in the dreariness and corrupted fantasy of a major part of its building.” Sloan Wilson’s *Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* (1955), a modern-day parable about the evils of acquisitiveness and the attempts of large corporations to eliminate individuality, also struck a resonant note in the 1950s. So did Malvina Reynolds’ popular song “Little Boxes,” which Pete Seeger made famous. Although it was written to deride the tract housing going up on the hillsides overlooking San Francisco Bay in Daly City, California, “Little Boxes” captured what the critics found so regrettable about Park Forest and Levittown: that the standardized houses were producing standardized persons with standardized views and standardized children.¹⁶

The culture critics’ emphasis on conformity is, in retrospect, understandable: photographs of each of the Levittowns show a small number of house types, four in Bucks County, extending as far as the eye can see. Photographs of the men who commuted to work from places such as Park Forest and Levittown similarly suggest conformity: almost everyone is dressed in white shirts, ties, and jackets, and the hat is an omnipresent article of male clothing. In short, the houses looked alike, the men looked alike, an astonishingly high percentage of the women were pregnant at any given time in the 1950s; even ages and income levels in these instant communities were similar. Everyone had moved from someplace else, and most suburbanites—William H. Whyte’s Organization Man and his spouse—engaged in a host of community activities, many organized around children, and sank roots into soil that until recently had been productive farmland. The March 1952 *House & Home* reported that Park Forest probably had “more clubs, committees, and service organizations per square foot—and more children—than any other town of its size in the country.”¹⁷

And yet residents didn’t judge their lives in the same way the culture critics did. Harry Henderson reported that residents of the instant bedroom communities rarely complained about the similarity of the houses or of their neighbors. He quoted a college graduate and mother of two children who told him: “We’re not peas in a pod.” She conceded that she anticipated this would be the case when the family moved to one of the six new suburbs Henderson studied, especially because income levels were so similar. “But it’s amazing how different and varied people are, likes and dislikes, attitudes and wants. I never really knew what people were like until I came here.”¹⁸ There is ample anecdotal evidence that suggests that many residents felt the same as did the mother of two. Marvin Bressler, a sociologist at Princeton who lived in Levittown, dismissed critics who described Levittown as “standardized and boring and nonintellectual.” Levittown was affordable housing that attracted a new economic cohort to suburbia, and it was, for them, “a symbol of middle-class attainment.”¹⁹ W. H. Whyte offered a similar assessment, noting that to residents “the curving superblocks of suburbia are the end of a long road from the city wards to middle-class respectability.”²⁰ Pancho Micir, the son of a Croatian immigrant father who had worked in the steel mills of Pittsburgh until moving to Levittown to work at the Fairless plant, recalled that the Levittown of his youth was highly diverse, at least among white ethnics: he encountered “different nationalities,” different cultural traditions and values, and a wide range of religious beliefs. Approximately 15 percent of Levittown’s population was Jewish, three times the national average, and large numbers of ethnic Catholics lived there as well.²¹

Perhaps the most convincing demonstration of individuality amid a landscape of conformity is the degree to which residents transformed identical tract houses into homes. Just as residents of Island Trees made Levitt’s mass-produced houses into dwellings that met their spatial needs and expressed their tastes,²² so did residents of Pennsylvania’s Levittown place their personal and familial stamp on their homes. Carports became garages or rooms, additions extended the Cape Cod (known as the Rancher) and the Levittowner in remarkably creative directions—new windows replaced the aluminum frames of the original Levitt editions, vinyl siding or new brick fronts replaced asbestos shingles, porches were enlarged, awnings, sheds, and landscape

features were added. The same phenomenon occurred in Park Forest. Garages were transformed into living space, porches became dens or bedrooms, new rooms extended the envelop of the house toward the rear of the lot. The transformation of the physical fabric of the house is important because residents expressed their individuality in their homes. Indeed, what Herbert J. Gans wrote of the third Levittown, in Willingboro, New Jersey, is undoubtedly true of Levittown, Pennsylvania and of Park Forest as well: "Levittowners have not become outgoing, mindless conformers; they remain individuals, fulfilling the social aspirations with which they came."²³

Unfortunately, in Park Forest and Levittown the diversity Pancho Micir and other residents remember was limited to white ethnics. Following federal housing policy, on Long Island the Levitts added restrictive covenants to deeds that excluded African Americans. Although the Supreme Court outlawed such covenants in *Shelley v. Kraemer* (1948), historian Arnold Hirsch has demonstrated that the Federal Housing Administration was reluctant to take steps to enforce nondiscrimination regulations and instead chose to maintain segregation, a policy that "manifested itself most clearly in its kid-glove handling of various Levittown developments."²⁴ William Levitt explained the firm's continuing resistance to integration: "if we sell one house to a Negro family, then 90 to 95 percent of our white customers will not buy into the community." To those who pleaded for a more inclusive policy he added, "we can solve a housing problem or we can try to solve a racial problem. But we cannot combine the two."²⁵

Pennsylvania's Levittown and Park Forest were segregated, though apparently, in the aftermath of *Shelley v. Kraemer*, without resorting to restrictive covenants. The Levitts simply refused to sell houses to African Americans. In August 1957, however, William and Daisy Myers purchased a house in Dogwood Hollow from the initial owner. What followed was a nightmare covered in the national media: the first night a rock shattered the picture window, and over the next several days crowds of angry whites milled about the house expressing outrage at the presence of an African American family living in their midst. A group of citizens organized the Levittown Betterment Committee to oppose the integration of their community, and that organization sought the aid of the Ku Klux Klan to drive the Myers family out of town. Next-door neighbor Lewis Wechsler's house had KKK painted on it, someone burned a five foot cross on his lawn, and a Confederate flag hung from the vacant house directly behind the Myers home. Some friends and neighbors stood with the Myers family, and two months after the harassment began the state Attorney General obtained an injunction against the leaders of the opposition. Daisy Myers recently recalled, "We hadn't taken fully into account—the prejudices of so many Americans—those silly enough to let skin color cause them to reject other human beings." The "housing market" drew her special attention as "a symbol of racial inequality." In a recent videotaped interview Mrs. Myers describes the events that took place in 1957 and expressed the hope she felt when moving into Levittown—that she would become a member of a community that respected the rights of all individuals regardless of color.²⁶

The first African American family moved into Park Forest in 1959, more than a year after the Myers family relocated to Levittown. Gregory Randall, author of the most recent book on the community, believes that the absence of racial minorities in the first eleven years of Park Forest's history was the result of the relatively high cost of apartments and houses and explains that given Klutznick's liberal credentials, any discrimination must have been "tacit and indirect."²⁷ Actually, it was neither. William H. Whyte reported that in the mid-1950s the community experienced an "acrid controversy over the possible admission of Negroes" and identified those most active in blocking integration as residents who had moved from Chicago neighborhoods that had been "taken over" by blacks.²⁸

The first black resident of Park Forest was Charles Wilson, a young Ph.D. who was teaching economics at DePaul University. Perhaps because of the national notoriety Levittown's

integration battle had received, village officials did what they could to ensure that Wilson would be peaceably accepted into the village. Those efforts notwithstanding, some residents were less than welcoming. A Park Forest Residents' Association organized briefly in 1959 with the hope of preventing integration and establishing "an official climate that will make the Negroes understand they are not welcome." One of the organizers of the residents group stated, "We're not opposed to Negroes, . . . We just don't want them in Park Forest." Wilson remained in the village for three years, when he took a teaching job elsewhere. In December 1962 Terry and Jacqueline Robbins moved into Park Forest with their two sons. Some racial incidents greeted them—teenagers shouting "Nigger, nigger, nigger" at the front of the house, garbage being thrown on their yard, and the like, but these quickly abated and the family felt welcome. Within five years there were 71 African American families in Park Forest, about 1 percent of the community's population. A 1967 article in *Look* described Park Forest as "a model for Chicago suburban integration."²⁹

Although the Levitts' behavior and the choices Klutznick made reflected that of most developers—the belief that segregation was necessary to ensure the success of a new suburb—Harry Henderson's conversations with residents of the first Levittown and five other instant communities on the metropolitan fringe led to a different conclusion: "nearly all agree that if Negroes had been accepted from the first," he reported, "there would have been no problem." Instead, the first two Levittowns became the largest segregated communities in the United States.³⁰ When the Island Trees Levittown turned 50 in 1997, Kenneth T. Jackson reflected on its early years and described Levitt's decision not to sell houses to African Americans as "an opportunity tragically lost." "There was such a demand for houses—they had people waiting on lines—that even if they had said there will be some blacks living there, white people would still have moved in."³¹ Not only is Levittown, Pennsylvania, a haunting reminder of how segregated Northern communities were in the 1950s. Tragically, the legacy of bias persisted over the next fifty years: in 2000 African Americans represented only 2.4 percent of Levittown's population.³²

In Park Forest, the African American population grew slowly from 1959 through 1970. In 1960, a year after the first African American family moved there, the U.S. Census recorded 8 blacks. A decade later there were 694 African American residents of Park Forest. After 1970 the rate of integration increased significantly, perhaps in response of the civil disorders of the late 1960s and implementation of federal fair housing legislation: in 1975 there were 2,883 African American residents. Between 1975 and 1980 the number increased to 3,178; the following decade the census counted 5,978 African American residents; and in 2000 the black population reached 9,643, 41 percent of the total population of Park Forest.³³

The divergent demographic patterns of Levittown and Park Forest are striking and demand further explanation. One potential explanation is that Park Forest had a very high concentration of well educated people, whereas Levittown had a sizeable white ethnic working-class population, the people who worked at the Fairless steel plant and other nearby industries and who, in many communities, were among those who opposed integration. Another possible explanation is the role that churches, especially liberal Protestant denominations and Jewish synagogues, played in promoting integration. Still another is the existence of significant differences in the enforcement of federal fair housing laws either at the state or the municipal level. Additional research to determine which factors account for the success or failure of integration in Park Forest and Levittown is ongoing.

The development of instant suburban communities in the aftermath of World War II, personified by Levittown and Park Forest, was an essential part of the emergence of the United States as the first suburban nation. A reconsideration of these two communities fifty years after they welcomed their first residents leads to two important conclusions. First, it challenges the

stereotypical characterizations of suburban life in the 1950s: the transformation of houses into homes and the remarkable ethnic diversity of these two communities suggest that the cultural critics' emphasis on conformity was significantly flawed. The evidence instead points to a persistent pattern of individualism within a landscape that bore the outward signs of sameness. Second, analysis of these communities demonstrates that race was a major though largely unstated and unstudied component of the nation's suburban dream during the 1950s. Restrictive covenants may have been declared unenforceable in *Shelley v. Kraemer*, but the federal government did little if anything to force developers who were benefiting from generous governmental subsidies to make housing available to African Americans. We are still living with the consequences of that policy.

Notes

- 1 Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 293.
- 2 Harry Henderson, "The Mass Produced Suburbs: I. How People Live in America's Newest Towns," *Harper's* 207 (Nov. 1953): 25-32 (quotations p. 26).
- 3 On Park Forest see Gregory C. Randall, *America's Original GI Town: Park Forest, Illinois* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000); William H. Whyte, Jr., *The Organization Man* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956); and Herbert J. Gans, "Progress of a Suburban Jewish Community," *Commentary* 23 (Feb. 1957): 113-22.
- 4 On the planning of Park Forest see Randall, *America's Original GI Town*, pp. 59-90. Perry is quoted in Eugenie L. Birch, "Five Generations of the Garden City: Tracing Howard's Legacy in Twentieth-Century Residential Planning," in Kermit C. Parsons and David Schuyler, eds., *From Garden City to Green City: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), p. 173. Mervyn Miller has demonstrated that the community designs of the English garden city planners Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin anticipated all the major features of Perry's Neighborhood Unit. See Miller, "The Origins of the Garden City Residential Neighborhood," in Parsons and Schuyler, eds., *From Garden City to Green City*, pp. 99-130.
- 5 Randall, *America's Original GI Town*, pp. 168f, 173, 134; U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, 1950*; "Eleven 'All-America' Cities of 1953," *American City* 69 (Feb. 1954): 112-13.
- 6 Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, passim.
- 7 Conn, "Bold Experiment in Way We Live is Social Failure," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Aug. 11, 2002; Jeff Speck, "A Successful Community That Opened Door to Sprawl," *ibid.*, Aug. 11, 2002. Speck acknowledged that the communities the Levitts built were more successful than most recently constructed suburbs. See also 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).
- 8 "The Industry Capitalism Forgot," *Fortune* 36 (Aug. 1947): 61ff.
- 9 Randall, *America's Original GI Town*, p.168.
- 10 For the California antecedents of the innovations in construction at Park Forest and the Levittowns see Greg Hise, *Magnetic Los Angeles: Planning the Twentieth Century Metropolis* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
- 11 Eric Larrabee, "The Six Thousand Houses That Levitt Built," *Harper's* 197 (Sept. 1948): 79-88; "Up from the Potato Fields," *Time* 56 (July 3, 1950); "The Industry Capitalism Forgot." See also Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- 12 Barbara M. Kelly, "Learning From Levittown," *The Long Island Historical Journal* 1 (Fall 1988): 39
- 13 Levitt, quoted in Curtis Miner, "Picture Window Paradise," *Pennsylvania Heritage* 28 (Spring 2002): 15.
- 14 Birch, "Five Generations of the Garden City," p. 173. See also Perry's volume, *Neighborhood and Community Planning* (New York: Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs, 1929).
- 15 Whyte, *Organization Man*, pp. 267-98 (quotation p. 280);
- 16 Mumford is quoted in Penn Kimball, "'Dream Town'—Large Economy Size," *New York Times Magazine*, Dec. 14, 1952, p. 42; Keats, *The Crack in the Picture Window* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1956), p. 7; Foley is quoted in Alan Ehrenhalt, *The Lost City: The Forgotten Virtues of Community in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1995), pp. 211-12; Sloan Wilson, *Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1955).
- 17 Whyte, *Organization Man*, pp. 280-98; Nicholas Lemann, "Naperville: Stressed Out in Suburbia," *Atlantic* 264 (Nov. 1989): 34-48; *House & Home*, quoted in Randall, *America's Original GI Town*, p. 160.
- 18 Henderson, "The Mass Produced Suburbs: I. How People Live in America's Newest Towns," p. 26. Henderson took a more critical stance in "The Mass-Produced Suburbs, Part II: Rugged American Collectivism," *Harper's* 207 (Dec. 1953): 80-86.
- 19 Bressler is quoted in Kathy Boccella, "At 40, Levittown thrives—and confounds critics," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Dec. 9, 1991.

- 20 Whyte, *Organization Man*, p. 267.
- 21 Micir is quoted in David Diamond, "The Children of Levittown," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Dec. 12, 1982. Harry Henderson reported that almost 50 percent of the residents of the Island Trees Levittown were Catholic. Henderson, "The Mass-Produced Suburbs, Part II: Rugged American Collectivism," p. 82.
- 22 Barbara M. Kelly, *Expanding the American Dream: Building and Rebuilding Levittown* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993).
- 23 Randall, *America's Original GI Town*, p. 178; Herbert J. Gans, *The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a New Suburban Community* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1967), p. 154.
- 24 Arnold R. Hirsch, "Choosing Segregation: Federal Housing Policy Between *Shelley* and *Brown*," in John F. Bauman, et al., *From Tenements to the Taylor Homes: In Search of an Urban Housing Policy in Twentieth-Century America* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), p. 213.
- 25 Levitt, quoted in C. Thompson, "Growing Pains of a Brand-new City," *Saturday Evening Post*, Aug. 7, 1954, pp. 26-27.
- 26 Daisy Myers with context by Linda Shopes, "Breaking Down Barriers," *Pennsylvania Heritage* 28 (Summer 2002): 12, 10. See also Marvin Bressler, "The Myers Case: An Instance of Successful Racial Invasion," *Social Problems* 8 (Fall 1960): 127-42. For examples of the national attention Levittown received see "Segregation: A Family Moves In," *Newsweek*, Aug. 26, 1957, p. 27; "Integration Troubles Beset Northern Town," *Life*, Sept. 2, 1957, pp. 43-46; "House for Sale," *Time*, Sept. 9, 1957; Brian R. Bittan, "Ordeal in Levittown," *Look*, Aug. 19, 1958; "Race Trouble in the North—When A Negro Family Moved Into a White Community," *U.S. News & World Report*, Aug. 30, 1958.
- 27 Randall, *America's Original GI Town*, pp. 179, 107. In *The New York Approach: Robert Moses, Urban Liberals, and the Redevelopment of the Inner City* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993), historian Joel Schwartz demolished the myth Randall repeats, that there must have been some correlation between liberal politics and acceptance of integration.
- 28 Whyte, *Organization Man*, p. 311.
- 29 "Negro in the Suburbs," *Look* 31 (May 16, 1967): 51-53ff.
- 30 Henderson, "The Mass-Produced Suburbs, Part II: Rugged American Collectivism," p. 85.
- 31 Jackson is quoted in Bruce Lambert, "At 50, Levittown Contends With Its Legacy of Bias," *New York Times*, Dec. 28, 1997.
- 32 U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, 2000*.
- 33 U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000*.