Rose Gates, 70, and her husband Alfred, 74 — he’s recovering from surgery and couldn’t be in the photograph — have lived since 1944 at Electric Heights, a housing development in Turtle Creek now owned cooperatively by residents. The government built the homes originally to rent to arms industry workers. The Gates reared, in order: Carol, Georgia, Alfred Jr., Harry, Herbert, Karen, Sharon, Charles, Elaine, Mary Virginia, Dorothy, Edgar, Richard, William, Thomas, Nellie, Walter and Winifred — 18 kids. Typical of the development, their home is modest, with three bedrooms.
In June 1955 a brief article appeared in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* under the headline “U.S. Disposes of 14 Housing Projects Here.” It reported that of the 16 projects built by the federal government to house defense workers in the Pittsburgh area between 1941 and 1943, 14 had been sold. The remaining two projects were expected to be sold within a short period. Riverview Homes, a project opened in September 1941 when First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt presented the key to the residents of the first completed apartment, had been among those already sold. Now without fanfare, Riverview Homes and the other projects built in the Pittsburgh area faded into obscurity.

The sale of projects such as Riverview Homes signaled the end of an important phase in the evolution of federal housing policy. It brought to a close the most ambitious model housing program working-class Pittsburgh had ever seen. This article will examine the implementation of that policy in the Pittsburgh area during and immediately after World War II. It will ask why the government built defense housing in Pittsburgh and in nearly a dozen surrounding mill towns. What kind of housing was built for these defense workers? Who lived in these projects and what happened to both the housing and the residents at the end of the war?

The latter question is of particular importance here. After all, the debate over how the federal government would dispose of this housing began even before a single unit was built. When the war ended in 1945, concern grew over the fate of these projects throughout the country. Support for their conversion to low-income hous-
Sixteen war housing projects, the most in any one Pennsylvania district, dotted the Pittsburgh region. After the war, residents at eight set up cooperative ownership plans and bought the projects from the government. Much of the housing still stands today; in many cases, original owners are still there.

During World War II, the nation was in the grips of the worst housing crisis in its history—a crisis aggravated by the war's end—residents of most Pittsburgh area projects were surprised when the government presented them the opportunity to stop renting their units from the government and to buy them outright. The option was an attractive one because of the general shortage of moderately priced housing in the area. Most industrial workers were unfamiliar with the kind of ownership offered: the Mutual Home Ownership Plan, the official name for so-called "cooperative housing." Federal officials hoped to use the Pittsburgh area as a testing ground for the Plan, an innovative program ideologically rooted in the New Deal and early twentieth century housing reform.

The Plan was the brainchild of Col. Lawrence Westbrook, a Texas engineer who had risen through the ranks of a number of New Deal agencies. During 1941, Westbrook directed the Federal Works Agency's (FWA) Division of Mutual Home Ownership Defense Housing, which built eight projects including: Audubon Park, Audubon, New Jersey; Winfield Park, Linden, New Jersey; Bellmawr Park, Gloucester, New Jersey; Pennypack Woods, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Walnut Grove, South Bend, Indiana; Avion Village, Grand Prairie, Texas; Dallas Park, Dallas, Texas; and Greenmont Village, Dayton, Ohio. From the time of their inception, these eight projects were earmarked for sale under the terms of the Mutual Home Ownership Plan. Westbrook's plan required residents to form a housing association to lease their project from the government at a low rate of interest, and to use any revenue from rent collection that exceeded operating costs as a down payment for purchasing the project.

World War II ended before any of these pilot projects had been purchased under the Mutual Home Ownership Plan; in fact the requisite leasing process had only just begun at a few projects. Nonetheless, housing officials remained convinced that it offered an excellent means of providing housing assistance to families who did not qualify for low income public housing or who could not purchase a home otherwise. Therefore, the Plan was modified, largely by eliminating the leasing stage, and ex-
tended to other housing projects, including most of those built in the Pittsburgh area between 1940 and 1942. 

The importance of the Plan as a model program for working-class Pittsburgh is best understood in the context of pre-World War II efforts for housing reform. Although the shortage of working-class housing was neither a new nor unique problem to Pittsburgh, it grew to crisis proportions by mid-1940.5

Housing conditions in Pittsburgh's mill districts became the subject of widespread attention after 1907 as a result of the Russell Sage Foundation's Pittsburgh Survey, an ambitious social and economic study of working-class life. The Survey examined, among other things, the relationship between poverty and substandard housing conditions. The photographs taken by Lewis Hine and other Survey photographers provided middle- and upper-class Americans with unforgettable glimpses into the very rooms where workers and their families lived and died.6

In the three decades after the Pittsburgh Survey, urban housing became an issue not only to philanthropic organizations such as the Russell Sage Foundation, but government and industry as well. The involvement of federal and local governments in the housing market escalated in times of national emergencies, including World War I and the Great Depression. For example, the post-World War I housing shortage prompted the Pittsburgh City Council to consider establishing municipal housing.7 Although such housing was never built, Pittsburgh had, by 1925, a tenement code, a standard building code and zoning ordinances affecting housing.8

The Depression brought increased federal involvement in housing. After the passage of enabling legislation by the Pennsylvania Legislature in 1937, the Pittsburgh Housing Authority (PHA) was authorized to receive loans from the U.S. Housing Authority to build public housing for low-income families within the city limits. The McKeesport Housing Authority (MHA) implemented a federally subsidized public housing program in that city, while the Allegheny County Housing Authority (ACHA) administered programs in the rest of the county. By 1938, these three authorities operated over a half-dozen projects.9

Public efforts to improve housing conditions in the Pittsburgh area existed alongside of those initiated by business and industrial interests. Cognizant of the fact that workers who had good housing were more productive than those who did not, industrialists became actively involved in the working-class housing market. Companies such as Midland Steel and Apollo Iron and Steel built housing for their workers, recognizing that it was in their own economic interest to have employees residing near their place of work.10 Vandergrift was one of the earliest model residential communities built by area industrialists. Apollo Iron and Steel's housing, built in 1895-96, was designed by Frederick Law Olmsted.11 In a similar vein, the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce hired professional architects to design one-and two-family homes which could be built on steep hillsides. The plans were made available to speculative builders.12

Efforts by philanthropic and social interest groups supplemented the piecemeal efforts made by government and industry to improve workers' access to decent, affordable housing. In 1928, the Federation of Social Agencies, the Civic Club of Allegheny County and the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce formed the Pittsburgh Housing Association. This private organization survived the Depression and later became an important source for analysis of the federal defense housing program's impact on local housing authorities and conditions.13

Of the privately sponsored experimental housing programs started in the Pittsburgh area, the most important was Chatham Village, a planned residential community constructed in the mid-1930s on Mount Washington. Built by a limited dividend corporation, financed by the Buhl Foundation, and designed by the famous New Towns planner, Clarence Stein, Chatham Village was immediately regarded as a model community, setting new standards in site planning and land use.14 Pittsburgh's workers would have to wait until World War II for Stein to return to design model housing for them.15

Chatham Village attracted admirers from all over the world. By contrast, no such notoriety surrounded Ohio View Acres and Shalercrest, the two residential communities Stein designed for the Pittsburgh area approximately five years later.16 This is largely explained by the fact that these projects were constructed to house industrial workers employed by defense contractors. As "defense" projects, they were a particular type of public housing, standing in contrast to low-income public housing like Bedford Dwellings and McKees Rocks Terrace. Ohio View Acres and Shalercrest were built with funding appropriated by Congress under the Lanham Act, also known as the National Defense Housing Act.17 Signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in October 1940, this measure authorized the FWA to construct housing projects for defense workers in areas that the president determined to be suffering from acute housing shortages.18

By mid-1941, both the ACHA and the PHA began to divert their attention and resources away from the construction of new low-in-
come public housing toward defense projects. The Lanham Act became a practical way for these authorities to obtain federal funds for public housing. This process was repeated in city after city across the nation. As a result, the number of permanent defense housing units climbed steadily, reaching 700,000 by the close of 1945. Although units were built in over 1,000 communities, in nearly every state, most were concentrated in five states. California, home of the aeronautics industry, led the nation in number of units, with Washington second, followed by Virginia, Texas and Pennsylvania.19

The 32,039 units built in Pennsylvania were located near military installations, ordnance plants, steel mills and major manufacturing plants in Allentown, Bethlehem, Erie, Johnstown, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.20 Projects also were built in smaller communities, including Middletown, Carlisle, Corry, Ellwood City and Williamsport.21 The Pittsburgh area had the greatest concentration of defense housing in Pennsylvania.22

By the beginning of 1942, construction had begun on the following projects: Glen Hazel Heights, Pittsburgh; Munhall Homesteads, Munhall Township; Riverview Homes and Monongahela Heights, Mifflin Township; Dravo Dwellings, Dravosburg; Woodland Terrace and Blair Heights, Clairton; North Braddock Heights, North Braddock; Electric Heights, Turtle Creek; Chartiers Terrace, Scott Township; Ohio View Acres, Stowe Township; Shalercrest, Shaler Township; Sheldon Park, Harrison Township; and Aluminum City Terrace, New Kensington.23

Projects in the Pittsburgh area were intended as lasting contributions to the housing stock in their respective communities. Federal officials wanted to show that they were not only capable of building economical housing, but also that such housing provided residents with a sense of community and identity. They hoped that these projects would serve as models to guide the course of post-war urban redevelopment. With this in mind, defense housing was built on hilltops in suburban-like settings, in almost every case. Fourteen projects featured a playground and community recreation center where organized activities were held for both adults and children. Many of these programs, which were run by the tenant councils that financed them, managed to turn a profit. Other services such as visiting dental and medical clinics were provided by Allegheny County or the City of Pittsburgh, depending on the geographical location of the project.24

Although intended to be models for emulation, the 14 projects were not utopian; each had its share of problems. Second quality “victory” building materials had often been substituted for first quality ones.25 Local building codes had not been met, in some instances. Drainage and erosion problems plagued some projects.26 Mine subsidence occurred at Glen Hazel Heights.27 Other projects had limited access to public transportation and shopping facilities. Nevertheless, compared to the temporary structures like trailers, and various stopgap forms of housing for workers in other cities, Pittsburgh fared very well indeed.

Area projects had not been built without opposition. Local governments had resented the intrusion of the federal government into housing market, which they traditionally had partially controlled. Those who profited the most from the scarcity of decent affordable housing — realtors, builders, bankers and owners of investment rental properties — opposed the projects most strenuously, but other reasons and/or excuses surfaced. Munhall, Pennsylvania, refused to allow the federal government to connect Munhall Homesteads sewers into the borough’s lines. As a result, the government had to take legal actions against the borough.28 W.C. Walley, a mayoral candidate in New Kensington in 1941, defeated the incumbent’s bid for re-election with his colorful criticism of the modern architecture of Aluminum City Terrace.29 William Stark, a resident of Turtle Creek’s Electric
Heights, recalled “when they built this (project), there was a hullabaloo in Turtle Creek; the people didn’t particularly want that project here...because it would bring in all kinds of riffraff.”

While city and borough fathers fought the intrusion of the federal government, industrial workers, who found it virtually impossible to find affordable housing anywhere near their jobs, welcomed it. A woman whose husband worked at the East Pittsburgh Westinghouse Electric Corp. plant recalled that “there simply wasn’t enough housing” and that even though the roads and sidewalks at Electric Heights were nothing but mud, she and her husband were “happy” to get an apartment at the project.

Another Electric Heights resident remembered that he was grateful to move into the project so he and his wife could have their own apartment rather than doubling-up with parents.

The difficulties that many families encountered in obtaining an apartment at these projects contributed to the apprehension some of them felt over the fate of their homes when the war ended in 1945. The residents worried that they would have to leave their homes in the midst of the post-war housing crisis. Where would they go when hundreds of people re-
The North Braddock Civic League, c. 1945, a social and political group organized mainly by the 48 black families who lived in the segregated North Braddock Heights war project, sponsored banquets and dances for about five years at the project's recreation center. According to Edith Simpson (second row, fifth from left), blacks were allotted use of the center generally two nights a week. She and her husband, Rufus, (far right, back row) helped lead the fight to end segregation when residents bought the development under the government's "co-op" rules after the war. The Simpsons moved there shortly after it opened in 1942.

In October 1945, the Pittsburgh newspapers reported the announcement anticipated since the end of the war: the federal government planned to sell area defense housing projects. Officials from the Federal Public Housing Authority pledged to work with local housing officials to dispose of the projects, but they faced a number of competing interests among residents, city and county housing officials and others, like local realtors. All hoped to influence the policy-making process.

Among the most vocal were the residents of the projects, few of whom wanted to move until they were ready to do so. Although they had heard talk, during the war, that the government might sell them their homes, they had not anticipated the opportunity to buy them under the Mutual Home Ownership Plan, like workers in Philadelphia, Camden, South Bend and the five other industrial pilot projects.

The residents were not content to sit and wait for news on the fate of their homes. With the assistance of their labor unions, they organized and began to educate themselves on what they would have to
do to buy their homes. Leaders emerged in each project; they did their best to gain the support of residents who were skeptical about the economic feasibility and social desirability of mutual home ownership.

Those interested in the Plan received a great deal of assistance from J. Alfred Wilner, a Pittsburgh attorney who served as the first general counsel to the PHA. Wilner first became involved with the sale of the defense housing projects in 1947, when Aluminum City Terrace residents hired him as their counsel to help negotiate the sale of the project to the Aluminum City Terrace Housing Association, which was organized according to the Plan’s requirements. The example set by Wilner and the Aluminum City residents encouraged reluctant residents at other projects to try mutual home ownership. According to one resident, many people were “afraid they were going to lose their money.” Between 1947 and 1957, Wilner helped residents at over a half-dozen Pittsburgh projects purchase their homes.

Federal housing could be disposed of in two ways. If local government requested it, through an appeal to Congress, the federal government would transfer the project’s title to local government, and it thereby became low-income housing. If this did not occur, the federal government would offer to sell projects to the residents under the Mutual Home Ownership Plan. City and county housing officials sought to obtain much of this housing through title transfers, but they encountered some resistance from borough governments over the desirability of converting these projects into low-income housing. During early 1947, the ACHA made a special effort to convince local governments of the need for their cooperation, but housing officials met with little success. Clairton did agree to request the conveyance of Blair Heights, a project reserved for blacks.

Borough governments gave different reasons why they would not support the ACHA’s plan to convert defense into low-income housing. Some claimed that they could not afford to provide municipal services to residents who paid no real estate taxes. Others denied the need for low-income public housing in their community, or opposed conversion because there was no housing available to which many residents — those would not qualify for public housing due to their income level — could relocate. In other cases, borough officials knew of the residents’ desire to buy their homes and did not want to interfere with their plans.

Federal housing officials recognized that race had a lot to do with the reluctance of local governments to support conversion of defense housing. In 1955, the Housing and Home Finance Agency’s Compliance Division stated that the progress on the disposition program had been interrupted by “local objections to concentrating racial minorities in special projects.” Local governments apparently felt that the conversion of projects into low-income housing would attract black families, and thereby upset the local status quo.

As early as 1945, the ACHA had acknowledged the possibility that the defense projects could be sold to the residents on a mutual or cooperative basis. County housing officials agreed that the idea offered a “substantial contribution to the greatest housing problem in Allegheny County, namely the housing of the industrial workers with an income between $1,200 and $2,500 a year.” At that time, however, there was little certainty as to whether Pittsburgh projects would be offered under the terms of the Plan.

The sale of Pittsburgh defense housing was a long and drawn out process. To residents and local officials, it seemed that federal housing officials regularly changed their minds concerning the when and how of defense housing disposition. What many did not realize
was that behind the scenes in Washington, a power struggle was going on between Congress and federal public housing officials. Congress did not favor conversion of defense housing to low-income public housing; it did everything possible to prevent title transfers and successfully eluded the calls of organized labor, and social interest and religious organizations for the reactivation of the federal public housing program. Rather, Congress wanted these officials to sell the defense housing as rapidly as possible, and preferably to private concerns. At the same time, however, it wanted these same officials to figure out how to use the housing to shelter the families of veterans and servicemen on active duty, while not displacing thousands of industrial workers and their families. In this context, it is hardly surprising that confusion was evident on the local level.

Eventually federal officials hammered out an order of preference for the sale of defense housing. This policy developed between 1947 and 1950 and was incorporated into the Housing Act of 1950, a measure intended to bring about the final disposition of all defense housing. Projects not specifically named in the law as eligible for becoming low-income housing were to be offered for sale as cooperative housing, unless special measures were taken within 60 days of the law's enactment. If residents failed to meet the legal deadlines for sale on a mutual ownership basis, the property was sold on the private market to the highest bidder.

Convinced of the merits of the Plan, federal officials decided to expand its implementation to include defense projects such as those in the Pittsburgh area which were alike in design and construction. Like residents of the eight pilot projects, the men and women who lived in the Pittsburgh area defense projects were, in most cases, skilled industrial workers and members of unions affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO).

The decision to offer Pittsburgh defense housing for mutual home ownership left federal officials open to criticism because this plan was closely associated with organized labor. During this period of anti-union sentiment, it is hardly surprising that the relationship was called into question. Just as labor unions, particularly those associated with the CIO, were thought to harbor communist sympathizers, so were many of the defense housing projects slated for sale. At Philadelphia's Pennypack Woods, one group of residents alleged that another group was full of communist sympathizers and opposed the second group's efforts to purchase the project.44

Similar incidents occurred in the Pittsburgh area. Electric Heights resident, Frank Panzio, a Westinghouse electrical worker who was an officer of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, was fired from his job when he was called to testify in front of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.45 Numerous other union members lived at this project and worked at the East Pittsburgh plant, thought to be a site of communist activities.46

While some Pittsburgh residents might have feared that projects such as Electric Heights would become havens for communists if purchased on a mutual ownership basis, others recognized the distinct possibility that they could become Democratic Party strongholds. Thomas Hartland, Chairman of the West Mifflin Borough

Michael Simpson, 3, on the porch of his parents' home at North Braddock Heights, c. 1949, with birds he nurtured from Easter chicks.
Republican Committee, told Housing and Home Finance Agency head Albert Cole that the projects should remain in the public domain because they were already “98% Democratic” and that the sale of the project to the residents would only serve to cement their leftist political leanings.47

Similarly, Ann Hausenberger of the Allegheny County Taxpayers' Building and Homeowners Association wrote to Vice President Richard M. Nixon to request that he stop the sale of Munhall Homesteads and other local defense projects to the residents on a mutual ownership basis. Informing the vice president that efforts to rebuild the Republican Party in the county had met with little success, she warned that the sale of the projects as planned would bring about the “defeat of our Republican Party.” The residents, she noted, would never be brought back into the republican fold because they would be “obligated” to the democrats who had “controlled their votes for the past twenty years.”48

Finally an appeal was sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower to stop the sale of the projects by a Munhall, Pennsylvania, woman who also foresaw dire consequences for the republicans. She informed the president that most of the residents of the projects were democrats who did their best to keep republicans from moving in. As republicans, her family was an exception. However, they were forced to pay for their political sentiments by the other residents who treated them “like lepers because we are Republicans.”49

The opponents of the Mutual Home Ownership Plan promoted anti-labor sentiments, fear of communism, and anxiety over racial integration in an attempt to prevent residents of the projects from realizing their goals. Yet, they were unable to stop the residents of the projects listed in the following table.50

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Name & Party & Race & Gender & Role \\
\hline
Edith Simpson & Republican & Black & Female & Office Jobs \\
\hline
Gail Simpson & Democratic & Black & Female & Office Jobs \\
\hline
Michael Simpson & Democratic & Black & Male & Office Jobs \\
\hline
Douglas Simpson & Democratic & Black & Male & Office Jobs \\
\hline
Rufus Simpson & Republican & Black & Male & Heavy Equipment Operator \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
### Pittsburgh Area Defense Housing Projects Converted to Cooperative, 1949-1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th># OF UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum City Terrace</td>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartiers Terrace</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dravosburg Dwellings</td>
<td>Dravosburg</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Heights</td>
<td>Turtle Creek</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munhall Terrace</td>
<td>Munhall</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Braddock Heights</td>
<td>North Braddock</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Homes</td>
<td>West Mifflin</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalercrest</td>
<td>Shaler Township</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eastern Housing Cooperative Organization, Summary of Characteristics of Member Cooperatives. Copy in possession of author. See footnote 1 for more detail.

Today it is evident that the residents' faith in the economic and social practicability of mutual home ownership was well-placed. Federal housing officials such as Lawrence Westbrook and those who shared in this faith also deserve recognition for their foresight and willingness to experiment with new solutions to a persistent problem. They saw in World War II defense housing programs a means for expanding a model housing program to serve the interest of families who neither qualified for low-income public housing nor could afford to purchase a home. This small success story stands in ironic contrast within the history of defense housing, traditionally depicted as a failure.
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■ Aluminum City Terrace, New Kensington, c. 1943.
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The Decline of the American Steel Industry
John P. Hoerr
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