

The normed family

Autor(en): **Angéli, Marc / Siress, Cary**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Trans : Publikationsreihe des Fachvereins der Studierenden am
Departement Architektur der ETH Zürich**

Band (Jahr): - **(2014)**

Heft 24

PDF erstellt am: **28.06.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-919427>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

072 – 073

2 / 3

The Normed Family

Marc Angélil & Cary Sireess

Norms lay the groundwork for a social order. They are engineered not only to steer group behavior, but also to organize territory. Take the example of Levittown, one of the first planned community projects in the late 1940s devised to answer the need for housing the middle class in post-war America. The prototype was centered on a model group: the young, nuclear, Caucasian family with two to three children – a select social unit to be housed in a mass-produced, free-standing, single-family dwelling on the edge of cities. The norm became a way of life for like generations to come. The formula is seemingly simple: father works downtown and mother is at home to care for the house and kids. Given this rather straightforward blueprint, it is no wonder that the real estate venture known as ‘suburbia’ spread like wildfire throughout the country, and later the world. Entire bedroom communities were stamped out, serving in the process to revitalize capitalism by fashioning a new breed of consumers, and thus create new market sectors for the car, insurance, retail, and construction industries to mention but a

few. Suburbia proved to be an ideal model for developers anxious to capitalize on the nuclear family and all its associated conventions. Yet this social order was based on a divisive policy, one that excluded those who did not fit the norm. The ideal family type worked to bracket other ethnic groups – most pointedly African Americans – out of the equation as is by now well known from Levittown, which had discrimination written into its founding legislation.¹ The rationale behind this move was that it was in the ‘best interest’ for business. Property values could only be maintained with the proper type of residents – no poverty, no crime, no mess. And so, segregation as a value was built into the dream of a new frontier out there beyond the city. In this sense, suburbia is only one of the more obvious missed opportunities to use norms to integrate populations rather than divide them according to arbitrary standards, which serve in the end to stigmatize those outside the norm.

¹ See David Kushner, ‘Levittown: Two Families, One Tycoon, and the Fight for Civil Rights in America’s Legendary Suburb’ (New York: Walker and Company, 2009).

Illustration: ‘Bernard Levey (& Family), nuclear family in front of their home in the new Levittown housing development in Pennsylvania’, photograph by Bernard Hoffman, courtesy Getty Images, 1950.

