November 30, 2012

To the Editors at *American Studies*:

Enclosed is my revised version of the article entitled “The Rural Past-in-Present and Postwar Sub/urban Progress.” Before detailing the changes I have made to this latest version, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to revise this piece for resubmission. I would also like to thank the three readers for their comments and ask you to please pass along this gratitude.

Although I ultimately decided to keep the same structure in this essay (beginning the core of my argument with a section on rurality as generally portrayed in the postwar, its application to representations of suburbia and, finally, how this manifested in understanding class and suburbia), I did add an introductory section. As you will see, I removed the anecdote that originally began the essay, instead beginning with a brief discussion of revisionist scholarship on postwar suburbia. This brief discussion addresses the concern that I did not account for the potential racial motivations in postwar suburban development (scholarship that I was in fact aware of but did not include in my original manuscript). I feel that this new discussion helps frame my own argument, another point of concern for a couple of the readers, including its importance in the body of scholarship on the postwar period. I will also note that I refocused my thesis statement to reflect this change, more forcefully stating the role of rurality in postwar discourse in centralizing middle-class suburban notions of progress and development (pages 1-2).

I have also included in this introduction a definition of terms (urban, sub/urban, rural and class difference) and the ways in which I approach these topics in this article. In addition, I took the advice of one reviewer to refer to demographic trends in order to more fully contextualize my discussion (pages 2-3). Admittedly, my discussion is very brief and certainly does not provide a full portrait of the postwar period, but since providing such a picture is not the central point of the paper, I feel confident in the brief outline that I did include. The points I make in light of the U.S. Census directly reflect the discourse that I focus on here: the concern with geographic and class difference in postwar culture.

I have added some material to the core discussion in order to clarify some of my points. Most of these additions include brief endnotes, and I have also incorporated one reader’s suggestion to more fully describe the photos I analyze on page 10. I have tried to go through and edit my pre-existing writing for clarity and ease of reading, as well as fixing some oversights that were pointed out by reviewers, for example, clearly defining what I mean by the “postwar period,” providing page numbers and correcting my punctuation regarding endnote numbers.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to revise this submission, and I hope that it adequately addresses the concerns of the reviewers and editors. Please let me know if there are any further questions or concerns regarding this work .