

insufficient to support their families in accordance with middle-class standards of living. Wives with or without children either had to produce income or throw themselves on the mercy of relatives who had problems of their own. . . .

How does a two-income family cope with the problem of bringing up young children? Not so long ago a woman of proved vocational ability was adjured to divide her life into two—or, more rarely, three—periods. She might work until she produced a baby, but then she must either bury her vocation altogether, exchanging it for that of housewife-and-mother, or else lay it away for long years with the rather feeble hope of resuscitating it after the children were grown. That picture has now changed out of all recognition. Indeed, one hears wives arguing that children, instead of constituting the unanswerable argument against the two-income family, are strong arguments in its favor.

“If it weren’t for the children,” said one wife to me, “I’d be tempted to try to get along on one salary, even if it meant skimping. But we need two incomes to enable us to have a house with a yard that the children can play in; to live in a neighborhood where I don’t have to worry about their playmates; to provide a guitar for the musical one and dancing lessons for the one who needs to improve her muscular coordination—not to mention teeth-straightening and medical insurance and the bonds we are stowing away for their education. . . .”

The depression years, the war years, and the postwar years have cracked the old economic-social family mold. These were forces outside the control of individual women, but they have learned a lesson from circumstances. The working wives of 1951 have learned to recognize the mistakes of my generation, and are determined not to repeat them. . . .

### 3. *The Move to Suburbia (1954)*

*Americans by the millions abandoned the cities and joined the exodus to suburbia in the 1940s and 1950s. Most migrating Americans were young married couples just beginning to form families and have children. They took up residence in brand spanking-new neighborhoods that they obviously preferred to the crowded, and expensive, turmoil of the cities. Yet countless observers found much to criticize in the new suburban way of life that was quickly becoming an American norm. What aspects of that lifestyle does the following article criticize? How persuasive is the criticism? If life in the suburbs was really as thin and conformist as the author claims, why did all those millions of people keep moving to suburbia? How was the raw, historyless character of suburban life any different from life on the thinly populated frontier?*

A young man who had attended an exclusive preparatory school and an Ivy League college felt that his horizon had been restricted because, during the years of his education he had met only the sons of bankers, brokers, executives, lawyers and doctors. He determined that, when the time came, *his* children would go to public school.

The time came. The young man and his wife moved out to the suburbs where their children could get fresh air and play space, go to public school and grow up

---

<sup>3</sup>From Sidonie M. Gruenberg, “Homogenized Children of New Suburbia,” *New York Times Magazine*, September 19, 1954, p. 14.

with children of all kinds. “And whom do my children meet?” he asks. “The children of bankers, brokers, executives, lawyers and doctors!”

Despite the drawback that depressed this particular parent, the suburb into which he moved had certain things in its favor, besides the obvious attraction of *lebensraum*.<sup>\*</sup> It was a town, one of the older suburbs. It had grown up gradually over the years with its own schools, churches and deepening civic consciousness until it had developed into a real *community* with traditions of its own.

New Suburbia is something else again. Around every major city from the Atlantic to the Pacific the new suburbs have been springing up like mushrooms in a damp season. They are sometimes created by dividing large estates—as on Long Island, in Westchester County and in areas around Chicago, Detroit and Los Angeles. More often the new suburbs are built on what had been until recently empty acreage. Whether in California or New Jersey they are typically “prefabricated” in all their details and the parts are suddenly assembled on the spot. Unlike towns and cities and the suburbs of the past, they do not evolve gradually but emerge full-blown. They are designed and constructed by corporations or real estate operators who work on mass-production principles. A hundred or a thousand houses open their doors almost simultaneously, ready for occupancy. . . .

. . . The new suburbanites take what they can afford and can get. And they pay a subtle psychological price. For one thing, the new suburb is a community only in the sense that it is an aggregate of dwellings—often identical houses. It may in time become a community, but not yet. No one has grown up in it; it has no traditions. We really don’t know what effect it will ultimately have on children; we can only conjecture.

The families of New Suburbia consist typically of a young couple with one or two children, or perhaps one child and another on the way. The child living here sees no elderly people, no teenagers. Except on weekends and holidays he sees only mothers and other children of his own age. This dearth of weekday variety was remarked on by a woman who had moved to a new suburb and returned after some months to visit friends in her former city neighborhood. “Though I have lived in the city most of my life,” she said, “I was actually startled to see such a variety of people, of every type and age. It seemed so long since I had seen old people and school kids, since I had seen men around in the daytime!”

If Old Suburbia is lacking in a variety of work going on that boys and girls can watch or actively share in, it at least has a garage, a movie theatre, a shoe repair shop. In New Suburbia there is often nothing but a supermarket and a gasoline station. In Old Suburbia children grow up seeing people of all ages and playing with children older than themselves—from whom each child normally learns the ways and customs appropriate to the age into which he matures day by day. In New Suburbia the children are likely to be nearly of the same age. In Old Suburbia the fathers take the train to the city each day, leaving the car with the mothers. In New Suburbia there is often no railroad station, so the fathers drive to work in their own cars or by “car pool.” The mothers remain—with the house and yard and children.

The children growing up in New Suburbia run the danger of becoming “homogenized.” In many of the new suburbs the white child never sees a Negro.

---

<sup>\*</sup>A German word meaning space required for life, growth, or activity.

In others the Jewish child never plays with any but Jewish children. Some of these suburbs are virtually all Catholic. In others there are no Catholics. Even without racial and religious segregation—and in these new developments groups tend to segregate themselves to an alarming degree—the pressure to conform is intense, and stultifying....

Moreover, in this atmosphere children are likely to picture the good life in terms of uniform, standardized patterns; and that tends to block invention and experiment. Because nothing out of the way ever happens in these quiet, sanitary and standardized surroundings, one wonders what will arouse the imagination of these children. What spiritual equivalent will they find for the challenge and inspiration that an older generation found during childhood in city streets, on farms, in market towns?...

Many of the mothers in these new suburbs have had considerable training in offices or shops and some have a degree of executive ability. In New Suburbia they find no outlets for their talents and energies and they tend to focus all their efforts upon their children. Everything that the mothers do, all the little chores, tend to take on disproportionate significance, so that the children feel the pressures while the mothers cannot help feeling frustrated and discontented. This does not mean that they are unhappy with their homes and their children, for they have, essentially, what every woman wants; but they are confused and often feel that there is something lacking in the lives they lead. At the same time, their children cannot help but get a picture of adults as being constantly concerned with trivialities.

Some of the other obvious shortcomings of the new suburbs are incidental to their very newness. In time, a church will be built, perhaps several. A meeting place or assembly hall will rise. In some new suburbs the school from the very first offers a meeting place for parents. But the important question, it seems to me, is how the parents can keep the benefits of New Suburbia without paying too heavy a price....

## B. *The Yalta Agreements*

---

### I. Franklin Roosevelt “Betrays” China and Japan (1945)

*One of President Roosevelt’s primary objectives at the Yalta conference was to coordinate with Stalin the final blows of the war. The American people were eager to induce the Soviet Union to enter the conflict against Japan so as to reduce their anticipated losses in the final stages of the assault. The Soviets had already suffered millions of casualties in fighting Hitler, and Stalin told Roosevelt that he would have to receive concessions if he were to justify another war to his war-weary people. The following, one of the top-secret Yalta agreements hammered out between Roosevelt and Stalin, was not made public until exactly a year later. The basic reason for secrecy was that the Soviet Union and Japan were not then at war, and publication or even leakage of the terms might prompt a Japanese attack before the Soviet Union was ready. A need*

---

<sup>1</sup>*Foreign Relations of the United States: The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955), p. 984.