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Time, Technology and the American Character
Brian Gallagher

While it is difficult to distinguish what is uniquely American, doing so is one of the many aims of American Studies. American Studies attempts to define what one means when one talks about “American Character.” In American Studies, things like the American character are analyzed in the context of historical events, myths, and popular culture. Events and myths like that of the frontier are central components to the analysis practiced in American Studies. Put simply, American Studies is an examination of the history and culture that brought Americans to where they are today. The central goal of this discipline is an attempt to explain how all of American history has served to shape and form a unique American character.

When one attempts to define American culture, several events and concepts come to mind—the frontier of the American West, the New World, cowboys and Indians, the land of opportunity, and so on. All of these things and more are integral components to establishing what one might define as American culture. It is essential to establish independent, unique characteristics of Americans in such a definition. While long ago many thought of the United States simply as an extension of England, this is certainly not the case today. America has emerged in the last century as a major figure in the global community. The product of this development and progression is a culture that is distinctly American. It is a culture that emphasizes individualism, opportunity, and expansion. These are central elements in achieving the “American Dream,” the ultimate ambition of American culture.

In an analysis of the enormity of American culture, it is necessary to investigate ideas and trends under a specific lens or context. One such context is that of time and space. It is appropriate to analyze a culture in such a context, as all events happen within these two boundaries. As far as anyone knows, it is not possible for anything to operate outside of time and space. These are the unbreakable laws of nature that dictate every choice and decision in any culture’s history. “As basic philosophical categories, time and space are particularly suitable as a framework for a general cultural history, because they are comprehensive, universal and essential” (Kern 2). It is especially advantageous to examine American culture in this fashion, for America experienced a rapid growth in a little time. Space was altered in drastic ways that took most countries hundreds of years. This development and growth are due primarily to the dramatic advancements of technology and science. This paper will analyze the growth of technology over time and its subsequent effect on the American character. While this rapid technological growth has affected the American character, it has also fostered such myths as that of the frontier, the cowboy, the rugged individual and manifest destiny. As a means of accomplishing this analysis, a comparison will be drawn between the technology of the later 19th and early 20th century and the late 20th century.

The Technology of the Late 19th and Early 20th Century
The Railroad

Following the Civil War, there was a great push for westward expansion in the United States. Americans felt it was their destiny to extend their influence across the
country. With this push for expansion came the development of a faster, more dependable type of transportation—the railroad (Athearn 251).

In the thirty-five years after the Civil War, the railroad became more and more popular. The railroad is simply a technological manifestation of the American desire to move westward. “Railroad locomotives became bigger and more powerful; tracks became smoother, rails of steel replaced straps of iron; coaches became safer and more comfortable….and greater speed with greater safety was attainable” (Oliver 415). The ingenuity needed to create the railroad is indicative of American character. As stated by John Oliver above, “greater speed with greater safety was attainable.” This was essential to westward expansion. Americans no longer had to travel in unreliable wagons across unexplored lands; the tracks had already been laid for them.

Despite the relative safety of traveling across the United States in a railroad car, those who built the railroad experienced hardship and adversity. Before the tracks had been laid, there was nothing but the untamed wilderness of the American West (Athearn 252). The determination and resourcefulness necessary for such an endeavor are exemplary of the American conception of rugged individualism. As an individual, a person can overcome even the most harsh and unforgiving terrain of nature. With this sort of confidence, no goal is unachievable. This tenacity is a central component of the American character. Those who built the railroad had to do so without favorable climate or environment. They were doing what no one had done before them. As a result of their dedication and the aid of technological developments like mass steel production, they “contributed to making the American railroad the nation’s greatest transportation system” (Oliver 415). With the increasing popularity of the railroad, the frontier was diminishing into nothingness. No longer did an individual have to trek across unknown territory to establish themselves and their family. They could do so simply by taking a railroad car.

The goal of laying tracks across the United States to form the transcontinental railroad is intimately related to the American outlook on time. As in contemporary America, citizens wanted the quickest way to reach their destination. Prior to the development of railroads across the United States, it would take months to travel to certain destinations. As such, these destinations were undesirable. The railroad changed this perception of far-away places. No longer were they virtually inaccessible. Anyone with the money to buy a train ticket could make their way out West to start a new life. The time that it would take for one to travel across the United States prior to the railroad could now be used in a much more productive way. Towns and cities as well as industry and commerce could be developed with resources transported by freight train. Consequently, the railroad served as a catalyst for growth and change all across the United States.

The Automobile

In the United States, the first cars became available for purchase in 1895 with the founding of the Duryea Motor Wagon company. These cars were gasoline-powered vehicles, improvements upon the earlier “clunky, steam-powered contraptions” of the past (Englebert 412). Following this, one of the greatest breakthroughs in automobile history occurred—the creation of the assembly line by Henry Ford. Time was a primary factor in creating the need for this innovation. Earlier cars took far too long to make and,
as a result, cost the average consumer too much for them to even consider purchasing one. “The conveyor belt dropped the total production time for an automobile from twelve-and-a-half hours to ninety-three minutes” (Englebert 416). With the institution of the assembly line, Ford was able to produce cars at a much faster rate, enabling him to lower the price.

As a result, roads were paved all over the United States to allow those with cars access to the entire country. In this, the automobile gave the average American the freedom to explore destinations which would have once taken too much time to reach without an automobile. This freedom to explore is a central component to the American character. A scenic drive in the car to a far-off place sometimes served as a release from the tensions of everyday life. A trip that would take hours on horseback and even longer on foot took only minutes by car. As a result, Americans came to rely on their cars more and more. This affinity for automobiles has a distinctly American flavor to it. “Nowhere else in the world has the automobile had such a profound impact on society and culture as in the United States. The automobile is the primary means of transportation, and driving is a national pastime” (Englebert 417). It is clear that this attraction is rooted in the time-saving attributes of the automobile.

The Telegraph

In 1838, Samuel F.B. Morse amazed observers with his presentation of the telegraph. The concept of the telegraph was remarkable to audiences who witnessed its use. “The first telegraph offices often provided seating for the public, who could scarcely believe that it was possible to sever language from human presence” (Standage 126). With the invention of the telegraph there were remarkable advances in both communications and global development. People throughout the world were notified of events as they happened. They no longer had to wait for the news to be transported from person to person. This could now be accomplished through technology. The implications and significance of the telegraph are clearly evident. As stated by the New York Times around the invention of the telegraph, “The Telegraph undoubtedly ranks foremost among that series of mighty discoveries that have gone to subjugate matter under the domain of mind” (Standage 126). Perhaps the most valuable result of the telegraph is the subsequent technology it set the stage for. Today, “the telegraph lives on within the communications technologies that have subsequently built upon its foundations: the telephone, the fax machine, and, more recently, the Internet” (Standage 205). With this spectacular development there was a great change throughout the world. Events now had worldly implications, creating a global community in a sense. This establishment of a global community required global safety regulations. There needed to be a coordinated effort on the part of all nations in order to establish acceptable conduct in a way that had never before been experienced. In reference to this necessity, United States Senator Alden Smith stated, “When nature moves in the same directions in all spheres, why should not the nations clear the sea of its conflicting idioms and wisely regulate this new servant of humanity” (Kern 67). Although this quotation is in reference to an incident which occurred at sea (the sinking of the Titanic), it is clearly applicable to any issue confronting a global community.
As a result of technology like the telegraph, the American perspective on time was greatly affected. This advancement served to create a sort of simultaneity of events throughout the world. Through technology, people could now experience things that were happening great distances away. Technology produced following the telegraph furthered the idea of simultaneity. People debated whether or not an event could be experienced all at once or whether or not things occurred in sequence. This debate manifested itself in the popular literature and culture of the time (Kern 68). The telegraph was a means of allowing users to fully experience the events of the presence. A quotation by Lord Salisbury in Kern’s *Culture of Time and Space* clearly demonstrates this idea of simultaneity and the new experience of the present. The telegraph “combined together almost at one moment…the opinions of the whole intelligent world with respect to everything that is passing at that time upon the face of the globe” (Kern 68).

**The Technology of the Late Twentieth Century**

**The Space Shuttle and Space, “The Final Frontier”**

In the late twentieth century, there were several landmark technological advances made. One of the most dramatic advances was that of Americans landing on the moon. This accomplishment was one of the greatest in all of history. With the Cold War, and the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, came the race between the two superpowers to launch a man into space. The race between the two began when, in 1957, the Soviets launched the first satellite into space, Sputnik I. Americans responded to the Soviet achievement by creating the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The program was dedicated to developing new and improved space technology which would help to further America’s position in the space race. Following the creation of NASA, there was a series of back-and-forth accomplishments between the two nations. In response to this, on May 25, 1961, President John F. Kennedy went to Congress with an ambition to land an American on the moon and return them safely back to earth by the end of the century (Layman 451). Subsequently, “On July 20, 1969, the human race accomplished its single greatest technological achievement of all time when a human first set foot on another celestial body” (NASA). Neil Armstrong became the first man to set foot on the moon, and as he stated, “That’s one small step for man; one giant leap for mankind” (NASA). This achievement instilled confidence in Americans, showing them that, despite the technology and power the Soviets possessed, the communists could still be beaten. This achievement was important for the morale of American citizens. Capitalist America had beaten the communist Soviets. Not only did this feat have an impact on the entire scientific world, it had a great influence on American character. Americans developed the idea that they could not be beaten.

Yet another significant element in landing on the moon was the conquering of the “Final Frontier.” In designating space as the final frontier, it became a symbol that Americans could relate to. This was analogous to the settlement of America. Americans could draw a parallel between landing on the moon and westward expansion. In the race to land on the moon, Americans encountered many of the same problems they had had to endure in settling the West. The environment on the moon was something that was totally new and undiscovered. The environment was as unforgiving and difficult as that of the West. There is little oxygen on the moon, forcing people to develop a way to
survive without it. This impediment became the catalyst for the space-suit, a suit which would allow a man to walk on the moon without suffocating. The ingenuity required to develop such solutions to these problems is yet another component of the American character at the time. Also, the notion of a man landing on the moon is also very similar to manifest destiny. Americans felt it was their duty to land on the moon. This pushed them to achieve this great feat.

The Darker Side of Technology: The Technology of 20th Century Warfare

In thinking of the “space race,” between the Soviets and the United States, it is possible to overlook the darker, more subtle race that went on. This race was one that concerned not technology to better life, but rather technology to end it. This race was one concerning one of the most destructive technologies known to man: nuclear arms. Whereas technologies like those concerned with medical science have the power to increase an individual’s time on earth, the technology of warfare has the power to terminate it.

In a review of technological developments in American warfare, some of the most shocking and horrific events in recent American history come to mind: the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the nuclear arms race, the Vietnam War and many others. “Each of these events was tied closely to the use or misuse, the unforeseen consequences or the malfunctions, of relatively new and powerful science-based technologies” (Marx 11). Each of these situations is without precedent and, as such, Americans were beginning to become uncomfortable with the unpredictable effects of technology. This general feeling gave rise to a typically postmodern concept, “technological pessimism.” In an essay on the idea of technological pessimism, Leo Marx of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology states, “Even if we fully credit the technical achievements of modernity, their seemingly destructive social and ecological consequences (or side effects) have been sufficiently conspicuous to account for much of today’s ‘technological pessimism’” (10). This critical view of technological advancement is in stark contrast to the popular American perspective of the past. In the past, technology had been responsible for prolonging life through developments in areas like medical research and construction. Americans marveled at the infinite possibilities associated with technology, without any real thought as to its destructive capabilities. While there were weapons technologies capable of ending life in the late 19th and early 20th century, none were capable of doing so as efficiently and on such a large scale as that of the late 20th century. This, in turn, gives rise to ethical issues concerning the direction of technology. Does a human have the right to end the time of thousands of other humans on Earth? This is the sort of complicated, crucial question that needed to be considered as a result of the development of weapons technologies.

The Vietnam War and the Myth of the Cowboy

This confidence and reliance on technology resulted in an approach to the Vietnam War that was typically American. Americans entered the Vietnam War with a bravado that is a clear manifestation of the myth of the cowboy. The American idea of the cowboy is that of a hero, one who saves everyone from outlaws and “bad guys.” The
cowboy is always the victor, and always in the right. However, the cowboy “is an imagined character, one created by misconception, myth and falsehood. He is a symbol of freedom, independence, strength and action” (Carlson 8).

The United States believed it could go into the war in typical cowboy fashion. Americans plunged into Vietnam headlong, relying on success through advanced technology and strength of numbers. They possessed the recently developed technology of helicopters and M16s (Williams 383). Also, they had yet to taste defeat in a war. In this, time played a factor. After a long period of prosperity and success, the nation developed the idea that it was invincible.

However, despite superior technology, Americans were unprepared for the guerrilla combat practiced by the North Vietnamese. As a result, the course of the war was not as predictable as had previously been anticipated. In this, the Vietnam War is similar to the misconceptions involved with the myths of the West. The American conception of the West is one in which cowboys distribute justice, making all of the clearly proper decisions in order to keep the peace. This was not the case. “Whatever else the West was, it was not a land of simple choices and clear-cut decisions; its pressures and problems may have been different from those in the East (in many cases they were indeed similar) but they were just as complex” (Murdoch 9). It is clear that this idea is analogous to the American experience with Vietnam. Americans believed they were entering the war as champions of liberty and democracy, aiming to instill these values and ideals in the Vietnamese people. They were fighting against communism in what was thought to be a clear-cut battle between good and evil. Despite this, the cowboy way simply did not work in the Vietnam War.

Americans believed that the conflict in Vietnam could be ended abruptly with U.S. intervention. In this, the American approach to Vietnam underestimated the role that time would play in the war. As time dragged on and the war still continued, there was a tremendous decrease in support and troop morale. Advanced technology could only take Americans so far.

The Computer

One of the greatest technological developments of the twentieth century was the computer. Computers began to be developed in the 1940s, following World War II. These early models were large, awkward devices that had a tendency to breaking down. The earliest American computer was more than fifty feet long, nine feet high, and weighed more than five tons (Englebert 401). By the 1960s, scientists found the solution to this inconvenience with the creation of the integrated circuit. Computers that once filled an entire room were replaced by smaller, more compact versions the size of a television (Layman 451). Computers were becoming, cheaper, more powerful, and more effective. As a result of this rapid development, the personal computer began to appear in the office, the classroom, and even the home. “By the end of the twentieth century, computers had become part of every aspect of society” (Englebert 400). Also, the development of a new programming language made computers more accessible to a broader American audience. Previously, computers had only been available to those who had the time to spend several years learning highly complex languages (Layman 451). These inventions marked the beginning of the information age, an age that would have an
impact on Americans for the rest of their lives. It is evident to anyone living in modern-day America that the invention of the computer served to change the way everything in the world worked. It is the contention of many that computers rank as one of the most important inventions of all time. Computers have changed American society on so many levels, “from commerce and communication to education and entertainment” (Englebert 405). Computers served to revolutionize the way people interacted. They served (and still serve) as an extraordinary means of connecting with other individuals across the earth.

In the development and refinement of computers, the concept of time played a central part. Tasks that would require hours for a human to complete are accomplished by computers in mere seconds. Whereas it would take a human a great length of time to perform calculations in their head, computers can calculate these numbers and figures almost instantly. As a result of computers, Americans need not worry about taking the time to complete a task themselves. The problem involved with the task then becomes the question of how it could be made automated. As a result of this demand for computerization and automation, computers are now making things quicker and more convenient in nearly every part of American life. Americans have become so used to their presence that many hardly even notice them anymore. “They are in the internal systems of cars, in supermarket check-out systems, and in automatic teller machines (ATMs)” (Englebert 406). While this list is a brief one, it is an indication of the millions of devices that utilize computers.

However, despite the great value of the computer in everyday American life, there is also a negative aspect of its presence. As a result of this new technology and the increase in mechanization, American life has sped up. This case is similar to technologies of the past, in which “the technologies passed on their instancy and speed to the users and, through them and through artists, to the wider culture” (Fischer 64). The emphasis of the past was to take one’s time in order to complete a task effectively and efficiently. Now that these tasks have become automated through computerization, the emphasis is on obtaining the solution or product as soon as possible. It is on this foundation that the popular expression “Time is money” is based. Goods that were once valued because of the time and effort it took for them to be produced have become the victim of mass production. Why take the time to produce a handmade quilt when a machine can produce this same quilt in minutes?

This approach to business and life in general is indicative of a philosophy that is distinctly American-Pragmatism. This philosophy is a “natural product of the American spirit and way of life” (MacKinnon 154). Due to the nature of the pioneering life of early Americans, they did not have the time to deal with tasks that required more time and effort than they were worth. As a result, their thinking was firmly based in rationality and practicality. Their lives depended on it. As such, it is no wonder that “a philosophy that originated here might naturally be predisposed to oppose relevant thinking and to favor practical intelligence” (MacKinnon 154). This manner of thinking clearly manifests itself in the automation and mechanization of contemporary American society.
The Internet

The Internet began as a project (then known as Advanced Research Projects Agency Network, or ARPANet) created in 1969 by the United States Department of Defense during the height of the Cold War. It was the world’s first network of electronically connected computers, designed to link organizations involved in defense research in as secure a manner as possible. This network could not be accessed by one outside the system and was designed to keep functioning even if some of the computers in the network did not (Englebert 387). Following the establishment of this network, the Internet extended its influence greatly with the development of a computer language called Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP). This computer language was one that many different computer systems could understand and is also the origin of the name of the Internet (Englebert 388). The next landmark event in the evolution of the Internet was the introduction of the World Wide Web in 1991 by a British physicist named Tim Berners-Lee. With this new innovation, the Internet could be accessed through the Web by any computer (Englebert 389).

As a result of the Internet, communication and business interaction were transformed. “A physical retail space was no longer necessary to sell a product; all you needed was a Web site” (Englebert 387). This lack of physical space which Englebert refers to was given the name “cyberspace.” Cyberspace is not the sort of conventional space that Americans had been used to. It is a unique, virtual space, a space which one can alter and modify without actually touching it. The Internet contains within itself a plethora of data and information. The vast information available to a person on the Internet would take the space of countless libraries to fill. Such a great quantity could only be stored in this virtual cyberspace. As with all things, time is intimately related to this shrinking of necessary storage space. Americans do not want to take the time to inspect hundreds of books in the library to find the information they need. With the invention of the Internet, extensive searching through a library was no longer necessary. The information is instantly at one’s fingertips, only a mouse-click away. As such, the Internet serves as another means of helping one to keep up with the rapid pace of the American society.

Conclusion

It is evident that time served as a catalyst for each of these technologies. With the exception of weapons technologies (technologies designed to end a person’s time on earth), each of these inventions was produced as a means of saving time. It is also clear that this approach of finding the quickest, most practical solution is a defining attribute of the American character. In the late 19th and early 20th Century, as well as the late 20th Century, the value and significance of time in American culture created the need for the aforementioned technologies. In turn, these technologies served to shape and refine the contemporary American character.
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Space and time have long been associated with America, in fact being the major reasons for the colonization and settlement of the land itself. The most recent form of settlement, suburbia, clearly predetermines how one spends one’s time, based on the way the community has been set up by planners. This paper will attempt to prove, through various studies, that the modern-day suburbs created after World War II have directly altered the way Americans spend their time and use their space.

American culture has its roots in time and space usage—colonists wouldn’t have been so excited over the prospect of a “New World” had they not been so preoccupied with the way their time was spent within their realm of the universe. The early settlers with strong religious inclinations were interested in finding a place to worship without persecution, as well as a societal structure that allotted what they deemed the proper amount of time for worship. The Puritans especially ascribed to the delegation of time for certain purposes, such as “keeping holy the Sabbath,” thus making Sunday a (mandatory) day of rest. Limits on what activities could occur both during the week and during the weekend were set. Other groups or individuals who came to settle the area sought space for property, and the more land one could acquire, the more of a success one would be hailed as gaining. The first settlements in what became the Thirteen Colonies reflected this desire to acquire. The most prosperous Americans were seen as those who, like Benjamin Franklin, pulled themselves up by the bootstraps, and became industrious members of society, oftentimes procuring great expanses of property through ingenuity and hard work. After all, many settlers came to America to strike out on their own, and the land was plentiful. The westward expansion of the country and its people only re-emphasize the correlation between space, time, and American culture; principles upon which this nation has grown have their foundations in the freedom the expansive land provides. Being productive and “making the most of one’s time” have been at the heart of this country since its earliest years, and is the most widely spread philosophy throughout the nation, especially in the middle-class stratosphere found in suburbia.

Thus, one need not look far in order to find that it has long been a part of the American character to seek out a personal space where one could spend one’s time. The suburbs, for many, were the modern-day equivalent to the New World; the station wagon may as well have been the Mayflower, carrying new settlers off into a world unknown. Although suburbs had existed since the mid-nineteenth century, the suburbs of the Eisenhower era and since are of a much different breed. In an era of mass production mania, homes became marketable in the same fashion as that of the automobile, with that same idea of initial affordability that made driving so accessible. The trend continues, as suburbs of suburbs are now being built across the nation.

The sheer growth of population after World War II was a driving force behind the suburban boom. Returning servicemen and their families needed somewhere they could go; the 42 million babies born between 1945 and 1960 (Martinson, xvi) and their parents simply couldn’t fit in America’s already burgeoning cities. The solution soon became apparent, and many developers, like the Levitts, capitalized on that fact, and soon began constructing what we call the modern American suburb. As of 1994, more than two-thirds of the American population resided in the suburbs (Langdon, 1).
To better understand the post-war suburban culture of the United States, Kenneth T. Jackson created a list of five basic characteristics or similarities between suburbs developed from 1945 to 1973 (238-41). Peripheral location from a major city, low population density, architectural similarity, easy availability, and economic and racial homogeneity were found to be the common underlying factors in post-war developments.

The architectural similarities among subdivisions created since 1945 can be broken down into four basic styles: Cape Cod, split-level, ranch, and modified Colonial. In addition to the architectural homogeneity in certain communities, such as in the famed Levittowns, Jackson found that each style dominated a certain period of time, when one style was the most popular in various eras. The original Levittown, created in Long Island, was comprised of Cape-cod style homes, and being the prototype for mass-produced suburbs, the Cape Cod style reigned supreme in the earlier years of development.

The peripheral location was logical in that the bulk of the population had been living in cities, and saw the newly developed suburbs as the most suitable choice to transplant. The availability, made possible by mass production techniques created by the Levitt family, as well as the subsequent affordability because of this process, made the post-war era of suburban sprawl prominent in the physical and cultural landscape.

Low population density and economic and racial homogeneity go hand in hand as well, as the use of zoning laws enabled towns to practice illegal discrimination under the guise of maintaining a town’s character. A case entitled Lionshead Lake, Inc., vs. Township of Wayne was fought in New Jersey in 1949, and is seen as a “classic” (King 462) instance in which the community itself decided to regulate who could live there. In order to avoid outright and obvious segregation based on economic standing, the town passed a zoning law creating a minimum size requirement in regards to the square footage of homes allowed in the town. The minimums of 768 square feet were allotted for a one-story home, 1,000 square feet for a two-story home with an attached garage, and 1,200 square feet with a two-story home without an attached garage (Haar 153). In previously built homes in Wayne, the applicability of the minimums ranged depending on the location of homes. In some areas, only twenty percent of current housing complied, whereas in the more well-to-do areas, one hundred percent compliance was seen (Haar 153).

Because the township lies on the edge of various established cities, it was perceived to be on the receiving end of the next wave of those leaving the city, and the predominantly upper-class WASP-populated community wanted to remain as secular as possible. The court ruled in favor of the town’s regulating minimum square footage in housing, citing that the possibilities of “shanties” being built would certainly “deteriorate land values” (Haar 153). The Committee on the Hygiene of Housing of the American Public Health Association had done studies to determine the correlation between the amount of living space and its effects on mental health. These findings helped bolster the township’s claim that it was acting on behalf of the general welfare of Wayne’s citizens, present and future (154). The committee provided many reasons why there ought to be these minimums, yet never mentioned the maximum occupancy of each home, nor the maximum square footage allowed per lot (Haar 154-5). Much was said in favor of open space, yet the considerations were not taken to the point of thinking about massive “McMansions” which now dominate the landscape, houses that under this zoning would be permitted and encouraged to exist. These minimums ensured that only a certain economic, and more pointedly, ethnic, group could afford housing in the township, as the minimums set often exceeded a lower-income family’s means.
The exclusionary practices of zoning in order to regulate space and those who occupied it were seen across America. In 1970, Blackjack, Missouri, was chosen to be the site of a federally subsidized townhouse complex. Black and white families with low to moderate income from St. Louis were to be the future residents of this community, much to the chagrin of the rest of Blackjack. Nine months after news of the subsidized housing project reached residents of this suburb, a new zoning ordinance was passed dictating that only three homes per acre would be allowed in the town. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development filed a lawsuit against the town, and the case went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, where the appellate court’s ruling of discrimination stood (King 466). The idea of racial homogeneity can be seen in the reflection of mere numbers. In a number of studies regarding race distribution in American suburbs, Purdue University professor John Stahura found that African Americans make up only two percent or less of the population in seventy percent of American suburbs (O’Connor 392). Thus, the space of the suburbs themselves, as well as those who could use it, was planned as much as the layout of the communities.

The way houses were designed in the modern suburbs also created new ways in which time was spent. Before the advent of central heating, the living room was just that—a place where the family came together, since the fireplace within was the best source of heat and therefore made that particular room the most comfortable. With central heating, however, along with better lighting in each room, each family member could exist separately in his or her own room, thereby reducing the time spent in one another’s company (Haar 22). Another factor in design is the placement of windows. In the newest suburban homes, windows are placed with aesthetics in mind; function has little to no place in the developer’s vision. In 1991, a couple was arrested and tried for lewdness (among other things) because their bathroom window afforded an eight-year-old neighbor a commanding view of their intercourse at night (Langdon 71).

In Herbert J. Gans’ study of Levittown, New Jersey, even the location of the kitchen window had some sort of ramification on the use of one’s time (157). It had been found that the direction the kitchen window faced in the Cape Cod-style houses would have an impact on which neighbors one was likely to associate with, based on whom they could see the most from that location. Along the same lines, Gans also found that close to half of those visited in the neighborhood lived directly across the street, with the second most popular choice being next door in the left-hand side (157). The role of the kitchen played a key part in the design of the homes themselves. With the kitchen less cut off and placed nearer the front of the house, as well as being surrounded by smaller rooms and less wall space, “the woman could run the house without ever leaving the kitchen. She could cook a gourmet meal for guests and still talk with them as she prepared the food. Or she could do the laundry and still keep an eye on the children,” at least according to Clifford Clark (Gillis 129).

Another change in design was reflected in the absence of the front porch, as well as the encouraged use of the backyard. Pre-World War II homes often possessed a spacious front porch, where entertaining as well as relaxation took place. The front porch was also a means of interaction with the outside world; a person passing on the street might stop by for a brief chat, and parents around the block could keep an eye out on the kids playing in the street. The backyard as the entertaining area gained prominence in the post-war era (Langdon 149). Poolside relaxation took the place of the porch, adding to the increased privatization of time and space in suburban homes.
A connected garage is important in the design; typically, modern homes have their kitchens connected to the garage, saving the time it takes to get groceries from the car to the house (Langdon 151). By 1990, seventy-two percent of suburban homes had a two-car garage attached, and fourteen percent had attached three-car garages (Langdon 149). In terms of square footage and what encompasses that space, things have changed in the past fifty years. In the late 1940s, at the advent of modern suburbia, a relatively large home would consist of 1,300 square feet of living space. By 1992, 1,920 square feet was the new average space in newly-constructed American homes—an increase of close to fifty percent (Langdon 149). The average three-car garage is composed of 700 square feet; the entire square footage of a Levittown house in 1947 could nearly fit inside today’s garage (Langdon 150). Based on the prime focus the garage has taken, one could suppose that the automobile has taken more of a priority in American life in the years since the end of World War II.

This phenomenon could perhaps be explained by a variety of factors. The popularity and relative availability of the automobile should be seen as two more essential ingredients to the settlement of suburbia. With the automobile, one did not have to live near one’s place of business; the daily commute became a way of life for millions of Americans, which is still very much a part of the suburban culture. A good example of this ever-growing trend can be seen in what is now considered a suburb of Boston: Cape Cod. Since 1960, the commuting population from Cape Cod has tripled, regardless of the fact that the daily roundtrip mileage measures around one hundred to one hundred and twenty miles (Langdon 6). This strenuous commute is part of a growing trend that journalists call the creation of “boondocks;” no longer simply fringing major cities, the newest suburbs are rapidly growing in formerly remote areas, hence the play on words (Langdon 6).

In Southern California, this increase in distance as well as population driving to and from that destination has been causing a transportation nightmare. The average freeway speed in the mid-1970s was more than fifty miles per hour; in 1984 it had decreased to forty-seven miles per hour. Traffic engineers predict that by 2010, if current trends are allowed to continue, the average freeway speed in Southern California would be reduced to roughly twenty-four miles per hour (7).

In addition to the commute, the amount of time spent at work in order to maintain a suburban home has grown as well. On average, the number of hours an American spends working has grown by 163 since 1970, according to Harvard University economist Juliet Schor. This total breaks down into an additional four weeks per year spent working, and a reduction of thirty-nine minutes of leisure time each day (Langdon 5). The combination of the time spent working as well as the time spent driving to and from work has to be subtracted from some other allotment of time, and so time spent with the family has decreased dramatically. Karen Palmer, a financial manager, expressed her feelings in an interview regarding working and having a young child at home: “When she was little, I had this fear [that she wouldn’t] recognize me” (as quoted in Langdon 9).

Besides the decrease in time spent with family members, those commuting to work also lack in opportunities to socialize with those they work, and lack in opportunity in meeting those with whom they share a neighborhood block. According to Langdon, there is an increased sense of disconnected amongst the commuters and the rest of their worlds. “Many people undoubtedly assume that a scarcity of daily contact with fellow inhabitants of their community is a fact of contemporary life beyond their control (14),” and unfortunately, in order to keep their space in the suburbs, this is true. According to the study done in
Crestwood Heights, this work schedule is followed by the idea that “time is saved by saving money—to buy ‘leisure’” (Seely, Sim, and Loosley 64).

The automobile is becoming more important to the suburban resident than his own house. The very design of the suburbs was created under the assumption that everyone moving out of the city would have access to at least one car, so the street configurations, as well as the prominence of garages on one’s property, were both key factors in development considerations. Also, the ordinances declaring residential zones versus business zones eliminated the corner store or downtown area of older towns and cities, and instead provided shopping malls and supermarkets that could only be reached plausibly by vehicle. A lack of public transportation, as well as the design of the street layout, provided another example of how one’s use of time is affected and in fact dictated by the use of space. The “curvilinear” street design found in nearly all modern suburbs had its prototype in the design of the Mount Auburn Cemetery in Cambridge, Massachusetts (Langdon 38). Designed to be more aesthetically pleasing, the cemetery’s pathways were made to wind their way through the property, thus creating a more pleasant atmosphere in comparison with straight, though direct, routes. Unfortunately for residents and visitors alike, the curvilinear street system in newer communities adds both confusion and time during each drive through the community; providing only one long, somewhat bewildering route as opposed to the freedom of the grid layout is yet another way in which one’s time is spent fruitlessly. Walking is almost discouraged by this community design, meaning how one travels from one space to another is limited to the car. This obviously creates a problem for those without cars; the young and elderly are at the mercy of car owners, and thus the way they spend their time is at the liberty of another.

In the ten years following World War II, the suburban outskirts flanked the city within a twenty to twenty-five mile radius (Dobriner 329). To get a clearer picture of this commuter hell, by 1958, forty percent of the nation’s traffic was moving along one percent of the available roadways, and ninety-three percent of suburban families owned at least one car. Because of poor planning, the “rush-hour” period was taking up to seventeen percent of a twenty-four hour period, or four hours, while forty to fifty percent of daily travel takes place in this time frame (Dobriner 332-3). Traffic engineers believed they had developed a system to better accommodate the commuters coming and going each day with the development of a street hierarchy. Here, each road has a specific purpose, decreasing in volume of traffic as well as speed. The limited access highway is the fastest and most used, and this road brings the commuters to and from the major highways leading to the cities. Leaving the limited access highway, one finds oneself on one of the arterial roads of the community, which were designed to accommodate a large flow of traffic moving fifty miles per hour. From the arterial road, one exits onto their collector road, often the only way in or out of a development. Off of this collector road are the minor streets, which house the residents of the community. This complex hierarchical design of streets was implemented in the post-World War II suburbs as a means of efficiency, to better accommodate the commuter residents as well as easing the flow of traffic in town (Langdon 29-31).

Walter Kulash, a transportation engineer working at Glatting Jackson Kercher Anglin Lopez Reinhert (a community planning firm from Orlando), argues against this organization of streets. For example, the arterial roads, designed to flow at fifty miles per hour, are the prime location for various businesses and shopping centers. The traffic signals and driveway for entering and exiting cause a great deal of back-up, and time spent on these “efficient” roads
increases dramatically (Langdon 29). In his study, Kulash also found that suburban motorists overestimate the amount of time spent at traffic lights by thirty percent (Langdon 35). This could be attributed to the monotony of the drive, due to soundproof barriers, mile after mile of chain superstores, or the multiplicity of same-styled houses. Thus, the suburbanite’s perception of time has been altered by the mere design of his space.

Levittown, New Jersey, formerly a small farming area known as Willingboro, was the third Levittown in the series, built right on the heels of the completion of one in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Again, the locations of these planned communities were not chosen in vain; New York and Philadelphia were two of the largest and most influential cities in the country, and with the perfect solution to their living situation. The third and final Levittown, as studied by Gans, was somewhat different than its predecessors; the occupants now had a choice of style when selecting their dwelling, thus reducing the appearance of the cookie-cutter neighborhood. However, the variation was only in three types of houses, and the amount of money one had would determine which home they could actually afford, which ranged from $11,500 to $14,500 (Gans xvii). Their living space was more or less chosen for them by the Levitts, in regards to the use of space in each type of home.

In his study, Gans actually lived in Levittown, New Jersey, for the first two years of its existence, from October 1958 to September of 1960, in an effort to examine the myths of the suburb and its so-called miseries. The practice of “neighboring,” or mingling with one’s surrounding families, was seen as what could make or break a person’s happiness in the community. As was found in a previous study conducted by Whyte in Park Forest, a resident was quoted as saying, “Whenever we see someone who is shy and withdrawn, we make a special effort with him” (Thorns 122). The supposed bond of commonality in neighbors caused many to use their similar living situations as means to social organization. Although many enjoyed the bonds created by living in close quarters, others who were not as socially inclined to mingle found the pressure suffocating.

The cul-de-sac, invented in 1929 by Radburn in Fair Lawn, New Jersey, became an increasingly popular neighborhood design, and many of the post-war suburbs employed them (Langdon 42). Seen as the perfect play area for kids, the cul-de-sac’s design also became a means to “enforce familiarity,” as Langdon puts it. As opposed to the grid formation of earlier developments, the cul-de-sac forces each homeowner to be more or less face-to-face with each neighbor on the block, often creating the sense of being under the microscope. One woman residing on a cul-de-sac felt particular animosity towards the situation; she felt as though she couldn’t even go to her car in the driveway without being scrutinized by nosey neighbors (43). Particularly in the era following World War II, the sense of sticking out or straying from the majority implicated one’s role in the Cold War conspiracy. McCarthyism even infected suburbia; William J. Levitt, one of the sons in that famous firm, captured it best in 1949: “No man who owns his own house and lot can be a Communist. He has too much to do.” (Gillis 114).

One can imagine how there were mixed reactions to the neighbor relations in the modern suburbs; some were feeling well at home in their new, homogenous surroundings, while others were feeling the ostracizing factor of either being “different” from the majority—being Jewish, older, not having children, etc—or simply because “It’s no like Philadelphia here. There you might know someone four blocks down the road as well as your next-door neighbor. Here you don’t know people down the road (Gans 156).” One’s
discomfort with one’s own space would determine how and where they spent their time in
the new suburbs, in comparison with their previous day-to-day schedule in the city.

As previously mentioned, one of the major factors for moving to the suburbs was to
provide a better life for the children. The “dangers” of the city were somehow eradicated
with the move to a lower-density, more aesthetically pleasing environment. This, however,
is now being looked back upon as a great misconception. As San Francisco architect Daniel
Solomon jokes, one doesn’t hear much about “cul-de-sac smarts” (Langdon 44). Myrna
Blyth, an editor at Ladies’ Home Journal, has a vision of not a neighborhood, but rather a
collection of solitary houses, with a single kid in each home, wasting away while watching
television. She sees the modern suburbs as a place more conducive to loneliness rather than
sociability, and statistics seem to back up this vision (Langdon 24). Ten percent of children
ages twelve to sixteen were found to experience a feeling of loneliness frequently, according
to a study by psychologist Nicholas Zill (24). Suicides committed among fifteen- to
nineteen-year-old Americans quadrupled from 1950 to 1988 (25). Although each case may
not apply directly to a suburban cause, the sprawl that occurred during this time period
coincides. As writer Sidonie M. Gruenberg of the New York Times Magazine wrote in 1985,
“Mass produced, standardized housing breeds standardized individuals, too—especially
among youngsters” (Jackson 244).

The great vision of the modern American dream, with the nuclear family at its
epicenter, was thought to be a product or perhaps produced the post-war American suburb.
Research, however, does not back up this ideal. In a study conducted by Condry, Siman,
and Bronfenbrenner (circa 1970), 766 sixth-graders were polled to see how their weekends were
spent. For each day, each child spent on average two to three hours with parents, more than
two to three hours with a group of friends, and about two to three additional hours with a
single friend (Haar 26). The time a child spent with peers is more than double that which he
or she spent with immediate family.

In Bronfenbrenner’s essay “The Split Society: Children vs. Adults,” he claims that parents
no longer raise their children, and the study is a reflection of the amount of time the parents
actually spend with their offspring. The children who spent a greater amount of time with
their peers were found to harbor more feeling of neglect, thus seeking an alternate means of
affection their working parents might not physically be able to offer. The amount of time
adults spend on work inevitably affects the amount of time spent with the family, and it
seems to be having a negative impact on the children, who said that they don’t necessarily
prefer spending time with their peers than with their parents; the option simply isn’t there.
The values a child is taught by the parents and the society of the suburbs affect the way one
perceives time. In the Crestwood Heights study, punctuality was found to be one of the most
constant, both directly and indirectly, taught “virtues” throughout the community (Seely,
Sim, and Loosley 65). The “work day,” or those days ranging from Monday through Friday,
determines where one must be, whether it is school for the children or time when the parents
are available for them to see. The use of the home space is dictated by this schedule, as the
living space remains relatively empty until at least 3:30 p.m., but more often than not the
entire family will not be fully assembled until dinner time, around 6:00 p.m. (Seely, Sim, and
Loosley 73). The weekend, however, is catch-up time for most families, when the schedule
is not so demanding or rigid, and activities designed to involve the whole family are
promoted (Seely, Sim, and Loosley 75). Adults, however, are trapped in the middle, as they
may need the weekend to catch up on work or household chores, or simply want to enjoy the little time they have in the home they work so hard to maintain.

A variety of factors contribute to the way a child spends his or her time in the suburbs. The need for “safety” created zoning laws in which businesses were not allowed to operate in residential zones. After-school and summer job opportunities, as well as a common meeting place, do not exist in most of the post-war communities. The design of the communities themselves do not make walking conducive, as Langdon, as well as many others, mention over and over again. The elimination of walking or bike riding to a friend’s house or school, or practice thus leaves how the child’s time is spent up to the parents. In Haar’s collection of essays, Margaret Mead’s, entitled “Freedom to Choose,” describes the consequences of design of the modern suburb. She explains that, overall, there is a “lack of privacy and freedom to move around,” based on the constant need for an automobile (Haar 22). Since the car is always needed, no one’s time is truly personal; everyone has to know where they’re going or where they’ve been. The mother’s role as chauffeur is depicted in Carpool: A Novel of Suburban Frustration. Author Mary Cahill wrote the novel as a means to convey her deep dissatisfaction with the way life is lived: “[Carpooling] is like a subculture. There are times when you feel you are wasting your life” (Langdon 46). Again, the use of space has a direct impact on the way individuals use their time.

The way in which women spend their time based on the space given in the new suburbs is of great interest as well. Beginning in the 1920s, the concept of home economics was derived from the pressing need for making women into time-management mavens, whose duties encompassed everything but making money. Figures of authority re-emphasized this point with articles, books, and speeches on the proper roles of their female counterparts. The Reverend John Ware exemplifies this hegemonic sentiment in the following comment: “Home is the particular sphere of women. With the world at large she has little to do. Her influence begins, centers, and ends in her home. [The home is] the workshop for the mother. It is not only where she is to live, to love, but where she is to care and labor. Her hours, days, weeks, months, and years are spent within its bounds; until she becomes an enthroned fixture, more indispensable than the house itself” (as quoted in Gillis 125).

The city, however crowded, smelly, dirty, or relatively unsafe it may have been, afforded homemakers the luxury of all services within either a walk or bus ride away, with the opportunity to get out of the house for a quick stroll. As Gillis states (115), the city offered everything within its boundaries, including the much-desired mental stimulation often found lacking in planned suburbia. The reduced amount of space between the amenities of one’s home in the city is starkly contrasted with that of the planned suburb. In the suburbs, a woman’s time consisted more of driving to and from such businesses, as well as being required to pick up the children from school and transport them to various activities, plus always tending to the regular homemaking duties that were perceived as her job only. Although nearly every family asked in various surveys as to their reasoning for moving to these prefabricated communities overwhelmingly replied first and foremost to create a better life for their family (Thorns 112-3), the woman’s sacrificing and suffering seemed to take away from this ideal notion. Even college-educated women were expected to fall into the role of homemaker, regardless of their ambition or otherwise comparable skills with men. Women were also expected to be the “face” of the family, or at least became representative of that since the husband was off at work somewhere distant. A great number of demands
and expectations were placed on female suburban residents; the “expectations,” however, were only seen from the dominant male perspective, and to what a woman should aspire had nothing to do with intellectual capacity of any sort. The goal was to reach the ideal set forth by men, and any sort of deviation on the part of the female was seen as sub-par performance. The following quote reflects the general attitude of the times in which it was spoken, but also demonstrates the lack of ground women as a whole have gained today: “The role of the wife provides the chief dilemma in this suburb as she has the problem of devoting herself to her husband and children and still being socially conscious, of being an influential figure within the social life of Crestwood Heights both for her own satisfaction and for the status enhancement of her household” (Thorns 115).

The emphasis on productivity and efficiency in all aspects of suburban life has taken its toll on the American population. As reflected most poignantly in the youth of today, the so-called “American Dream” is not so much American as it is pure advertisement. In the post-war era, marketers, rather than heroes, have woven the cultural fabric that most perceive as “America.” Is this the next chapter in America’s heritage? We as a people have been sold images that are supposed to represent the American character. In the past, colorful individuals with strong wills and perseverance made various characteristics and events the embodiment of what everyone proudly hailed as American. Today, we merely rely on what is spoon-fed to us via public officials and outdated history books, in addition to whatever they say in the media.

The planned communities created after World War II completely dictate how one’s time is consumed, based on the use of space. The liberal use of one’s time and the freedom of one’s use of space are of no longer a matter of choice in the modern American suburb—unless one makes the choice to move.
WORKS CITED


O’Connor, Carol A. “Sorting Out the Suburbs: Patterns of Land Use, Class, and Culture.” *American Quarterly* 37, 3 1985.


Technology in the American Home
Gail Katherine Brice

American culture is unique due to the diverse groups of people brought together to form a single country. The culture of this society is one that places a great deal of importance on time. Through various books, journals, and articles, one is able to encounter a plethora of readings that stress the importance of time and space in the United States. These various readings examine numerous aspects of our society that support the idea that time can not be wasted.

The culture of time and space relates to the way society utilizes time, which in turn affects society’s space. In the culture of a society, in this case, American society, people of diverse races, classes, and ethnicities create different spaces over time, due to people performing various activities, which obviously causes them to spend their time in different ways. Therefore, the way in which people spend their time can directly affect the kind or type of space that they take part in and vice versa. Thus, by evaluating the various spaces of the American society over time, one can begin to understand the culture of the American people.

One aspect of American Studies strives to compare the culture of time and space. Another broader approach would be to compare time and space in the twentieth century U.S.A. with that of the nineteenth and recent twenty-first centuries. By examining and comparing the current culture with that of the later 19th and early 20th centuries, one is able to begin to understand the events that took place in different areas of society that resulted in major changes over the course of these past two centuries.

This paper will examine the idea that over time, the American individual gained more time to participate in personal space, first related to the family, and later strictly personal, through the advancement of technology, thus decreasing the amount of time invested in community space and activities. Technology clearly affects numerous aspects of society and personal life; however, this paper will focus on the effects it had and has within the home. Macgregor J. Wise explains how people, as a whole approach or view technology. One person “approaches technology like one would approach social space, and one approaches technology when one approaches social space” (Wise 125). With this quote, Wise strives to explain that technology and social space are intertwined; one relies on the other. This paper will further explain how technology has reshaped Americans from a group of rather community-centered people to a group of more family-oriented individuals and then to individually-oriented people. Several examples of changes in technology through the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, which caused changes in space, will support this theory. In addition, the question will be examined of whether class, gender, and race or ethnicity played a significant role in the development of this thesis. Perspectives from a variety of people will further assist in constructing this idea.

Through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and, now, into the twenty-first, an overwhelming number of changes occurred within American society, many of which were experienced in the home. The radio and television, in particular, are two key pieces of technology that have made drastic changes within the home and the community. With the increasing advancements of these two technological devices, space within the home changed from being family-centered to being almost completely individually-centered.
The radio started to become popular as a household appliance in the early 1920’s. Mike Adams, of the California Historical Radio Society stated, “The decade begins with people listening to home-made crystal sets with headphones, progresses to large battery-operated sets with dozens of dials and a horn speaker to electric console radios designed as fine furniture, single knob tuning and loudspeakers” (Adams). After World War I ended, the radio moved out of car garages and into the homes of many Americans. Louis Carlat, author of *A Cleanser for the Mind* stated, “Between the early twenties and the mid-thirties it was transformed from a male-dominated hobby of the garage or attic into a furnishing for respectable families” (Carlat 115).

As it moved from the garage into the home, the radio became a source of togetherness for families. Carlat continues to explain the radio’s effect on family life in its early stages of the 1920s:

Old rules governing social contact between the sexes has been broken by modern entertainments . . . The auto’s ability to remove couples from watchful eyes, dark movie theaters, crowded dance halls, amusement park devices that threw riders into each other’s arms – In contrast to these amusements, radio could entertain the whole family within the safety of the home. (Carlat 130)

Where several other new forms of technology seemed to break apart the importance of time spent with family, the radio focused on bringing it back. In the early years, the radio resulted in young teenagers, particularly, no longer having to look outside the home in order to find pleasure or entertainment.

The modernization of society resulted in the radio’s physical changes. Also, the advertisements regarding radios were forced to make proper adjustments in order to appeal to the new female consumer. “The transition from male toy to a component of domestic space required recasting radio hardware as a feminine object, and listening as a feminine activity” (Carlat 116). This was a distinct event in terms of the radio because it moved from the male-dominated space into the female space of domesticity over the course of only about twenty years, which covered the time it was invented up to the time it was introduced in the home.

In its beginnings in the American home in the 1920s and the 1930s, the radio was considered the most popular form of home entertainment in the United States. At its start, the radio incorporated numerous variety shows with “music, slapstick or ethnic humor, and often suggestive situations” ("Old Time Radio"). As the society became more attuned to the radio, the various shows became increasingly popular. “By the mid-1930s radio featured all the genres popular in other forms of American entertainment: comedy, drama, horror, mystery, romance, music, and so on” ("Old Time Radio").

Despite its popularity, in the early stages of its progress into the American home, the radio was a rather expensive addition to home appliances. “Radio ownership in the twenties was sharply divided along class lines” (Carlat 120). In fact, many working class families were simply not able to afford this new invention. Carlat explains, “Advertisements showed radios in elegant, even opulent surroundings, emphasizing that this was a cultural luxury or status item” (Carlat 120). Since the radio was considered a luxury through the 1920s, only select families were privileged to attain one of these
status-symbolizing pieces of equipment as an addition to their home furnishings. Carlat says:

This reflected the fact that factory-built receivers frequently cost more than a hundred dollars, putting them out of the reach of many families ... fully assembled receiver sets remained instruments of middle and upper class leisure during the twenties. (Carlat 121)

With this quote, the sharp line between families being able to obtain radios and those who were not was clearly identified.

In addition, in the early stages of the radio as part of the domestic life, it not only limited people based on class, it also limited people based on race, or ethnicity. “Not surprisingly given the distribution of wealth in the United States in 1930, an overwhelming majority of receivers in that year were in the homes of white Americans, particularly the native-born living in large cities” (Carlat 120). Thus in radio’s early years, only select families were given the opportunity to enjoy this new technological advancement.

Through the course of the twentieth century, as the radio steadily increased in production, more people were within reach of obtaining this appliance. By the end of the century, it was commonplace for families, regardless of class, race, or ethnicity, to have a radio in their home. Mary Miller, of the University of Georgia stated “In 1990, 99% of homes had at least one radio. The average American home owned five radios” (Miller). Over time, cheaper radios adopted standard buttons and capabilities. In addition, more expensive radios, especially today, have a surplus of functions. “Radio’s capabilities, control mechanisms, and outward appearance have all been redesigned to accommodate the change from hobby device to instrument of culture and social control” (Carlat 131). As Miller explained, the majority of families in American society, even nearly fifteen years ago, had a radio in their home. However, it is definitely possible that the types of radios found within homes differed from class to class, which could adversely reflect a difference between races or ethnicities, as well.

The radio has offered Americans the ability to be experiencing the spaces of two different places at one time. In its beginning, the radio created an increase of family time. As Carlat explained the switch of the radio from its place in the garage to its place in the home, he mentioned several advertisements during the 1920s. Carlat stated, “Numerous other illustrations show idealized white affluent domesticity, in which children are happily united with their mothers, and husbands with wives, before a receiver” (Carlat 131). This increase of family time was mainly due to the fact that radios were so expensive, so there was only one receiver within each household. However, just as the radio started to become attainable to the common people, it seemed to serve as a stepping stone in America as an even more creative form of technology soon entered into this ever-advancing society, the television.

When televisions were first introduced into the American home, a single television was often placed in the family, or living room. Having this element of technology in a main living area resulted in families spending more time together, as television time was family time. In addition, as more family time accumulated, there was less time to participate in community-oriented activities. Further into the twentieth century, televisions began to appear in other rooms of the house, and more than one
television in each household was commonplace. In October 2002, “98% of houses in the United States have at least one television set” (Cohen). If a house had additional television sets, than this meant that the televisions were spread into other rooms of the home. In October 2002, “In America, approximately 20% of children between the ages of 2 - 7 have televisions in their rooms” (Cohen). As this increase of televisions throughout the home occurred, the amount of family time decreased.

In 1954, psychologist, Hilde Himmelweit, suggested, “Viewing television is more of a family activity than listening to the radio or visiting the cinema” (Himmelweit 377). Therefore, during the mid-1900s, the television was considered a positive attribute to the American home. In Himmelweit’s study, she surveyed children, posing the question:

What are the most important ways in which television has really changed things at home? 21 percent of the older and 13 percent of the younger viewers singled out the fact that the family was at home more or that its members saw more of one another. (Himmelweit 379)

This survey suggests that the people of the younger generation welcomed the new form of technology in the home with a positive outlook. Himmelweit continued to point out the positive aspects of television in the home by stating, “As many as 18 and 20 percent . . . made the even more important point that viewing improved the general tone of things at home, that there was more to do and talk about, that the family got on better together, and that there was more peace and quiet” (Himmelweit 379).

In regards to social classes, only homes of wealthy American families were privileged enough to adopt this new piece of entertainment into their homes. The cost of a television box was often far out of reach for the average working American. Thus, many immigrants, or ethnic groups, who did not yet gain civil rights as American citizens until later in the century, were not able to own a television. Through the course of the century, similar to the radio, as some features became standard, televisions slowly became affordable to people of all classes, races, and ethnic backgrounds.

Despite a sense of increased family unity, there were also speculations about the amount of family interaction during a time of television viewing. More specifically, some proposed the difference of interaction of younger versus older children. Himmelweit explains:

As the child grows older, his viewing experience becomes increasingly personal; he makes fewer attempts to either share it with other member of the family, or to draw them into it afterwards. At this stage viewing can occur as much in isolation as if the child were physically alone (Himmelweit 381).

During the course of the twentieth century, the amount of television sets in the (average) American home increased. Anthony Curtis Ph.D. explained the percentage increase of television sets in homes over the course of the twentieth century:
Certainly, there was an extreme increase of televisions in American homes. In order to verify the extreme increase of television sets in American homes, another chart is provided. The following is a chart from the PBS website, which describes the increase of televisions in homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of homes with a television set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Nearly 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>More than 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>More than 98% &amp; 99% had color T.V. sets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Curtis)

With this drastic increase, children were given the opportunity to actually have a television in their own room; thus, this offered television a way to enhance individual space and time within the home.

Even without a surplus of televisions in households, many families experienced television’s capabilities of offering one his or her personal space in a house of chaos. In 1986, David Morley states, “In higher density families, TV viewing may function as a way of avoiding conflicts or lessening tensions in lieu of spatial privacy” (Morley 21). However, although it is viewed as a means of avoiding conflict, television is also considered a means for conversation initiators for families. “Television can be seen to provide . . . for encounters between family members, where the content of the television programme they are watching together may often simply serve as a common experiential ground for conversation” (Morley 22). Therefore, during the decade of the 1980s, many families still watched television together, and, although they may not have been conversing during the program, some believe that it would offer ideas for conversations at a later time, either later in the day, or perhaps even during the next day. Morley fully explains this idea stating:
One can examine the ways in which television provides family members with different schedules for gathering, the ways in which television provides acceptable zones for private pursuits, the ways in which television programming does not so much intrude on existing family activities as provide organizing centers or focuses for new types of communicative contexts. (Morley 22)

Therefore, at this time in American society, the television was still considered a positive attribute in the American home, which brought families closer together. However, other writers during this time had thought a little differently. As time passed from the origination of the television set, the opinion of television’s effect on the American family changed. As Himmelweit suggested, many people first looked to the television as a positive contribution to the American household. Albert Borgmann, in 1985, claims, “Television is not rated particularly highly as a general way of spending time, and in fact was evaluated below average compared to other free-time activities” (Borgmann 143). As the television became more of a necessity, instead of the status symbol that it was in its early years, the positive attitude towards this technology decreased. Now many strive to participate in activities that bring more joy into their lives. “We feel uneasiness about our passivity and guilt and sorrow at the loss of our traditions or alternatives” (Borgmann 143). Borgmann continues by stating, “More engaging activities such as ‘being with friends, helping others, religion, and reading’ are thought to be more satisfying than television viewing” (Borgmann 143).

Dianne Smith stated, “Although the family is the oldest and historically the most important of all human institutions, there seems to be more ‘at risk’ families today than ever before” (Smith). Through her journal article, Smith suggests that more families need to engage in physical activity in order to strengthen their bonds. In Smith’s article she stated:

Ragheb (1975) concluded from his study regarding the relationship between leisure time activities and family cohesiveness that the more time a family spends together participating in recreational activities the higher degree of family cohesiveness. (Qtd. In Smith)

These studies support the importance of physical activity among family members. However, through the increase of technological advances, the time for families to actually partake in leisurely activities seems to be very limited. Therefore, as technological space increased in the family life, shared leisurely activities decreased among families.

In fact, other sources support this idea that television hinders time for shared leisurely activity, as well as effects behavior and attitudes. Professor Stewart Cohen stated, “Television influences work-leisure relations, aesthetic interests and values, consumer behavior patterns, parent-child attitudes and socialization practices” (Cohen). As the adventurous, rugged American vanishes into the west, this type of American character almost seems to leave with it, or perhaps the character simply adjusts to the present day and age.

Technology evidently had and has a major effect on American families, which in turn affects American society. The effect of technology on our society could easily be compared to several different American myths. The myth of the frontier is the most
common and evokes a sense of improvement, an overarching idea that in time things will get better. Through the improvements and modernizations of the radio and the television, the technologies certainly became more advanced. However, as the technologies improved, it seems as though the rugged individualism that Crevecceur promoted and Ben Franklin explained slowly diminished with the increases and improvements of technology. Instead of traveling out west and experiencing the harsh realities of the wilderness, Americans have been able to experience these times through simply turning on the television and watching a show. Instead of going to a Broadway musical or opera show and experiencing first hand the beauty of music, Americans are able to turn the dial on and listen to music on the radio.

In a counter argument, the American character with traits of improvement and individualistic could be developed through the constant advances in technology. The American character causes people to feel that a certain design or a certain way is never quite good enough; things must still get better. Therefore, there is still a type of frontier in relation to the technological world. However, through all of the excess spaces that have been created through the constant and continuous modernization of objects and materials, Americans do not seem to take the time to truly enjoy them. Cohen and Smith both suggested that families do not give enough time to actually share in leisurely activities, which are often a way to strengthen family bonds. However, instead of partaking in a family activity, Cohen says, “Demographic data suggest that, on average, American adults have 41 work-free hours each week; of these, television viewing consumes more time than any other activity” (Cohen). When television was first developed, many people looked towards it with a positive attitude. Today it is often a negative activity to participate in during one’s free time.

In order to gain a better perspective on technology’s effect on the American home, an interview was conducted with Edward Auer, a sixty-four-year old male, who grew up in the Bronx, New York. Questions were based on the radio and television during his childhood. When he was questioned about the effect of the radio in his home, he explained that the radio was often the center of entertainment when he was a young boy. However, as he grew into his teen years, his family was able to afford a television, and that piece of technology certainly overpowered the entertainment of the radio. As he talked about the television in his home, he explained, “We had only one black and white television. It sat in the family room and everyone watched shows together” (Auer). Auer’s responses clearly agreed with and supported the research that in the television’s early years, it was primarily a family activity.

In addition, a further interview was conducted with Melissa Risch, an eighteen-year-old female, currently attending La Salle University. Melissa was questioned based on the role of television in her current home situation since televisions are a more predominant main form of technology today. She said that she has about four televisions, which all are located in different areas of her home. When she was questioned on her viewing time and style, she said that she usually views about three times a week and when she does watch television, it is usually an individual activity; however, at select times, it is a family activity. In general Risch stated, “I feel that television brings my family farther apart because we are each watching our own shows at different times” (Risch). Risch’s thoughts reflect the negative views that many people have regarding television, which contradict Auer’s positive thoughts on television viewing in the 1950s.
Over time, television’s role in the household changed; thus, this resulted in the shift from more family-centered homes to more individually centered ones.

Over time, technological space changed and modernized, which caused other spaces to apparently be affected as well. For instance, Cohen and Smith suggested that the modernization of television resulted in more families focusing on various shows instead of participating in other more fulfilling leisurely activities. Even the way in which television is viewed today has shifted from a positive view in its beginnings, which Morley clearly explains to a much more negative one; this is also proposed in Borgmann’s writings. Himmelweit supported Borgmann’s negative view on television, suggesting that although families could view shows together, they could still be experiencing the time in complete isolation. Himmelweit stressed that if conversation does not occur then it was as if all of the family members were watching the show as an individual activity, even if they were all together in the same room. As the television spread into other areas of the home, it clearly created less family space and an increase of personal space.

Similar to the television, the radio started with positive beginnings in the decade of the 1920s. Carlat explained the phenomena of the radio’s shift from the male space of males’ garages into the female space of the cult of domesticity. In addition, he stressed that the clear lines between the affluent and the working class were evident, particularly in regard to radios, since they were a rather expensive piece of home furnishing when it was moved into the space of the home. However, as this space became increasingly common over time, the price of the product decreased; thus, the interesting and exciting space of radios were opened up to nearly all members of society, or at least this space was no longer limited to one particular area.

Furthermore, as additional technology, and later, modernizations of technology became available to the American society, the gap between the rich and the poor seemed to increase. The lack of technology, specifically regarding schools, is often referred to as the digital divide. The PBS website explains the problem our society faces today:

Digital divide shines a light on the role computers play in widening social gaps throughout our society, particularly among young people. By providing equitable and meaningful access to technology we can ensure that all children step into the 21st Century together. (“Digital Divide”)

Digital Divide occurs because different opportunities through technology are offered to people at different times. If the various spaces among technology were equalized before being modernized, this problem may be able to be fixed; however, with the continuous drive to improve, it is unlikely that this will happen. It is clear that technology certainly assists society in many positive aspects, however; it also hinders society to work together, thus fostering the importance of personal space and personal gain.

Through these examples, it is evident that through time and the modernization of technology, the American individual was offered more opportunities to enjoy personal space. In the beginning years of the radio and television, these technological advances seemed to encourage a surplus of family time. However, as further advances were made, these products began to increase personal space and limited family space.
The American family simply does not have as much time to spend on community-oriented activities as they did in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. With the creation of the radio and the television, many individuals are spending more time focusing on their immediate surroundings, which sometimes includes family activities, but also clearly includes their own personal space. As the various books, journals, articles, and interviews suggest, over the time of the past twentieth century and now into the twenty-first, the American individual gained more time to participate in personal space. This personal space was first related to the family, and now, today is related strictly to the individual. Through these demanding advancements of technology, the amount of time to invest in community space and activities has decreased.
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Time and Space: A Benefit and Drawback for the Modern Woman
Rachel Bausinger

As America continues to develop as an extremely influential country in today’s world, more attention is given to this development. American Studies specifically seek to analyze the American character as well as American trends and adaptations that Americans have undergone over time. Likewise, time and space is another way of analyzing the uniqueness of America as a country. Studying how Americans view or use their time and space reveals a deep impression on the ways Americans live their lives differently from other countries in the world.

Women of today and yesterday have always been pressed for time. However, the things they did with their time have changed over the years for a great deal of women. In the past, women filled their time with mostly household chores and the rearing of children (Iglehart 15). Today, women are seeking more individual paths of higher education and developing careers before they even consider starting a family. In essence, they are spending more time on themselves first, and pushing back domestic chores for later in life.

In addition, women’s space has also changed. Naturally, space and time are concepts that are difficult to separate. And in the case of women, because their opportunities in society have increased over time, so has their access to certain spaces. Today, women are spending much more of their time doing things outside of the home so that naturally they are not limited to the home. And, even inside the home, women have gained more neutral space or even personal space for typical male-centered purposes of the past, such as offices. In essence, because of a number of advancements for women in the 20th century, women have become much more present in other realms of society aside from the home.

One specification that must be made is the idea that there are still women who are housewives and spend their time within the home. However, a majority of women are choosing to develop their lives professionally before taking on the domestic role (Iglehart 17). And, once women do achieve in both sides of the domestic and professional world, their time is more pressed than ever before. Their time has been more compromised which creates additional issues of time and space that were not pertinent to women of the past. It is this specific issue of time and space in American Studies that will serve as an area that is studied in order to gain a deeper understanding of the American character.

At a time when the “50’s housewife” was a commodity, women were actually stepping out of the home and joining men in society. Prior to the mid-20th century, women still found themselves as an asset to the household. Society expected women to work solely for the household. One source writes, “The prevailing sentiment suggested that children needed full-time mothers to move successfully through life” (Iglehart 15). However, the same source also says, “The around the clock presence of the mother is no longer a moral obligation” (Iglehart 15). American society was making changes for women and women were certainly taking advantage of these changes. A new philosophy on the position of women in society was surfacing. Defender for women’s rights Lester Frank Ward claims, “Where the only objects with which women come in contact are those of the kitchen, the nursery, the drawing-room, and the wardrobe, how will she be
expected to have broad ideas of life, the world and the universe” (Matthews 133). An overall change of societal expectations was bridging the gap between women’s wish to leave the home and to seek ways of filling her time elsewhere.

While movements in society allowed for more women’s rights, technology also helped women to take it easy on the dishes and join a club or volunteer. As household technology assisted women in chores, it also cut back on time spent doing chores. James Gleick suggests in his book *Faster* that the modern conveniences, such as the microwave or dishwasher, allow someone to “apply these time savings to your chores, your obligations, and your assignments” (136). He suggests that while the microwave really saves only ninety seconds, it is ninety extra seconds that many value. Furthermore, simpler inventions have created a great deal of time to be used elsewhere. While it might take an hour or more to scrub the floor, a mop could do the trick in ten minutes. In essence, because of these time-savers, women had opportunities to seek other employment options outside the home (Iglehart 7).

Furthermore, time spent cooking also decreased. The revolutionary idea of “quick and easy meals” actually began in the 1950s as women joined the workforce. Gleick also comments, “Packaged dry breakfast cereals, ready to douse with milk and eat, began as a fast alternative to cooked grains like oatmeal, instant or not” (147). The food market is one of the largest areas that has adapted to time saving energies in the home. Gleick writes, “Prepared, precooked, prepackaged meals – all take up more supermarket space than fresh fruits and vegetables. They threaten to surpass the rest of the traditional stock: the mere ingredients of meals” (148). Women’s magazines, like the *Journal*, offered meals that involve canned or instant foods (Matthews 211). Today modern magazines such as *Family Circle* and *Good Housekeeping* offer time saving strategies on cooking, cleaning and various other household responsibilities. Likewise, the hit television program on the Food Network *Rachael Ray’s 30-Minute Meals* offers complete meal options in fewer than thirty minutes.

The actual setup of the household began to change as well. An article in *McCall’s* magazine read, “Men, women and children are achieving it together. They are creating this new warmer way of life, not as women alone or as men alone, isolated from one another, but as a family sharing a common experience” (Leavitt 172). The separation of spheres was slowly disappearing as men and women began to share household space. While women still tended to household tasks, such as cooking, space changes within the home changed the isolation of women. For example, the kitchen that opens into the living area allowed the women to still be present as she cooked while watched over the children or conversed with the family (Leavitt 187). This change eliminated the separation. In previous years, women were confined to closed kitchens and the family room was typically completely separate from the kitchen. But, the more open living arrangement allowed for a more neutral space.

While the 1950s were a catalyst for the change of women’s time and space, the later years only brought more transformations. Iglehart did a study comparing women in 1957 to women in 1976. The study surveyed 850 women who worked full time in the home or in the labor market. The results are as shown:
The results show a 19 percent decrease in women working full-time in the home, and a 19 percent increase in women working full-time in the labor market. Needless to say, in twenty years, women were spending less time in the home and more time in the labor market.

The same study also surveyed the same group of women on their preference for either doing full-time housework or other kinds of work. The results are as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Work</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Housework</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Iglehart 28)

These results show a similar tendency in the first table. Again, not only are women joining work outside the home, but they agree to work outside the home more than ever before. Iglehart found that contrary in the post-war period, women in the second half of the 20th century felt as if the role of the housewife was “keeping her down” (Iglehart 60). In essence, not only was the time spent in the home for most women changing, but so were the attitudes on time spent in the home for women.

Today, twenty years after the Iglehart studies, women are persistently raising the bar for working outside the home. A 1990 study found that 74 percent of women aged 24-25 were in the work force, a 30 percent jump since 1976 (Crispell 38). And a more recent book found that sixty-two million American women are at work, which makes up 47% of the American work force (Hewlett 133).

Women are steadily spending more time working outside the home, rather than settling down inside the home. Furthermore, if women are giving more time to themselves once they are independent, then they postpone giving time to marriage and child-bearing. Crispell finds that in 1956, the average age that women were married was 20.1. while in 1990, the age rose to 24 for a first marriage. However, this is the average; the tendency is for educated, professional women to wait until their twenties or late thirties to marry. Another source writes, “Today’s 38-year-old woman is yesterdays 28-year-old in terms of readiness for marriage” (Hewlett 185). Based on this assumption, women seem not ready to settle down early in life.

American popular culture is catching on to this new trend as seen in television and film. Two of television’s most popular sitcoms, Friends and Sex and the City focus on the thirty year old adults who work and enjoy the single life. Friends includes both women and men. However, Sex and the City specifically centers around four women who live in the city and certainly are not looking to settle down -- hence the title. While the show brings in issues of physicality, it also develops the individualism within each character. TBS’s promotion for the show reads, “Carrie Bradshaw has the perfect life. Fabulous friends, a rewarding job and more designer shoes than any woman could ever wear” (TBS online). This headline suggests that having the perfect life today means having a great job and lots of friends and material goods. Notice that family and men are
not included. Another source writes, “It can be isolating to feel your old cronies are living the *Sex and the City* life while you’re stuck on *Yes, Dear*” (Poniewozik 3). Because popular culture is so influential, television series are changing the expectations placed on women to settle down and marry young.

Even though women are pushing back walking down the aisle more today than ever before, they are waiting to bear children even more. Most argue that reproduction is the single most discouraging issue for a woman’s personal success (Macneall and Wu 2). The article, “Education, Work and Childbearing after Age 30” also suggests that “a woman weighs the costs and benefits of having children at a particular juncture of her life, and that her decision will be influence by her education, career, and financial goals” (Macneall and Wu 2). Exposure to other options than the typical housewife has proved appealing to women, so women are opting to wait these days. The article later claims that although women are choosing to take advantage of opportunities while they are young, that does not mean that they are no longer interested in becoming mothers -- they are simply delaying it. The article reads, “The pursuit of education and careers takes time, and for many women it appears that delaying motherhood is a reasonable means to negotiate their varied roles and aspirations” (Macneall and Wu 11).

So when are women having children these days? The average has hit a recent record high of 25.1 years. The number one reason given was that women are delaying child birth into their thirties and forties, bringing up the average. In 1970, the current age was 21.4 years. Since then, the average has been rising steadily (“Average Age” 1). In fact, societal expectations are accepting the more professional side of women instead of the 1950s housewife. One source writes that “delaying marriage and children seems like the sensible thing to do” (Hewlett 168). Waiting until “graduate degrees are in hand and their careers are securely under way” may be more desirable (Hewlett 168). It is becoming increasingly difficult for women who have children early to participate equally in society with the women who pursue careers first. Poniewozik comments, “Older moms – especially in communities where putting children on hold for careers is common – can look down on younger women as babies with babies” (4). Not only do younger mothers have difficulty finding time to still be young and raise a family, but society seems to disapprove of them as well.

Furthermore, professional advice is clear on saying that postponing childbirth will give “huge payoffs in the workplace” (Hewlett 126). Hewlett believes child-bearing at an early age will immensely affect a woman’s personal success in the work force. She says, “Motherhood does derail and destroy careers and needs to be avoided if a young woman wants to get a career off the ground in an optimal fashion…A successful career, particularly in its early stages, is extraordinarily demanding these days (Hewlett 126). Naturally, women are taking the advice offered.

However, simply waiting does not solve all the problems. While women are delaying domesticity for a more career-centered lifestyle, many issues arise once children are actually born. The greatest issue is the time-crunch. It certainly seems as if women simply do not have enough time to do all they want personally and professionally today. Mixing the housewife and the professional has certainly been the trend, but many women are finding difficulty in dealing with the two roles at once. Over the last twenty years, women have double their time spend on the job. 29 percent of women making around
$55,000 a year spend more than fifty hours a week working (Hewlett 89). A personal quote from a woman gives her schedule in terms of time:

My schedule is unreal. I usually get to work around nine, except for Mondays when we have an 8 o’clock meeting. And usually I stay until 10 -10:30 pm. I also put in several hours on Sundays. What happens is that during the regular day I do the work that requires contact with other people. And in the evenings and on Sundays, I do the work that has been dumped on me by my various bosses. Evenings and weekends tend to be pure execution (Hewlett 130).

This particular woman is attempting to prioritize within her career, let alone her home, especially with the addition of children. In general, the greater the education and occupational prestige, the more time in the work force over a woman’s lifetime will also increase (Macneall and Wu 3).

So, while time outside the home has increased by 50 percent, time spent doing housework inside the home has only decreased by 14 percent (Swiss and Walker 57). This is essentially the dilemma that millions of American women are dealing with today. Finding the time to go to work, do housework, cook and still spend time with children is a difficult balancing act for many. Professional women these days spend a great deal of time worrying about whether their “career is hurting their children,” much more than it is their husbands (Swiss and Walker 51).

Finding time for one’s child is important to most mothers and having a career does not always work with this desire. In reference to the woman above who works every day of the week except Saturday, it is daunting to think what she would do if a child was thrown into the mix. For Bonnie Maslin, mother quoted in Creating a Life by Sylvia Hewlett, making time for both is a struggle. She does not even find time to make it home most nights to eat dinner with her child, let alone get home in time to read them a bedtime story (Hewlett 266).

Again popular culture catches on with these struggles as well. In the recent film Raising Helen, a young, successful woman inherits three children from her deceased sister and struggles with making time and domesticating herself. Likewise, in the 1990s movie Stepmom, the stepmother enters a family personally and impacted negatively professionally. As she takes on the motherly role of her newly acquired children, her high-profile career begins to suffer. Her boss ends up giving her an ultimatum based on the grounds that she has lost her edge and dedication. He tells her that if she leave early to pick up her step-children, he will have to let her go permanently. She simply does not put enough time into her career like she used to now that she has children to care for and she faces consequences because of it.

As seen in the film Stepmom, women experience grave difficulties when balancing being there on the job and being there for their children. While women might be accepted in the professional world, their personal lives often interfere causing issues in the working world. Because women do not always have the time for family and career, their tasks for motherhood often overlap into busy work days. Perhaps a woman might need to leave work early to get her children to appointments or practices. One source writes, “At least in America, employers do such a poor job supporting working mothers –
providing little in the way of paid parenting leave, job-back guarantees, flextime or quality childcare – that women routinely become downwardly mobile in the labor market once they have children” (Hewlett 126).

Overlapping motherhood responsibilities and career might possibly save time for many women who face issues of job loss or resignation. Unfortunately, it is even more of a problem for many women who must work to support her family financially. For a great number of women, time has become money in more ways than one. The OECD comments, “Women with family responsibilities frequently have a severely restricted choice of employment, of hours worked and of location of work, especially where childcare facilities of reasonable cost are lacking” (OECD 15).

A great number of women might not be receiving help from employers, so they seek other options. The most common way of finding more time for children is simply cutting back hours. Many women today seek part-time work to accommodate having a family. Swiss and Walker write, “The personal advantage of a reduced work schedule is clear for women who want to spend more time with children. Part-time work can mean a mother is available to attend afternoon school programs, greet her children when they get off the school bus, and take them to doctor appointments” (91). While women can still bring in some money towards the finances, they may not need to spend so much time working. Part-time work allows women to have the best of both worlds.

Women in various careers are choosing to make a compromise between their family and profession by choosing to work part-time, allowing more time for family. A Maryland pediatrician wants what so many women do in the modern world, “career, family and the time to enjoy both” (Croasdale 1). In order to compensate for more family time, Jennifer Shu cut back her hours to work part time in her practice and only sees patients after hours in the clinic (Croasdale 1). While Shu is an example of the many women who are seeking fewer hours, part-time work is particularly difficult in her field. For medicine, the more women in the field, the even more difficult challenge the work place poses. If female doctors continue to follow in Shu and many others’ footsteps by working part-time, experts believe that “medicine will face major cultural changes and may need to expand its work force to continue to ensure patient access” (Croasdale 2). Doctors are needed round the clock, which means if women are to be doctors then they, too, need to be available around the clock, not just three days a week from five to eight p.m.

Time is extremely valued by many working mothers. And as they move up in the professional ladder, they are asking for some help if working part-time is not an option financially. In order to help with the time crunch, women are asking for reduced hours, paid parenting and career breaks in general. If they do receive these options, many will see it as “the gift of time” (Hewlett 269). Time will only tell if women get what they need in the workplace. In addition, one woman decided to have less children so they the time she does have is not further compromised. A physician in California cut her working hours from eighty to sixty during the week to compensate for the birth of her child. However, she also claims she is stopping at one child because of the time crunch. She says, “One of the main reasons I have only one child is so she will not have to divide the time we have together with another child” (Swiss and Walker 58). Having fewer children and hours on the job is only the beginning to women’s adjustment to their integration into the professional world.
While the women in America have certainly moved up in the world at the expense of their time, it is no surprise they continue to follow the trends of the modern woman that were previously discussed. Very few countries, if any, offer the kinds of opportunities for women in terms of upward mobility that America does. Furthermore, at a time period when America was integrating its women into the economy, America also made the greatest jump in female share of labor force of any country in the world. Refer to the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1982</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>+ 9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>+ 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>+ 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>+ 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>+ 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>+ 8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>+ 13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OECD 14)

Not only did American women experience the greatest jump into their economy, but in 1982, they were only a few percentage points behind only one other country, Finland, as far as the most women in the labor force. So, what is it that makes American women that much more prone to change their daily lives and compromise their time today?

Americans have always fostered individuality. America is a country rooted in different cultures and freedoms that allow these cultures to practice as they please. So, naturally, Americans find themselves with a multitude of characteristics pulling from different cultures. More specifically, America provides a great deal of opportunity in the workplace. America provides a great deal of variety within career opportunities and areas within those careers that allow a person’s talents to shine individually.

Moreover, America has offered more and more opportunity for people to acquire post-secondary education. For women especially, they are able to acquire the same degrees as men since the before the turn of the century. In 1870, women were integrated into colleges and universities, making up one fifth of enrollment nationwide. Furthermore, in 1984 women made up 49 percent of members in undergraduate post-secondary institutions, 49 percent of Master’s programs and 33 percent of doctoral programs. That would make a twenty-nine percent increase in a century (“Women’s History in America” 1).

Ironically, America is one of the youngest powers in the world. Yet, as a country, America has pushed its issues faster than most countries. What this all means for the American women is that as America seeks to improve their future, women naturally take advantage of it for their personal development. Not only does entrance into the workplace encourage improvement and individuality, but it also promotes equality, another hallmark of the American character. Freedom of choice and opportunity is what America hopes to capture in the lives of its citizens.

Unfortunately, as women do enter the workplace and attempt to handle time constraints, few organizations offer help to do so. Perhaps in the future, women will receive even more assistance as they become more involved in society. Overall, no
matter what takes place in the years to come, it is likely that America will only encourage more opportunity and areas of development for women and even more people in this country.

As time quickly progresses in the American nation, it is evident that women’s lives have changed greatly in the past fifty years. Through time and space, women have altered the ways in which they live. Such ways include postponing marriage and college, introducing more work hours into their week, and spending less time on housework. However, now that women are spending more time outside the home, their time has been compromised without much professional support. Whether women choose to wait or not to have children, working mothers in general seem to be some of the most pressed-for-time people working in American. One mother writes, “But when this mother of three, who works sixty hours a week, talks about the United States work culture, she emphasizes, ‘I think you pay a price for being a woman – period’” (Swiss and Walker 53). While the equality women have received in American society has certainly been a blessing, women are still searching for more. Whether it be help from their husbands or help from their bosses, they will need more to effectively continue to place their mark in American society.
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In 1982, the Supreme Court ruled that any child, citizen or not, legal resident or not, is entitled to free and appropriate education in the United States. This ruling has forever changed the school system in America. Now illegal immigrants are educated through the citizen’s tax dollars. This does not seem fair to many tax paying American citizens. However, the issue is not as black and white as this piece of paper. This is a controversial issue. Should innocent children be left out on the streets and denied a future because of a choice their mother or father made several years ago? Should tax paying citizens provide a free ride for those illegal aliens who do not pay anything to the state, while their children are suffering budget cuts and larger class size classrooms? Both sides can present a potent argument, but which side will benefit America in the long run? It is the choice America and its government need to make.

Several laws have been applied to search for the correct answer in this contentious issue. As stated above, the Supreme Court decision in Plyler vs. Doe renewed the right that any child may receive free and appropriate education from kindergarten to twelfth grade. The argument for this decision stemmed from the Constitution itself, stating nowhere that these freedoms were to be granted only to United States citizens, rather than simply persons. Another law which has gained a great deal of public debate is the California proposal called Proposition 187, which required school officials and employees to report illegal immigrants or aliens to the government. However, this law was overturned through various debates in Congress due to the denial of the 14th Amendment and the 1982 decision of Plyler vs. Doe. DREAM Act, Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act, is the most recent legal action towards making it easier for illegal aliens to use the education system at a higher level. This Act would allow certain illegal immigrant students become legal if they have lived in the United States for at least five years and have graduated from a U.S. high school or have attended college in the United States. The DREAM Act demonstrates more legal push for illegal immigrants to use the education system as a means of becoming the common American.

The push for the denial of Proposition 187 was the root of several newspaper articles during this time, which was the same time as the 1996 presidential elections. Both sides of this debate have been presented within several articles in newspapers and magazines as well. According to Knight Ridder Tribune News Service, in the June 4, 1996 edition it was stated that many illegal immigrant students are afraid after hearing about a bill that may not allow illegal immigrants to receive an American education. Christopher Marquis, the writer of this article, adds that these immigrants are of more than 640,000 undocumented school children in America. In Marquis’ article he describes the support many people have against this new idea. He describes a coalition of various groups forming together who have said that this law would punish innocent people and not halt the illegal immigration rates the United States readily sees entering into the country. They argue that these children had no choice in the manner of coming to America and would be left on the streets if not admitted to public schools. In 1996, George W. Bush, then governor of Texas, stated, “I believe that once children are in
Texas, regardless of how their parents arrived here, it is in our best interest to educate them. An educated child is less likely to commit a crime and more likely to succeed” (Quoted in Marquis).

Marquis does not take sides and also describes the feelings of others who believe that the illegal immigrants are crowding the classrooms and placing burdens on the school districts that now need more money for the overwhelming amounts of additional students, who illegally entered the United States. Marquis also describes that the solution is not simple. According to analysts, the reason why immigrants come to the United States illegally is because of jobs, not education. In order to cut back the illegal immigrants, the United States needs to become stern upon the borders and employers who hire illegal immigrants. Nevertheless, illegal immigrants are crossing the borders and the children are entering into the schools. California, which has the highest amount of illegal immigrants in any state in America, pays an approximate 1.8 billion dollars to educate these illegal aliens. Those who pushed for the Proposition to become legal argued that this money could be spent to benefit citizens. Marquis has brought the reader to a seesaw state by not taking sides and printing the two sides of the debate.

By September of 1996, The Knight Ridder Tribune News Service reflected the viewpoints of several government officials. Newt Gingrich, former house speaker, and former California Governor, Pete Wilson, pushed the Senate and former president, Bill Clinton, to reject the bill that would ban schooling to illegal immigrants. Several government officials were quoted in this article representing the reasoning behind its dismissal in the U.S. courts. By September, less than two months before the presidential election, Gingrich supports the bill; however, in March of 1996, another article from the Knight Ridder Tribune published Gingrich’s original feelings about this bill banning illegal immigrants to use the American school system. He was quoted saying, “Offering free tax-paid goods to illegals has increased the number of illegals. It is wrong for us to be the welfare capital of the world” (Knight Ridder Tribune 39). Gingrich was not April fooling when he stated this on April 1. He stated earlier in that year in March his dislike for illegal immigrants entering the school system using the money of tax paying Americans when he said, “This used to be a land of opportunity. It’s now the land of welfare” (Quoted in Farragher). Thus as the presidential election approached, Gingrich and many others came closer to rejecting the bill. The American public needed to be reminded of the Supreme Court ruling about the Texas case, that all persons are guaranteed the right to free and appropriate education by the 14th Amendment.

This debate of whether Plyler vs. Doe’s decision is beneficial to America and its future well being dates back earlier than the presidential election debates of 1996. Rather, this debate reached a high point in the year 1994 when California introduced Proposition 187, which would require school officials and employers to report any illegal alien in the school system or in their employment to government officials. As one teacher commented, “...As if we don’t have enough work to worry about who is legal and illegal” (Jackson). Many teachers and administrators opposed this proposition, as well as the illegal immigrants and their parents. The reasoning behind this opposition is found in numerous newspapers during this time. News articles stated the deep opposition of this new proposition in California. The superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School district, Waldemar Rojas, was quoted saying, “I will not take part in putting 30,000 kids in this state out on the street with nothing to do and in despair. I will not be part of
creating a permanent underclass” (Jackson). Rojas also argued it was another Jim Crow rule, referencing the racism towards African-Americans. She also made reference to the numerous other times in American history when Americans viewed ethnicity as a reason for denial of entry or lock up, including the Chinese and Japanese. However, never in American history did the government take action against the Italians or Germans even though they were enemies during World War II. Rojas concluded her statement by stating, “Proposition said nothing about making schools better” (Jackson). Rojas is suggesting that the U.S. look more closely to making schools better than pointing the blame on the illegal immigrants attending. Jackson comments on other reasons why illegal immigrants in the school districts of California should not be forced out. Many illegal immigrants keep the areas running because of their high employment in the garment industry, childcare, hospital maintenance, restaurant work, and gardening. Therefore, taking these children out of the schools will force not only them onto the streets but also their parents to working to care for them thus lowering their income. This will cause a rise in the lower class. The decision affects many children already established in America. Jackson comments that many children have been here all their lives and do not know about their so-called homeland. America is their homeland and they have assimilated here to American culture.

Yet again, the problem goes back to the United States government. According to Robeson, the federal government should pay the bill of these school districts of illegal immigrants, since the government is allowing the illegal immigrants entry. According to The Los Angeles Times, the amount of money California spends on illegal immigrants is approximately $4.6 billion a year. With this large amount of money being spent on illegal immigrants, the increase in the budget gap continues to run approximately $8 billion to $12 billion a year. Robeson asks who pays this bill, since every 24 hours an estimated four to five thousand illegal immigrants cross the Mexican border to enter the state of California. Many of these immigrants are bringing their families, which in turn affects the school system as they enter the local public schools.

As more and more enter, not only are they bringing their families, but also their culture and language. James Thornton describes the negative effects of illegal immigrants not only in numbers but also in money in his essay entitled Anti Illegal Immigration Laws Would Benefit Society published in Opposing View Points. By bringing their language, mainly Spanish, with them, the school districts are required to have English as a Second Language, ESL, teachers available to aid these children’s needs. Not only does this cost money to hire the teacher, supplies are also needed in order to support the programs. Thornton highly opposes illegal immigrants for other reasons as well. His nativist’s views include lack of assimilation, “many recent arrivals from Mexico and Central America are now resisting assimilation; they are intent not only on retaining their old loyalties and folkways, but are attempting to force them on local residents – reverse assimilation” (Thornton). Just how many illegal immigrants are coming here to assimilate or not assimilate according to Thornton? It is rather difficult to count the number of illegal immigrants in America since they do not readily identify themselves for fear of deportation. Nevertheless, various sources have attempted to calculate this number. Estimations range from 2 million to 12 million, depending on the political party or viewpoint of the source on illegal immigrants. In 1992 the Bureau of the Census estimated that 2 million illegal immigrants over the previous decade have entered the
United States, which has caused the population to increase. The INS (Immigrants and Naturalization Service), another source, estimated in 1996 that 5 million illegal aliens make America their home. The INS also commented that California was the leading state, followed by Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, and Arizona which are largely affected by these illegal immigrants living in these states. (Rein)

California and Texas were the leading two states of illegal immigrants living there due to the Mexican border. The amount of Mexican immigrants coming to the United States grew during World War I since hostility was high with European nations and the open door closed slightly. This immigration was further fueled by the need for laborers since many Americans were fighting in the war. This increase in immigration has become greater and greater as Mexican immigrants still migrate seeking employment and a better opportunity. This includes education, even higher education.

The continued debate not only causes disputes among Americans, but also among the politicians as well. In the publication of Human Events in November of 2003, David Freddoso interviewed Democratic and Republican senators about their opinion on the matter of the DREAM Act. The senators included, Daniel Akaka from Hawaii, Wayne Allard from Colorado, Russ Feingold from Wisconsin, Ben Nelson from Nebraska, Don Nickles from Oklahoma, and Jim Talent from Montana. Senator Wayne Allard, a Republican, stated, “I think we have to be careful about creating incentives for people to come into this country illegally. I think we have to honor those people who have followed the process and come here legally” (Freddoso 3). However, Senator Russ Feingold, a Democrat, sees the long-term advantages to this new act. “If we’re looking at a person who has successfully gone through high school and wants to go to college, obviously we’re hoping that this person will be integrated into society and hopefully that they’ll become a full-fledged citizens at some point” (Quoted in Freddoso 3). Although some cannot see this long-term advantage because of the here and now disadvantage of money, especially tax payers’ money. A man from San Diego wrote to the New York Times with his strong opinion, “illegal becomes legal to allow employers to hire workers on the cheap while taxpayers pick up the tab for education and health care” (Slater 4.8). This reader points out a key reason for the amount of illegal immigrant children in American schools; their parents come here by the incentive for jobs.

Similar to the DREAM Act, many colleges are allowing illegal immigrants to receive tuition breaks. In Maryland and Virginia, colleges are allowing illegal immigrants to pay in state tuition. There are a few prerequisites before getting this tuition break. In Virginia, the students must have graduated from a Virginia high school, been residents for five years, are trying to secure legal status, and prove their parents have paid Virginia income taxes for at least the past three years. While in Maryland the prerequisites are more laid back and include the student must have attended a school in Maryland for at least three years, graduated from a Maryland high school, and submit an affidavit stating they were applying for citizenship as soon as they are eligible to do so. This tuition break may seem like little difference, but in Maryland residents pay $4,800 per year while out-of-state students pay more than $14,000 a year, a difference of at least $9,200 a year. Many believe this is illegal, which they are correct according to the 1996 federal law prohibiting illegal immigrants acquiring tuition breaks that are not available to all American citizens. Although this law stands valid, many universities and colleges avoid this by stating that eligibility of the in-state tuition is based on the high school the student
attends and not where they live. These breaks are credited to benefit those illegal immigrants who were brought here by their parents at a young age and are established in every way, except immigration status. The bill would still require normal admission process for these illegal immigrants and just allow them to pay a lower tuition rate are the arguments of those who supported this bill in Maryland. (Montgomery)

Berna Miller provides data for this idea of educating the illegal immigrants. In her article, “Educating the ‘Other’ Children” in American Demographics, Miller describes the positive affects of illegal immigrants as students in the American school system. Miller demonstrates the repetitive argument of the long-term affects of educating the children, “The cost of not educating the children of undocumented aliens could, in the end, be far greater” (Miller 49). These issues go far deeper than economic issue; it is also a social, political, and moral issue. Although this issue is more than an economic issue, Miller provides the statistics for this ever growing population. Miller confirms the estimated number of undocumented immigrants of five million in 1996. Miller also provides that the Urban Institute of Washington, D.C. estimated the cost of educating the 640,000 illegal immigrants was approximately $3.1 billion in all of the seven top states with illegal immigrants. This number is rather low compared to other numbers given for the amount spent, because this number does not include the special programs for immigrants, such as ESL programs. However, Miller does provide an estimate from Donald Huddle of Rice University for the Carrying Capacity Network of Washington, D.C. stating illegal immigrant children cost $4.5 billion and additional $891 million for those illegal immigrant school children enrolled in special services. These large sums of money are what push parents of native-born children to the edge. These parents see the quality of their children’s education deteriorate because of crowding in classrooms and money spent on special programs and bilingual teachers for the illegal immigrants. This money seems to be wasted when immigrant neighborhoods remain to offer Spanish-language services thus reduces the motivation to learn English and lessens the chances in the school to teach English effectively.

Miller found that the foreign-born student is less likely to drop out of school, which is surprising due to the fact that many feel they will be unable to work after high school because of the residential status and limitation. Miller provides the reason for this lower rate of drop out is because of the foreign-born spending less time watching TV and more time doing homework. This also relates to the amount of income the families have. Miller does not illustrate that most foreign-born do not have high amounts of income and therefore do not have the luxury of a TV or are working a majority of that time. However, why the drop out rate is lower for foreign-born needs further research and confirmation and is there a low rate of drop outs in the illegal immigrant population as well. If these students are not dropping out, then the classrooms are overcrowded throughout the years of public education. Still the debate continues and Miller provides no solutions.

Many feel there is no solution, but in America the courts determine the solution and according to the 1982 Supreme Court ruling in Plyler vs. Doe, this should not be a topic of debate. Persons, not legal residents, of the United States are granted the right to free and appropriate education, which is given under the 14th Amendment. However, Halle Butler reveals this is a new concern for America. Supporters of Proposition 187 dispute that Plyler vs. Doe is no longer a good law because of the difference in America since then, 22 years later. These supporters believe that the “ever-growing illegal
immigrant population has consequences in the United States today that were unforeseeable in 1982” (Butler 5). These unforeseeable consequences include crime rates, drug problems, and loss of jobs. Although Miller points out those immigrants make jobs according to Julian Simon and provide between $12,000 and $20,000 more to the U.S. government taxes than they used in government services.

Many, who oppose the illegal immigrants using the school system and taxpayers’ money, believe the Constitution is being read wrong. David Jacobson, author of Rights Across Borders, commented on the Plyler vs. Doe case, “The Plyler and related cases demonstrate the elasticity of the Constitution…” (Jacobson 102). On the other hand, cultural pluralist debate that immigrants have used the school system to advance themselves, John Isbister, author of Immigration Debate, argues, “good, accessible public education is essential to immigrants’ integration into American life” (Isbister 196).

These debates between nativist, who want no immigration into the United States, versus the cultural pluralist, who believe that the United States is a place where persons can foster differences and diversity, has been a part of American history since the immigration rush began in the late 1800s. Many immigrants were drawn here because of what Roger Daniels calls The Statue of Liberty Myth, trying to find wealth and escape from poverty in the land of opportunity. This is also known as the American Dream, which pulls immigrants to America. This escape from poverty is seen on the border of Mexico. These immigrants are seeking for better jobs, which will lead to wealth. Roy Beck even describes this poverty in his book, The Case Against Immigration. He states that immigrant children have one thing in common: poverty. Poverty children come from impoverished parents. With this in mind one can see how poverty is brought into the school system as more and more immigrant families come to America looking for prosperity and consequently use American welfare programs for breakfast and lunch services in school.

As stated above, Thornton argues that illegal immigrants are not assimilating into the American culture and in fact are reverse assimilating. Thornton is not a strong believer in the Melting Pot analogy; as more and more ethnic groups enter the United States they become part of the American stew. This analogy was used to describe American life and has become a myth, as color of skin and physical attributes have caused America to define ethnic persons. Clear lines now are shown between ethnicities and cultural pride have not become mixed in the giant pot. Schools and work use to be the places where the melting would occur. In order to assimilate immigrants into America, children attended school and learned the English language there, as well, as cleanliness and American characteristics, while adults found jobs and Jane Addams settlement houses to educate them into the American way of life.

Addams established the settlement houses, run by collegiate women, to educate not only the adults but also their children. Cleanliness, finding a job, and sewing were some of the lessons taught at the settlement houses. Today, schools still foster this idea of adjustment. The immigrant children legal or illegal, are now teaching their parents how to adjust to American life through the school system. They learn to read and write in English. Public schools also foster learning in home economics, the fine arts, and woodshop, similar to Addams settlement houses.

Those who are against illegal immigrants in the school system do not care if they are learning to become Americans or becoming assimilated into the American way of
life. These illegal aliens are still using the tax dollars of legal Americans. Although the Constitution and 14th Amendment grant this right to illegal aliens, this freedom has been in debate earlier in history. In 1921, teacher was fined for violating a language law by teaching in another language. This turned into the Supreme Court case Meyer vs. Nebraska and Meyers, the teacher, won the case because the language law interfered with the freedom of the parents upbringing of their children’s education. Thus the Supreme Court gave the 14th Amendment as the reason for the freedoms of the school. This ruling was equivalent to the Pierce vs. Little Sisters in 1925 when the 14th Amendment was given for the reason of allowing students to attend private schools. In short, the 14th Amendment has been able to protect all persons, legal or illegal, in their pursuit of education.

Why then if this is so clear in court cases, is there still a debate? As stated above, America has drastically changed since these laws were created and unforeseeable problems have arisen. Those against illegal immigrants argue this point; however, this side of the debate appears to lack a stronger research of consequences of illegal immigrants being in the school system. This side provides great statistics of the number of illegal aliens in America, but how they received these numbers is a debate in itself. Also these supporters against illegal immigrants in the schools failed to report about the consequences of not allowing illegal immigrant children into the schools.

The opposing side provides similar statistics allowing the public to see yes America does have an immigration problem; nevertheless, the children are not behind the problem, the government needs to step up and take responsibility for the borders. Supporters of illegal immigrants in the school system are backed by the government ruling of the Supreme Court and several close associated cases. They have presented clear data to show that illegal immigrants contribute to America at great lengths, financially, socially, and economically, despite other opinions. This side of the debate makes a stronger argument; yet, it is a decision that affects Americans everywhere, not just the top seven immigrant states. It is a fine line between allowing the illegal immigrants to use legal American money and pushing innocent children out on the streets of America creating a new population of poor, lower class. The future of America is at stake according to those who support illegal immigrants in the school system. Although, what the future will bring to America no one knows.

This important issue of today may not even be an issue of tomorrow. Many researchers predict that soon the dominant white races in America will become the minority race to the Hispanic or African or Asian races, especially as more and more of these immigrants are coming to America. Illegal immigrants may have an easier way to become citizens, so that this debate is no longer a concern for Americans. This needs further research whether illegal immigrants will be granted an easier way to become American citizens or if the majority of Americans will be Hispanic, Asian, or African. Either way, it does not solve the problem of today. But there seems to be no clear answer. The controversy debates back and forth between money and border control, which both need to be carefully looked at in America. Where is the money being spent on border patrol? Could this save money in our schools by allowing fewer immigrants into America or will this be taking away money that is meant for the school system? Again, not all the answers are clear and this gray issue will not be solved in one day, but over time it may
diminish and become another chapter in a history book found in the American school system.
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