

James Best

Professor Courtney Batson

History 113R

25 November 2014

In the mid 20th century women were upset by the role they had in American Society. The United States had just come out of World War II, where women's efforts in helping America by doing jobs that men had done when they left for war, was a big reason why the US was successful in winning the war in the Pacific. During that time women felt a sense of empowerment and pride in the fact that they did all they could to aid in the war effort. That all fell apart as they men began to return home. Women such as Betty Friedan, and Marynia Farnham and Ferdinand Lundberg explain their two conflicting views about the place women have in America. While Friedman expressed her dissatisfaction toward the return to the old ways of the US, where married women's place was in the home and women were not supposed to be workers Farnham and Ferdinand were very supportive of the role women had in the home and viewed it as important to the psychological development of women in America.

Betty Friedan explains in her essay *The Problem That Has No Name* (1963) about the "feminine mystique" and that basically many women lacked the drive to find a real purpose in their lives beyond domestic duties. She goes into detail about the fact that women were pushed back by the "feminine mystique" and began to not care about other issues outside the home. (Skinner, 326) In her essay she writes "the problem lay buried, unspoken for many years in the minds of American women. It was a strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning

that women suffered in the United States. Each suburban wife struggled with it alone. As she made the beds, shopped for groceries, matched slipcover material, ate peanut butter sandwiches with her children, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night- she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question- "Is this all?" (Skinner, 326) Through this quote Friedan is questioning the role of women in the mid twentieth century.

She is expressing what she thinks goes on in the minds of women everywhere and believes that they should say "How did I get here?" and "Is this all that is planned for my life?"

Friedan begins to go deeper into her overwhelming dissatisfaction with the feminine mystique and explain the fact that women were discouraged to achieve social and educational dreams. She says "They were taught to pity the neurotic, unfeminine, unhappy women who wanted to be poets or physicists or presidents. They learned that truly feminine women do not want careers. higher education, political rights, - the independence and the opportunities that the old fashioned feminists fought for" (Skinner, 326) For so long women have fought to have rights to receive an education and to dream to become the best. All those dreams seemed to have been crushed in Friedan's eyes. Women achieving successful careers were now looked at as a problem "Nobody argued whether women were inferior or superior to men; they were simply different. Word like "emancipation and "career sounded strange and embarrassing; no one had used them for years." "They gloried their role as women, and wrote proudly on the census blank: "Occupation : Housewife." "The "Women Problem" in America no longer existed"(Skinner, 327) The accumulation of all these things led to the oppression of women in america. Friedan was extremely upset with this and voiced her opinion clearly in her essay but not all women felt the same way

Marynia Farnham and Ferdinand Lundberg wrote "Modern Women : The Lost Sex" around fifteen years before Friedman's piece "The Problem that Has No Name" In Farnham and Lundberg's essay take a different perspective to the idea of the "feminine mystique" that Friedman had wrote about and explain how women were viewed as the "lost sex" meaning that because women were going into the workforce they were doomed. They write that "The women arriving at maturity today does so with certain fixed attitudes derived from her background and training. Her home life, very often, has been distorted." (Skinner, 315) She continues say that "She has enjoyed an education identical with that of her brother. She expects to be allowed to select any kind of work for which she has inclination and training. She also, generally expects to marry. At any rate, she usually intends to have "a go" at it." (Skinner, 315) One can view Farnham and Lundberg's position is fairly radical. They are appalled by many things that would very well uplift women in their feeling of self confidence and self worth. Thier words attempt to condemn women to a life of cooking cleaning and taking care of the children of their family and they seem quite contempt with it. The essay begins to become a bit out of control when Farnham and Lundberg write " She expects to find sexual gratification and believes in her inalienable right so to do. She is legally free to live and move as she chooses. She may seek divorce if her marriage fails to gratify her . She has access to contraceptive information so that, theoretically, she may control the size and spacing of her family. In very many instances, she owns and disposes of her own property. She has, it appears, her destiny entirely in her own hands." (Skinner,315)

This could be seen as almost laughable considering how far women have come since the 19th century. It is almost as if Farnham and Lundberg are too blind to see the fact that they no

longer live in a day where this is possible. Women have worked too hard to accomplish what they have to sit back and eagerly want to be controlled by men once again. Women have the right to control their own destiny and it may be what Friedan is trying to explain to women 15 years later. That they hold the power to impact the world. They can go out and work and make a difference but yet their minds are polluted by the “feminine mystique” the influence of others to turn them back to the ways of the two separate spheres and being under the control of their husbands. It is almost ridiculous that something like this would happen at such a time but understandable. With men coming back from war women wanted to pay respect to them. They had fought and gone through so much and the last thing they wanted to see was women taking over the jobs of men. Women did not necessarily want to become like men in the workforce but to be able to exercise the freedom to work even when they were married. It was frowned upon by society at that time and that is the reason why it took years to bring women out of this mindset.

Both of these pieces by Friedan and Farnham and Lundberg are arguments against each other. One wanted a “restoration to domestic norms” (Skinner, 315) and one going against that notion of the “feminine mystique” (Skinner, 326). In essence, they are the same thing. The positions that both have are different and one was more compelling than the other. Friedman’s piece was more believable. One could see women at a time where they need something like that to wake them up to the realities of the world and help them see that they are moving backward in terms of feminine equality. Farnham and Lundberg’s position although quite compelling, is most likely unrealistic and unachievable due to the fact that so many years have passed since their views were normal. They are unable to understand that the times have changed and because their views were so radical it might have outraged many feminists and sparked them to fight back

against the oppression of women by man. All in all both pieces fight to state a position that their is a serious problem in America coming out of World War II. The only thing is that Betty Friedan's ideas are far more obtainable than Farnham and Lundberg's.