A. As you read this section, take notes summarizing how public education changed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th>Education Before the 1920s</th>
<th>Education During the 1920s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Types of courses

3. Immigrants

4. Financing

B. As you read about how America’s popular culture developed in the 1920s, give at least two specific examples of each area of popular culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazines</th>
<th>Education Before the 1920s</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Education During the 1920s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Radio

3. Sports

4. Movies

5. Theater, music, and art

6. Literature

C. On the back of this paper, briefly explain who Charles A. Lindbergh was and how he became America’s “most beloved hero” of the 1920s.
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SKILLBUILDER PRACTICE  Drawing Conclusions

Just as Charles Lindbergh and other heroes of the 1920s provide insights into the mood of the decade, heroes of other eras can give us a sense of what those times were like and what people valued. Read the passage, then complete the chart with conclusions you draw about attitudes of the 1980s. Cite two supporting statements for each conclusion. (See Skillbuilder Handbook, p. R19.)

Traditional Heroes  Through the centuries, societies have admired people who exemplified values such as courage, a willingness to sacrifice for others, and the strength to stand up for their beliefs at all costs. However, as conditions and values change, the kinds of heroes also change.

Heroes for the ’80s In 1985, the magazine U.S. News & World Report commissioned a survey of young adults, 18 through 24 years old, to identify the people they most admired. The top ten heroes were (1) actor Clint Eastwood; (2) actor and comedian Eddie Murphy; (3) then-President Ronald Reagan; (4) actress and physical fitness advocate Jane Fonda; (5 and 6) a tie between actress Sally Field and movie director, writer, and producer Steven Spielberg; (7 and 8) a tie between Pope John Paul II and missionary Mother Teresa; (9 and 10) another tie between entertainers Michael Jackson and Tina Turner.

Most of the people on the list represent an optimistic, vigorous outlook. For example, President Reagan’s dauntless positive outlook seemed unshaken, even after he had been shot by a would-be assassin in 1981. Likewise, the workout tapes and fitness books by Jane Fonda, then 47 years old, projected an image of youth and vitality.

Survey respondents pointed to the strong, courageous characters Eastwood and Field have played in their films. Eastwood’s characters were tough, no-nonsense good guys; Field’s were determined, struggling women who fought for what they believed.

Murphy and Spielberg drew praise for their creativity and remarkable box-office success, Murphy’s ability to make people laugh, and Spielberg’s direction of such films as E.T. and Close Encounters of the Third Kind. Likewise, the phenomenal energy and performance abilities of Michael Jackson and Tina Turner prompted their inclusion on the list.

Ironically, Pope John Paul II and Mother Teresa are the only people on the list whose personal lives actually fit the traditional sense of a hero. Their lives embody what some of the film characters represent—courage, sacrifice, and helping others. Also, these two are the only heroes who have not gained material wealth from their work.

Conclusion 1:

Support:

Support:

Conclusion 2:

Support:

Support:
Matching

A. Match the person in the first column with his or her accomplishments in the second column.

_____ 1. F. Scott Fitzgerald a. wrote poems celebrating youth
_____ 2. Helen Willis b. famous home-run slugger
_____ 3. Ernest Hemingway c. made first solo flight across Atlantic
_____ 4. Edna St. Vincent Millay d. dominated women’s tennis
_____ 5. Babe Ruth e. introduced simple, tough style of prose
_____ 6. Charles A. Lindbergh f. wrote *The Great Gatsby*

Main Ideas

B. Answer the following questions in the space provided.

1. What prompted the sharp rise in high school enrollment during the 1920s?

2. How did radio have a strong impact on American society?

3. What major themes did the writers of the 1920s promote?
During the early 1920s, trains were the preferred means of long-distance travel in the United States. Airlines concentrated on fulfilling money-making postal contracts for carrying mail between cities. Carrying passengers was not profitable nor a priority. The 8 to 16 passengers per flight were assaulted by motor noise, cold drafts, vibration, and the dizziness of high altitudes. Most of them had to sign releases giving airlines the right to dump them anywhere along the route that mail bags could be picked up.

Then, in 1926, the Air Commerce Act was passed. Standards were established for pilot selection and flight equipment, and the day of thinking of flying as mostly for “daredevils” was nearing an end. By 1930 stewardesses (dressed in nurses’ uniforms!) began serving on some flights. Comfort became a priority—as did speed.

In 1929, when a trip from New York to Los Angeles entirely by rail took about three days, a journey combining trains and planes brought that travel time down to less than two days, about 46 hours. At the time, commercial airliners were still not allowed to fly at night, so a plane would fly during the day, landing often to refuel. In the evening, its passengers would move by train overnight to a spot where a plane would be waiting to fly them to their next refueling stop along the way to their destination. Small towns with airports gained fleeting fame at the time.

The combination of air and rail travel lasted about 18 months, but it served to hook Americans on flying. In 1926 less than 6,000 people chose air travel; in 1930 the number was nearly 400,000.

By 1931, improved airplanes could fly greater nonstop distances and at night. In 1934 the trip from New York to Los Angeles was down to as little as 18 hours, with just three refueling stops.
Interpreting Text and Visuals

1. Imagine that it is 1925 and you live in Chicago. You have learned that a friend is about to fly to Salt Lake City. Make up a description of such a flight to warn your friend about what he or she might encounter.

2. In 1930 about how long did it take to travel by rail from New York to each of these places: Chicago, Denver, and Los Angeles?

3. In 1921, how many air routes served New York? served Chicago?

4. What were the final destinations of coast-to-coast flights in 1921?

5. What was the quickest time from New York to Los Angeles by air in 1929? in 1934?

6. What regions of the United States still lacked air routes in 1930?

7. It is 1921 and you want to fly from St. Louis to Cheyenne, Wyoming. Describe how you would get there.

It is now 1929. How might you get to Cheyenne by air this time?
At the age of 25, Charles A. Lindbergh made his historic flight from Long Island to France in just under 34 hours. As you read part of an interview that Lindbergh gave after he arrived in Paris, think about how the public reacted to his accomplishment.

Well, here I am in the hands of American Ambassador Herrick. From what I have seen of it, I am sure I am going to like Paris.

It isn’t part of my plans to fly my plane back to the United States, although that doesn’t mean I have finished my flying career. If I thought that was going to be the result of my flight across the Atlantic, you may be sure I would never have undertaken it. Indeed, I hope that I will be able to do some flying over here in Europe—that is, if the souvenir hunters left enough of my plane last night.

Incidentally, that reception I got was the most dangerous part of the whole flight. If wind and storm had handled me as vigorously as that Reception Committee of Fifty Thousand, I would never have reached Paris and I wouldn’t be eating a 3-o’clock-in-the-afternoon breakfast here in Uncle Sam’s Embassy.

There’s one thing I wish to get straight about this flight. They call me “Lucky,” but luck isn’t enough. As a matter of fact, I had what I regarded and still regard as the best existing plane to make the flight from New York to Paris. I had what I regard as the best engine, and I was equipped with what were in the circumstances the best possible instruments for making such efforts. I hope I made good use of what I had.

That I landed with considerable gasoline left means that I had recalled the fact that so many flights had failed because of lack of fuel, and that was one mistake I tried to avoid. . . .

The only real danger I had was at night. In the daytime I knew where I was going, but in the evening and at night it was largely a matter of guesswork. However, my instruments were so good that I never could get more than 200 miles off my course, and that was easy to correct, and I had enough extra gasoline to take care of a number of such deviations. All in all, the trip over the Atlantic, especially the latter half, was much better than I expected. . . .

I appreciated the reception which had been prepared for me, and had intended taxiing up to the front of the hangars, but no sooner had my plane touched the ground than a human sea swept toward it. I saw there was a danger of killing people with my propeller, and I quickly came to a stop.

That reception was the most dangerous part of the trip. Never in my life have I seen anything like that human sea. It isn’t clear to me yet just what happened. Before I knew it I had been hoisted out of the cockpit, and one moment was on the shoulders of some men and the next moment on the ground.

It seemed to be even more dangerous for my plane than for me. I saw one man tear away the switch and another took something out of the cockpit. Then, when they started cutting pieces of cloth from the wings, I struggled to get back to the plane, but it was impossible. . . .

I look forward to the day when transatlantic flying will be a regular thing. It is a question largely of money. If people can be found willing to spend enough to make proper preparations, there is no reason why it can’t be made very practical. Of course, there are many things to be studied, one of the most important points being whether the single-motor or multimotor ship is best. . . .

I didn’t bring any extra clothes with me. I am wearing a borrowed suit now. It was a case of clothes or gasoline, and I took the gasoline. I have a check on a Paris bank and am going to cash it tomorrow morning, buy shirts, socks, and other things. I expect to have a good time in Paris.

But I do want to do a little flying over here.


Research Options

1. If you could interview Lindbergh, what would you ask him about his flight? Jot down five questions and then find answers in a history book or encyclopedia.

2. Find out how the Spirit of St. Louis was similar to and different from airplanes today. Make a chart based on your research and share it with classmates.
In 1915, Georgia O’Keeffe became dissatisfied with everything she had painted until then. So she destroyed almost all of it. She then started over, developing a style that made her one of the most important of all American artists.

O’Keeffe showed artistic talent when young and studied in both Chicago and New York. She even won an award for a still-life painting. However, the work dissatisfied her. It seemed merely to imitate a style that was accepted. “I began to realize that a lot of people had done this same kind of thing,” she later recalled. “I didn’t think I could do it any better.” She stopped painting and took work as a commercial artist.

Illness forced her to abandon that work five years later. After taking an art class, she became interested in the simplified style of Oriental art. The interest quickened her desire to begin art again. First, though, she destroyed almost all the art she had created until then. She began to draw some charcoal sketches in which she reduced real objects to their most abstract form. She sent them to a friend in New York, with the instruction to reveal them to nobody else. The friend, disobeying, showed the work to Alfred Stieglitz, an art dealer and photographer. Stieglitz was so impressed he began to exhibit the drawings in his gallery. When O’Keeffe found out, she protested. However, Stieglitz calmed her down, and they began a professional and personal relationship that lasted the rest of his life. They were married in 1924, but most important, Stieglitz encouraged O’Keeffe to paint whatever she liked.

She did so—for more than 60 years. O’Keeffe became famous for her spare, clean work. She drew, painted in watercolors, and painted in oil. She created small studies only 7-by-9 inches and huge canvases that were 8-by-24 feet. She painted flowers, doors, barns, and the sky—whatever interested her. Many of her paintings are so realistic that they have been called photographic. Yet underlying them all is an abstract feeling for the form of the object. Often she painted the same object repeatedly. In each canvas, the object became less and less recognizable. The last work in the series shows the forms and colors of the object, which can no longer be recognized as an object.

O’Keeffe painted what was around her. When she first settled with Stieglitz in New York, she painted the moon and sun over city buildings. They had a summer home on a lake, and she painted the flowers she saw there. Later she visited New Mexico and became enchanted by its landscape. Many of the works painted there show the bleached bones of cattle or horses. Critics said this work showed a preoccupation with death. O’Keeffe denied it. “There was no rain, so the flowers didn’t come,” she said. “Bones were easy to find, so I began collecting bones.” Among her most well-known works are a series looking at the sky through the holes in an animal skull.

She returned to New Mexico each summer after that. When Stieglitz died in 1946, O’Keeffe moved there permanently. Later, she began to travel extensively to Europe and the Orient. Flying gave her new subjects. She “noticed a surprising number of deserts and wonderful rivers. . . . You see such marvelous things, such incredible colors.” She painted a new series that portrayed winding rivers framed in a landscape seen from the air.

O’Keeffe’s approach was unique in American art. She refused to be categorized with one school of art or another. “I’m not a joiner,” she said. She painted until her death at age 99.

Questions
1. Why did O’Keeffe not like her early work?
2. Would you say that O’Keeffe was more interested in natural or human objects? Explain your answer.
3. How is O’Keeffe’s art both realistic and abstract?