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Introduction

Frederick W. Jordan
Woodberry Forest School
Woodberry Forest, Virginia

The United States, it has been said, was born in the country but grew up in the city. Only one in twenty citizens of the agrarian republic conceived in Philadelphia in 1789 lived in an urban area, but by 1870 it was one in three, and a half century later, a majority. Though this development spanned the entire American experience, the years between the Civil War and the Great War seemed to compress and accelerate the changes as cities grew at what seemed to their residents to be stupendous rates. A woman who arrived in Detroit in 1870 found a city of just under 80,000; by 1920, she would have watched it grow to nearly a million. Within the same time period, Chicago grew ninefold, from about 300,000 to 2.7 million. By 1920, New York, fueled by the 1898 amalgamation of its five boroughs, had reached the stupendous size of more than 5.6 million people.¹

This shift was far more than merely statistical. By 1900, America had become an urban nation in its dominant tone, in its economy and work, and in its culture and aspiration as well as its demography. Gradually—and then seemingly suddenly—cities emerged as the focal points of the nation’s economic growth, social mobility, and a changing culture of leisure and entertainment. They comprised the market of a consumer economy, and the petri dish of a social experiment that was breathtaking in its ambition to see if the disparate peoples of the earth could live together in one place. Cities became, as Walt Whitman rhapsodically gushed, places of “splendor, picturesqueness, and oceanic amplitude and rush,” which provided him “a continued exaltation and absolute fulfillment.”²

Teaching the history of urbanization poses a challenge for teachers of AP® United States History courses. Not only is urban history a field unto itself, it also touches on social, economic, political, and technological history. It involves subjects as seemingly disparate as the settlement patterns of immigrants who came into cities, the development of inventions such as streetcars and the harnessing of electrical current, the transformation of views and patterns of leisure, the construction of buildings unprecedented in both size and number, and the development of new political mechanisms to address attendant and increasingly serious problems. Not only are these topics crucial in understanding the growth of cities in the Gilded Age, they also lay the base for an understanding of subsequent developments in United States history. Urbanization provides much of a raison d’être for the Progressive Movement; it sets the stage for the cultural conflicts of the 1920s; it undergoes its own transformation in post-World War II suburbanization; and it is the crucial context of the urban riots of the 1960s that form a vital part of understanding the civil rights movement.

This special focus packet is designed to provide teachers of AP U.S. History courses with an overview of how historians have thought about urban history since the field itself emerged, and also to give them some practical examples of how they might teach the material in creative, content-oriented ways. The introductory scholarly essay by Professor James Carroll of Iona College should provide instructors with an overview of how historians have thought of these matters. He deftly weaves together urbanization’s disparate themes, and instructors who desire to read further in the subject will find a wealth of good suggestions in both his footnotes and bibliography. The “boots-on-the-ground” section features lesson plans by three experienced teachers of United States history survey courses. Sue Ikenberry of Georgetown Day School (Washington, D.C.) provides opportunity to lead students through two key developments in Gilded Age urbanization: the rise of a consumer economy and the problems of the urban political machines. Geri Hastings of Catonsville High School (Maryland) and my colleague Matt Boesen of Woodberry Forest School (Virginia) both move forward into the Progressive Era and examine the response to urbanization.

Hastings offers a wide view of Progressivism as a response to urban problems, providing a simulation involving many of the key figures in the Progressive Era. Where Hastings focuses on the macrocosm, Boesen looks at the microcosm and has written a roundtable lesson on the case of *Lochner v. New York*. Boesen touches on the problems of urban labor and the issue of whether or not government could properly regulate such an area. Few teachers, if any, will have the time in a survey course to try out all these ideas, but our hope is that they will be of help to some teachers.
Urbanization During the Gilded Age and Progressive Era: An Overview

James Carroll
Iona College
New Rochelle, New York

Introduction

The scholarly developments in the field of urbanization during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era are both exciting and daunting. The growth of cities influenced virtually every social, cultural, and economic movement in the United States between the Civil War and World War I. Moreover, urbanization is a dynamic topic attracting many scholars from a wide array of historical specializations, ranging from gender to political history. This broad sweep does not easily lend itself to synthesis and must be considered in connection with industrialization and immigration. In total, however, urbanization marks a vital turning point in the history of the United States and continues to influence the character of the nation. This essay makes a modest effort to review this issue by examining the trends and ideas pursued by historians of urbanization and to propose new ways of exploring this topic.

Overview

The most significant historic development of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era was the sweeping urbanization of the U.S. population. This demographic transition was fueled by the swelling numbers of European immigrants, growing rural populations displaced by increasing agricultural efficiency, and the emerging industrial focus of the American economy. All of these forces coalesced in a 30-year period and thoroughly transformed the face of the American nation. There were many challenges,
however, that accompanied rapid urbanization, and many political, social, and technological innovations were needed to successfully navigate these changes. American urban centers were remarkably resilient and met the various challenges with vigor and ingenuity. The accomplishments are still visible in many American cities.

The term “urbanization” requires clarification since it is frequently used to describe any event or development associated with cities. In fact, few note that urbanization is a process and not a place. The mass movement of people from rural areas to more densely populated environs is the process of urbanization, and the growth of cities is the response to this evolutionary change. For historians, however, the term “urban” is clearly aligned with specific places that meet a prescribed set of criteria. The presence of densely populated districts, vertical housing (tenements), an industrial core area, and ethnic enclaves are all common elements of urban settings. The historiography and research developments in the field of urban history during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era ordinarily focus on these characteristics.1

The Gilded Age and Progressive Era spans from 1876 to 1920 and conveniently captures the period of urbanization in the United States. This chronological designation requires some additional consideration to account for the historical complexities that emerged in tandem with the rise of large cities. In the first half of this period—the Gilded Age—the United States experienced a dramatic rise in European immigration, rapid industrialization, and significant movement away from rural/agricultural areas. Each of these developments was responsible, in part, for the speedy urbanization of American society. The Progressive Era, another period of sustained urban growth, produced a humanitarian response to the problems and excesses that were created during the Gilded Age. The Progressives focused on a wide array of issues, but many of their enduring changes were those associated with urban reform.

The sudden rise of cities in the United States left little time for rational urban planning, development of building codes, creation of police or fire departments, resolution of waste disposal challenges, and many other attendant issues. By 1900, New York City, Chicago, and Philadelphia had populations in excess of one million (see Table 1—Appendix), yet the infrastructures of these cities were ill-equipped to support this growth. For instance, by 1890 horses in New York City deposited daily
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500,000 pounds of manure and 45,000 gallons of urine\(^2\) on congested streets with no sanctioned method of disposing of the dung. As with most challenges facing urban areas, this was only addressed after safety or health concerns surfaced. It was first tackled by Colonel George Waring and his “White Wings,” a highly professional and systematic corps of street cleaners in New York City, starting in 1895. Overall, the magnitude and scope of urban infrastructure required close relations between city government and those with the skills and ideas to improve urban living. By World War I, most large cities in the United States benefited from strong associations between city politicians and urban planners. The degree to which city life became “livable” was heralded by Kate Ascher in \textit{The Works: An Anatomy of a City}: “rarely does a resident of any of the world’s great metropolitan areas pause to consider the complexity of urban life or the myriad systems that operate round the clock to support it.”\(^3\)

The rise of cities and process of urbanization tended to be concentrated on the two coasts and interior areas well served by waterways and rail transportation hubs. However, few regions of the country were spared from significant demographic shifts since many rural areas were depopulated in the process of urbanization. Table 2 in the Appendix highlights major demographic changes in the United States between 1880 and 1920. The prominent place held by New York City in the urbanization of the United States was secured during the Civil War when the population eclipsed one million people. By 1920, a majority of all Americans were urban dwellers.

\textbf{The Rise of the City and the Historiography of Urbanization}

The study of urbanization and urban history owes great tribute to the erudite and lifelong efforts of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., who placed the city at the center of historical debate and launched a productive historiographical discourse that continues to the present. In his 1933 book, \textit{The Rise of the City}, he stated clearly that the United States was developing into an urban nation, and that continued economic and cultural growth required the successful resolution of the tensions between those who embraced the rural/agricultural character of our past history and those who realized that the urban/industrial paradigm was the future of the nation. The narrative touched on all regions of the country and gave equal time to the negative elements of urban life such as crime, slums, and inadequate sanitation, as well as to the positive

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
aspects of city dwelling—technology, invention, the fine arts, education, and the like. At the same time, Schlesinger emphasized a battery of nativist and racist fears which pitted the farmer against immigrant “hordes” and those who preferred outdoor life against industrial workers in urban slums.

For all its strengths, Schlesinger’s masterpiece was not immune to criticism. Scholars noted that The Rise of the City did not provide a coherent model for analyzing social history and that much of the narrative discussed changing cultural norms in the closing decades of the nineteenth century with little connection to urban events. Charles A. Beard chided Schlesinger and mused that “the reader who lived through the period here surveyed will experience the sensation of living scenes over again; he will walk once more as in a dream amid the sights, sounds, and smells of Xenia, Ohio, and New York City; he will hear again the big booming confusion.” Despite the lack of interpretive analysis, however, The Rise of the City clearly shaped the discussion of the history of American urbanization for decades to come.

In 1940, Schlesinger published an essay in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review that attempted to address the criticisms leveled against The Rise of the City and to extend Frederick Jackson Turner’s structural analysis to examining urban life. In “The City in American History,” he echoed Turner’s belief that “there seems likely to be an urban reinterpretation of our history” and clearly argued that economic and social patterns of urban life are essential components of social history. Moreover, he highlighted the continuous nature of urbanization in American history and how American society gradually changed and adapted to issues and events surrounding urbanization. The essay provided a positive analysis of urbanization and the growth of cities.

Sixty years after the publication of The Rise of the City, 1878–1898, Terrence McDonald echoed the common view that Arthur M. Schlesinger Sr. was the starting point for those interested in exploring urbanization and the growth of U.S. cities. The impressive development of urban history in the post–World War II era was framed around Schlesinger’s ideas, and while many scholars in the 1950s and 1960s questioned his influence, McDonald affirmed his place as “father” of urban history. The laudatory qualities of urban life—education, literature, science, invention, fine arts, social reform, public hygiene, and leisure time—introduced by Schlesinger in 1933 are recast in this article and reevaluated using new ideas and theories.

A balanced and objective consideration of urbanization explores the contributions made by Schlesinger while considering theories and ideas that both complement and contradict the Schlesinger thesis. There are a variety of questions that must be answered to appreciate the historical complexities of urbanization during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. How did the United States move from a rural to an urban nation? How did technology develop in tandem with industrialization and urbanization? How did European immigration both fuel and complicate urban growth in the United States? And finally, how did city governments and urban politicians respond to their constituencies?

These questions extend the themes first raised by Schlesinger and provide ample opportunity to reveal key theories and concepts associated with urbanization. Indeed, urban planning, the creation of urban enclaves, religious pluralism, ethnic heterogeneity, the presence of second-tier cities and suburbs, and the forces of race, class, and gender are all elements of urbanization during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era.

**Topics Related to Urbanization**

In 1890 Jacob Riis, a Danish immigrant and social reformer, described Manhattan, his adopted home, in a compelling manner:

> A map of the city, colored to designate nationalities, would show more stripes than on a skin of a zebra, and more colors than any rainbow. The city on such a map would fall into two great halves, green for the Irish on the West Side tenement districts, and blue for the Germans on the East Side. But intermingled with these ground colors would be an odd variety of tints that would give the whole the appearance of an extraordinary crazy-quilt.  

The year that these words were penned, New York City’s population approached two million, 42 percent of whom were foreign born. The more important observation is Riis’s reference to the “odd variety of tints,” since this is easily extended to other urban areas and accurately represents the ethnic and cultural diversification that occurred during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. The period is full of revolutionary changes—improvements in technology, challenges associated with industrialization, changes brought by the second wave of immigration, innovations in urban planning

---

and infrastructure development, and the machinations of urban politics—which have occupied the energies and efforts of scholars during the last quarter century.

In virtually every major city in the United States, a core industrial zone dictated the form and manner of urban expansion and development. In fact, most urban areas emerged as a result of the increased demands of industrialists for a cheap and steady supply of laborers and ready access to transportation links. The demands of city living and industrial development constituted the principal stimulus for the technological improvements of the late nineteenth century. The symbiotic connection between urbanization and industrialization created what Schlesinger called “a new sectionalism,” where tensions emerged at the boundaries of retreating rural/agricultural areas and advancing urban/industrial settings, thus generating two cultures—“one static, individualistic, agricultural, the other dynamic, collectivistic, urban.” The vibrant junction between these two developments was addressed by Carl Abbott, who posited that “revolutions in transportation and production seemed to make urbanization inevitable” and that cities were epicenters of creativity and progress. This theme has garnered considerable attention from those concerned with industrial development, labor unions, tenements, slums, and social life in densely populated areas of the country.

The urbanization of the United States was accelerated by industrialization, technology, and the migration of peoples. The first two components are critical dimensions and have received some attention, yet the human factor of urban growth constitutes the most important segment of this phenomena. While internal migration from rural areas to cities accounted for some of the increase in urban population, the most important factor was the 23.5 million people who arrived in the United States between 1890 and 1920. The role of ethnic enclaves and gender definitions in the lives of these immigrants are astutely considered by Hasia Diner in Lower East Side Memories and Erin’s Daughters in America. She argues that many urban dwellers proudly identified with their urban “slums,” which served as vital points of cultural transition for the new arrivals. She also maintains that women made critical contributions to the development of U.S. cities, a topic previously overlooked by historians. The combined efforts of immigration historians and scholars of urbanization have produced a rich and important body of literature touching upon topics as disparate as prostitution and religion and as synergistic as ethnicity and

assimilation. In many respects, immigrants shaped the geographic contours of urban life and, as such, are the most prolific topics of scholarly research.\textsuperscript{11}

Most historiographical treatments tend to focus on a single dimension of urbanization—construction of transportation networks, creation of public utilities, sanitary crusades, residential and industrial architecture, and waterworks, among others—without critically evaluating the convergence of these forces.\textsuperscript{12} Robert Barrows's 1996 essay "Urbanizing America" is exceptional because it summarizes and evaluates the major factors associated with urbanization across a broad geographic spectrum. His analysis includes major metropolises and small cities, ethnic enclaves and streetcar suburbs, and the northeast corridor and the south. Moreover, this essay succinctly summarizes urban growth, technological advances, architectural milestones, city politics, and social decay in many urban centers. Barrows aptly concludes with a remark by a prominent economist who described the late nineteenth-century city as "the spectroscope of society; it analyzes and sifts the population, separating and classifying the diverse elements. The entire process of civilization is a process of differentiation, and the city is the greatest differentiator. The cities, as the foci of progress, inevitably contain both good and bad."\textsuperscript{13} This prescient observation is still pertinent to many urban areas today.

The effects of technological advances were quickly felt in larger cities, particularly New York, but were promptly carried to urban environs in all parts of the nation. The customary litany of urban woes included waste disposal, sanitation, paved streets, bridges, garbage disposal, waterworks, rail lines, fire safety, and the like, which captured the imagination of city officials and entrepreneurs seeking solutions and profits. The application of electricity to power urban transportation

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
accelerated urban sprawl, facilitated the growth of concentric rings of settlement ("urban suburbs"), and amplified socioeconomic divisions among urban dwellers. While the trolley and streetcar augmented the horizontal growth of urban places, advances and improvements in load-bearing steel and curtail-wall construction allowed for vertical growth and the emergence of skyscrapers in most urban settings. In *Gotham: A History of New York City* to 1898, Edwin Burrows and Mike Wallace chronicle the technological transformation of New York City and point out how these changes guided developments in other urban areas. By the close of the nineteenth century, urban technology was replicated, adapted, and improved by city planners and urban boosters from coast to coast. The exponential improvements in technology defined the spatial geography and architectural design of most cities and ensured that by the close of the Progressive Era, cities were healthier and safer places for urban dwellers.

The high population density of the early twentieth century put pressure on fragile infrastructures and demanded ingenuity and insight from urban planners and politicians. Both of these topics have drawn critical attention from historians who desire a rational description of city development and those who want to dispute the simplistic dismissal of political machines as "corrupt to the core." Progressive reformers exerted significant influence on politicians and charted impressive legislation that improved urban living. Building codes were passed that required minimum living space, access to fresh air, bathroom facilities, steady water supply, adequate stairwells and egress, and other modifications that improved housing. In the wake of the Triangle Shirtwaist fire in 1911, state and local governments responded by implementing fire codes to improve building safety. A carefully choreographed array of city services—police, fire, sanitation, building and health departments, public schools, and others—were standard features throughout the nation by 1920. Clearly between 1880 and 1920, urban areas became cleaner and healthier as a result of a consistent and coherent codification of regulations and laws that were enacted by city planners and politicians.

---


Urban politicians and machine politics were negatively caricatured by many critics, especially Thomas Nast who vilified the unsavory activities of Tammany Hall’s William Marcy “Boss” Tweed in New York. However, some recent observers have argued that party bosses frequently encouraged social reforms, assisted the masses in adjusting to life in the United States, and promoted legislation to ensure orderly urban expansion. Despite common references to political corruption and honest graft, urban politicians, on balance, appear to have made many positive contributions to urban life.17

**Summation and Related Themes**

An overview of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era inevitably narrows to three major movements—industrialization, immigration, and urbanization. The interconnectedness among these competing forces makes causal analysis a complex task. The chronological developments are fairly well established, yet they still engender debate and discussion among historians. The ideas circulated in the last 20 years on urbanization integrate immigration and industrialization into the discussion; rely on paradigms related to race, class, and gender; empower ethnicity as a defining component of city life; and detail the importance of urban neighborhoods in the process of assimilation.

Since the late 1990s, the field of urban history, and most other facets of American history, have been revitalized by transnational theories and interpretations. In fact, most recent journal-length treatments of urbanization include important elements of this new school of historical thought. For instance, the processes of urbanization in Australia and Argentina share important similarities with the United States and were also influenced by the twin forces of immigration and industrialization. This comparative dimension provides a global interpretation of urbanization and extends the trajectories of inquiry.18

Suburbanization, second-tier cities, religion, and the “Great Migration” of African Americans still require additional exploration by scholars focused on urbanization during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. Several of these developments could be pursued using interdisciplinary and transnational approaches, which would greatly expand scholarly discourse. The continued vitality of this topic is obvious given the

---

wide array of books published in the field and the multitude of articles that appear regularly in scholarly journals, especially *The Journal of Urban History*, which is devoted to this specific topic.19
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### Appendix

#### TABLE 1

Population Patterns, 1870–1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>250,525</td>
<td>560,892</td>
<td>748,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>298,977</td>
<td>1,698,575</td>
<td>2,701,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>216,239</td>
<td>325,902</td>
<td>401,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>5,728</td>
<td>102,479</td>
<td>576,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>74,440</td>
<td>285,315</td>
<td>457,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>191,418</td>
<td>287,104</td>
<td>387,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,478,103</td>
<td>3,437,202</td>
<td>5,620,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1,293,687</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>1,823,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>86,075</td>
<td>321,616</td>
<td>588,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>8,293</td>
<td>90,426</td>
<td>258,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>51,038</td>
<td>85,050</td>
<td>177,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>149,473</td>
<td>342,782</td>
<td>506,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>237,194</td>
<td>315,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 2

Urban Growth During the Gilded Age and Progressive Era

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Urban</th>
<th>% Rural</th>
<th>Number of Urban Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>1,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>1,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>2,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>2,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advertising in the Gilded Age, 1880–1920

Sue Ikenberry
Georgetown Day School
Washington, D.C.

If there is one thing students know, it is advertising. That’s why studying nineteenth-century advertisements is a promising way to help them learn about the ways in which post–Civil War industrialization, urbanization, and commercial expansion changed the social and economic landscape in America.

The nineteenth century was an era of unprecedented growth and change in American history. Population, income, and territory all grew as never before, and there was a huge increase in consumer markets, manufacturing, and technological innovation. Railroads, now crisscrossing the country, provided access to new customers near and far. There were innovations in technology that revolutionized agriculture and manufacturing. The rise of factories made possible the mass production of goods that earlier in the century had been made by a single skilled craftsman—milling flour, sewing clothes, and producing new products such as lawn mowers and wringer washing machines. The transformation in production forever changed the lifestyle of the American employee and laborer, greatly expanding the time and opportunities for leisure activities. Bicycles, cameras, and musical instruments now provided hobbies; trips, amusement parks, athletic events, and dance halls became urban destinations. The rapid development of new consumer markets brought about tremendous changes in advertising. New advances in printing technology, including mechanization and lithography, reduced production costs and improved the visual quality of printed advertising materials. Among the most widespread of the emerging forms of advertising was the trade catalog. Manufacturers began to compete for consumer spending on a huge new variety of manufactured goods: purported cure-alls, household appliances such as iceboxes, stoves, sewing machines, and packaged and canned foods. Giving students a chance to work with
late nineteenth-century advertisements gives them insight into this process, and is helpful as the AP Exam approaches and the exam document-based question (DBQ) is in sight.

On the next page are a number of links to advertising brochures, leaflets, and even cookbooks designed to promote a product, as well as trade cards and information for retailers. In addition to the background on developments in industry, transportation, and urbanization, teachers may want to remind students that there were technological advances in printing throughout the century that not only resulted in lower costs for printing but also made possible greater use of illustrations (though photographs do not become at all easy to print until the 1890s). The introduction of chromolithography just before the Civil War made possible extensive use of color in commercial advertising. At the same time, concentrated markets emerged as cities grew and spilled into suburbs, and railroads made it possible to envision selling even to isolated, rural Americans. In order to reach these markets, producers promoted their goods in magazines, brochures, and trade cards.

**Ideas for Lesson Plans**

A worksheet for students appears below, which could be used in a number of ways:

Take students to the computer lab and let them work in pairs on the groups of advertisements and advertising brochures suggested by the links provided. The form is designed to take about 20 minutes, leaving plenty of time in a block-length class to ask questions. The class and the students can draw conclusions and make observations as appropriate. Alternatively, the teacher might choose various themes and ask how the different ads illustrate them. The form is designed to draw students’ attention to various changes in technology, highlighting some of the ways in which the ads illustrate economic and social trends of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. How does the student’s ad highlight the importance of railroads? The rise of big business? Are there advertisements that reflect developments in science and technology? Are there particular values that these ads reflect? What are attitudes toward the role of women? How are children depicted? What is a modern home supposed to be like? Do students see ads appealing to matters of status? How would the existence of these nationally advertised products make the nation seem more unified? Any of these questions would make the point that these are not “only” advertisements but also an entryway into an entire world of social and economic values. National products were sold by national organizations, all of which contributed to a growing national identity. It is also interesting to point out to students, if they
have not already noticed, that pictures of factories invariably contain black smoke proudly being spewed into the atmosphere. It’s a good place to remind students that for most Americans the pride taken in the improvements brought on by factories was important: smoke belching into the air was to many a sign of progress.

If the computer lab is not a good place to hold a teaching class, it would also work to print out some or all of these ads and break students into small groups. Have the student groups fill out the worksheet and then report back to the entire class. The teacher could also use one or more of the ads as a warm-up activity, perhaps over the course of several days. Students could look at a printed copy or a PowerPoint slide and write a paragraph discussing how it might be tied to or illustrate the rise of big business, railroads, and the commercial economy. (Note: the exhibit of trade cards at Baker Library, Harvard University, at http://www.library.hbs.edu/hc/exhibits/tcard/, would work especially well in this context, as would the many digitized trade cards found at http://www.tradecards.com/articles/articles.html.)

Students especially enjoy seeing old advertisements for products that still exist—Carnation Milk, Quaker Oats, Gold Medal Flour, and Ivory Soap. Giving students a chance to do a bit of research on these ads is a way of providing each with a unique view into the rise of big business.
Worksheet: Looking at the Origins of Our Consumer Culture

Working in pairs, choose ONE of the advertising brochures or broadsides on the back of this form for examination and research. Answer the following questions:

(Note: There is a wide variety of advertisements in the pool. There may therefore be some questions that some can’t answer fully or that don’t entirely pertain to their selection, but most students will be able to answer the questions.)

- What product or line of products was featured in your ad?
- When was it created?
- What audience is it designed for? (Note: Not all these brochures are designed for consumers. Some may have been written for storeowners, wholesalers, or even traveling salesmen.)
- Where was the product made?
- What can you find out about the company that made this product? Is it still in existence? Was it a monopoly? If so, was it vertically or horizontally integrated?
- How and why do you think this brand emerged at this particular time?
- How does the product depend on new developments in technology, science, and transportation? Urbanization? Education? Changes in the way people were earning their living?
- Do you think the product worked? Why? Why not?
- How expensive was the product in nineteenth-century money? Who could afford to purchase this product?

These Web sites may help you make a cost estimate:
http://www.measuringworth.com/uscompare
http://econweb.rutgers.edu/rockoff/HowMuch.htm
http://www.waynesthisandthat.com/cost.htm

- What are some of the values, attitudes, and new lifestyle choices that are promoted by this advertisement?
- On what basis do you draw these conclusions?
- What does the ad imply about gender roles?
- Attitudes toward children?
- Attitudes about the home?
- Do you see appeals that deal with status or class? What are they?
- What about this ad is like something we might see today? What is different?
- Overall, what does this ad tell you about the period that we are studying?
Assessments

Students who filled out a form for homework will have completed one potential assessment; an essay question on a test or exam might be a good way to judge how well the information has been incorporated into the student’s understanding of social, economic, and cultural developments in the late nineteenth century. The question might be something like this:

*Analyze some of the ways in which developments in transportation, technology, urbanization, and the rise of big business changed American culture and lifestyle. Use at least one advertisement discussed in class as a way to illustrate your answer.*

Alternatively, one or more advertisements could be included on a test or quiz involving this period. Students can be asked to discuss the ad in the context of industrialization and urbanization. Advertisements can be used as prompts for written warm-up activities, and the resulting writing exercises can be evaluated.
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Any set of lesson ideas for the post–Civil War era—especially when urbanization is the focus—needs to deal with urban politics and the development of the new style of political organization called the “machine.” The political machine and the boss came out of changing electoral politics centered around the expansion of the white male franchise. Beginning in the 1840s, huge waves of immigration rapidly transformed urban voters from mostly native-born to a rich ethnic mix—primarily Irish Catholics and Germans at first, and later Southern and Eastern Europeans. These groups often came to America with few resources and faced active hostility because of religious and/or linguistic differences. As a result of the migration, cities grew rapidly. There was much to be built: transportation systems, streets, new municipal buildings, and sewers and water piping systems. And there were all sorts of new jobs: for police, for people to build and maintain the infrastructure, and for an emerging bureaucracy. And as the cities grew fantastically, so did the construction contracts and jobs—on a scale never seen before. Under these circumstances, it is perhaps easy to view the emerging political machine as inevitable, but in fact the ways of looking at the emergence of the boss and his machine have varied. In the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century the bosses and their machines were often defined and explained by their opponents—usually reformers or muckrakers, sometimes foreign visitors. In his famous two-volume work, *The American Commonwealth* (1888), Lord James Bryce provided a classic overview. The emphasis of these authors was generally on how the machine worked and on the damage done to the city treasury.
by the patronage, organization, and the corruption manifested in bribery, kickbacks, padded contracts, and swollen voter lists.

Around the time of the Second World War, a group of sociologists and political scientists launched a new perspective. Robert K. Merton and the functionalist school cast a new eye on the machines and found some things to appreciate in the bosses and their political control. These authors emphasized that at a time when there was no social “safety net”—no welfare, no food stamps, no unemployment insurance, no public employment agencies—the political machine filled a very real need. It provided all these things and more: Christmas turkey baskets, bountiful patronage, social networks, and even a career ladder for the hardworking, ambitious young man from a disadvantaged ethnic group. Historians writing after the war, most notably Richard Hofstadter, adopted some or all of this perspective. From this viewpoint, the machine and even the boss became expressions of the immigrants’ need for material and psychological help, while the reformer was depicted as someone who was simply protecting his status and his middle-class morality and outlook. A third view has emerged in recent years. Historians such as Jon Teaford have focused more on the limits of the machines, pointing out that the bosses were in many cases neither as powerful as once thought nor so uniform in approach. Their approaches varied from one city to the next; some were efficient and humane, others were not.

The question of why the urban political machines began to die out is also increasingly contested ground. The conventional answer used to be that New Deal programs took away the need for the benefits of the machine. But more recent studies indicate that many bosses (Pendergast in Missouri, for example) prospered with New Deal money to hand out. So, like the bosses themselves, most answers are local.

Most textbooks seem to reflect and report on the first two of these perspectives, concerning themselves with the corruption or the ways in which urban political machines interacted with burgeoning immigrant populations. The focus is nearly always on the “Uber-Boss,” William M. Tweed. Typically textbooks point to Tweed’s corruption but also devote few lines to the positive role that urban machines may have played as well.

**Class Strategy #1**

Many textbooks have an inset with a few paragraphs from William L. Reardon’s writings on *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall*, originally a newspaper series that was compiled into a little book in 1963. It is in the public domain and thus readily available on the Internet:
Since the chapters are short, and are all readable and interesting, assign as homework one chapter to each student, with questions, and perhaps have everyone read Chapter 23, which is the classic account of Plunkitt’s day. The subsequent class could begin by asking each student to briefly summarize his or her chapter and state for the class the most interesting Plunkitt observation or story. Students could discuss the ways in which Plunkitt’s techniques are still part of the contemporary political scene. (See the worksheet in the Appendix, pg. 31.)

**Class Strategy #2**

Another possible class might consist of a debate on the pros and cons of urban machine politics. Were the machines and the bosses who often ran them fundamentally so corrupt that they damaged the American political process? Or were they a humane response to the problems of immigrants and poor workers in the city?

*Evidence against the machine*: In addition to information available in their textbooks, students arguing that the political machines were bad for cities might look at some or all of the following:

- Brief summary in Digital History: http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article_display.cfm?HHID=211
- A great collection of Thomas Nast’s political cartoons, with some very useful detail in the *Nevada Observer*: http://www.nevadaobserver.com/TNO%20Reference%20Page%20File/Photo%20Page%202.htm

Bryce’s *The American Commonwealth* is also in the public domain and is easily available online from the Liberty Fund at http://oll.libertyfund.org. Chapters 58–68 eloquently lay out the case against the urban machine as it was made in 1888.

*Evidence for the machine*: Students arguing that machines filled a need for the immigrants pouring into the cities could profitably consult these sources:

- They could start with the last chapter of *Plunkitt*, which makes as good a case as can be made for the usefulness of the Tammany District Leader.
- Teachers who try to insert comparative perspectives into their courses will want to direct their students to: http://www arts.u-szeged.hu/american/americana/vollno1/szelpal.htm, a long article that compares U.S. political machines to politics in Hungary.
The piece is clearly organized around specific arguments in favor of the machine.

- Finally, a few pages (pp. 4–22) from Hofstadter’s *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR* (New York, 1955) will provide arguments for both sides as well as a chance for students to be exposed to the writing of one of the greatest American historians of the 20th century.

### Class Strategy #3

“Urban Politics: Machines and Reformers.” A ready-made lesson plan, focusing on New York, which could be used in part or in total, has been created by City University of New York, LaGuardia Community College, and the *New York Times*. The readings and visuals begin in the post–Civil War period, and go through the twentieth century. The lesson plan, geared to the New York State eleventh-grade curriculum, is available at:

http://www1.cuny.edu/portal_ur/content/voting_curriculum/urban_politics.html

### Class Strategy #4

Students also might enjoy reenacting the trial of Boss Tweed. The biographies by Mandelbaum and Hershkowitz would provide more than enough detail in terms of names of witnesses and charges.

### Some Other Ideas

Because of the rise of newspapers and national magazines during the post–Civil War period, there are a great number of political cartoons available. The most famous are certainly by Thomas Nast (see *HarpWeek’s* Web site on the 1872 election at http://nastandgreeley.harpweek.com/default.asp for some of the most detailed and elegant of these). A cartoon could be used as a trigger for a warm-up writing activity.

For students in urban settings, teachers might find it best to give students a chance to learn something about their local history. Here in Washington, D.C., for example, we have our own controversial “Boss Shepherd,” and almost every city and large town has some bit of urban history that would be of interest to students.
Assessments

Students could be asked to write an essay assessing the strengths and weaknesses of urban political machines. If students prepared for a debate in class, they could submit their position papers as homework. They could then respond to a statement such as this:

*Machine politics in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century cities had many critics, but on balance the machines were a natural and benign response to the pressures of urban growth.*

On a test or quiz, students could be asked to comment on a political cartoon pertaining to an urban boss, or to a quotation from *Plunkitt*.

If students are in a city they could be asked to interview people who may remember a political boss in their city. Students also might find it interesting to discuss some of *Plunkitt’s* ideas with a contemporary political figure—someone on the country council, an alderman, or even an elected school board official might be an apt subject for such an interview.
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Appendix

Worksheet:

*Plunkitt of Tammany Hall*: “He seen his opportunities and he took ’em.”

Read Chapter 23 in *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall*, the ideas of George Washington Plunkitt as told to a reporter in 1906.

Read one other chapter as assigned and answer these questions from your reading in *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall*.

- Who was George Washington Plunkitt?
- What was his position?
- When did he live?
- Briefly summarize the chapter you read.
- What was the most interesting story or quotation from this chapter?

Chapter 23

- How does Plunkitt spend a typical day?
- Why?
- What does this chapter say about ethnic groups in New York City and Plunkitt’s approach to them?
- What in your reading from Plunkitt reminds you of politics as it’s practiced today?
- What seems very different?
- If you were running against George Washington Plunkitt, what might you say to try to defeat him?
A Roundtable Discussion on

*Lochner v. New York*

Matthew C. Boesen
Woodberry Forest School
Woodberry Forest, Virginia

Compared to other subfields in American history—colonial history, African American history, or legal history, to name a few—urban history is atypical. Historians of urban America focus their attention not on a particular era, population, or disciplinary approach to the past, but on a specific kind of place: America’s cities. By definition, America’s cities bring together people in a confined space. For experienced historians and novice history students alike, the congestion and energy of America’s cities create a dynamic and exciting point of entry into the story of America’s past.

By any standard, America’s cities at the turn of the twentieth century were bubbling cauldrons of historical change. Urbanization was both cause and consequence of the industrial revolution, arguably the most significant episode in late nineteenth-century America. Not surprisingly, therefore, America’s cities are the location of several of the events in this era that consistently garner extensive coverage in American history textbooks. The Triangle Shirtwaist Factory Fire, the Pullman Strike, and Jane Addams’s Hull House cannot be understood apart from their urban contexts. Sweatshops, strikes, unions, tenements, Robber Barons, corporations, immigration, crime, the “boss,” mass consumption, leisure: the city shaped and conditioned each of these key elements of American life at the dawn of the twentieth century.

The hothouse environment of America’s cities during this era often energizes class discussion, but it can be very difficult for students to approach this course with the broadminded objectivity that history teachers try to cultivate. In particular, students tend to approach issues of class in this period from their own perspectives.
They see the great industrialists of 1900 through the prism of America’s wealthy in 2008; likewise, they view the poor of America’s cities during this era as differently clothed counterparts of today’s less fortunate. Teaching this period in American history therefore challenges teachers to encourage their students to step outside their own perspective—to step, ideally, back in time into the shoes of those who lived through the upheavals of early twentieth-century America.

A roundtable discussion can offer an ideal way to force students to adjust their perspective and see this era from the perspective of those who lived through it. Sitting in a tight circle with other students—all of whom represent a different perspective on the turbulence of the period—forces students to re-create the densely packed world of America’s cities at the turn of the century. If executed well, such a discussion can help students appreciate the daunting complexity and vital excitement of urban history.

Supreme Court cases can be a useful point of entry into any era of American history. The most celebrated cases in the Court’s history highlight key developments in principal units of an American history survey course: *Dred Scott v. Sandford* and the coming of the Civil War, for example, or *Brown v. Board of Education* and the Civil Rights Movement. In much the same way, *Lochner v. New York* (1905) provides students with a compelling snapshot of urban history during the Progressive Era. In *Lochner*, the court addressed the constitutionality of the Bakeshop Act of 1895, a New York state statute that limited bakery workers to 10 hours of work per day or 60 hours per week. Ultimately, the court struck down the statute as a violation of the freedom of contract protected by the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment. The case therefore dealt a crushing blow to Progressives’ attempts to ameliorate working conditions in American cities, and the case has since come to define an era—the “Lochner Era”—in the Court’s history defined by judicial activism and laissez-faire constitutionalism.

Several of the strands commonly woven into textbook accounts of this period have significant points of contact with *Lochner*. As noted above, the legislation in question was clearly the product of Progressive reformers’ efforts. Proponents of the legislation—and Justice John Marshall Harlan’s dissenting opinion in the case—utilized the expertise of several social scientists who provided key evidence to support the Bakeshop Act. Opponents of the act utilized the arguments of William Graham Sumner and other Social Darwinists who attempted to justify a laissez-faire state despite the widespread suffering it permitted. Workers in New York’s bakeries endured endless hours—sometimes over one hundred hours per
week—in unspeakable conditions, conditions that unquestionably had a harmful impact upon their health. Influenced by a muckraking press that played an active role in the crusade to improve working conditions in the state, the Bakeshop Act of 1895 was debated and passed in a political world dominated by city “bosses” and machine politics. *Lochner v. New York*, in other words, is about much more than the Supreme Court and the Constitution. Taught from a broader perspective, *Lochner* brings together legal history, social history, economic history, political history, and intellectual history in one compelling story of urban America during the Progressive Era.

A roundtable discussion on *Lochner* serves well as a capstone project covering the history of the Gilded Age and the Progressive Era. Ideally, students should be given one or two days to research the individual they have chosen to represent; even brief consultation of basic reference works available in most libraries would give students the foundation they need to participate in an informed and thoughtful manner. Students should be encouraged to consider their individual’s response to the problem that the Bakeshop Act sought to address, their views on the Bakeshop Act itself, and—if applicable—the views that they would bring to the judicial resolution of the case in the Supreme Court. A suggested, but by no means exhaustive list, of possible “participants” could include the following:

Justice Rufus Peckham (writer of the majority opinion in the case)
Justice John Marshall Harlan (writer of a dissenting opinion in the case)
Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes (writer of a dissenting opinion in the case)
Andrew Carnegie (industrialist, author of *Gospel of Wealth*)
Cornelius Vanderbilt (railroad tycoon, defender of unbridled laissez-faire and the “self-made” man)
William Graham Sumner (Social Darwinist)
Eugene Debs (presidential candidate of the Socialist Party of America)
Edward Bellamy (author of utopian novel *Looking Backward*)
Terence Powderly (leader of the Knights of Labor)
“Big Bill” Haywood (leader of the Industrial Workers of the World)
Henry Bowers (founder of the xenophobic American Protective Association—immigration restriction)
Jacob Riis (“Muckraker” and author of *How the Other Half Lives*)
George Washington Plunkitt (city boss)
Washington Gladden (leader of the Social Gospel movement)
Jane Addams (leader of the Settlement House Movement)
Louis Brandeis (Progressive reformer, later Supreme Court Justice)
Theodore Roosevelt (Progressive president)
Woodrow Wilson (Progressive president)
Robert La Follette (successful state-level Progressive reformer)

The teacher could also provide a brief summary of the case—perhaps from Kermit Hall, ed., *The Oxford Companion to the Supreme Court of the United States*, 2nd ed. (2005)—to ensure that everyone “at the table” has a common background on the facts of the case itself. If scheduling constraints do not allow for more reading outside of class, this background could easily be provided in a brief 5–10 minute lecture on the background and facts of the case.

Each student should come to class prepared to make a 1–2 minute presentation explaining their thoughts on *Lochner*. In a nutshell, each student should (1) take a side in the case. Should the court rule for New York and uphold the maximum hours law? Or should the Court rule for *Lochner* and strike down the law as unconstitutional? and (2) explain why the court should take that side. What reasoning/justification best supports the court’s decision? Many of the participants in the roundtable are not lawyers or judges, and therefore responses to question (2) will necessarily go beyond the legal and constitutional questions at issue in *Lochner*. It is worthwhile to note, however, that judges in this era—like today—are generally willing to use extrajudicial sources when considering the outcome of a given case. Many historians have asserted, for example, that laissez-faire and Social Darwinism had a profound influence on the judges who voted for the majority in *Lochner*; likewise, Justice Harlan’s dissenting opinion in *Lochner* clearly demonstrates the relationship between professional social science and the Progressive Movement.

If the students are reasonably well prepared, a roundtable discussion such as this can create a truly student-centered lesson. Ideally, roughly half of the participants should be assigned roles that support the legislation in question; the other half should be assigned roles that seek to strike down the law. Each individual participant, however, will bring a different perspective to bear on the question of maximum hour laws—different answers to the “why” question noted above. These different
perspectives, in turn, should transform a two-sided debate into a discussion among several related but distinct perspectives on the topic.

The following questions could help provoke student discussion:

1. What are the most significant problems facing America’s cities at the turn of the century? Is this sort of legislation ultimately beneficial or detrimental to the nation’s welfare?

2. In general, should the government pass legislation designed to improve working conditions—or the lot of workers in general? What are the likely consequences of this sort of legislation? What other options should the government—or private individuals—pursue in order to address the problem?

3. What are the constitutional questions involved in the case? Why does the New York legislature think it has the power to pass a maximum hours law? Why do the opponents of the Bakeshop Act think that the law is unconstitutional?

After the discussion, a quick “debriefing” discussion will help students collect their thoughts about the questions *Lochner* raises. A good way to get this kind of discussion started is to ask students to shed their assigned roles and cast their vote about the wisdom of the Bakeshop law. Any division of opinion at all on this question could be the basis for further discussion, which should lead students to consider which of the perspectives/rationales presented in the case were the most compelling. Finally, students could write an essay on the case that explains their thoughts in more depth. Evaluating the persuasiveness of the several perspectives presented in the roundtable requires students to employ their analytical skills and move beyond simple regurgitation of the material. Ultimately, then, the conflicting perspectives presented in this roundtable discussion do more than illustrate the cacophony of voices that filled America’s cities at the turn of the century; they also challenge students to consider the difficult “why” and “how” questions at the heart of historical scholarship.

Lessons for the Progressive Movement

Geri Hastings
Catonsville High School
Catonsville, Maryland

Historical Context

The Progressive Era (1890–1920) was an attempt to fix the many problems created during the Gilded Age, many of which resulted from the rapid urbanization of the period. Following the Panic and Depression of 1893, which engendered massive unemployment and discontent among the poor, Progressive reformers focused Americans’ attention on the many problems in American society caused by industrialization and rapid urbanization. Progressivism, which gained its start at the local and state levels of government, later influenced national legislation and national politicians, but disappeared around the beginning of the 1920s. While the movement had roots in the Populist Movement of the 1880s and 1890s, it developed quite differently from Populism and became an urban reform movement led by middle and upper class reformers. By the early 1900s, the return to the gold standard, the discovery of gold in the Yukon Territory, and the influx of immigrants to the United States, alleviated many of the problems that had given rise to the rural Populist Movement. But urban problems continued. While the Progressives desired many of the same goals as the Populists, they focused more on the problems caused by industrialization that affected cities. It was fundamentally an urban movement, though it had elements that reached into other parts of the country. The Progressives, as their name implies, were forward looking and had no desire to go back to America as it had been. Rather, Progressives wanted to live in this new industrial America while rectifying the many problems that continued to trouble its citizens.
The areas of Progressive concern were also in many ways similar to the concerns of the reformers in the antebellum era. In fact a number of antebellum reform movements put on hold by the Civil War rose up again in the late nineteenth century and came to fruition during the Progressive Movement. Both the women’s suffrage reformers and the temperance reformers successfully supported the passage of amendments giving women the right to vote and prohibiting the sale or manufacture of alcoholic beverages. In addition, Progressive reformers, similar to the reformers of the Jacksonian era, focused on educational reform through John Dewey’s activities and also on world peace through the establishment of the League of Nations. African American Progressive reformers, like abolitionists in the previous era, sought equal opportunities both socially and politically for black Americans. However, at the dawn of the twentieth century, these African Americans were seeking freedom, not from slavery, but from the restrictive Jim Crow laws.

The Progressive Movement was such an important movement because it heralded the start of government’s attempts to solve the political, economic, and social problems of American society. Rather than leaving the welfare of Americans to private charities, government at the local, state, and national levels began to deal with the problems of America caused by rapid industrialization and urbanization. In many ways Franklin Roosevelt, as he prepared to launch his New Deal, looked back to the Progressive Movement for ideas and inspiration.

Objectives:
The following unit looks at the origins, goals, and support for the Progressive Movement in order to determine the movement’s impact on American society. Students will also be asked to evaluate the role of the reformers in the Progressive Movement with special emphasis on women and African American reformers. The unit includes a number of hands-on activities that encourage students to take a more active role in understanding this time period. The home assignment and initiatory activities are designed to ensure that students have the content information they need for a deeper understanding of the Progressive Movement and to set the stage for “What’s Wrong With America?”—the Progressive Reformers’ Congressional Hearing—which is the central focus of the lessons.
Procedure:

I. Begin by assigning the textbook chapter on the Progressives for homework a few days in advance of the lessons. Depending upon available time, students may work alone reading and taking notes, or students may be assigned one of the questions below as a “jigsaw” activity to be shared with a small group of classmates. In either case, direct students to answer the following questions:

- Analyze the relationship of the Progressive Movement to the rise of large cities that occurred in the late nineteenth century.
- Explain the conditions that gave rise to the Progressive Movement at the end of the nineteenth century and describe the major goals of the Progressive Movement at the local, state, and national levels that attempted to address these conditions.
- Describe the people (including their occupations) at the forefront of the Progressive Movement and the philosophies that motivated these men and women to become Progressive reformers. (Focus on the goals of the urban-middle-class reformers, upper-middle-class reformers, working-class reformers, and socialists if the information is available in your textbook.)
- How did the muckrakers contribute to the Progressive Movement? List at least seven muckraking authors, their works, the subject matter of their works, and the extent to which their efforts were successful. Be sure to also describe any magazines that were important instruments of the muckrakers.
- List at least six of the prominent organizations that either came into being or grew stronger as a result of the Progressive Movement. Explain why these organizations began and what the specific goals of each organization were.
- Describe and identify opponents of the Progressive Movement and why they did so.
- Explain the new view of government that emerged by the turn of the century. Identify the political and social reforms that had been accomplished by 1918 at the local, state, and national levels and the attitude of Presidents Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson regarding the Progressive Movement.
II. In the class period(s) following the jigsaw activity, conduct the “Congressional Hearing: What’s Wrong With America? A Progressive Reformers’ Meeting of the Minds.” The meeting of the minds can take 1–3 class periods depending upon the size of the class, the length of the class period, and the depth of student research.

**PROGRESSIVE MEETING OF THE MINDS:**
**A CONGRESSIONAL HEARING TO DETERMINE WHAT'S WRONG WITH AMERICA?**

*Question:* What do you see as the most pressing problem facing America and what do you suggest be done to deal with this problem?

**Time:** February 1912 (moved question and time to the left)

**Place:** The U.S. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.

**Moderator of the Hearing:** The president of the U.S. Senate, James S. Sherman

**Scenario:** One year prior to the conclusion of the Taft administration, members of the Senate summon reformers from across the nation to come together to testify at a Senate Select Committee hearing. At the hearing, each Progressive reformer will be asked to identify what is believed to be the most pressing problem America is facing and provide suggestions regarding how to fix the problem.

**Character Information:** For this Select Committee Hearing, students will be assigned to be either Progressive reformers or U.S. Senators. Lists of Progressive reformers and U.S. Senators are provided below. The ratio of reformers to Senators should be roughly 3:1. (If there are 28 students there should be 21 reformers and 7 Senators. This ratio may be modified to suit the needs of the class and the instructor.)

**1) Progressive Reformers**

Using at least one primary source and a minimum of two secondary sources (no traditional encyclopedias, Internet encyclopedias, or classroom textbooks may be used), students should:

- Identify the reformer’s occupation and socioeconomic background
- Determine the social ill which the reformer is attacking
- Explain the solution to the social ill that the reformer is advocating
- Identify any books or articles on the subject that the reformer has written and any legislation the reformer has supported.
- Identify major accomplishments of the reformer
• Identify local, state, and national legislation already passed in the area of concern as well as Supreme Court cases that have already been decided (1890–1912)

*Information should be limited to the time period 1880–1912.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSSIBLE LIST OF REFORMERS FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL HEARING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Reform</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Addams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Kelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Gates Starr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles W. Eliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s Suffrage and Women’s Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Chapman Catt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Perkins Gilman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Brandeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Sanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Gospel Movement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Rauschenbusch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Gladden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sheldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Reform</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene V. Debs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Mary Harris Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Spargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration and Eugenics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Galton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temperance/Prohibition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Willard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Corruption</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Graham Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Steffens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Muir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifford Pinchot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics/Scientific Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Reform</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert La Follette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam “Golden Rule” Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiram Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems Caused by Trusts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Tarbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Stannard Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Bellamy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African American Rights</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.E.B. DuBois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker T. Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida B. Wells-Barnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Julia Cooper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) Senators

Using three secondary sources, unless a primary source is available, students should:

• Identify the political party and political leaning of the Senator, i.e., liberal or conservative
• Identify the state from which the Senator was elected
• Identify the number of years the Senator served in the Senate
• Identify the Senator’s previous occupations and qualifications for office
• Identify the Senator’s legislative and societal accomplishments

Information should be limited to the time period 1880–1912. A good source of background information is www.bioguide.congress.gov. A list of possible Senators has been provided below.

**LIST OF SENATORS IN THE 62nd CONGRESS in 1912**

President of the Senate: James S. Sherman, Vice President of the United States

Presidents’ Pro Tempore: Augustus O. Bacon (GA)
   Jacob H. Gallinger (NH)
   Charles Curtis (KS)
   Henry Cabot Lodge (MA)
   Frank B. Brandegee (CT)

Composition of the Senate: 52 Republicans, 43 Democrats  Total: 95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>John H. Bankhead (D)</td>
<td>William Alden Smith (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph F. Johnston (D)</td>
<td>Charles E. Townsend (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Henry Fashurst (D)</td>
<td>Knute Nelson (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcus A. Smith (D)</td>
<td>Moses E. Clapp (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>James P. Clarke (D)</td>
<td>LeRoy Percy (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Davis (D)</td>
<td>John S. Williams (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>George C. Perkins (R)</td>
<td>William J. Stone (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John D. Works (R)</td>
<td>James A. Reed (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Simon Guggenheim (R)</td>
<td>Joseph M. Dixon (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles J. Hughes (died 1/11/1911)</td>
<td>Henry L. Myers (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seat remained vacant until 1/15/1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Frank B. Brandegee (R)</td>
<td>Norris Brown (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George P. McLean (R)</td>
<td>Gilbert M. Hitchcock (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Knute Nelson (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moses E. Clapp (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>LeRoy Percy (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John S. Williams (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Joseph M. Dixon (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry L. Myers (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Norris Brown (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert M. Hitchcock (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. William Frye resigned as president pro tempore because of ill health and died in August 1911. Choosing his successor proved difficult for the Senate because Senate Republicans, then in the majority, were split between the Progressive and conservative factions, each promoting its own candidate. Similarly, the Democrats proposed their own candidate. As a result of this three-way split, no individual received a majority vote. During May and June, 1911, ballot after ballot failed to elect a new president pro tempore. Finally senators agreed to a compromise solution. Democrat Augustus Bacon served for a single day during the vice president’s absence. Thereafter, Bacon and four Republicans—Curtis, Gallinger, Lodge, and Brandegee—served alternately as president pro tempore for the remainder of the 62nd Congress.
### LIST OF SENATORS IN THE 62nd CONGRESS in 1912

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Democratic Senators</th>
<th>Republican Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Henry A. duPont (R)</td>
<td>Francis G. Newlands (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harry A. Richardson (R)</td>
<td>George S. Nixon (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Duncan U. Fletcher (D)</td>
<td>Jacob H. Gallinger (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan P. Bryan (D)</td>
<td>Henry E. Burnham (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Augustus O. Bacon (D)</td>
<td>Frank O. Briggs (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoke Smith (D)</td>
<td>James E. Martine (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Weldon B. Heyburn (R)</td>
<td>Thomas B. Catron (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William E. Borah (R)</td>
<td>Albert B. Fall (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Shelby M. Cullum (R)</td>
<td>Elihu A. Root (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Lorimer (R)</td>
<td>James A. O’Gorman (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Benjamin F. Shively (D)</td>
<td>Furnifold M. Simmons (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John W. Kern (D)</td>
<td>Lee S. Overman (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Albert B. Cummins (R)</td>
<td>Porter J. McCumber (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William S. Kenyon (R)</td>
<td>Asle J. Gronna (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Charles Curtis (R)</td>
<td>Theodore E. Burton (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph L. Bristow (R)</td>
<td>Atlee Pomerene (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Thomas R. Paynter (D)</td>
<td>Thomas P. Gore (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William O. Bradley (R)</td>
<td>Robert L. Owen (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Murphy J. Foster (D)</td>
<td>Jonathan Bourne, Jr. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John R. Thornton (D)</td>
<td>George E. Chamberlain (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Obadiah Gardner (D)</td>
<td>Boies Penrose (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles F. Johnson (D)</td>
<td>George T. Oliver (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Isidor Raynor (D)</td>
<td>George P. Wetmore (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John W. Smith (D)</td>
<td>Henry F. Lippitt (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Henry Cabot Lodge (R)</td>
<td>Benjamin T. Tillman (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winthrop M. Crane (R)</td>
<td>Ellison D. Smith (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Robert J. Gamble (R)</td>
<td>Thomas S. Martin (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coe I. Crawford (R)</td>
<td>Claude A. Swanson (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Robert L. Taylor (D)</td>
<td>Wesley L. Jones (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luke Lea (D)</td>
<td>Miles Poindexter (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Charles A. Culberson (D)</td>
<td>Clarence W. Watson (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph W. Bailey (D)</td>
<td>William E. Chilton (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Reed Smoot (R)</td>
<td>Robert M. La Follette, Sr. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Sutherland (R)</td>
<td>Isaac Stephenson (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>William P. Dillingham (R)</td>
<td>Clarence D. Clark (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carroll S. Page (R)</td>
<td>Francis E. Warren (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Procedure for the Hearing:

During the Congressional hearing, students should compile all their information on note cards. They should not read directly from the note cards unless they are directly quoting something brief and specific. They must speak during the hearing as if they are the persons they are portraying. Each student should be given a name tag and a list of debate participants and must refer to other students by the name that is on the name tag. Senators should sit at desks in the front of the room. Reformers should sit at desks in the audience together with other reformers sharing their interests and area of concern. Prior to the hearing, the Senators should develop the order in which the reformer witnesses will testify and call the reformers to the podium in that order. It is suggested that the Congressmen recognize the remaining reformers who share the same concern, i.e., conservation, women’s suffrage, education, or other issues, before moving to an additional area of concern.

Students who are not presenting, both reformers and Senators, should take notes during the hearing. Reformers’ presentations before the Senate committee should be limited to three minutes. Senators should limit to three the number of questions asked of each reformer. Senators should prepare the questions they will ask in advance and base the questions not only on their research but also on the résumés submitted to them by the reformers.

When a reformer has been acknowledged and called to the podium, the reformer should present a brief background summary, and then make a three-minute presentation that identifies the area of concern and explains what should be done to address that concern. Since this is a hearing before the U.S. Senate, reformers should feel free to advocate legislation they would like to have passed. At the conclusion of the presentation (Senators should use a stopwatch so presenters do not exceed their time), the Senator assigned to that reformer should ask the reformer the three questions the Senator has previously prepared. The reformer should be prepared enough for this hearing to answer whatever pertinent question is asked. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Senators should caucus in private (the hall works well if no other area is available) and select the area of concern that they believe has been best represented at the hearing.

Bibliography:

A bibliography with a minimum of three sources, one of which must be a primary source, must be part of each character’s résumé. The bibliography should follow either the MLA or Turabian format, depending on your school’s preferences. As always,
works cited in bibliographies must be placed in alphabetical order according to the
author’s last name or title of the book or article if there is no author.

**Grading:**

The reformers’ presentations are worth 30 points each: 15 points for the general
information and 5 points for the answer to each question. The résumé is worth 20
points for a total of 50 points. Reformers should be judged on the delivery of their
presentation, the quality of the content information presented, the quality of the
responses to the Senators’ questions, rapport with the Senators, and demeanor during
the presentation.

The Senators should be judged on the quality of the questions that they pose
and on their demeanor during the hearing. Questions should be specific to the
character being questioned and should reflect the research the Senator has done for
each reformer the Senator will question. Each Senator should ask a minimum of 10
questions worth 3 points each for a total of 30 points. The résumé is worth 20 points
for a total of 50 points.

**Résumé Information:**

Below is a sample of a résumé for the Congressional hearing. (A key follows the
résumé.) Two copies of the résumé must be submitted by each reformer: one to the
instructor on the day of the hearing and one to the Senate committee members three
days prior to the hearing. Senators’ résumés may be submitted to the instructor on
the day of the hearing. Senators need only submit one copy of their résumé to the
instructor.

**SAMPLE RÉSUMÉ**

Mother Mary Harris Jones (1)
Cork, Ireland (2)
February 1, 1912 (3)

**Objective (4):**

To draw America’s attention the plight of labor and to expose Americans to
the poor conditions under which laborers toil.

**Summary (5):**

I have been a leading activist in the American labor movement. After
the death of my husband and four children in a yellow fever epidemic in
Tennessee in 1867, I moved to Chicago where I opened a dressmaking
shop. Unfortunately, the Great Chicago Fire of 1871 destroyed my home and
business. Following that tragedy, I dedicated my life to the union cause and became active as a strike organizer with both the Knights of Labor and the United Mine Workers. As a labor activist, I convinced many laborers to strike for better working conditions, higher wages, and shorter hours. Later I joined the Socialist Party, and in 1905 I was active in founding the Industrial Workers of the World. At the age of 73, I led a march from Philadelphia to Sagamore Hill on Long Island to confront President Theodore Roosevelt about the exploitation of children and the need to eliminate child labor. I have been called the “Miners’ Angel,” and I am famous for saying, “Pray for the dead and fight like hell for the living.”

Professional Experience (6):
1857–1861 Worked as a schoolteacher in Michigan and Tennessee
1867–1871 Owner of a Chicago dressmaking shop
1878– present Active as a labor organizer, particularly with the Knights of Labor and the United Mine Workers

Major Accomplishments (7):
1902 Jailed in West Virginia for leading a miners’ strike in 1902. Called “the most dangerous woman in America” by West Virginia District Attorney Reese Blizzard. When I was arrested for ignoring an injunction banning meetings by striking miners, Blizzard said, “When she crooks her finger, twenty thousand contented men lay down.”
1903 Organized the “Children’s Crusade,” a march from Kensington, Pennsylvania, to Oyster Bay, New York, the home of Theodore Roosevelt, with banners demanding “We want time to play!” and “We want to go to school!” This march brought the issue of child labor to the attention of the public.
1905 Helped found the Industrial Workers of the World, a radical labor union.

References (8):
Eugene V. Debs Socialist and founder of the American Railway Union
Emma Goldman Socialist and anarchist who conspired to assassinate Henry Frick after the Homestead Steel Strike
John Spargo Progressive labor reformer and author of The Bitter Cry of the Children
Addendum (9):

The following excerpt, “The March of the Mill Children,” 1903, taken from material that I hope to include later in my autobiography, shows the sad plight of child labor:

In the spring of 1903 I went to Kensington, Pennsylvania, where seventy-five thousand textile workers were on strike. Of this number at least ten thousand were little children. The workers were striking for more pay and shorter hours. Every day little children came into Union Headquarters, some with their hands off, some with the thumb missing, some with their fingers off at the knuckle. They were stooped things, round-shouldered, and skinny. Many of them were not over ten years of age, the state law prohibited their working before they were twelve years of age.

The law was poorly enforced and the mothers of these children often swore falsely as to their children’s age. In a single block in Kensington, fourteen women, mothers of twenty-two children all under twelve, explained it was a question of starvation or perjury. That the fathers had been killed or maimed in the mines.

Bibliography (10):

### KEY TO COMPONENTS OF THE RÉSUMÉ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Points Total = 20 points</th>
<th>Information (The numbers listed next to each heading are to direct students to the key and should not be used when writing the résumé.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Include relevant professional experience prior to the date of the Congressional hearing, convocation, or debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Include relevant major accomplishments prior to the date of the Congressional hearing, convocation, or debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Include a minimum of three references, all of whom should be on the list of Congressional hearing, convocation, or debate characters. There should be a brief explanation of the qualifications of each person used as a reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Include an addendum if you wish. The addendum is not mandatory. It adds to the fullness of the résumé and certainly demonstrates the student’s use of primary sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Include a bibliography with a minimum of three sources, one of which must be a print source and one of which must contain a primary source. Bibliographic entries must be in correct MLA format, and the sources must be in alphabetical order according to the author’s last name, or, if there is no author, according to the first word in the title that is not “a/an” or “the.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Following the Congressional hearing, students should create a five-column chart that deals with the concerns of the Progressives and legislation that addressed those concerns. Working in groups, students should complete both the chart and the questions that follow the chart. This activity can serve as both a formative assessment and a student activity.

Chart columns should highlight the following:

1. Area of concern
2. Names of reformers interested in each area of concern
3. Federal legislation and amendments passed during each presidential administration that addressed Progressive concerns: briefly explain the purpose of the legislation and the amendments passed during the
   - Roosevelt administration;
   - Taft administration;
   - Wilson administration.

Follow the chart with these questions:

1. Which Progressive area(s) of concern appeared to have the greatest support at the national level? Explain why.
2. Which Progressive area(s) of concern appeared to have the least support at the national level? Explain why.
3. To what extent did the Progressive Movement attain success at the national level? Explain.

IV. As a summative assessment, direct students to complete the handout entitled “The Progressive Era: Conventional Wisdom.” This assessment can be assigned to students working individually or in groups and requires students to not only display factual knowledge (who/what is it) but also to think critically as to whether the person, movement, or idea was thriving or on its way out during the Progressive Movement. A lively discussion should accompany a review of student answers as not all students will reach the same conclusion for each item. For example, some students may say that labor unions were “in” during this time period, citing Theodore Roosevelt’s handling of the Anthracite Coal Strike of 1902 or the Clayton Antitrust Act that exempted labor unions from antitrust prosecution. However, other students might determine that labor unions were “out” or that attitudes toward labor remained “unchanged” during this time period, noting the *Lochner v. New York* case and the lack of union strike activity during the Progressive Movement.

If you read *Newsweek* magazine, you will probably be familiar with the “Conventional Wisdom” (referred to as “CW” below) section which highlights (with arrows) who or what “is in” and who or what “is out” during any given week. For example, the following selection might have been taken from the magazine during the week of January 28, 2008, in the midst of the presidential primaries:

*After months of considering how to fix the economic mess, Bush and Congress came up with... throw money to the American people. What’s next? Free flat-screen TVs for every family?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CW</th>
<th>CW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>He helped get us into this mess; he should be helping to get us out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelosi</td>
<td>Spirit of compromise and willingness to work with Bush helped save the day. Symbolic!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Californians</td>
<td>Rain, snow, mud slides, avalanches—what’s next for the “left” coast? Thought the downturn in the housing market was punishment enough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Directions:**

On the next two pages you will follow a similar procedure for evaluating people, ideas, and movements of the Progressive Era (1895–1920). It is your job to determine, according to the point of view of the Progressive reformers, what was “in ↑,” what was “out ↓,” and what stayed remarkably the same ↔. *However, if Progressive reformers would have deemed that something was “out,” you must explain why according to their point of view.* Some items may be open to interpretation, and discussion and may have more than one answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People, ideas, and movements</th>
<th>↑↓↔</th>
<th>Reasons for your decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Darwinism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gospel Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Uncle Joe” Cannon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Insurgents in Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Guard Republicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People, ideas, and movements</td>
<td>↑↓↔</td>
<td>Reasons for your decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert La Follette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muckrakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperance/Prohibition Movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuous Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Rockefeller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Call of the Wild</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horatio Alger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Holden v. Hardy</em> (1898)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lochner v. New York</em> (1905)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People, ideas, and movements</td>
<td>Reasons for your decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Thomas Fortune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. As a final essay, students can be assigned the following:

*The Progressive Movement has been described as both Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian in nature. To what extent is this characterization valid?*
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