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a concise interpretation of the Progressive Era along the lines of Robert Wiebe’s “search for order” and concludes with a cogent analysis of “Riis’s View of Poverty.” Leviatin is especially effective in his positioning of Riis. While not dismissing Riis’s racial and class biases, he places him clearly among those social reformers who blamed environmental conditions rather than genetics for urban property. Within these sections, Leviatin also examines issues of class, consumerism, sensationalism, and Riis’s legacy. Leviatin never loses the reader to abstract theory, yet thoroughly equips students to undertake their own critical analysis of the document.

This text does pose at least two challenges for classroom use. First, the “breadth versus depth” dilemma is ever-present. While it might fit within the parameters of topics courses, teachers will find it more difficult to give it its due in a typical survey course. The other obstacle, I expect, will be more problematic. Due to the production style, Riis’s photographs lose some of their visual power. Though the new reprints make a wonderful addition, the largest photographs measure only a few inches (4x5). Students might wonder what all the fuss is about. Facial expressions, dark corners, and tattered clothes fade into the distance. Instructors might solve this in part by foregrounding Leviatin’s incisive comparison of Riis’s “illustrated lectures” with his book. Or they might augment the text with slides and the 1971 oversized publication. But since Riis’s most powerful contribution was his use of the “well-orchestrated visual,” this remains a serious shortcoming. Nevertheless, How the Other Half Lives offers a lively, rigorous introduction to both the content and methods of “doing” progressive era history.
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Nancy Woloch’s Muller v. Oregon is another gem in the Bedford Series in History and Culture. Like its sister volumes, Woloch’s work is well crafted for effective classroom use. Her focus is the important 1908 Supreme Court case involving protective labor laws brought by the owner of an Oregon laundry. He held that the 1903 law limiting women employed in factories or laundries to ten hours a day “violated his right to freedom of contract under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.”

At the outset the author raises a number of interesting questions for instructors and students to consider as they embark on an investigation of this important case. (As one who employs the Bedford Series often, I wish more of the volumes included such an extensive supply of thoughtful questions.) Woloch’s queries stimulate analytical
thinking and provide an adequate preview for class discussion. For example, she challenges readers to consider whether the Supreme Court’s decision in *Muller* reflects “human considerations or sexist assumptions” and also asks students to ponder whether the “reformers who prepared Oregon’s defense have been betrayed over time by developments they could not anticipate and shifts in attitudes they could not foresee.”

*Muller v. Oregon* provides interesting fodder for classroom discussion because, as Woloch asserts, the case “leads a double life in constitutional history—as both a step forward on the road to modern labor standards and a step backward away from sexual equality.” A particularly valuable aspect of the volume is the author’s success at bringing the issues surrounding the case up to date and making it meaningful for today’s students. An example of this is Woloch’s discussion of contemporary critics’ views of the Brandeis Brief (one of the documents that outlined Oregon’s case). In addition, she chronicles subsequent legislation regarding wages, hours, and discrimination through the early 1990s, specifically the push for minimum wage laws, the New Deal’s labor legislation, and the Equal Pay Act of 1963. Through the preliminary discussion that contextualizes the documents comprising the heart of the study, Woloch helps the reader understand that “public policies have tangled origins, complex histories, and unforeseen consequences”—one might add long term consequences to her list.

The book’s second section contains the documents collection. Its breadth provides a fine accompaniment to Woloch’s preliminary discussion. Each source is preceded by brief but informative remarks that place it in context. In addition to the excerpted documents directly related to *Muller v. Oregon*, Woloch provides such interesting and useful pieces as *Ritchie v. People* (1895), Florence Kelley’s “The Right to Leisure” (1905), Caroline J. Gleason’s “A Living Wage in Oregon” (1913), as well as Kelley’s “Twenty Questions About the ERA” (1922). The book’s final section consists of a helpful appendix containing a chronology of important wages and hours cases between 1895 and 1941 as well as an annotated “Suggested Reading” chapter.

Undergraduates enrolled in lower-level survey courses will find *Muller v. Oregon* challenging to read because, even though Woloch provides a thorough introduction to the case and each ancillary document, the work assumes a solid working knowledge of progressivism and its legacies. Thus, most instructors might deem the book appropriate for junior and senior-level courses that focus on constitutional law, labor, or progressivism. *Muller v. Oregon: A Brief History with Documents* is a solid, engaging, and useful volume that will challenge students to think analytically about labor, wages, and progressivism.