

was a civil rights and labor activist), or how representative these life stories may be for the author's immigrant group or for immigrant children more broadly. The book's copyediting also could have been more thorough. For example, Klapper refers to Norwegians eating a porridge called *ømmegrot* when the correct word is *rømmegrot* (106), and I noted at least one date error in the note on sources, unfortunately a reference to the *Annals of Iowa* (209).

Because the book aimed to provide an overview of immigrant children in America, readers from Iowa or other states in the upper Midwest may be disappointed by how much attention is focused on the experiences of children in large urban areas or immigrant communities in other regions of the United States, with relatively few references to rural immigrant children. Nonetheless, for a general reader or undergraduate student interested in immigrant children, this book is an excellent introduction to the field. Both its broad scope and the helpful "note on sources" should encourage further reading and research on immigrant children in specific ethnic groups or particular regions of the nation.

*Hard Work and a Good Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps in Minnesota*, by Barbara W. Sommer. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2008. vii, 205 pp. Illustrations, maps, appendixes, notes, bibliography, index. \$27.95 cloth.

*Nature's New Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental Movement*, by Neil M. Maher. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 316 pp. Illustrations, maps, tables, notes, index. \$35.00 cloth.

Reviewer Gregg R. Narber is assistant professor of history at Luther College. His latest book, *The Impact of the New Deal on Iowa*, is scheduled for publication later this year.

At a time when the "greenness" of products is heavily promoted, and when tired and failing levees in Iowa unleash floodwaters, producing uncounted tons of lost topsoil, billions of dollars of crop and property loss, and grief to thousands of families, it seems appropriate to revisit a time when conservation's needs were addressed with action—even if not always perfect action—rather than carefully framed sales pitches, when trees were planted rather than scythed, and when a U.S. president's "Tree Army" sought to keep the nation's soil in place. Both reviewed works do so by examining the federal government's most suc-

cessful conservation effort ever and the New Deal's most popular program: the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC).

Looking back, the achievements of the CCC nearly defy belief. Nationally, from 1933 to 1942, 2.5 million CCC enrollees "planted 2.3 billion trees . . . on 2.5 million acres of previously barren, denuded, or unproductive land . . . half of the trees ever planted in U.S. history." The CCC developed 800 new state parks; constructed 10,000 small reservoirs, 46,000 bridges, and 13,000 miles of hiking trails; stocked rivers with 1 million fish; created 68,000 miles of fire breaks; and built 3,000 fire lookout towers, dozens of visitor centers, and more than 200 museums, interpretive sites, and park lodges (Maher, 43-76).

Barbara Sommer's *Hard Work and a Good Deal* adds a paean to Minnesota's CCC to a bookshelf of histories of the CCC in the several states and particular parks, company in which it stands out for its organization, well-chosen photos, and readability. The data Sommer arrays for the accomplishments of the Minnesota CCC are as impressive as the national data. Neil Maher's *Nature's New Deal* invites us to accord the CCC a centrality in the history of environmentalism.

In terms of interest to Iowans, the projects undertaken by the Minnesota CCC were similar to projects undertaken in Iowa. While Iowa had a single CCC program for American Indians (at Tama), though, Minnesota had several such programs on its reservations. (Minnesota also had a CCC company of veterans, which Iowa lacked.) Work in Minnesota state parks and on erosion control projects was much like that done in Iowa; and in contemporary interviews Minnesota enrollees, like their Iowa counterparts—hard up, single males, aged 18-25, who were paid \$30 per month, of which \$22 to \$25 went home to support their families—take continuing pride in what the CCC accomplished, and articulate high regard for what CCC work did for them and their families. In light of these similarities, Sommer's descriptions of life and work in the Minnesota CCC give a reasonable sense of how Iowa's CCC workers lived and worked, although Iowa companies stood less risk of frostbite. (Minnesota camps worked their enrollees outdoors every day unless it got "too cold," and "too cold" meant minus 30° Fahrenheit!) Unlike Iowa, Minnesota had a significant African American population and consequently a large number of black CCC enrollees. They were rigidly segregated in Minnesota CCC camps—in accord with army policies of the time—and most were sent to work in all-black camps in southern states. Sommer's particular contribution is the documentation of the insult, frustration, and mostly unavailing protest of Minnesota's African American community when confronted with Jim Crow racial order in the CCC. African Americans

wanted their sons to work in Minnesota, rarely got what they wanted, and, when they did, got it only in segregated form.

In terms of more general interest, Sommer's narrative clearly contextualizes the CCC for those unfamiliar with it and skillfully interweaves excerpts from interviews with former CCC enrollees. These voices keep *Hard Work* lively and add a human dimension to her story. (The Iowa Department of Natural Resources conducted similar interviews with former Iowa CCC enrollees and has posted them on the department's Web site.) Oral histories, particularly ones compiled at a 50- to 60-year remove from the event, are obviously problematic, but the way Sommer uses them—to provide color, emotional content, and a sense of the lasting pride of CCC veterans—seems appropriate.

In *Nature's New Deal* Neil Maher considers the CCC from a national perspective. He emphasizes, first, the political uses Franklin Roosevelt made of the CCC, particularly to cement New Deal allegiance among rural Americans and in the western states. FDR had learned as governor of New York that conservation provided political benefits at scant cost in political capital. When dust storms began to blow, the CCC added erosion control projects to its work in Minnesota and nationally. The value of soil conservation was by then, thanks to the dust, evident to most Americans. Consequently, there was as much to be gained politically and as little to be lost from soil conservation and erosion control as had proved true with reforestation. Such activities had been an early focus in Iowa with its considerable complement of unemployed youth and fewer forests.

Work on state parks likewise began earlier in Iowa than in Minnesota and many other states. Key to this was that Iowa had in place a comprehensive 25-year plan for the development of state parks, preservation of areas of geological significance, protection of habitat, and the like. States such as Minnesota had to develop such plans quickly, usually from scratch, as a precondition for using CCC labor. Although Iowa had a model plan, the state lacked the means to implement it until the CCC provided the missing means. Iowa's plan was advanced by more than a decade through federal and CCC efforts. Iowa state parks nearly doubled in number, and both new and existing parks were transformed by the CCC with lodges and interpretive centers, picnic shelters, cabins, latrines and septic systems, miles of hiking trails, artificial beaches, and more. (See Rebecca Conard, *Places of Quiet Beauty: Parks, Preserves, and Environmentalism* [1997], chap. 4.)

Some pristine nature was either destroyed or much altered to create such park amenities, a source of growing controversy. Maher's discussion of the conflict between "conservation" and what we might

now call “environmentalism” calls attention to a conflict that is still very much with us and is the second primary emphasis of *Nature’s New Deal*. As early as the Progressive Era, the conflict Maher describes was framed in terms we would find familiar: *conservation*, identified with Gifford Pinchot, first chief of the Forest Service under Theodore Roosevelt, meant prudent management of natural resources so they might be exploited but not depleted; *wilderness preservation*, identified with John Muir, signified protecting pristine nature. The Progressives, Theodore Roosevelt included, emphasized conservation as so defined, and FDR’s bent was similar, although the preservationist current had some pull on FDR as well.

Because FDR thought experiences in nature were antidotes to urban ills, he introduced yet a third strain of “conservation” to compete with the other two: “conservation of human resources.” New Deal officials proudly recounted statistics showing the weight and height gains of CCC enrollees and the muscle they added, one facet of the “human conservation” Roosevelt advocated. The enrollees were “restored” by their work in natural settings. Increased leisure—forced leisure, in the case of Depression-idled workers, and leisure for the masses, aspired to in the context of economic security and a 40-hour work week pursued by the New Deal—implied more opportunities for more people for comparably restorative experiences in nature. The drive to create recreational infrastructure in parks proved prescient, although it left preservationists aghast: millions of new visitors recreated in increasingly accessible national, state, and local parks. Reported increases in usage of 600 percent were common.

As Maher documents, CCC activities evolved in response to this increasingly three-sided debate, seeking to accommodate all three visions to some degree. These three demands still shape debates about parks, wilderness, and the fate of natural resources and landscapes. In the New Deal’s final years, Roosevelt sought to institutionalize the juggling and balancing function among these competing interests—preserving pristine nature, managing resources, and increasing recreational access to experiences in nature—in a single Department of Conservation. The centralizing tendencies of this proposal and others, however, ran into the political realities of conservative backlash in the late 1930s, so there is, of course, no such cabinet-level department. Such discussions of how New Deal political debates about the role of the CCC brought us to the environmental politics of today is the third emphasis of *Nature’s New Deal*.

There are many claimants to primacy as the source for green thinking, ecological consciousness, and wilderness preservation. Maher per-

suades that the New Deal and the CCC deserve a central place in that history. Besides enlarging the debate to include human conservation, the ranks of the interested were swelled by what the CCC accomplished, not least by former enrollees who flocked to forestry jobs and the forestry departments of state universities, but also by the legion of citizens who had come to value recreating in altered landscapes, and even by the opponents of CCC "violations" of pristine nature. All became and their successors remain advocates for conservation, however defined.

*Labor's Cold War: Local Politics in a Global Context*, edited by Shelton Stromquist. The Working Class in American History Series. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008. ix, 304 pp. Illustration, bibliographic references, index. \$70.00 cloth, \$25.00 paper.

Reviewer Martin Halpern is professor of history at Henderson State University. He is the author of *Unions, Radicals, and Democratic Presidents: Seeking Social Change in the Twentieth Century* (2003); and *UAW Politics in the Cold War Era* (1988).

*Labor's Cold War* stems from a 2000 conference organized by the Center for Recent United States History. Several essays illuminate important developments in the history of labor in the Midwest; all are well researched and address questions animating current scholarly debates.

To what degree did the cold war narrow visionary impulses in the labor movement? Rosemary Feurer chronicles the "community-based grass roots" (60) campaign of District 8 of the left-wing United Electrical Workers (UE) to democratically plan economic development, protect the environment, and create interesting jobs through a Missouri Valley Authority (MVA). The UE at first gained diverse allies, but as the cold war intensified, it became preoccupied with defending itself. Moderate CIO leaders sidelined left-wing activists, and MVA opponents used antisocialist rhetoric to defeat the project. In Milwaukee, Eric Fure-Slocum notes, AFL, CIO, and community activists sought non-market approaches to expanding housing but began to divide because of anticommunism in 1946. Although cold war liberals succeeded in promoting racial tolerance, the vision of a large-scale interracial public housing program was replaced by a limited segregated program tied to business-oriented economic development. In Japan, Christopher Gerteis argues, encouragement of unionization by New Dealers in the U.S. occupation led to vibrant movements among Japanese working women, many of whom put achieving gender equality on their list of goals. The cold war hurt all union militants but was