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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.
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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
particularly costly for women as even left-wing leaders seeking to resist the occupation’s shift to suppression of union rights confined women to subordinate roles.

How strong and long-lasting was the Communist-led trend within the labor movement? Robert Cherney provides a helpful review of diverse networks of organizations and government agencies on the Pacific Coast active in opposing communism long before the purges of the late 1940s. He highlights the mini-purge undertaken by anti-Communists during the period of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, notes that “not even Harry Bridges could persuade rank-and-file longshoremen to oppose Roosevelt” in 1940, and concludes that “the acceptance of the CP within the CIO was always tenuous at best” (37). The fact that Bridges’ San Francisco local voted to endorse Roosevelt despite his position might better be used as evidence of the existence of democracy within the International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union, which Bridges headed for another 37 years.

Two essays provide evidence that unionists labeled Communist were well accepted within the CIO and continued to have strong followings during the cold war years. James Lorence argues that the abiding strength of the left-wing Mine Mill and Smelter Workers union in the Southwest stemmed in significant part from its close connection with Mexican American workers’ struggles for equality. Lorence also emphasizes Mine Mill’s democratic unionism and its support for feminist activism, recounted in the film Salt of the Earth. Local 890, highlighted in the film, “retained its independent identity” and “found it possible to maintain democratic local control” (219) even after Mine Mill merged with the Steelworkers union in 1967. Lisa Kannenberg notes rank-and-file and community support for Schenectady UE Local 301 and its ability to resist raids. Even after its popular president decided to lead the local into the UE’s anti-Communist rival on pragmatic grounds in 1954, the UE received over 35 percent of the vote in the ensuing election contest, “a tribute to that union’s remarkable resilience and the loyalty it inspired” (157).

To what degree did a significant progressive trend survive cold war repression of labor radicalism? In an essay on the United Auto Workers’ experience during the Korean War, Seth Widgerson argues that anti-Communist president Walter Reuther used “controlled worker militancy” (246) to settle grievances and gain improved contracts but politically failed to receive the help he expected from the Truman Administration on wages, prices, civil rights, and meaningful participation in economic mobilization agencies. David Lewis-Colman notes, moreover, that Reuther’s moderate approach to civil rights pro-
duced some results, but he marginalized the radical black caucuses that were “best situated to generate the bottom-up pressure” and achieve “real gains” for Detroit’s black workers (131). In an essay on Mexican Americans’ struggle for fair employment in Los Angeles, however, Kenneth Burt argues that there was activism by overlapping alliances that included anti-Communists as well as Communists. The alliances achieved the election of Edmund Roybal to the Los Angeles City Council in 1949. Although they failed to secure a fair employment ordinance, Roybal, the Community Services Organization, and a liberal anti-Communist network led principally by Socialists and Social Democrats helped secure the passage of state legislation in 1959.
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One of the many useful features on Google Book Search is its “Places Mentioned in this Book,” an on-screen map that locates every place mentioned in a book. On the map for James H. Omvig’s *The Blindness Revolution: Jernigan in His Own Words*, a dense mass of red arrows obscures the state of Iowa, gradually thinning as you reach its borders, with a smattering of arrows beyond. This is an Iowa story.

Kenneth Jernigan arrived in Iowa in 1958 with a master’s degree in English, four years of teaching experience at the Tennessee School for the Blind, and five years with the California Training Center for the Blind, to become director of Iowa’s Commission for the Blind. The Commission was in a sorry state. The year before, a federal study had found it to be the least effective state agency for the blind in the country. By the time Jernigan left in 1978, however, it was considered a model for the nation. How he accomplished that is the tale Omvig sets out to tell.

Jernigan’s professed aim was to demonstrate that blindness was the least of the problems that he and other blind people faced, that their generally low educational achievement and underemployment were the result of societal prejudice. The “blindness revolution” of the title was the product of Jernigan’s long struggle against two entrenched adversaries: blindness professionals whose paternalism and low expectations fostered habits of dependency and self-doubt among blind people, and certain Iowa politicians who fought with Jernigan over re-