

allowing them to use emmenagogues or abortifacients before that point without legal repercussions, from the 1790s on states eliminated the distinction between abortion before and after quickening while outlawing abortifacient drugs. In this climate, there was little interest in exotic abortifacients. The second cause, though, involves the colonial enterprise itself. Administrators and bioprospectors, almost all men, were pronatalist. They had no interest in drugs that might reduce fertility; on the contrary, they were deeply concerned about the failure of colonial populations, especially slave populations, to reproduce themselves. They had little incentive to study abortifacients or to transmit knowledge of them to a European medical community that, in any case, had little interest in such knowledge.

I find this account convincing, if necessarily drawn with a broad brush. Schiebinger notes one instance in which knowledge of an exotic abortifacient was deliberately suppressed; in most cases it did not need to be. No grand conspiracy was needed to keep such knowledge away from European women. Social structures that embodied masculine, pronatalist interests generated the indifference that produced ignorance. But not complete ignorance. In the pages of Sloane and Merian—and today, in indigenous communities throughout the Caribbean—knowledge of herbal abortifacients has been preserved. Schiebinger ends with a lament for knowledge that might have been lost forever due to “state politics that enmesh innocent plants in their web” (241). But her tale admits a more optimistic reading. In the case of the pride-of-Barbados, that knowledge was not lost, merely neglected by European medicine. Today, ethnobotanists and bioprospectors are eagerly seeking out new drugs in indigenous communities and in the pages of old herbals. In the twenty-first century, whether such knowledge will be preserved or lost—and if preserved, whether its indigenous possessors will be compensated—seems less a question of state politics than of global capital: that is, whether pharmaceutical companies can find or create a market. Then and now, bioprospectors follow the money.

Brian W. Ogilvie  
University of Massachusetts Amherst

**Lawrence M. Lipin, *Workers and the Wild: Conservation, Consumerism, and Labor in Oregon, 1910-1930* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007).**

To some extent, while environmental historians struggle to connect the history of human relations with non-human nature to the history of social conflict, labour historians tend to overlook the role of non-human nature in reshaping social conflict. Two years ago, Liza Piper's short essay in *Left History* outlined some of the intersections and obstacles between left history and environmental history, seeking to highlight the possibilities for considerable overlap (11.1 2006: 41-46). Lawrence M. Lipin's study of the relationship between organized labour and early

conservation policies in Oregon neatly situates itself in the middle of that intellectual overlap to provide an important contribution to the subfields of both labour and environmental history.

*Workers and the Wild*, which appears in the extensive *The Working Class in American History* series, attempts to answer a puzzling historical problem regarding Oregon in the early decades of the twentieth century. Why did organized labour in Oregon, initially opposed to early conservation measures, begin to endorse nature tourism and conservation by the 1930s? Lipin roots his original and insightful argument in a broader ideological shift in Oregon labour from producerism to consumerism.

This concise and pithy monograph charts this shift through four chapters that take the reader from the early efforts of the Oregon State Federation of Labor (OSFL) to construct a producers' republic to the rise of what Lizabeth Cohen has called a consumers' republic. Lipin focuses his argument in the first chapter on the single-tax movement, inspired by Henry George's *Poverty and Progress* (1879). The single-tax, he argues, emphasized organized labour's desire to see all of the state's natural resources put to full use. Specifically, the tax was aimed at land speculators (or wealth exploiters) who held vast 'unimproved' properties. Furthermore, the single-tax linked the interests of urban workers with rural farmers by stressing the importance of producers in Oregon society. If more land could be put to productive use in the rural hinterland, fewer people would flock to cities like Portland seeking work and driving down wages. Because of this producerist ethos, labour opposed efforts to conserve rural nature for the leisure and recreation of middle-class tourists and sportsmen. The OSFL vigorously protested what it considered to be wasteful construction of scenic roads into Oregon's rural areas in order to promote class privilege.

Taking his cue from Karl Jacoby and others who have examined urban/rural conflicts associated with the American conservation movement, Lipin examines how both rural producers and urban workers were aligned in their opposition to middle-class sportsmen, game wardens, and conservation measures that restricted access to fish and wildlife. This is an important contribution to the literature on conservation history because it demonstrates that the class conflicts in the early conservation movement were not simply divided along an urban/rural axis, but were instead a conflict between producers and consumers.

This alliance between urban workers and rural producers was, however, only temporary. The third chapter examines the impact of the mass production of cheap automobiles on working-class culture in Oregon. Affordable automobility brought urban workers into regular contact with the non-human natural world outside of the city limits. Weekend trips and vacations became popular during the 1920s, allowing workers to visit some of the scenic sites that middle-class sportsmen and tourists had promoted a decade earlier. Lipin contends that this engagement with nature transformed labour's ideological commitment to a producerist

outlook. This transformation would eventually sever the alignment of interests between urban workers and rural producers.

Finally, Lipin concludes his narrative by examining some additional cultural cleavages that emerged in the Oregon labour movement during the 1920s and led to the end of the struggle for a producers' republic. In particular, he highlights the role of the Ku Klux Klan and religious sectarianism. These cultural divisions, along with more regular engagement with Oregon's nature retreats, made workers ambivalent about past opposition to conservation policies as they embraced the pleasures of the consumers' republic. The abandonment of producerism is symbolized by the OSFL's endorsement of a state income tax initiative in 1923.

Lipin's carefully constructed argument offers environmental and labour historians some compelling new ways to look at the relationship between labour and non-human nature. He connects class perceptions of nature to changing ideas of production and consumption. This, I believe, is one of the best ways that environmental history can speak to matters of social conflict. Differing levels of access to the productive or consumptive use of finite resources sits at the heart of social inequity. In a world with limited food and other energy resources, class can be defined by one's ability to control those resources. The debates over conservation policies in Oregon pivoted on different class perceptions of the legitimate use of the natural resources of the state. Lipin's book also demonstrates the utility of considering the role of non-human nature in labour history. His contention that workers' engagement with the natural world, facilitated by mass automobility, changed labour's ideological commitment to a producerist outlook illustrates the significance of human-nature relations in Oregon's labour history.

For environmental historians looking for a discussion of the role of non-human nature as an agent of historical change, this book falls short (although this can be found in other work on Oregon environmental history). For instance, there is little discussion of the role of salmon migration behaviour, fire ecology, rural wildlife population patterns, and weather. Did any of these non-human natural forces alter the shape of conservation policy in Oregon? Perhaps, but these details are not explored in any depth in this book. Mention of these shortcomings should not detract from what is a very fine study of conservation and labour history that provides a unique and innovative argument. Lipin's accessible writing style will appeal to both researchers and students interested in environmental and labour history.

Sean Kheraj  
University of British Columbia