tools, tried and true, to critique our own consumer society. I strongly encourage you to read this book and to carry on in the tradition of trade unionist Robert Hunter, who in 1916 wrote, "Workers must stand by each other, believe in each other and love each other in the shop. But there must also be unity where they go to the grocer and clothier" (113). This is an enduring lesson in an age of global markets.

Labor Market Politics and the Great War: The Department of Labor, the States, and the First U.S. Employment Service, 1907–1933, by William J. Breen. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1997. xix, 233 pp. Illustrations, graphs, tables, notes, bibliographical essay, index. \$35.00 cloth.

REVIEWED BY ELLIS W. HAWLEY, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

The importance of the U.S. Employment Service (USES) in the wartime government of 1917-1918 and in the larger processes of American state-building has long been ignored or understated, largely, it seems, because the agency's central records were destroyed. Prior to this effort by William Breen, no historian had undertaken to reconstruct the agency's story from surviving records in other collections, especially those held by state archives, where Breen has found and used surprisingly rich resources. The result is a solidly documented, carefully crafted, theoretically sophisticated, and lucidly written study showing that the wartime USES became a major agency with far-reaching powers and that conflicts over its administrative form reflected larger battles over America's acquisition of a modern administrative state. The study should be of particular interest both to historians of the war's home front and to scholars of how federalism, mobilization initiatives, and private-sector organizational developments affected public administrative formation.

Three major themes stand out: the expansion and growing regulatory power of the wartime USES, the conflict within it between national centralizers and state-based advocates of a federal system, and the political misjudgments that delayed its establishment as a major peacetime service until 1933. Beginning with a chapter on prewar labor markets and employment services, Breen then devotes three chapters to the initiatives, debates, and failures of 1917, two to developments leading to the federalist triumph of 1918, two to regional variations and operations in selected states (especially Connecticut and Ohio), and two plus an epilogue to postwar developments. A central problem, he argues, was the inability of centralizing bureaucrats in the Labor Department to secure and convince others that it had the neces-

sary administrative capacities. Professional expertise was concentrated in state agencies with prewar roots, and eventually their vision of state offices operating as parts of a federal system was the one adopted, both in 1918 and in 1933. In 1919, however, a resurgence of the wartime quarrel over administrative form became a major factor in the failure to secure the congressional, business, labor, and community support needed for more than marginal peacetime operation.

In places Breen also notes that the USES administrative structure was part of a war corporatism as well as a war federalism. This was true of the advisory board system eventually adopted and of the tripartite (labor, business, USES) community labor boards that shared some administrative tasks. His evidence, however, indicates that the initiatives for such arrangements came from government officials rather than private power wielders and that USES corporatism never involved the delegation of administrative duties to an organized industry, as was being done by agencies such as the War Industries Board and the Food Administration. The reason Breen gives is that the private employment service industry was chaotic, highly fragmented, somewhat disreputable, and possessed little of the expertise and administrative capacity that labor market managers needed. USES managers thus saw the private employment service industry as something to be regulated or eliminated rather than as a potential administrative partner. This explanation would be more convincing if the book provided greater detail about the industry and its service providers. More would be welcome, both in the initial chapter and at points in the debate when the industry opposes USES expansion and resists licensing and regulatory legislation.

Unfortunately for students of the Iowa experience, Iowa is not one of the states upon which Breen focuses in detail. Indeed, there is no entry for Iowa in the index, and he has nothing at all to say about its USES office or the employment work done by its defense councils and farm bureaus. His research strategy was to visit the nine states that seemed to have the most promising archival collections. For the Midwest those included Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Ohio, but not Iowa. He does, however, discern a midwestern pattern marked by relatively strong prewar state systems that had to be negotiated with, special concerns about agricultural labor, and fearful efforts to keep the USES from stripping the region of its industrial work force. Presumably, Iowa shared in some of this pattern. But the extent to which it did is an interesting question that awaits further research by Iowa historians.

Still, even if Iowa is ignored and too little is said about the factors ruling out a government-supported industry organization, Breen is to be commended for rescuing the pre-1933 USES from obscurity and making its history a case study of one contested path taken to forge an American substitute for the European administrative state. These are no small accomplishments.

A Cautious Patriotism: The American Churches and the Second World War, by Gerald L. Sittser. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997. x, 317 pp. Notes, bibliography, index. \$39.95 cloth.

Women against the Good War: Conscientious Objection and Gender on the American Home Front, 1941–1947, by Rachel Waltner Goossen. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997. xiii, 180 pp. Illustrations, tables, notes, bibliography, index. \$39.95 cloth, \$15.95 paper.

REVIEWED BY BILL DOUGLAS, DES MOINES

With very different lenses and filters, Gerald Sittser and Rachel Waltner Goossen have both contributed to our understanding of the warladen culture of the United States during World War II.

In 1948, Ray Abrams—known for writing *Preachers Present Arms* during the 1930s, a blistering attack on U.S. churches for their unquestioning support for World War I—assessed the position of American churches regarding World War II. His article noted a new degree of caution during the later war. With much more attention to the details and nuances of the religious situations in the United States during the 1940s, Sittser reaches the same conclusion.

Sittser's intellectual—specifically theological—history of institutions focuses on churches' attitudes toward impending conflict and then the fact of war. Carefully sifting through denominational journals and resolutions, he sought and usually found the premises and assumptions that underlay any disagreement. Sittser is at his best when describing, summarizing, and assessing diverse theological positions, giving judicious treatment to Niebuhrain realism and pacifism, to modernism and fundamentalism alike.

Sittser is persuasive in marshaling the evidence to show that patriotism in American churches was cautious, in contrast to World War I; and listing the legacy of World War I and the influence of Reinhold Niebuhr as causes also seems right. But his own work seems overly cautious in drawing conclusions. Several questions remain unanswered. How much influence did this caution exert on the government and on the larger society? How much erosion of religious authority occurred

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.