

vant scholarship on Populism, Congress, and Iowa and national politics, some of which would compel him to revise arguments or address additional issues. Worse, his primary research was too limited to permit a comprehensive or fully persuasive biography. While making good use of the limited papers of Weaver and Bryan, the author otherwise ignored important manuscript collections of Greenbackers such as "Calamity" Weller, Populists such as Ignatius Donnelly and Marion Butler, and other reformers such as Henry Demarest Lloyd, all of which contain valuable material on Weaver, some of it casting him in a less attractive light than does this biography. The limited research base also leads to an often unbalanced book, with events or issues seemingly discussed not because of their importance but because of the easy accessibility of sources. Thus an inconsequential cattle drive to California in 1853, for instance, receives seven pages of coverage because Weaver wrote about it, but Weaver's extensive, controversial, and significant activities in 1895 to control the Populist Party and promote fusion, widely discussed in manuscript collections and newspapers not examined, earn only a few sketchy sentences.

In some respects, then, this book only supplements rather than supplants Haynes's old biography. But it does succeed in calling deserved attention to an important political figure; perhaps it will also succeed in encouraging further research and a fuller understanding of Weaver and the agrarian political movements he sometimes dominated.

Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen, by Christopher Capozzola. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. xi, 334 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$34.95 cloth.

Democracy's Prisoner: Eugene V. Debs, the Great War, and the Right to Dissent, by Ernest Freeberg. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008. ix, 380 pp. Illustrations, notes, index. \$29.95 cloth.

Reviewer Bill R. Douglas lives and works in Des Moines. He has written about World War I dissent in articles for *Minnesota History*, *Annals of Iowa*, *Wapsipicon Almanac*, and *Free Flowing*.

In her novel *The Bonney Family*, Iowan Ruth Suckow portrays her protagonist Sarah Bonney volunteering to quilt with other women during World War I, while silently denying the spoken consensus that knitting would win the war or that she would want that. While he does not cite Suckow, Christopher Capozzola would say that Sarah Bonney experienced "coercive voluntarism." In an ambitious, imaginative, and admirable synthesis, he seeks to explain the dissonance. He has assembled

a mountain of evidence, reminiscent of H. C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite's *Opponents of War, 1917–1918* (1957) but with a more ambitious aim. Like Peterson and Fite's — judging only from internal evidence, I think Peterson's radical conclusions were watered down by his surviving colleague — Capozzola's conclusions seem bifurcated: “coercive voluntarism,” after all, is more a contradiction than a paradox.

Six chapters examine aspects of coercive voluntarism: the draft, conscientious objection, women, vigilantism, free speech, and enemy aliens. The concept of coercive voluntarism was perhaps best summed up by Woodrow Wilson himself, in claiming that the draft registration of men between age 21 and 30 represented “a nation that has volunteered in mass.” Wilson neglected to mention the criminal penalty for not registering.

World War I selective service law is particularly slippery in at least four ways: it kept changing; conscientious objection was nominally recognized at the June 5, 1917, draft registration, but the War Department did not clearly define alternatives for draftees until May 1918; registration was required of aliens, but the draft was not supposed to apply to many of them; practice did not always correspond with law. Capozzola's chapter on the draft had me raising one or more of these points as I read, but since one cannot write everything at once, I was generally answered several pages on. In his chapter on conscientious objection, he emphasizes its rarity, but he follows the War Department practice of not counting objectors willing to accept noncombatant status within the military, who almost certainly outnumbered absolutists.

Capozzola manages to find fresh evidence for the well-mined topics of vigilantism and free speech. But if citizen action often exceeded what the Wilson administration thought prudent, I am less inclined than Capozzola to see that as exculpatory, given the government's initiation of repression. His synthesis suffers, too, from leaving out many of the main players in the antiwar movement, such as Robert La Follette, Scott Nearing, Victor Berger, Meyer London, and Charles Lindbergh Sr.

In the chapter on enemy aliens, Capozzola's math is confusing. On page 204, he states that only 482,000 German aliens had registered as such, “far below the 2.5 million German-born persons counted in the 1910 census.” But five pages earlier, he states that 74 percent of German-born residents in the 1920 census had been naturalized — and hence would not be “enemy aliens.” That goes a long way toward explaining the non-registration rate.

Capozzola discovered a new resource for Iowa historians in the National Archives: the Buchanan County draft board report. Not surprisingly, he also mentions Iowa as a place of dissent and uniformity

(11, 72, 98, 156, 198). Oxford University Press has, unlike most history publishers these days, admirably included a bibliography, one that will be a boon to future research. Let me suggest three omissions, which may reflect weaknesses in the argument: Gerlof Homan's *Mennonites in the Great War* (1994); Frank Grubbs's study of the People's Council on Peace and Democracy (1968); and, representative of a vast swath of local research, Nancy Derr's article in this journal (1989) on how power in Lowden, Iowa, shifted from German-Americans to non-hyphenated Americans.

Given Capozzola's prodigious analytical skills, I wish he would have carried them a step further and asked, as Eugene Debs did: Who benefits? Of course, that question got Debs into trouble in Canton, Ohio.

A reviewer of Ellis Parker Butler's Muscatine-based novel *Dominie Dean* remarked on the difficulty of portraying a genuinely good person (coincidentally, sales of Butler's 1917 book were a casualty of the war — perhaps because its antiwar take on the Civil War became suddenly unfashionable). Historians are taught to eschew hagiography, which is usually easy to do but becomes a problem when writing about a saint. To his credit, Ernest Freeberg does not shrink from the evidence: Eugene Victor Debs, entering prison for his vocal opposition to the war, had a remarkably positive effect on his wardens and his fellow prisoners (on his guards, not so much; if they had been unionized as they are today, they might have found more common ground). Woodrow Wilson disdained Debs's secular saintliness almost as much as Debs disliked Wilson's Presbyterian rectitude. That was not a good chemistry for postwar reconciliation. Debs's probity would be proven when he entrained secretly and alone from prison in Atlanta in March 1921 for an audience with President Warren G. Harding's attorney general in Washington, D.C., and returned to prison on the honor system. Harding would eventually pardon Debs on Christmas.

Freeberg's real hero, though, is Lucy Robbins. Starting as an anarchist who somehow fell into the job of running Debs's amnesty campaign, she realized instinctively that the campaign would need labor support to succeed. To her amazement, American Federation of Labor president Samuel Gompers agreed; unlike Wilson, the prowar Gompers was a pragmatist who realized that labor needed its socialist wing (although the center-left would not hold after 1924). Freeberg's argument that this campaign was a new phenomenon folds into Capozzola's argument that World War I created a new relationship between citizens and the state; Freeberg might also have nodded to earlier campaigns, such as that documented in Adam Hochschild's *King Leopold's Ghost* (1998) — and, for that matter, abolitionism.

The *manufacture of consent* is a term associated with Noam Chomsky, but was originated by Walter Lippmann to describe World War I, as Capozzola points out. The “industrialization” of citizenship (my phrase) was a mixed blessing, but one of its unintended consequences was a more institutionalized recognition of the right to dissent.

The Grace Abbott Reader, edited by John Sorensen with Judith Sealander. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008. xxxv, 132 pp. Biographical timeline, notes, bibliography, index. \$21.95 paper.

Reviewer Suzanne O’Dea is an independent scholar. She is the author of *From Suffrage to the Senate: America’s Political Women, An Encyclopedia of Leaders, Causes and Issues* (2006); *Iowa Women of Achievement* (1996); *Legislators and Politicians: Iowa’s Women Lawmakers* (1995); and “The Immigrants’ Advocate: Mary Treglia and the Sioux City Community House, 1921–1959” (*Annals of Iowa*, 1990).

Grace Abbott (1878–1939) and her sister Edith Abbott (1876–1957), both natives of Grand Island, Nebraska, became two of the nation’s leading social reformers in the early twentieth century. Both women gained experience at Chicago’s Hull House, and then each pursued her own path, although neither strayed from working to improve the lives of the marginalized. Grace began her professional work in Chicago as an advocate for immigrants, later as an advocate for children, serving as chief of the U.S. Children’s Bureau from 1921 to 1934. The 18 writings in *The Grace Abbott Reader*, dating from 1909 to 1941, sample Abbott’s thoughts on immigrants, children, and women. Many of the pieces have been previously published; others are from the Grace Abbott Papers housed at the Nebraska State Historical Society. In these speeches, articles, and notes, Abbott’s passion, frustration, and commitment to the various causes shout from the page — as does her occasional sizzling sarcasm. Introductory sections written by Edith and others provide context.

Abbott’s essays and other writings emerge from her experiences as a native midwesterner who also became a professional in that region. In several of the essays, she draws on her observations and research at the local level, generally Chicago, to suggest national policy, especially in the areas of protections for immigrants and regarding restrictions on child labor. At the same time, the brevity of most of the articles makes them a series of snapshots, suggesting the range of her work but not allowing the reader to examine it in depth.