Disquiet in the Land: Cultural Conflict in American Mennonite Communities
their narrative and the stories of many other university-based nursing schools already available, if mainly in dissertation form. Still, by virtue of their will and wit in wading through extant primary documents, Anderson and Penningroth have produced perhaps the best published volume on university nursing education since Ethel Johns and Blanche Pfefferkorn's *Johns Hopkins Hospital School of Nursing, 1889–1949* (1954).


**REVIEWED BY STEVEN D. RESCHLY, TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY**

Mennonite history is something like a good news–bad news joke. The good news is, Mennonites take religious tradition and community very seriously. The bad news? Mennonites fight regularly over religious expressions of community. The incongruity of conscientious objectors to military service warring with each other has struck more than one observer. But somehow it makes sense to insiders.

Conflicts among Mennonites are often not thoroughly documented, unlike other denominations. There is a certain embarrassment and circumspection about disunity, in contrast to the endless rounds of self-justification and attack one finds in groups more comfortable with strife. Fred Kniss's first accomplishment, therefore, was systematically documenting more than 200 cases of conflict between 1870 and 1985 in the four states where Mennonite population is the largest—Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, and Indiana. The narrative sections of the book, the telling of stories with honesty and sympathy, are its strong point.

Kniss took this information and, for his Ph.D. dissertation in sociology at the University of Chicago, sought to identify systematic patterns of conflict by using the methods of comparative historical analysis. He posited four thematic periods of conflict: innovation, 1870–1906; authority, 1907–1934; sectarian boundaries, 1935–1958; and sectarian initiatives, 1959–1985. These conflicts revolved around two core paradigms of Mennonite faith and life—traditionalism and communalism. All sides in any given conflict mobilized the organizational and cultural resources at their disposal, including ideas, to support tradition or communal priorities. Kniss insisted on reifying ideas as concrete resources, expanding resource mobilization theory beyond material and political assets. Some attention to French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's writings on cultural capital would have strengthened this aspect of the argument.
Kniss analyzed five conflict outcomes and formulated four hypotheses about patterns of Mennonite conflict. A given conflict might wither, or result in defeat, schism, compromise, or victory. Twentieth-century trends in results and processes included “the changing locus of legitimate authority, shifts in the salience of certain cultural resources, and the increasing complexity and professionalization of Mennonites’ denominational organization” (150). In short, the content of a conflict was crucial at the start, while organizational factors, such as the likelihood and effectiveness of third-party intervention, more directly influenced outcomes.

Disquiet in the Land reveals significant patterns of conflict in Mennonite history. I am less sanguine about using Kniss’s models for predicting future outcomes. The sheer unpredictability and contingency of each situation, the interactive complexity of social forces and personalities, and the cussedness of human nature make the next major conflict difficult to fit into any models. The outcome of incipient Mennonite schisms and compromises over homosexuality, for example, is still unclear. All sides will mobilize ideological and organizational resources, utilizing while denying outside influences such as New Right and Gay Liberation rhetoric, and conflicts will tend toward all-or-nothing battles. Who will win? Who knows?

In any case, Kniss offers conceptual tools to analyze present and future conflicts, and his ideas and images are good to think about. In the nearly taboo and slightly humiliating world of Mennonite conflict, this book is a good door to walk through toward more openness on the subject.