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Farmers Union between 1945 and 1954" so that the reader can evaluate the actions of Patton and Stover as rational responses to the world in which they lived. He argues persuasively that "when Farmers Union members criticized programs like the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and NATO, they did so . . . in a reasonably moderate tone that did not express any preference for communism or any desire to see Soviet flags flying over the nation's Capitol. They appeared, in short, to want to widen the scope of political dialogue in the nation and to offer alternatives to what seemed to them an excessively limited list of options"(6). Unfortunately, as I. F. Stone wrote of such ideas in his 1952 Hidden History of the Korean War (34), by 1950 "they had been made to seem naive, outmoded, and dangerous—if not downright subversive."

Harvest of Dissent documents the political price American society paid for declaring that even moderate dissent was akin to betrayal. Fred Stover was hounded out of the FU, watched by the FBI, and marginalized for his views. Not even James Patton's conversion to the true faith of anticommunism was enough to atone for the original sins of the FU. The National Farmers Union lost influence throughout the 1950s and remained a favorite target of anticommunists.

From an Iowa perspective, Field's work reminds us of the mixed legacy of agrarian radicalism in the state. Iowans Henry A. Wallace and Fred Stover offered an alternative vision of American policy and took part in the postwar political debate only to be condemned as "fellow travelers." The national anticommunist crusade all but silenced Stover as a champion of Iowa's small farmers and eliminated the IFU as a political force. Yet Stover's warnings about the "unholy alliance" of business and government remain salient today, in an era of corporate hog farming, collapsing grain prices, and a new round of farmers leaving the land.


REVIEWED BY PHILIP L. FRANZ, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

The history of American nursing is today blossoming in the hands of professional historians. The discipline has found controversy, the kind that generates an audience and constructive debate, in the issues of nurses' authority as more (or less) than "the physician's hand," and
nursing’s standing over time as vocation, semi-profession, or profession. Since 1993, *Nursing History Review* has established itself as a worthy adjunct to other journals in the history of medicine. Indeed, the soil is rapidly being prepared for a synthesis of nursing histories that would be, to borrow from the title of the monograph under review, complete in all its parts.

Lee Anderson and Kathy Penningroth, inspired by the centenary celebration of the founding of the University of Iowa Training School for Nurses, contribute substantially and substantively to that growing corpus of professional nursing histories. Well aware of the pitfalls of amateur histories, the authors begin by reconstituting the history of nursing history and calling for scholarly compassion in its presentation by and for nurses and others. “The historian of nursing,” they remark sagely, “must construct a narrative sufficiently elastic to serve two quite different audiences, namely non-historian nurses and non-nurse historians” (6).

The remainder of the book is divided into five chapters illustrating the development of nursing education at the University of Iowa and developments in American nursing generally. In response to rapid industrialization and population expansion between 1898 and 1928, the authors argue, nursing moved away from unlicensed home practice and into hospital diploma programs. At the University of Iowa, the school of nursing experienced dramatic growth in patient admissions and student enrollments, and shifted from a two- to three-year curriculum as it tried to match the expectations of medical experts. Between 1929 and 1949, the school of nursing endured depression and contingency, but remained responsive by generalizing service and standardizing curriculum requirements. The period 1950 to 1964 witnessed postwar revitalization and new baccalaureate and graduate nursing programs budding in a young, fragile, but full college of nursing. From 1965 to 1980 Iowa nursing paralleled medicine in experiencing increasing clinical specialization, rising patient expectations, and soaring health care costs. Since 1980, the college has found national recognition in its pathbreaking digital charting system, nursing interventions classification project, gerontological research, and doctoral degree program.

*Complete in All Its Parts* is best where it describes the professional machinery operating in dynamic institutional settings. But because it relies on national and local economic and political forces as explanatory subventions, it does not always reveal broader generalizations about the history of nursing in and outside of Iowa. The authors do not, for instance, explore epistemological correspondences between
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.