incorporate her chapter, “Potions, Pills, and Jumping Ropes: The Technology of Birth Control,” in their courses. Scholars of women’s history would profit from reading this book as well.

KAROL K. WEAVER
Susquehanna University


This book by two renowned Mennonite scholars examines the experience of Mennonites and Amish during the American Civil War. Advertised as the “first scholarly treatment of pacifism during the Civil War” (jacket cover), Mennonites, Amish, and the American Civil War adds to the understanding of both the Confederate and Union homefronts and to religion during the war, but its most significant contribution is to Anabaptist studies. Mennonites and Amish occupy two branches of the Anabaptist family tree. Another stem, the Brethren, or Dunkers, is not part of this study.

Lehman and Nolt emphasize adjustments made by the pacifist Mennonites and Amish in response to the Civil War, and they spin a complex account in which Mennonite and Amish communities in three regions reacted differently. In Pennsylvania prior to the war, the lines that separated the two kingdoms, that is, the traditional Anabaptist teaching that kept Christians apart from the sinful world, especially government, had blurred. Pennsylvania Mennonites voted—first Whig, then Republican—and they held local public office. Consequently, Mennonites there felt comfortable with the civic world. During the war they navigated a middle course in which they paid commutation fees in exchange for draft exemptions. In the Shenandoah Valley, however, striking a deal with civil authorities was much more difficult. Most valley Mennonites were antislavery Unionists, which made their situation particularly precarious, and the Confederacy only partially recognized their rights as conscientious objectors. John Kline, a Dunker, was the principal Anabaptist advocate, but he was briefly imprisoned in 1862 and assassinated.
in 1864, an indication of the difficulties Anabaptists faced in the valley. In the second year of the war, Confederate law exempted church members who paid a $500 fine, but many young men were not yet members because membership normally came with marriage in the early to mid-twenties. An Underground Railroad through the western Virginia mountains spirited away many unprotected conscientious objectors. For midwestern Mennonites and Amish the lines between the two kingdoms were sharp, and, consequently, they lacked the tradition of public involvement that Pennsylvania Mennonites had. Instead, midwestern Mennonites and Amish articulated no middle ground and defined their situation as a stark choice between participation and nonparticipation. Not surprisingly, then, midwestern Mennonites and Amish joined the military in larger numbers than in the other two regions. Thus, the Mennonite and Amish narrative in each region differed, leading the authors to conclude that these two Anabaptist fellowships do not “share a singular Civil War story” (3).

Further complicating the adjustments required of Mennonites and Amish was their opposition to slavery, probably more consistent than that of the famed Quakers, and they also were Unionists, eager to see the rebellion suppressed. Mennonites and Amish, therefore, struggled to reconcile support for the great cause with their nonresistant principles, another quandary as they found their way in troublesome times.

Although favoring complexity over common threads, Lehman and Nolt acknowledge that Mennonites and Amish remained consistent with their nonresistant scruples despite the occasional Anabaptist who performed military service. The authors support this assumption with very detailed and impressive research that produced long lists of soldiers and conscientious objectors.

The power of the assembled data leaves a desire for doing a little more with it. The book’s thoughtful conclusion describes the importance of the Civil War experience for Mennonites and Amish, but the absence of concluding analytical paragraphs to chapters and the lack of a subtitle for the book suggests that room might remain for big ideas. Lehman and Nolt, for example, do not draw large lessons about the homefront because they believe that the Mennonite and Amish story is unique. Also, it might be interesting to know if Mennonite and Amish conscientious objectors during the Civil War faced modern nation-states and emerging nationalism or if this episode is merely another chapter in Anabaptist nonresistance, little different from their refusal to patrol the walls of early modern European towns.
These qualms aside, *Mennonites, Amish, and the American Civil War* has several obvious strengths. It includes the drama of the period, especially when the homefront and military front converged. Moreover, it is an informative work that whets the appetite—a high compliment—for similar scholarly studies of Anabaptists and military service, especially prior to the twentieth century. Likewise, although the authors claim that the Civil War had no lasting impact on Mennonite identity, their book nevertheless sparks curiosity about Anabaptists during the period immediately after the war, about which very little has been written.

Thus, Lehman and Nolt contribute significantly to the growing body of scholarship on the homefront and religion during the Civil War and to increasingly sophisticated and scholarly Anabaptist studies. The book will be a great read during the coming Civil War sesquicentennial for all those interested in the homefront in general and the Anabaptist experience in particular.

STEVE LONGENECKER
Bridgewater College


Chandra Manning investigates what “ordinary soldiers thought about the relationship between slavery and the Civil War” (4). But in one of the most important recent books on the Civil War—it draws from the letters and diaries of over 1,100 Civil War soldiers, both U.S. and Confederate, and the regimental newspapers these soldiers edited—Manning shows us how slavery mattered in ways that have previously eluded scholars. Historians have long discussed the lives and minds of the Civil War’s common soldiers but have disagreed regarding the extent to which ideology and patriotism motivated these soldiers. In contrast to those historians who argue that community and group cohesion influenced the Civil War’s common soldiers more than ideas, Manning counters that the soldiers were “intensely ideological” (18). She also finds that soldiers...