Book Reviews


Drawn from the J. J. Thiessen and John and Margaret Friesen Lectures delivered at Canadian Mennonite University in 2017, this slim volume offers the considered reflections of a senior historian of sixteenth-century Swiss Anabaptism on the subject of religious tolerance. It acts as a counterpoint to the 500th anniversary celebrations of Luther’s Reformation, which also splintered Christendom into warring factions and escalated the judicial prosecution of religious dissenters such as the Anabaptists. Arnold Snyder observes that Luther and the other Reformers had all argued for religious toleration in the early Reformation, but Luther’s experience with the rise of Anabaptism and the violence of the Peasants’ War in 1525 convinced him that only obedience to the state and confessional compulsion could ensure the survival of the evangelical movement. This, Snyder suggests, serves as a warning when considering how to respond to terrorism or racist violence. Should we allow fear to compel us to hand over individual rights to governments as Luther had, or should we maintain the tradition of tolerance and inclusion of liberal democracies? Snyder naturally opposes efforts to silence dissent and coerce conformity to a “majoritarian norm” (16), noting how during the Reformation this did not lead to uniformity of belief and obedience to the state, but to the violence that ripped Europe apart for well over a hundred years.

Snyder’s discussion is divided into the original three lectures, the first two concentrating on Lutheran arguments for, and then against, toleration, and the last on the Swiss Anabaptist responses. He deals fairly with the historiography of early modern toleration, noting how current scholarship emphasizes the regional variation and factors behind toleration and coexistence, much of it arising from the desire of people to simply get along. Snyder’s central question is: “How did a theology of salvation by faith through grace, which appears to lead to a theology supporting toleration of individual belief, become a theology that supported institutionalized intolerance carried out by a territorial state?” (23) He admits that all confessions, including the Anabaptists, believed that they had discovered the one true faith, and that exclusivity inevitably led to intolerance. It is, however, on the subject of the Anabaptists that Snyder presents his most original argument, and it is impressive. He acknowledges that the bad reputation of the Dutch Anabaptist reformation, especially in Münster (1533-1535), contributed to the turn to state coercion by Protestant Reformers. As an example, Snyder dissects the justification penned by the Lutheran Urbanus Rhegius, revealing how Rhegius misused Scripture to craft a self-serving manifesto for religious authoritarianism.
Snyder is, however, not guilty of an anachronistic reading of Rhegius, for such criticism was already made in the sixteenth century, both by humanists such as Sebastian Castellio and by the Swiss Anabaptists, the latter advancing not only scriptural arguments against compulsion, but also very effective critiques of those Protestant pastors who did not live up to their own standards. Such anticlericalism resonated with the Swiss people who also became deeply impressed by the piety of the Anabaptists. They therefore resisted the prosecutorial fervor of their leaders and allowed the Anabaptists to survive.

Given that Snyder suggests that the Dutch Anabaptists were a factor in the Lutheran turn to coercion, it would have been nice to see a mention of how they helped shape the promotion of religious toleration in the Dutch Republic, which in the 1570s turned away from persecution and adopted freedom of conscience. For example, Snyder states that religious toleration “became policy thanks to secular Enlightenment thinkers and governments” (41). Yet, it was precisely in the Dutch Republic where Enlightenment thinkers like Locke and Spinoza had the opportunity for a lived experience of religious diversity and toleration as they developed their philosophies. New research is revealing that Mennonites were leading figures in this reevaluation of religious accommodation well before this philosophical turn. Were their Swiss coreligionists in touch with them?

This caveat aside, Snyder’s volume is a great and easy read. He does not shy away from contemporary lessons and observations. Having proven how the positive reputation of the Anabaptists and their arguments for toleration helped end persecution, Snyder concludes that “incremental resistance to unjust orders is more important in giving actual shape to our world than we might imagine” (98). Intolerance is based on “ignorance which allows negative stereotypes to flourish,” and the Swiss Anabaptist story “demonstrates the power of personal relationships in countering attempts to demonize” (99). At a time when religious intolerance and irrational conspiratorial thinking are resurgent, Snyder’s observations deserve a wide audience.

University of New Brunswick

GARY K. WAITE


In the course of the last twenty years, the Amish have gained considerable renown for their environmentally friendly ways. No less a cultural critic than Wendell Berry has feted the ability of Amish farmers to live in sync with nature’s rhythms, and Christian environmentalist Nancy Sleeth titled the account of her quest for “a more sustainable life” Almost Amish. During the same period, however, animal rights activists have targeted Amish puppy mills in their billboard campaigns, and the Environmental Protection Agency traced the development of a dead zone in the Chesapeake Bay to nutrient runoff from
manure-laden Lancaster County Amish farms. Do the Amish care for the environment, or do they not?

In *Nature and the Environment in Amish Life*, David L. McConnell and Marilyn D. Loveless answer that question in a clear and nuanced way. At a time when fewer than 20 percent of Amish families in large Amish settlements make their living by farming, the authors wisely extend their gaze beyond Amish agricultural practices. In doing so, they seek to explore “Amish lives and livelihoods in all their diversity in order to better understand their ecological imagination, their behavior interactions with the natural world, and the relevance of the Amish for the broader effort to promote a sustainable world” (7). Given the scores of Amish affiliations that now exist—and an Amish geographical footprint that extends to thirty-one states and four Canadian provinces—exploring Amish lives and livelihoods in all their diversity is no mean task, but the authors have done their research. Their sampling of Amish communities and practices is both wide and deep, and their analyses are couched in careful terms.

The authors divide their work into four parts. Part I, titled “Growing Up Rural,” looks at the importance of nature in Amish childhood and, in a quantitatively oriented second chapter, at the Amish “ecological footprint” as compared with their non-Amish neighbors. Part II, “Working with Nature,” considers income-producing endeavors that require Amish people to exercise dominion over nature on a regular basis: farming, lumbering, and all manner of animal breeding. Part III moves from the world of work to the world of leisure—hunting, fishing, trapping, birding, hiking, and sightseeing—and, in a chapter that does not fit very well under the leisure umbrella, the use of natural medicines in human healing. Part IV, titled “The Amish as Environmentalists,” returns to the book’s primary question: Is it appropriate to think about the Amish as environmentalists, and, if so, in what way?

The book’s findings will not surprise those who know the Amish well, but they are nonetheless valuable, for they provide correctives to popular misconceptions about the Amish and add nuance to overly broad generalizations. As for the assumption that the Amish live lightly on the earth, the authors, who surveyed Amish and non-Amish families in four Ohio counties, find this to be generally the case (if measured on a per capita basis), although much of this difference is attributable to the Amish’s limited use of fossil fuels for transportation purposes. As for the consumption of other goods and services, the New Order Amish do not differ much from their non-Amish neighbors, but the more conservative Amish groups (Swartzentruber, Andy Weaver, and Old Order) do consume less. Of course, many of these per capita differences disappear when carbon footprints are calculated on a household basis, because many Amish households consist of six or eight or even more members. And because Amish houses are large, natural gas is cheap, and the Amish like to be warm in wintertime (Andy Weaver families set their thermostats, on average, at 73.3°F), the carbon footprint for household heating is considerably higher for the Amish than it is for the English.

This, of course, raises the question about the eco-friendliness of the Amish. According to McConnell and Loveless, the key distinction to make on this point is one between environmental intentions and environmental outcomes. Although
one can certainly find Amish people who articulate a religiously informed environmental ethic (the author David Kline is the most obvious example), most Amish people have a very anthropocentric and therefore utilitarian view of the natural world. Indeed, the authors find among the Amish considerable resistance to environmental regulations that seek to protect non-human elements of nature. Moreover, they find almost no concern among the Amish about climate change, an apathy rooted in their simplistic conflation of weather with climate, their misunderstanding of theoretical science, and their theological conviction that God controls the fate of the planet. Citing a host of Amish voices, some of which will make progressive readers cringe, the authors conclude that “the views of the Amish hardly make them a model for environmentally conscious living” (228).

That said, intention does not equate to outcome. Just as the most convinced environmentalist can carve out a large carbon footprint, climate skeptics can live environmentally friendly lives. And because behavior, more than attitude, reduces one’s environmental impact on the world, the authors argue that the Amish do have something to offer those who look to them as models for environmental living. Although the Amish are not committed recyclers, their devotion to the idea “Use it up, wear it out, make do, or do without” provides a valuable contrast to a culture of quick-and-easy disposability; and although most Amish families consume more today than their ancestors did, they continue to “show that a life well lived doesn’t require endless consumption” (229). In that sense, the authors say, observers who look to the Amish for clues on cutting back are not searching in vain.

Nature and the Environment in Amish Life is filled with important findings about an understudied realm of Amish culture, and the authors organize their discoveries in a coherent way. Their critiques of Amish anthropocentrism are gentle but persistent, and time and again they correct the assumption that the Amish have tamed the desire to make (or save) money, a craving that’s on display in their manipulation of nature and in their resistance to environmental regulations. There are a few places in the book where I wished for more elaboration (e.g., the chapter on natural healing begs for a more thorough consideration of Amish views on immunization), and the cover image, a photograph of eleven Amish children playing in a creek, advances an Edenic stereotype that the book seeks to dispel. But these are minor quibbles in a book that is thick with insight, not only about Amish life, but also about the construction of the “ecological Amish” by their non-Amish admirers. I plan to return to the book frequently, and I am eager to share it with my students.

Messiah College

DAVID WEAVER-ZERCHER


Mark Douglas’s important new book re-narrates the history of Christian pacifism, aiming to tell the tradition’s story in ways that prepare pacifists for a
new epoch—an "Environmental Age"—in which warfare is increasingly shaped by environmental forces. The book is driven by careful historical research, contains compelling suggestions for pacifist theology and ethics, and furthers a conversation, just barely begun, about how Christian ethics engage environmental conflict.

*Christian Pacifism for an Environmental Age* begins with a crucial, far-reaching premise: In the era of climate change, "we are entering a new social imaginary shaped by environmental concerns" (2). In the face of far-reaching planetary changes, ecology will color our self-understandings and shape our ways of seeing the world. Living in this age means that environmental change is becoming "a lens through which we make sense of all other issues" (21).

As Mike Hulme argued in his landmark 2009 book, *Why We Disagree About Climate Change*, climate change is more than an environmental problem; it is a culturally charged idea, encompassing all our anxieties and expressing our deepest values. How we engage that idea reflects and reforms our identities and ethics, he wrote, so that instead of trying to "solve" climate change, we should ask "what climate change can do for us" (Hulme, 341). Douglas’s book attempts to answer that question for Christian pacifists: Climate change can help pacifists reconstruct their tradition and thereby renew their witness.

The book undertakes this climate-compelled reform in two phases. First, Douglas “demythologizes” pacifist history; second, he reconstructs it within a theological account of time and tradition. Most of the book is devoted to the first task, unsettling what Douglas calls “the conventional narrative of Christian pacifism.” This narrative is a simplistic, essentialist, and cyclical history—a myth of spotless origins (the pure pacifism of the early church and its martyrs) followed by a precipitous fall (the “Constantinian shift”) that in turn drives a continuous pattern of ecclesial separation, enabling a miraculous return to the beginning. Douglas tracks this narrative across a range of seminal texts in pacifist historiography, including Guy F. Hershberger’s *War, Peace, and Nonresistance* and Roland Bainton’s *Christian Attitudes to War and Peace*.

Although some of Douglas’s critiques are predictable—the early church was never uniformly pacifist; the New Testament is not as univocal or as clear as pacifists presume; the Constantinian shift was a more complex process than pacifists acknowledge—they are all well-argued and closely researched, and so warrant attention even from scholars well-versed in such debates. Other critiques are distinctive, opening new avenues for inquiry and reflection. Across three fascinating chapters (2-4), Douglas argues that the early church’s pacifism was intimately linked to anti-Semitism, and that its preoccupations with moral and social purity affected the peculiar forms of violence that would come to characterize Christendom. Despite this unflattering appraisal, the point is not to debunk or debase Christian pacifism, but rather to liberate the tradition from its essentialist, supersessionist, mythological ways of telling its story. “In demythologizing pacifism, I hope to temporalize—and thereby humanize—it,” he writes (9). More than anything else, the book is about how to read history. It unfolds in a series of historical revisions, the ethical upshots of which lie in the historiographical principles employed. The gist is to replace the hermeneutics of
perfectionism with complexity and ambiguity, and thereby to transform the dysfunctional politics of purity and division into the congenial practices of bricolage and collaboration.

In its reconstructive phase, the book offers a general theology of “the movement of traditions through time” (11) before closing with a revised history of Christian pacifism. Both chapters are conceptually rich, and, in particular, Douglas’s proposal to ground pacifism upon a theological notion of “fidelity to God” (223-228) offers the tradition an appealing way forward during a time of considerable tumult.

What does all this have to do with contemporary climate conflict or emerging environmental imaginaries? That question, and Douglas’s answers, are peppered throughout the text. But they are far less central to the book’s intellectual energy, its focal arguments or its structure, than one might expect. If the book did not mention climate change or environmental conflict, it would say roughly the same thing and would make just as profound a contribution to contemporary scholarship on Christian pacifism. There are a few important exceptions to this point, and they are enough to make the book valuable reading for anyone interested in how climate change bears on Christian ethics. One stems from the unique moral predicament of climate change, which entangles all Christians in unjust global systems and war-shaping planetary dynamics. Embroiled in violent ecologies under conditions of universal complicity and shared culpability, pacifists in the Environmental Age should see reasons to transform their purist ecclesologies and identitarian politics into more pragmatic, conversational, and invitational moral styles (79-81). Most interestingly, Douglas concludes with an account of how historical climatic changes influenced the development of Christian pacifism. In terms of readying the tradition for an era defined by anthropogenic environmental forces, this is the book’s most powerful move, for it begins to overcome a spectacular blind spot in the Christian moral imagination, reconceiving faith and life in real relation to creation.

But excluding the fifteen intriguing pages on the environmental history of Christian pacifism (230-245), contemporary environmental imaginaries are peripheral to the way Douglas develops his argument. Those expecting a direct exchange between the moral framework of Christian pacifism and contemporary ecological concerns will be disappointed. So will those seeking dialogue between political ethics and environmental thought. The book does not engage environmental ethics, or give more than a bibliographical nod to ecological theologies.

There may be something useful about Douglas’s near total disregard for Christian environmental thought, however, because it allows the book to blaze a new path toward a Christian theo-ethics of the environment: “Rather than addressing [Lynn] White’s claims about the human/nonhuman dualism within Christianity, perhaps we should be attending to the dualism implicit in modern historiographic projects . . . between the natural and the political” (248). That is an interesting and promising proposal (albeit one presaged by many other works in the environmental humanities) with the potential to generate a new genre of
Christian reflection, linking historical theology and environmental history together with political ethics for ecological concerns.

Readers of this journal may find the book generative for another reason, as pacifists of Anabaptist persuasion now need to renew their tradition while grappling with the toxic, ubiquitous legacy of John Howard Yoder. Perhaps Douglas’s reconstructed pacifism could offer an alternative, a way to think pacifist thoughts and tell pacifist stories unsullied by our congenital history of sexualized violence and our theological inheritance of collective complacency. Yet the violence of John Howard Yoder is an elephant in the room throughout the book. Douglas repeatedly returns to the idea that pacifists should be forthright about the flaws of their forebears, humanizing them, in order to accept and forgive them (8, 106-108, 199). But Yoder’s theological descendants should remain vigilant, knowing all too well the dangerous allure of his theo-logic. Forgiveness or acceptance in this case seems wrong, especially while so many in pacifist churches still cherish Yoder’s thought while continuing to countenance all manner of patriarchal abuse. In any case, it is the victims—not the inheritors—of history’s violent men who hold the prerogative to forgive (or not to). Still, Douglas invites pacifists to attend more honestly to the sins in their shared past, and this call will resonate immediately. Where he points the way toward a pacifist theological ethics less reliant on preposterous myths of unbroken faithfulness, and less dependent on perfectionist conceptions of a pure and gentle church, today’s pacifists will have multiple reasons to take note—not because renouncing perfectionism implies forgiving abusers, but because the church will always be twisted and grotesque where it denies, covers up, or refuses to deal with the violence within.

The book is insightful and provocative, and should impact the ways Christians tell the story of pacifism. On the other hand, it has very little to say about pacifist approaches to environmental issues. By focusing on his version of Hulme’s question—what can climate change do for Christian pacifism?—Douglas shelves the question of what Christian pacifism can do to engage climate change. But that choice is deliberate, born of a conviction that the major frameworks of Christian ethics require thoroughgoing reconstruction before they can be made useful in our strange new climate. For Christian scholars, then, the book presents a profound challenge to take climate change seriously as an unsettling yet fundamental condition for moral and theological reflection in our times. Christian pacifists might also choose to take the book as a practical challenge: to show how their tradition can be renewed and made useful in nonviolent engagements with climate change.

*University of Virginia*

**LUKE BECK KREIDER**

---


In this book, Melissa Florer-Bixler, pastor of Raleigh Mennonite Church, plays—not frivolously, but seriously—with the Scriptures. In lucid style, the experienced writer retells, mines, stretches, and questions the pages of the Old
Testament in what she describes as “a series of marginalia” that center on love of a wide array of neighbors. Eleven brief chapters profess to speak of God: God of Reckoning, God of Neighbors, of Victims, Memory, Wanderers, Darkness, Wonder, Birds, the Vulnerable, the Table, and Friendship. Vignettes comprise each chapter; reflections on, and questions arising from, reading the Old Testament lead to stories of life with friends, neighbors past and present.

The first chapter begins with the Benedictines of St. John’s Abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota, with Titus being read, then turns to Hannah Crasson (a former enslaved woman from North Carolina), Malinda Berry, Araminta Ross (Harriet Tubman), Rowan Williams, Rabbi Eliezer, Saint Augustine of Hippo, a fellow conference attendee, and a congregant named Jeff.

This first chapter offers the reader a sense of Florer-Bixler’s approach and commitments. In retelling her thoughts upon hearing Titus 9:9–10 at morning prayer, the author demonstrates the error of the cliché that the Old Testament is full of violence, while the New contains nothing disturbing. The Old Testament’s celebration of life and the fruitfulness of the land is beautifully conveyed in chapter 7, “God of Wonder.” There she writes,

I can imagine the lines of wooden benches before a white priest much like the one before me today, reciting these words over rows of black faces. Submission. Fidelity. Dogma. Holiness. All intertwined into a catastrophic misconstrual of the Bible for the sake of turning human bodies into capitalist profit. (27)

The wrestling in reading Scripture is not only with the text, but also with the interpretive communities we inherit along with the text. “Titus reminds me of my own willingness to coexist alongside modern-day slavery, even as this epistle remembers a Christian tradition that abetted the enslavement of African people” (28). In Titus and with remembrance of oppressive readings of Titus, Florer-Bixler invites us to meet the God of our own reckoning.

In the introduction, Florer-Bixler notes Ellen Davis’s call to read the biblical text slowly. Here, Florer-Bixler also witnesses to another of Davis’s guiding principles for biblical interpretation: reading with a spirit of repentance. Properly construed, “[r]eading Scripture is an invitation to being undone—a way to a God who invites us into the world of another” (29). Reading repentantly, for Florer-Bixler, is a matter of neighborly reading.

Reading together is the subject of the author’s discussion of Saint Augustine of Hippo later in the first chapter. In the late fourth (not the third) century, the north African bishop heard that Christians were “frustrated by the opacity of the Bible.” Why couldn’t angels simply come to explain the Scriptures to them? Quoting Augustine, Florer-Bixler writes that “the work of interpretation is not for instruction alone; it is for creating a temple out of God’s people, a task that leads us toward love, ‘pouring soul into soul’” (34).

In describing her congregation’s practice of sharing that extends the sermon, Florer-Bixler makes clear that believers, in reading Scripture together, find understanding. The turn in discussion gave this reader pause. In the introduction to de doctrina christiana, Augustine does suggest that God’s speech and action through humans corresponds to the love they have for one another; but his vision
is of individuals in the Church handing on understanding that they have received to each other. Is that quite the understanding within Raleigh Mennonite Church? What is at stake in the difference between handing on and discovering together?

Given the focus throughout the book on reading alongside others, I had high expectations for the final chapter, “God of Friendship,” which highlights the Book of Ruth. Florer-Bixler beautifully summarizes the import of Ruth’s story, which “complicates our sense of being at home. It is a story that confounds where home happens and between whom, where intimacy happens, within what boundaries, and how those boundaries are blurred between peoples and borders and families” (171). She continues: “The author sets Orpah over against Ruth. Orpah is the one who chooses the stable world of biological family; Ruth chooses outside kinship by binding herself to Naomi, her companion and friend” (171). But is such a contrast between “biological family” and Ruth and Naomi’s relationship appropriate to the ancient context of the Book of Ruth? Ruth and Naomi are not only friends; they are mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, a fact emphasized by the recurrence of the Hebrew words for these relations in Ruth 1.

Florer-Bixler has swerved around the fact that the narrative assumes an extensive kinship group and one that has obligations to the family and property of those who die without heirs. This avoidance has theological implications. Though the Gospels portray Jesus as using extreme language to identify the fact that one’s family commitments ought not take priority over the kingdom of God (Lk. 14:26), Jesus is not against biological families. Jesus cares for his own mother even at his death (Jn. 19:25-27), and he expands those whom he considers his family, declaring, “My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it” (Lk. 8:21). Jesus enables his friends to be called his brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers.

Florer Bixler’s creative and wide-ranging approach is captivating. Her generosity and humility lead to wisdom as she welcomes diverse readers to engage the Old Testament fruitfully.

Eastern Mennonite University

ANDREA SANER


Paul Ham, an Australian historian-writer educated at the London School of Economics, has written a number of critically acclaimed books on twentieth-century topics, including Young Hitler: The Making of the Führer; 1914; and Passchendaele: Requiem for Doomed Youth, winner of the 2018 Douglas Stewart Prize for Non-Fiction. In New Jerusalem his objective is to write a narrative of the sixteen-month Anabaptist regime in Münster, from February 1534 to June 1535, that is accessible to the general reader. He achieves this with a history based on the Reformation and Anabaptist careers of Melchior Hoffman, Bernhard Rothmann, Jan Matthijs of Haarlem, and Jan Bockelson of Leiden. Ham has an excellent sense of the panorama of Christian church history and an impressive understanding of
biblical culture, which enables him to evoke images from the Old and New Testaments that must have counted heavily in the experience of lay people newly acquainted with the German vernacular Bible of Martin Luther.

The inaccessibility of English translations of the writings of Hoffman and Rothmann makes Ham’s account heavily dependent on scholarly literature in English. The “Melchiorites” were Anabaptists in north Germany and the Netherlands heavily influenced by the theology of the Swabian furrier Melchior Hoffman. Ham’s treatment of Hoffman frames his story of Anabaptist Münster. Hoffman had expected the apocalypse to center on Strasbourg in 1533. Ham depends primarily on the study of Hoffman by Klaus Deppermann (1979), far superior to earlier books on Hoffman that took insufficient account of changes in his thinking. Ham correctly stresses Hoffman’s belief in human free will, although he seems confused about Hoffman’s Docetic Christology of the heavenly flesh of Christ, which connected him both to the Münster Anabaptists and the later Mennonites. Following Deppermann, he underscores the peaceful role Hoffman’s followers were expected to play in Strasbourg in 1533, according to which the city would resist the Emperor Charles V (regarded as the spearhead of a devilish Trinity), after which the Melchiorites would set out as missionaries throughout the world.

Ham’s treatment of Bernhard Rothmann depends on various sources—most prominently Karl-Heinz Kirchhoff, Ralf Klötzer, and Willem de Bakker, but also on an earlier Socialist historiographical school that interpreted Rothmann as a protagonist of class struggle. Although from a poor background, Rothmann was in fact a highly educated humanist with a polished Latin style. Without doubt, Rothmann brought the Reformation to Münster, but interacting with the Wassenberger preachers, he avoided a Wittenberg-centered Reformation theology. Ham is unaware that, both in Strasbourg with Martin Bucer and Wolfgang Capito and in Münster with Rothmann and the Wassenbergers, there were first-generation Reformation countercurrents to the theology of Luther and Melanchthon. The Strasbourgers made their accommodation with Wittenberg by endorsing Melanchthon’s Augsburg Confession (1530), but in the course of 1533 Rothmann and the Wassenbergers refused to do the same. De Bakker argues convincingly that at this point Rothmann was directing Münster to a Swiss-Dutch “Reformed” theology.

Ham is insufficiently aware of non-Lutheran currents in the early magisterial Reformation. Consequently, his narrative overlooks the fact that Rothmann held the place of leading reformer in Münster only from February 1532 until the fall of 1533, after which the Münster council removed him and replaced him with the Hessian Lutheran theologian Dietrich Fabricius. This set the stage for Rothmann and the pastors allied with him to accept Melchiorite Anabaptism in January 1534. In the next six weeks, a three-cornered religious struggle between Anabaptists, Lutherans, and Catholics led to the election of a pro-Anabaptist council on February 23, 1534, and the subsequent expulsion of Lutherans and Catholics.

Neither Jan Matthijs nor Jan Bockelson left writings behind. Ham’s narrative tries to describe what occurred in Anabaptist Münster, under siege by the mercenary troops of Bishop Franz von Waldeck, subsequently supported by three
Circles of the Holy Roman Empire. Almost all sources for this history are hostile: Kerssenbrock, Gresbeck, and the interrogations of Anabaptist leaders after the end of the siege in June 1535. Only the writings of Bernhard Rothmann, by then a propagandist for the Anabaptist regime trying to gain support from Melchiorites in the Netherlands, are favorable to the Münster Anabaptists. There are distinctions, however, among hostile sources. Most informative are the interrogations of Antonius Corvinus, apparently a series of polite conversations. Gresbeck was an eyewitness; but his account merits skepticism. He was most of all interested in protecting his family property; for a long time he did this by fighting for the Anabaptist defenders, although he wrote subsequently that he despised them inwardly.

Since Carl Adolf Cornelius in 1853, all professional historians of Anabaptist Münster have warned against trusting the colorful, extensive account of Hermann von Kerssenbrock written between 1564 and 1573. Kerssenbrock was a teenage student in Münster expelled in February 1534. He was later a schoolteacher in Münster, and he does provide indirect access to otherwise lost documentary material. Like many of his predecessors, Ham uses Kerssenbrock extensively. For instance, after the suppression of a revolt against polygamy in late summer 1534, Ham describes rampant sexual debauchery in Münster “according to Kerssenbrock’s lurid eyewitness account.” Of course, Kerssenbrock had fled Münster months earlier.

Still, Ham is on the whole convincing about Jan Matthijs and Jan Bockelson. In the brief six weeks before he was killed in a suicidal sortie on April 5 (Easter), 1534, Jan Matthijs was a raging presence barely controlled by the Anabaptist leadership circle. It is hard not to modernize him as “psychotic.” Bockelson was entirely different—a gifted sociopath, remarkably adept at extending his power by whatever means necessary. He had better tactical sense than to destroy the former burgomaster of Münster, Berndt Knipperdolling, when Knipperdolling openly expressed jealousy and resentment at being merely second-in-command. But he was also willing to expel from the city women and children who were of no further use for the defense of Münster.

The trend in recent interpretations of Anabaptist Münster—especially Karl-Heinz Kirchoff and Rolf Klötzer—has been to resist the tendency of both Gresbeck and Kerssenbrock to blame outsiders from the Netherlands for polygamy, community of goods, and the misery of the siege. They point out that, both under the government of the Twelve Elders and Jan’s new Davidic Kingship, there was a careful balancing of the power of natives of Münster and of outside Anabaptists. Moreover, the local Anabaptists did not share their houses and land with the newcomers; if anything, they fudged on “community of goods.” Ham thinks that violence came to Anabaptist Münster because it was natural for Jan Matthijs to expect the Anabaptists to undertake an apocalyptic crusade. Kirchoff and Klötzer note that communal self-defense was the automatic response of the Münster council and guilds trying to maintain their independence against the Bishops of Münster at each stage of the Reformation. Ham assumes (with no evidence) that Jan Bockelson was inspired by the prior example of Thomas Müntzer in the Peasants’ War. The current understanding is that Bishop Franz von Waldeck
received assistance from three Circles of the Empire at the end of 1534 because the Diet of Speyer had decreed in 1526 that nothing like the German Peasants’ War could be permitted to happen again.

Despite differences in interpretation from the scholars who seem to be winning many of the detailed arguments about Anabaptist Münster, Ham has succeeded in producing a vivid narrative for the general reader. What happened in Münster is understandable only against the background of Melchior Hoffman’s dashed expectations for Strasbourg in 1533 and Bernhard Rothmann’s initiation of the Reformation inside Münster’s city walls following February 1532. Ham describes the impressive sixteen-month resistance to an army of mercenaries by a population the majority of whom were adult women, as well as the organization and exploitation of these women by a system of polygyny. He discusses the resistance to polygamy and shows how and why it failed. The failed attempts at assault on the city on May 26 and August 31, 1534, are vividly described, as well as the final blockade and slow starvation of the besieged following April 1535. This is climaxed by a circumstantial description of the final battle in the city on July 25, 1535, and the horrific triple execution spectacle on January 22, 1536.

Queen’s University

JAMES M. STAYER


We are all on impossible journeys, Jeff Gundy writes, but he provides for us rest and revelation. His poems bring us to a place of beauty; they remind us of that other life, through the trees and across the field.

This wonderful collection contains a little Zen and several meditations with otters, quilts, simplicity, and gravel. His poems are down-to-earth; they reflect life as it is, but they yearn for something a little better, a little more. He gives “plain advice” (9) along with questions and contradictions. He tells us of “lessons” learned from “a gentle childhood” (89). He connects the past to the present, the ordinary to the sacred: “Everything is connected, and everything is precisely itself” (17). There are poems about the cost of war, fracking and progress, bikes, guitars and trees, and so many trees. Most of the trees are good. He offers poems about the terrible things we’ve done to the creatures of the earth, to the whales: we are judged yet still loved, but not saved from our actions. Gundy wants to heal the earth, to create a dust to “make the plastics vanish” (15), but he also wants lunch. And who doesn’t like a well-crafted poem mocking committee meetings?

Gundy often ponders the big theological questions with academic skill, but remains accessible—and occasionally he just wants to play. One of his poems is reminiscent of Cynthia Rylant’s work, using humor to question who God is and how God thinks. Gundy’s poem “The God of Dirt” does this, and the book is worth the price for this poem alone. In the poem, God “scowled and asked [him] what we’d done with the treasure.” It’s a conversation at once confronting, easy, and mysterious. At the end of the poem God sings; then she whispers “something soft” (41) before spinning away.
Almost any Mennonite who has bought a new bike, more expensive, lighter, and faster than the old one, can relate to the narrator in the poem “Privilege.” We Mennonites ponder expensive purchases over long periods of time, justifying our wants. We have heard those same sermons. Some of us even save dryer lint, to wad up in old toilet paper cardboard to start campfires. We’re taught to be thrifty. And a few of us, I dare say, like the narrator, have slipped out of church quickly, so as not to have to talk to anyone, not to have to invite a stranger home to dinner. And “the people [we] love have mostly not been shot by strangers, starved in camps, or/ hounded from their homes by deranged fanatics” (19). But some of us have trouble loving people we do love. Others, too, have lost connections with old friends, and when we do talk, we have become “worn out wondering what to ask or to say” (20).

There are poems about a grandson, not yet 2 years old, singing “come thou fount of every blessing” (42), and about flying to Denver and seeing the clouds from above, “pale and pure as a vast range of [his] mother’s mashed potatoes” (63). But it’s not just from nostalgia that he writes; he is telling us where he was instead of where the others, the well-behaved, thought he should be. He is flying.

Part Two, “A gap in the fence,” talks about gaps in relationships, how sometimes we ignore what we should fix: the sick neighbor’s shed, its metal banging and shaking; how we mean to stop on our way home from work and put in a few screws, but we don’t. Later in the book he writes an elegy for his neighbor that is not typical or sentimental. He remembers “Gregg turning clay on the wheel,/ talking as his hands centered and shaped it, graceful/ and efficient as a hawk carving circles in the air” (38).

The final section of the book, “The boy who listened too hard,” contains poems about his childhood on the farm and in church on the hard pews where “the preacher’s voice was not harsh and not loud.” But he is anxious. What if he answers the preacher’s call? What if he walks to the front? Will there be questions “not unkind but particular[?]” And “who wanted to be sitting in those hard pews at thirty, at sixty, at eighty, with the/ clock ticking down the seconds till your heart clutches and sighs and gives it up/ once and for all?” He wants “to keep [his] eyes open,” “to look out and to/ the long slow line of the horizon and brilliant endless lens of the sky” (78).

In a later poem titled “Gundy Puzzles Over His Failure To Change His Name Or Take Off To New York City To Become A Songwriter,” he goes to the “safe college, . . . takes the first safe job offered and . . . [settles] in the same gray house for decades.” He travels in novels but retreats back “to the same pretty good bed” (74). He compares his work as an English professor to the work of a sheepdog, but he wants more than safety for his class, his “beautiful, temporary tribe” (86). He wants to lead them and us, his readers, onto some new path among lilacs and dogwoods, and if we get cold, he wants to “stand like a tree and warm [us]” (86). And he does throughout this book.

Shepherd’s Field Community, Philippi, W.Va.  

CHERYL DENISE

When Daniel Shank Cruz insists in Queering Mennonite Literature that Mennonite values are themselves “queer” and that queer Mennonite literature is “a natural extension of the Mennonite spirit” (11) he not only argues for greater relationship between the LGBTQ community and the Mennonite church, but he also urges us to think beyond the binary, beyond categories that isolate the queer Mennonite and reduce her to mere deviation.

For Cruz, the religious-queer binary is in need of total collapse, and the Mennonite church could facilitate this collapse by recognizing the values shared by these communities. Just as neither settles for cultural assimilation, or the status quo, both the queer and the Mennonite call out hegemonic injustice and inspire broader political imaginaries. And both know intimately what it means to endure trauma at the hands of the state. Maintaining that “being raised to think as a Mennonite means being raised to think queerly in the broader sense” (11), Cruz attunes us to what we share—love for our communities, an activist spirit informed by radical politics and rejection of state values, and a desire for peace. Under his insightful and careful analysis in Queering Mennonite Literature, the queer Mennonite not only rejects her presumed paradox but embodies a hopeful future as first articulated by queer theorist José Esteban Muñoz and reaffirmed by Cruz. That is, the future is beautifully queer.

Motivated to illuminate the coalitional possibilities between the Mennonite church and queer communities, Cruz offers close readings of contemporary and near contemporary texts in queer Mennonite literature, from the lesbian bildungsroman Somewhere Else by Jan Guenther Braun to Casey Plett’s short stories about trans Mennonite experiences. Through each, Cruz teases out those character movements and narrative gestures that signal Mennonite roots. For example, in Christina Penner’s novel Widows of Hamilton House and in Wes Funk’s autobiography Wes Side Story, Cruz explores how literature acts as archive, preserving the queer Mennonite voice that is so often lost or erased. Here he considers the work of Ann Cvetkovich to draw parallels between the exiled queer and the exiled Mennonite, both of whom turn to archive to stave off “oblivion” (33). Archive, Cruz explains, not only protects the past against erasure, but it also makes the present survivable for queer Mennonites by ensuring their visibility.

In his chapter on Jan Guenther Braun’s Somewhere Else, Cruz evinces this pain of displacement, first felt by migrating Mennonites and then inherited by young queers in the church. In Somewhere Else, Cruz explains how a Mennonite upbringing issues unique pressures for one trying to understand her own desires—how Braun’s main character Jess must leave the church, must flee danger, to find imaginable survival. In this chapter and those following, Cruz surveys those texts that present the queer Mennonite experience as saturated by trace, the past rupturing the present. He turns to Jessica Penner and Shaken in the Water to illuminate how intergenerational trauma reproduces in the queer Mennonite, and he brings in boneyard by Stephen Beachy to examine martyrdom and American
violence, and the queer body as caught between. Finally, Cruz’s chapter on trans Mennonite literature returns to archive and visibility. He looks to Miriam Suzanne’s *Riding SideSaddle* to explicate how unconventional literary forms can complicate our demands for legibility, that equality does not require sameness (119).

Cruz’s primary objective in *Queering Mennonite Literature* is to inspire the collapse of the queer/Mennonite binary, but he also urges us to consider the implications of language itself, that words matter. Our language and the way we use it matters. For academics and artists alike, language not only organizes meaning but also produces it, enacting worlds and making visible the possibility of other worlds. Take, for example, the word *forbearance*, which indicates an act of withholding, but when mobilized, it also actively withholds. While it intends to stabilize a fracturing church and preserve its community, its most vulnerable members are often forced to choose between what Cruz describes as exile and self-negation (108). Under forbearance, the queer Mennonite still waits, her liminality translating as contradiction, her two identities positioned against one another.

Throughout *Queering Mennonite Literature* Cruz is both critical of and sympathetic to the Mennonite church. The church has been and continues to be a homophobic space for many queer-identified Mennonites; but as Cruz reminds us, Mennonites have also been historically othered, exiled, and persecuted, even as “this position has largely been lost in North America, and the official Mennonite community now participates in the marginalization of LGBT persons” (12). Similarly, Cruz criticizes current trajectories within queer theory, even as it informs his literary focus, in that queer theory has too often foreclosed religion despite the faith-based upbringing of many queers. Instead, Cruz aims to underscore the shared values between queers and the church, not to erase or deflect difference, but to imagine a community that desires the discomforts of growth. However, in his efforts to collapse the distances between Mennonite and queer communities, Cruz does at times reach for reconciliation when tension may better reflect the relationship between the Mennonite church and the LGBTQ community. For example, in comparing early Anabaptist resistance of the state to ACT UP activism during the AIDS crisis of the 1980s and 1990s, Cruz tempers the urgency and tone of ACT UP (10) while also overlooking some significant differences. Though the early Anabaptist church resisted state interference, refusing to baptize infants and defying tax rolls, ACT UP faced death without government intervention. But even in such a tenuous comparison, Cruz’s intentions are persistent and important.

*Queering Mennonite Literature* serves as a project of world-making. Rather than look to literature for its definitions of the world, Cruz’s literary priorities extend beyond the descriptive into the constructive and coalitional. Such openness “may be scary,” he writes. “Which is why boundaries can be comforting and are often defended vigorously, the lack of limits also allow[ing] for the possibility of revolutionary change” (106). The visibility of queer Mennonite literature has grown exponentially in the past few decades, concomitant to the emergence and expansions of queer theory. As Cruz explains, queer theory works from the margins to incite political change, illuminating subaltern ways of living. For
queers, such possibilities, as we find them in literature, are life saving. Cruz’s work at the intersection of religion, sexuality, and literature reveals what is both plain and crucial—there have always been queer Mennonites. From which we can extrapolate, there will always be queer Mennonites. “Engaging with queer theory is one way for Mennonites to return to their radical roots,” Cruz argues (12). Mennonite and Anabaptist scholars as well as queer and literary theorists would do well to take up Cruz’s project. Which is to say, Queering Mennonite Literature is an important text for activists, artists, and academics alike, for those who desire change, embrace discomfort, and strive toward queer horizons.

University of Pittsburgh

CAITLIN MACKENZIE


While working as a research consultant with a large international organization, I wondered if it was both necessary and appropriate for me to bring up questions about the breakneck speed of the project and the decision-making power of local partners. In Ethics in Peacebuilding: A Practical Guide, Reina C. Neufeldt frames ethical reflection as the space for consideration of such questions. True to its title, this volume offers practical guidance of how ethical considerations, commonplace for conflict transformation practitioners, can be engaged carefully, intentionally, and systematically.

From the framing of problems within conflict analysis, to the goals pursued in a given project or approach, to what is being monitored and evaluated, Neufeldt asserts that moral values—beliefs and ideas about what is “good and right”—shape every aspect of efforts to stop violent conflict and transform the structural injustices so often at its roots (4). The challenge is to bring ethics, an assessment of moral values and their implications, to the foreground “in order to ensure that we are really living out the values that we want to live out in our work” (13). Rather than arguing for a particular set of values as the foundation of peacebuilding, Ethics in Peacebuilding provides recommendations, frameworks, and tools for integrating ethical reflection within peacebuilding initiatives. The author draws from her own rich experience as well as practice-oriented literature, using examples that vary between ethical missteps and promising practices.

Ethics in Peacebuilding is primarily designed as a text on applied ethics for peace and conflict studies courses. It is also targeted to a practitioner audience, and written in clear and accessible prose. The text includes discussion questions and activities at the end of each chapter, case studies from peacebuilding and development organizations, and visual diagrams of the models and ideas presented throughout the volume. Neufeldt, who teaches peace and conflict studies at Conrad Grebel University, also serves as a consultant on monitoring and evaluation in peacebuilding. To this work, she brings some of the same strengths I have come to appreciate from her body of writing in that area: keen attention to power dynamics, careful consideration of process, and a gentle critique of top-
down, liberal peacebuilding models in favor of localized, bottom-up, and grassroots approaches.

In her first two chapters, Neufeldt defines the contents and contours of ethical reflection and outlines a “doable” process of ethical reflection as a part of regular action-reflection cycles (17). Such a process entails identification of underlying values (ethical deliberation), careful consideration of values (ethical thinking), and the application of ethical thinking to decision-making (ethical action). Readers are equipped with actionable steps and examples for how to address barriers to ethical reflection, including time constraints and the hesitancy to address painful issues and topics among people already working in an intense, and often traumagenic, environment. There is also the challenge of how to balance concerns about individual responsibility for ethical decisions with attention to collective support and accountability. Both the introductory and concluding chapters provide guidelines on how to do this: develop group routines for action-reflection cycles that forefront ethics and values, cultivate healthy environments for ethical reflection and action through formal policies and protocols and informal cultural practices, and formulate everyday interventions that address barriers such as groupthink.

The three chapters in the center of the book contain the volume’s most significant contributions, which lie in shifting ethical considerations from individual to communal frames, and articulate how moral theories can be used as practical tools for ethical reflection and decision-making. Redefining “moral community” as a group of people who share similar moral values, Neufeldt argues that social change involves not only negotiation among multiple moral communities, but also the process of communities reshaping their moral values. Key sources of moral values are not only religion and philosophy, but also social and political contexts. In regard to the latter, Neufeldt draws heavily on the work of the religious ethicist Miguel de la Torre, who argues that one’s social identity and relationship to power shapes one’s values more than one’s commitment to a specific creed or ideology. Neufeldt illustrates the key implications of this idea and the concept of moral communities in one of the most interesting case studies in the text—a discussion of how East Timor’s history of resistance to colonialism has led to the moral value of resistance in that country. Because of a lack of a deep engagement with the values within the moral communities in East Timor, international peacebuilders not only misinterpreted specific incidences of violent conflict but also made operational decisions that communicated harmful messages to parties in conflict and ultimately undermined the goals of their work.

In the fourth chapter, the most vital section of *Ethics in Peacebuilding*, Neufeldt proposes a system of ethical deliberation consisting of five moral theories (consequentialism; deontology or duty-based ethics; virtue ethics; ethics of care; and Ubuntu ethics). These theories highlight the diverse values of outcomes, responsibilities, moral character, concern for others, and interconnectedness, respectively. Together, they operate as a set of filters, or lenses, for doing ethical deliberation and thinking from different perspectives. The text includes guiding questions for each moral theory and examples of how each lens foregrounds different issues in a single ethical dilemma, making this approach especially
“doable.” The following chapter, on how to solve ethical dilemmas creatively, lists a number of exercises for generating creative options in groups and choosing among them. For example, in the “healthy contradictions” exercise, each person in a group “tries on” one of the five moral theories and brainstorms responses to a specific ethical dilemma rooted in that perspective.

While there is some exploration of the role of faith as a source of ethical values, the moral theories at the core of this volume are presented in secular terms, largely divorced from considerations of faith and spirituality. I would have liked to see further engagement or guidance on how the moral theories Neufeldt presents might be integrated or utilized alongside faith-based values frameworks. There is, nevertheless, fascinating engagement with faith-based values through several anecdotes. For instance, Neufeldt recounts a story from her work with Catholic Relief Services in which a workshop held for Burundian church leaders “became an unintentional site of competing moral values” (19). In the end, the values of spirituality, relationship-building, and healing—of great significance to the church leaders—were largely left out in order to focus on developing a “technically proficient and appropriate proposal for a US-AID funded peacebuilding project” (19). Ultimately, Neufeldt suggests that open and deliberate thinking about the values prioritized by the different stakeholders may have yielded a far different result.

While Ethics in Peacebuilding is primarily offered as a guide for practical reflection, there is also an important argument advanced: while dominant peacebuilding approaches are guided by outcomes-based thinking (e.g., do no harm) and duty-based ethics (e.g., the responsibility of intervention), the values of relationality and moral excellence are prioritized far too little. As Neufeldt asserts, “These considerations, and critiques of the lack thereof, often mark the complaints of grassroots peacebuilders and local communities against international peacebuilders—e.g., that foreign peacebuilders are distanced, think they know what is right, are unaware of local norms and insult locals, corrupt local youth, and engage in immoral acts” (73). A strength of this volume, however, is that it goes beyond this critique to offer tools for questioning common assumptions and developing creative solutions informed by alternative imaginaries—even while operating within a field of practice that continues to be shaped by colonial histories and unbalanced power.

While many conflict transformation practitioners cite the need and importance of values-based peacebuilding, there are far fewer voices addressing how to identify the values that should guide peace and justice initiatives, and how to systematically develop a values-based practice. Filling this gap, Reina Neufeldt’s thoughtful volume on applied ethics delivers a surplus of insight for students, educators, and practitioners.

Eastern Mennonite University

JOHONNA TURNER
Book Reviews


As the Second World War ended, not only were countries across Europe—Germany in particular—physically destroyed but the people had also been damaged in body and soul. An ecumenical church leader from Switzerland, Adolf Keller, traveled to the United States to report on the huge needs in Europe. Already in 1942 he had asked: “Who will re-educate a young generation which has thrown away former values and sits in a dark vacuum?” (34).

Christians in North America saw both needs “of offering humanitarian relief and spiritual renewal” (4). James C. Enns’s monograph is based on his dissertation—his bibliography contains more than 400 titles—and has a clear structure. In five chapters Enns describes different Christian groups who helped suffering people in Europe, especially in West Germany. These groups tried to educate the Germans in democratic practices and also helped them to recover the heritage of the Reformation.

The ecumenical movement worked together with the traditional Protestant churches. “Bread First, Catechisms Later!” (53) was one slogan. CRALOG, an ecumenical coalition of different American relief agencies, worked together with the Protestant relief agency “Evangelisches Hilfswerk” and the domestic mission agency “Innere Mission.” The smaller churches also benefited and received help to meet the “material and spiritual needs of postwar Germany” (51). North Americans also wanted to democratize the Protestant state churches, the “Landeskirchen.”

The radical stream of the Reformation was represented by the Mennonites and the Baptists. The North American relief organization Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) contacted German Mennonites and “used their German congregations as bases from which to reach out to the wider German populace” (61). Consequently, 10 percent of MCC’s relief aid was delivered to German Mennonites while 90 percent was distributed to the general German population “without institutional prejudice” (68). One aim of the North American Mennonites was “helping European churches organize a visible peace witness in the face of escalating Cold War policies of military deterrence” (61). To foster this renewal in spiritual life, MCC supported the establishment of the German-language Bienenberg Bible School in Switzerland. The Baptists operated sixteen “feeding programs, fourteen of which were specifically for members of Baptist congregations” (79). Baptist World Relief helped reconstruct churches and supported theological institutions such as the Baptist seminary in Hamburg, the publishing house in Kassel (79), and a new seminary in Switzerland at Rüschlikon (85).

Para-church mission organizations, such as Youth for Christ (YFC), also came from the United States and Canada. Enns labels them “Conservative Evangelical Missions.” Their aims were “Personal Revival and Democratic Freedom” (103). These missions sought out and worked with students at universities in Germany, such as the Free University in West Berlin, which were surrounded by the communist German Democratic Republic. “Besides saving one’s soul, American
conservative evangelicals believed that ‘inviting Christ into your life’ fostered the personal freedoms of democracy, thus immunizing people against Communism” (104). YFC had an “anti-Communist rhetoric,” a close association with US military servicemen, and an “American flavour” (106). It organized “crusades” and regarded Germany as a spiritual “battleground” (111). YFC missionaries were “not only ambassadors of American revivalism, but also apostles of American pop culture” (118). They used a musical style popular on radio and a choreography popular on television.

From YFC emerged two other types of mission agencies important for Germany. The Janz Team Ministries (JTM) had a Mennonite background, arriving from the Canadian prairies and bringing mass evangelism to the cities of Germany (123). JTM began as a gospel music quartet of three brothers: Leo, Hildor, and Adolph Janz, plus Cornie Enns, the father of the book’s author. In the summer of 1951 they came to Germany with YFC for a three-month-long ministry. At the end of the 1950s JTM returned to Germany to undertake their own kind of mission. They conducted their evangelistic efforts through radio broadcasts; a periodical, paper, Der Ruf; and mass campaigns. They settled in Lörrach close to Switzerland and worked in the German language for over two decades. JTM only went into towns where local congregations invited them.

The most controversial and famous North American missionary was the Baptist preacher Billy Graham (chapter 4). Graham initially came to Europe with YFC Ministries but soon built up his own mission agency. Between 1954 and 1970 Graham went to Germany five times. In 1954, 30,000 people attended his rally in a football stadium in Düsseldorf and in the same year 80,000 people gathered with him in the Olympic Stadium in Berlin. Public opinion in Germany was divided. Some thought he was a gifted preacher; others called him a “Showmaster” or “God’s Well-Organized Machine Gun” (146f). At the beginning of his ministries in Germany, Graham divided the world into two camps: “Western culture, which had its foundation on the Bible and Christian revival” and “atheistic Communism . . . motivated by the devil” (152). In later years Graham “moderated his anti-Communist rhetoric” (153). “By playing a key role in the formation of Evangelikaler (Evangelical) identity, Graham was giving a group of German Protestants a new way of understanding their Reformation heritage” (175). This led to the “watershed” meeting of the International Congress on World Evangelization (ICOWE) in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1974 (176).

Thus Enns concentrates his review on the years 1945 to 1974, although he offers some observations on the period between 1974 and 1990. The great merit of Enns’s account is that he differentiates among the missionary movements from North America to West Germany in the postwar era: the ecumenical movement; the Mennonite and Baptist missions; and the para-church mission agencies. Enns does not look only at one group in isolation; he shows parallel developments in historical context, so that one can compare the state churches (Landeskirchen), the believers’ church (Freikirchen,) and the evangelical (Evangelikale) movements across decades.

But there are also some deficiencies to note. There were, for example, other important Mennonite activities after World War II than those which Enns presents.
For instance, groups of “PAX men” came to Germany as volunteers to build houses for refugees and conduct youth work among German Mennonites. With the Trainee Exchange Program of Mennonite Central Committee, German volunteers went to North America for one year and returned with new ideas, strengthened in their faith and Mennonite identity. MCC published a periodical, Der Mennonit, every month. Additionally, a periodical for youth, Junge Gemeinde, and a Mennonite yearbook, Mennonitisches Jahrbuch, were published. Enns does not recognize these as important German-language periodicals for German Mennonites. It would have been good if a proofreader proficient in German had read Enns’s book before publication and corrected frequent language flaws.

Nevertheless, James C. Enns has done a great service by describing what happened in postwar West Germany through the efforts to renew its democracy and Christianity. It seems that his heart beats most warmly for the kind of mission the Janz Team Ministries from Canada undertook, albeit in a modern and modified way. Based on a perspective held by the “Deutsche Evangelische Allianz” (German Evangelical Alliance), Enns compares this approach with other mission activities and thereby documents the relationship of North American missions to the development of evangelistic-revivalistic faith in West Germany as well as to several of the German free churches, and extending to the state churches of Germany.
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