This double issue commemorates the 50th anniversary of *Mennonite Life*, which began publication in January 1946. At the age of 50, *Mennonite Life* has undergone a reorganization of editorial staff and a return to its roots in terms of editorial content. Readers will see more of these changes in the upcoming September issue.

This issue looks back over the last 50 years by reprinting certain characteristic articles from the five decades of the journal's existence. There is no way to represent all of the many facets of *Mennonite Life*'s content through the years, but these reprinted articles give a few glimpses of the varied and changing focus of attention over half a century.

We begin with a new essay by Wynn M. Goering, academic dean at Bethel College, on trends and patterns in *Mennonite Life*'s fifty years. Goering has led the way in reorganizing the journal's administration and inspiring vision for the future.

"Active or Passive Christianity" by Cornelius Krahn was the lead article in the first issue of *Mennonite Life*, setting the tone for the new journal. Krahn has led the way in reorganizing the journal's administration and inspiring vision for the future.

"Destruction and Reconstruction of Mennonite Churches in Holland" by S. H. N. Gorter also comes from the first issue of January 1946. Gorter was, at the time, pastor of the Mennonite church in Rotterdam and active in Dutch Mennonite relief work.

"The Mennonite Community at Meade" by J. W. Fretz, from the July 1951 issue, is a sample from a long series of articles in the 1950s profiling Mennonite communities throughout North America. These articles described prominent families, schools, churches, farms, businesses, and homes with a sense of accomplishment and future promise. Fretz was professor of sociology at Bethel College and later became president of Conrad Grebel College in Waterloo, Ontario.

"What of Mennonite Broadcasting?" from the July 1952 issue consists of four short opinion pieces nicely illustrating the different perspectives of Mennonite groups contributing to *Mennonite Life*.

"Where Have All the Lovers Gone?" by Vincent Harding illustrates the strong impact of the 1960s, even on *Mennonite Life*. Harding was at the time professor of history at Spelman College.

"H. R. Voth: Ethnologist" by Fred Eggan, from the June 1982 issue, illustrates another prominent focus of *Mennonite Life*'s attention, missions and missionaries. Eggan is a (non-Mennonite) researcher of Hopi culture.

John Ruth's poem "Lecture for a Limited Audience" from the March 1983 issue exemplifies all too briefly the fine arts interests of *Mennonite Life*. Ruth is well known as an author, film maker, and pastor from Harleysville, Pennsylvania.

"Dying to be Pure: The Martyr Story" by Melvin Goering, from the December 1992 issue, was written in response to James C. Juhnke's play about the martyr Dirk Willems, "Dirk's Exodus." Goering's essay, in addition to continuing the arts theme, represents *Mennonite Life*'s commitment to debating theological and ethical issues in a Mennonite context. Goering, a former philosophy professor, is CEO of Prairie View, Inc., a Mennonite-related mental health center in Newton, Kansas.

*Mennonite Life* has traditionally published an annual Mennonite Bibliography, attempting to apprise its readers of recently published material of interest to Mennonite studies. The first bibliography, from the April 1947 issue, comprised a page and a half and is reprinted here. Then follows the 1996 edition of the bibliography, 8 pages in much smaller type, compiled by Barbara A. Thiesen, Technical Services Librarian and Co-director of Libraries at Bethel College.

This issue also includes several new book reviews, another long-standing *Mennonite Life* feature. These reviews come from our considerable backlog awaiting publication.

At this 50 year anniversary, we have also compiled a 50 year cumulative index. Since this index is much too large to publish in an issue of the journal, it is available as a separate volume for $10.00. Please contact us if you want a copy.

John D. Thiesen
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It's a scholarly truism that the most important date in any book is the date of its publication. Historians, theologians, philosophers, poets—we are all, ineluctably, creatures of our times. So it is that the articles reprinted in this 50th anniversary issue of *Mennonite Life* bear the peculiar imprints of their days. The marks are clear and easily discernible through the lens of time.

But if you start at the beginning of *Mennonite Life*, with the first edition of January 1946, and page through all 197 issues to the present one, you sense also something unchanging. *Mennonite Life* has a fundamental personality, a set of passions and habits of mind that have characterized it from its inception. Some of these traits are predictable, while others are surprising and counter-intuitive.

1. From the start, *Mennonite Life* was an immodest undertaking.

The frontispiece of the very first issue informed readers that *Mennonite Life* would be “published in the interest of the best in the religious, social, and economic phases of Mennonite culture” (emphases added). Part of striving for the best, certainly, was to involve the great minds of the Mennonite world: C. Henry Smith, H. A. Fast, J. C. Wenger and H. S. Bender, to list some of the more prominent contributors to the first volume. Another part of that interest was the effort to build up the fellowship. Thus when J. E. Hartzler wrote, in an article on “Philosophy in the Mennonite Tradition” (April 1948), that “Mennonite philosophy is a good philosophy,” he was performing an act of encouragement rather than critique.

At other moments, though, the best of Mennonite culture in *Mennonite Life* has been asserted with a moral earnestness bordering on arrogance. John C. Wenger’s explanation of “Basic Issues of Nonconformity” in January 1954, outlined our need “to remain humble exponents of nonresistance and nonconformity,” lest we “sink down to the level of a lukewarm twentieth-century Christendom.” Ecumenicism, beware! Four decades later this peculiar mixture of humility and hubris persists in *Mennonite Life*, though not perhaps in such obvious forms.

2. *Mennonite Life* has always been aggressive.

In his inaugural editorial, Cornelius Krahn characterized Anabaptists as an “active and aggressive force” in the divine drama of salvation. For Krahn, that meant that *Mennonite Life* should present “the problems of our churches and communities of the past and present—both here and abroad,” for “we have no choice but to confront them.”

Initially *Mennonite Life* showed a preference for first-person accounts of activism, starting with Albert Gaeddert’s query, “What Have We Learned from Civilian Public Service?” (June 1946). Experiences with racism suffused the 1960s: Anna Marie Peterson, a senior at Bethel College, described her year at Spelman College in Atlanta in the article, “I Attended a School for Negro Women” (January 1961); two other Bethel students, David Janzen and Kay Peters, reported on their adventures in “Students Protest in Washington, D.C.” (April 1962); and Vincent Harding, then a member of the History Department at Spelman College, provided a sobering look at justice and nonviolence in “Where Have All the Lovers Gone?” (January 1967). Later volumes reflect a more scholarly approach, but the tone of purposeful aggressiveness remains. Keith Sprunger’s article in an issue focusing on Vietnam, “Learning the Wrong Lessons” (April 1968), or James Juhnke’s bi-centennial article, “Revolution Without Independence” (September 1976), show that the lessons of history can be equally as powerful as the lessons of personal experience, when confronting “the problems of our churches and communities.”

3. *Mennonite Life* has always been prescient.

“Prescient—to have knowledge of actions or events before they occur.” How else to account for Cornelius Krahn’s assertion, which preceded not only satellites, fax machines, and the World Wide Web, but television itself, that “modern means of communication have thrown all the problems of the world into our compact and confined Mennonite churches and communities” (January 1946)? Or C. E. Krebbiel’s complaint about the third-floor location of the chapel in the Administration Building of Bethel College—that it “is a serious handicap to invalid church members”—some forty-five years before the Americans with Disabilities Act? (And 48 years before the actual installation of an elevator in the building, scheduled for completion this September!) Or the discussion of media and the Mennonite church in “What of Mennonite Broadcasting,” in July 1952? Or Vernon Neufeld’s ideas on “Inter-Mennonite Cooperation,” in April 1963?
Not quite so uncanny, but still of interest, are the individual contributions that foreshadow distinguished Mennonite careers. Gordon Kaufman, whose body of theological work will be feted in a symposium at Bethel College this November, made his first scholarly contribution to Mennonite Life in October 1953, the ink barely dry on his doctoral degree from Yale. “Mennonite Mobility and the Christian Calling” (January 1964) was an early example of the Mennonite demographic studies for which Leland Harder would become known. And when Albert J. Meyer, then Professor of Physics and academic dean at Bethel College, wrote the article entitled, “Needed: A Mennonite Philosophy of Higher Education” in January of 1962, he could not have known of the course on which he would later embark with the Mennonite Board of Education, dedicated to articulating just such a creed.

4. Mennonite Life has always striven to be inclusive.

Within the boundaries imposed by the category, Mennonite Life has been both eclectic and progressive. The first two issues in 1946 featured Mennonite groups from the Amish to the General Conference in eight different countries. Over 50 writers from Europe, Canada, and America, were listed as “Contributing Editors.” Three of the writers in the first issue were women.

(Cornelius Krahn’s devotion to inclusiveness sometimes bordered on the obsessive, and resulted in some startling editorial contrasts. A January 1962 issue devoted to higher education in the Mennonite world also featured two articles on Amish communities in Nebraska!)

5. Mennonite Life has always been intellectually demanding.

Mennonite Life has never written down to its audience. Though not intended as an academic journal, it has nonetheless assumed a very high order of intellectual curiosity and scholarly discipline. Harold Gross’s article, “Reflections on Kant and the Mennonites” in July 1946, was the first of many to make significant intellectual demands on its readers. “What We Found in Moundridge” was a careful attempt by Bethel College economics professor J. Lloyd Spaulding and his “Contemporary Community” class to make some statistically valid observations about the differences between Mennonites and other residents of the town (July 1952). The annual Mennonite bibliography (which first appeared in April 1947) and the book reviews (which began to be a regular feature in 1950), continue to be resources for lay and professional interests alike.

6. Finally, Mennonite Life has always been passionate.

Though it’s not a prominent word in the Mennonite lexicon, “passion” is indeed the sentiment that makes itself felt in every issue of Mennonite Life. Cornelius Krahn set the tone that has been maintained in the magazine ever since. A year ago this summer, the editors and staff members of Mennonite Life got together to discuss the magazine’s future. Subscriptions had been declining, publication costs had been rising, and everyone felt the pressures of lives already beset by other volunteer duties. We asked ourselves whether Mennonite Life was worth continuing.

You see by this issue, of course, that our answer was “yes”—for the simple reason that we, too, are passionate about “the interest of the best of Mennonite culture.” In subsequent issues we’ll be inaugurating a new editorial board and a slightly different format, as the magazine attempts to remain fresh and relevant. But in the final analysis, Mennonite Life at 50 will be the same magazine it has always been in the most important of ways—the way of the heart. As William Wordsworth expressed it:

My heart leaps up when I behold
A rainbow in the sky:
So was it when my life began;
So is it now I am a man:
So be it when I shall grow old,
Or let me die!

Mennonite Life is not ready to die just yet. We invite you to join us in the task Cornelius Krahn beheld some 50 years ago: to “make a contribution to a greater and more abundant realization of ‘Mennonite life’ as it should be.”
Active or Passive Christianity

By CORNELIUS KRAHN

The Oberammergau Passion Play is not unique. Similar plays were quite common throughout the Middle Ages. They depicted a phase of the life of Christ and were presented in churches. With the addition of worldly elements they were banned from the churches and were continued in the market square.

The presentation of the life of Christ or any phase of salvation in a drama is symbolic. It expresses a certain concept of Christianity which is common even today. Not only in Oriental, but also in some Western churches display, liturgy, and formalism are essential parts of Christianity.

Christianity of the Middle Ages was passive. The Christian was a spectator of a divine drama. Without wishing to be irreverent, let us illustrate it like this: God is the stage manager, Christ and the divine host are the actors, Christians are the audience. God created the world and man. Through sin the fellowship between God and man was broken. To atone the sins and restore the fellowship God sent His Son. In this divine drama, man is more or less passive. Even Luther and Calvin did not entirely rid themselves of this concept of Christianity. In Dante’s Divine Comedy, Milton’s Paradise Lost, and Klopstock’s Messiah, we find the same theme. It consists of the prehistoric fall of the angels and the historic fall of Adam and Eve (Act I), and the restoration of man’s original state (Act II). This theme is the center of worship, meditation, philosophy, and literature. In modern times Anglo-Saxon Christianity has made out of the Second Coming of Christ, a third act of this drama. The stage is set for the final act. The play is coming to a close. There is a hush, a suspense before the curtain falls at the close of the last act.

What is the Mennonite attitude toward the divine drama? This question leads directly to the essence of Mennonitism. Also it may be of significance in solving some of our problems. Mennonites have seldom, if ever, been passive onlookers, but for divine or human entertainment. They were too practical and time was too precious for that. They were orthodox in their belief in the divine plan of salvation. For them Christianity was less a matter of thinking and contemplation, and more a matter of attitudes and actions. They did not consider themselves spectators but rather co-actors in the sacred drama. As far as the third act of the drama is concerned they definitely anticipated the Second Coming of Christ; this only made them more zealous co-workers of God. The few instances in which some attempted to chart future events and set dates concerning the coming of Christ were catastrophic and sobering.

Thus, the essence of Mennonitism was unique. It emphasized strongly that Christianity is an active and aggressive force in a world of sin. The early Anabaptists dug through the rubble of tradition until they believed to have reached that true foundation of which Paul writes: “Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” It was their desire as co-workers of God to build on this foundation free from debris “gold, silver, and precious stones.” They testified in word, deed, and blood in public debates, in the markets, in cathedrals, in courtrooms, in universities, wherever they went. Every member was a missionary; every man an actor in the divine drama. This is exemplified by the testimony of a Catholic persecutor who remarked to an Anabaptist martyr in a prison cell, “Before you join your church you cannot distinguish between ‘a’ and ‘b’, afterwards you know the Bible better than we theologians.” This knowledge of the Bible, coupled with the aggressive spirit of testimony which found expression in consecrated living, accounts for the rapid spread of Anabaptism, in spite of severe persecution.

Is Mennonitism today still the aggressive force we have been describing? If not, why did it become passive? Because of its unique concept of Christianity, Anabaptism found itself in contradiction to existing churches, social, and civic institutions. The medieval idea that God was ruling His universe with the help of His two arms—the church and the government—prevailed even during and after the Reformation. Any new arm (church) was immediately amputated as a pseudo arm. According to the Anabaptists, the government had no right to interfere with the inner life of a church. The “established churches,” naturally, did not object; they had been established by the government. For this reason early Anabaptism, severely persecuted and deprived of its trained intellectual leaders, became a movement of peasants and the lower middle class. Therefore today, with the exception of the Netherlands, the Mennonites are still predominantly rural. Like the saints of the Middle Ages, who went into the deserts to save their own souls, Mennonites settled in uninhabited countries to find religious liberty and to preserve the true spirit of Christianity. Sometimes their withdrawal may have resulted in being an end in itself and have become a matter of self-preservation. But, as the monks would join the world in distress and tribulation to acknowledge their solidarity with a world in sin and serve it in
a Christian spirit, so would Mennonite communities as a rule perform their Christian duties and obligations. Also, they were quietly testifying to the surrounding world by demonstrating what a Christian community can achieve in solving religious, social, cultural, and economic problems.

It is true, the Mennonite "ark of Noah" has never been perfect. Too often it anchored in a quiet, peaceful port instead of doing its mission on the high sea. How did we become complacent? Severe persecution forced the Mennonites to withdraw from the world to till the soil in quietness. Their strength is at once their weakness. This is the route by which we became passive on-lookers.

How can a passive Christian become active? Time is playing into our hands. The "Chinese wall" that surrounded us is gone. Modern means of communication have thrown all the problems of the world into our compact and confined Mennonite churches and communities. We have no choice but to confront them. How are we going to solve them? Many solutions, other than the traditional ones, are being offered to our young people. We could not, and would not isolate them from proposed solutions, but we certainly cannot afford to withhold from them our own answers to these problems.

Formerly all doves were kept secure in the ark surrounded by a world flooded with sin. Here an atmosphere was developed which instilled the characteristics and beliefs of the church into all of its members without much discussion or consciousness of it. Today the situation is different. The windows of the ark are open. Many a dove leaves without ever returning. It escapes into the world instead of from the world. But it may still be escaping the problems it confronts.

Together we have to realize what the mission of our Christian church is and how we can fulfill it best. We have to be fully acquainted with the trends of today and tomorrow, but we must also know what the essence and characteristics of our church were yesterday. Analyzing the past and the present will enable us to point out which way will lead to what goal. When a farmer wishes to make a straight furrow he must have a goal in line with the point from which he started. Looking back, we find that the early Mennonites started out on the solid foundation, "Jesus Christ, the same, yesterday, today, and forever."

This is the foundation upon which we wish to present in Mennonite Life the problems of our churches and communities of the past and present,—both here and abroad. Only thus, with the help of God, can we make a contribution to a greater and more abundant realization of Mennonite life "as it should be."

I only thank and to the Angels Listen

I wonder how it felt to hear the story
In later years of pilgrimage on earth
That angel voices resonant with "Glory!" Proclaimed salvation's coming at Thy birth.
I wonder how it felt—when through the ages
The hosts of angels worshiped at Thy feet
And from eternal time to years unending
The great hallelujahs Thy presence greet.

I wonder how it felt to know that shepherds Came kneeling to Thy lovely manger-bed;
That far across a desert, lit with starlight,
The wise men came to crown Thee King instead.
I wonder how it felt—when all around Thee
There was no room like once in Bethlehem,
No room in hearts so dark, so sin infected,
And in Thyself lay power to heal all men.

I wonder how it felt to be a stranger
Within a world by Thy creation lost;
Where foxes have their holes and birds their nest build.
But for the Son of Man no place to rest.
I wonder how it felt to walk through corn fields
And he rebuked for pitching a few ears.
When having kept the covenant of promise
To feed earth's creatures to their end of years,
I wonder how it felt to be rejected,
To find so few that loved Thee in return
To hear the multitudes in anger shouting
While strong compassion in Thy heart did burn.
I wonder how it felt to be so emptied
So stripped upon a cross at last to die—
When legions of Thy mighty unseen armies
By one command of Thee would have drowned nigh.

I cannot know the currents of emotion
That stirred Thy heart in pilgrimage on earth.
I only thank for that first Christmas morn—
That gave Thee to us—Savior at thy birth.
I only thank and to the angels listen
I worship kneeling at the manger
O God! I'll spread the glorious truths afar.
—Joanna S. Andres
Destruction and Re-construction of Mennonite Churches in Holland

By S. H. N. GORTER

The God of heaven, he will prosper us; therefore, we his servants will arise and build. (Nehemiah 2:20)

During the years of war the Dutch people have suffered severely and have endured great hardships. The Mennonite brotherhood had its share of suffering. Reading the reports from the various congregations, one is impressed by the great number of brothers and sisters who perished in this time of distress. In my own church, at Rotterdam, I recently completed the list of members for the last half year. The number of those who died was large. Many of the people did not survive the period of starvation. Humanly speaking, they were carried to the grave too early, and this has been the case in all urban churches in the western part of the country. But it is even more lamentable that so many from almost all our churches—have had to die an unnatural death, because of the war in general, bombings, and deportations to Germany. More than a hundred of our brothers have perished in the concentration camps. Among them are two of our ministers Rev. Albert Keuter, The Hague, and Rev. Andre du Croix, Winschoten, and a student from our Theological Seminary, Wieger Smit. Some were executed because of their "underground" activities during the German occupation. Among them was a student Gysbert Gorter. Everywhere in our congregation are wounded hearts and our only comfort is the faith, that even that which we do not understand has its place in the plan and work of God.

In comparison to all these sufferings, the material losses are insignificant, and yet they affect our life and even our religious life. We Protestants do not consider our churches as the only places to worship God. We know that a real fellowship with Him is possible without them and that as Mennonites we do not look for large buildings and splendors in our churches. Yet they are the centers of our faith and congregational activities where together we experience in a special way the nearness of God, His Word, His Calling and His Grace. When we lose these old familiar places of worship or when they are damaged, we consider it a great loss. Generations before erected the buildings in honor of God, and we feel a lack in our worship when they are gone.

In this respect too we have suffered. Four churches were completely destroyed and several more were damaged. The first one that was destroyed was the church at Wageningen, located in the middle of our country in the hills of the Rhine. When the Germans invaded the country on May 10, 1940, this city was in the zone of fighting. The church located...
Mennonite Church of Rotterdam with beautifully carved pulpit.

No splinter of the organ and pulpit of the Rotterdam Church was left.

The Mennonite Church of Rotterdam had a fine pipeorgan.
outside of the city, was hit and nothing but ruin remains. It was a friendly little church. The Mennonite congregation of Wageningen is young and active, and under the leadership of Rev. B. Dufour it made plans to rebuild the church. Fortunately, this did not materialize because in 1945 Wageningen experienced much heavier destruction than before. This time the parsonage, also was completely destroyed. Meanwhile the congregation has been meeting in the laboratory of the agricultural school. I once preached in this surrounding and was peculiarly impressed when asked to preach in a laboratory, surrounded by blackboards, water and gas faucets, and other scientific equipment.

In those days we were struck even harder. The Germans moved westward and approached Rotterdam south of the Meuse river. Hitler's blitz, however, did not break the will of resistance. Rotterdam was no easy prey. The bridge across the Meuse river, defended by the Dutch marines, was a hindrance to the Germans. The German high command used a terrible weapon to set an example of warning to the other cities. Rotterdam was bombed. At noon Tuesday, May 14, 1940, hundreds of bombers came toward our city and dropped thousands of incendiary bombs. Within an hour and a half, old Rotterdam was a pile of rubble, and some of our sections of the city were also destroyed. Thousands of refugees were escaping from the burning city.

It was at this time that our church was destroyed. This was not only a great loss to our congregation but, also, to the Brotherhood as a whole. We cherished our church. It had been built in 1755 out of the legacy of the brothers Jan and Pieter Bisshop. Unchanged for years, the church had been a place of worship; and according to the practice of those days, it was located in the inner side of a block of old Rotterdam, where it was quiet. Whosoever entered the church, coming from the lively business section of our city, was surrounded by an atmosphere of quiet and worship. Our church was built with an appreciation of art in a baroque style. The pulpit was beautifully carved, and the pipe organ was very valuable. In the church council room were many pictures of the former pastors of the congregation. We had modernly equipped rooms for religious education and smaller meetings.

At noon, May 15, I found my way through the smoking and smelling rubble to the place where the church once stood. On the way I always hoped that our beautiful church would have been spared, but now I saw the four bare walls with the holes where formerly the high windows had been.

Many times I have returned to the ruins. Often I have looked for some remnant—a splinter of wood from the pulpit or from the organ—but it was in vain. Nothing was left. Everything had been blown to bits. And now the place where the church stood can hardly be recognized. The walls have been torn down and leveled. When one of the Canadian Mennonites [C. F. Klassen?] who in former years had so much admired the church at the St. Laurens Straat, came to Rotterdam, we did not repeat the unpleasant pilgrimage to the ruins of our church.

Since then the Mennonite congregation of Rotterdam has been moving from place to place for worshiping. For a while we met in the "Noorsche Kerk," but this church too was bombed. Then we met in a hospital, which later was taken over by the Germans. We met for a while in a school building but this too was taken. We met in other churches and halls and are now temporarily meeting in a museum, where we have a nice room at our disposal. Naturally, we cannot stay here very long. The life of the congregation continues undisturbed. Again and again the members find each other for fellowship, no matter how often we change the location. However, it is difficult, and we long to have our own church building. We have a number of plans. We had nine architects make blue prints for a new building, and from two (one made by a brother of the church) we shall choose one. But we realize that the building projects will not be completed for years. We realize also that we will not have what we had. In the old building we found an atmosphere of century-old piety; but we hope that a younger generation will possess a treasure in the new church which we lost in the old one.

It was to be expected that the old city Vlissingen (Flushing) would have to bring great sacrifices during the war. It is located at the approaches to the city of Antwerp and has a large shipyard. Right next to the cranes stood the Mennonite church, built during the nineteenth century in old Dutch architectural style, with beautiful gables. The pulpit was on the long side of the church so that the congregation was sitting in a semi-circle around the minister. For a long time the church remained unharmed, but on April 12, 1942 it was hit and destroyed and with it the building of the caretaker. The lady pastor, Rev. M. de Boer, met her congregation at various places and then regularly at the Lutheran church. Vlissingen had to endure much more. For a while almost the entire congregation lived as refugees in villages in the city of Middelburg. The real trouble came when the whole island of
Walcheren was flooded. But now most of the people are back again. Here, too, plans of building for a new church are under way but they are far from being materialized.

During the close of the war Nymegen was in the front lines for more than a half year. Among the many valuable things that were destroyed was the Mennonite Church. I must confess that I personally lost something very dear to me in that church. It was here in this plain church with its neat interior and windows which faced the inside of the church yard that I, as a little boy, was first consciously influenced by the preaching of the Gospel. Here I attended the catechism classes. It was here that I was baptized in my youth. In later years I was privileged to preach from the pulpit of this church. Thus memory is tied to this church through many reminiscences; and so it is with many others. The only remnant of the church is a small part of a gable. Under the leadership of Rev. Y. S. Baruma the congregation will erect a new building, perhaps larger than the former. Yet there is something lost that cannot be replaced.

Four churches were totally destroyed. At many other places churches were damaged to greater or lesser degrees. In modern total warfare one cannot escape and there is no security during air raids. Our country was destroyed from the south to the north. At the Belgium border the Mennonite church of Aardenburg was damaged and has been temporarily restored. In the Province of Friesland, near Witmarsum, the birthplace of Menno Simons, in Makkum, a bomb was dropped on our church, but the church could be restored. In Pingjum, where Menno Simons served as a Catholic priest,
the church, which now belongs to the Reformed is destroyed. In Waal, on the Island of Texel, in a plainly built Mennonite Church, a bombshell shattered the pulpit. The Bible, which had been on the pulpit, was found in a corner undamaged. For a long time we feared for the fate of Arnhem. As is known everywhere, there was heavy fighting in and around the city from September, 1944, to the end of the year. To a great extent the city has been destroyed; our church, however, was only slightly damaged and can be repaired. Our congregation has been meeting with its minister Rev. J. E. Tuininga, in the anteroom. The church of Ymuiden, the harbor of Amsterdam, has been looted and the beautiful organ destroyed.

Summarizing the whole of our Netherlands Brotherhood, we have cause to be thankful for many things—that our lives have been spared and that after a year of enforced separation we are united again. We can meet again, and express ourselves freely. The Algemeene Doopsgezinde Societeit (General Conference of Mennonites in Holland) is making plans for great work to be done. It has chosen a new leader in Rev. C. Nijdam.

Meanwhile there are many material losses that have to be restored. The destruction of numerous buildings and thousands of dwellings in the entire country is so great that we can expect little help from government and people. In this respect we must rely entirely on ourselves. That is not bad, because the common need and mutual help cannot otherwise but revive and strengthen the spiritual life of the Brotherhood. Already at all places money is being collected for the Emergency Fund that has been created by the Algemeene Doopsgezinde Societeit. Even from the smallest churches significant contributions have come in. But if one considers that we need a million guilders ($500,000, estimated roughly) for reconstructing the churches only, it is evident that we have hardly begun. Besides all the other obligations which our international Mennonite Brotherhood has to fulfill these days, it will, no doubt, lend willing ears and hands to the Dutch brethren in their reconstruction project. This was our trust during the time of suffering throughout the years of war.

We Mennonites have scattered all over the world throughout the centuries, and yet we have found each other again and again. It is true, we meet as those who differ, but not strangers. God has kept a tie between us and He brings Mennonites together in a reviving way even in our day. To be a part of the great Brotherhood of Jesus Christ, in which each one in his way can fulfill his duty, in a world of displacement, is a source of comfort and strength which comes from God.

Editor's Note. This article is a free translation from the Dutch. The writer of it has for many years been active in the Dutch Mennonite Emergency Relief Board, helping displaced Mennonites, especially from Russia. Upon request Reverend Gorter sent us this valuable, vivid, first-hand information concerning the destruction of Mennonite churches in Holland and plans for their reconstruction. Through the efforts of Rev. W. Koekebakker and Rev. H. S. N. Gorter we were able to present to our readers the first pictures showing some Mennonite churches of Holland before and after they were destroyed by bombs. Those who wish to help our Dutch Brethren in their reconstruction project should forward their gifts to the Mennonite Central Committee, Akron, Pennsylvania.

Flooding Walcheren Island

By M. de BOER

Editor's Note. This is first-hand information on the disaster that was brought to a Dutch island in modern, total warfare. The Mennonite Churches referred to are those of Vlissingen (Flushing), a significant port and industrial center, and Middelburg, the capital of the Province of Zeeland. It happens that both of these pastors are women, which is common among the Mennonites in Holland. This account was published in the August issue of the Elspeetse Brief and is abbreviated here in free translation.

When the Allies were invading "fortress Europe," Antwerp, one of the significant approaches which was heavily fortified by the Germans, had to be taken. To break the German position on Walcheren Island, the Royal Air Force blasted the dikes and flooded the island.

Things began to happen here in Walcheren early in September, 1944, with indescribable confusion. One evacuation decree followed another, un-
THE GEORGE I. REMPEL FAMILY, MEADE.

The children in the order of age are: Margaret 24, Herman 22, Willie 21, John 19, Edwin 17, Pete 16, Walter 14, Eldon 12, Irma 10, Marilyn 8, Donald 6, Ilene 4, Helen 2 (not on picture).

THE Mennonite Community at Meade

BY J. W. FRETZ

The visitor to the Meade, Kansas, Mennonite community is likely to be impressed by four or five pronounced characteristics.

Characteristics

First is the impression that the Mennonite settlement is very compact, spelling group solidarity. Second, as the visitor becomes acquainted with the people and their homes, he will note the characteristically large farm families. A third impression is the unique pattern of dual farming. Not only do practically all of the farmers raise cattle and grain, but it seems as if every farmer has a side line in the form of a shop, small factory, commercial enterprises.
cial service or part-time job in town. A fourth noticeable characteristic is the dominance of the church in the community. It is the focal point of all activity in the community. It is literally and figuratively the source of the community’s strength, the repository of its best ideas, the very fountain of its collective life. Finally, the visitor is impressed with the way the community holds its youth. The Mennonites have their own high school and thus control the character of their secondary educational system in which their young people are trained. Few Meade young people go to college. Most of them find jobs locally or are provided with farms where they settle down in homes of their own not far from their parents.

There is a certain colonial frontier pattern of settlement reflected in the Meade area. Families seem to be settled in kinship groups. As one drives through the settlement under the guidance of such a well-informed and promising young community leader as Henry Loewen he is told that in this area live the Reimers, there the Loewens, beyond the Bartels, the Friesens, the Rempels, the Wiens, the Edigers and others. This settlement by families is due to the larger tracts of land which the early settlers bought and then divided for their sons and sons-in-law. There is still much of the atmosphere, flavor, and appearance of the open prairies. Trees are found only around the homesteads and buildings.

The Mennonite settlement is located ten to twenty miles south of Meade running in an east-west direction.

Dave Classen’s Country Store is a farm service center. Wheat harvesting in the Meade area with large combine.
At the present time the settlement expansion is in a northward and eastward direction. As one drives south from the town of Meade, he can see both the Cimarron River and the hills of northern Oklahoma. Here and there a number of the original settlers are still living on the homes they acquired forty-five years ago.

Among the oldest of the residents is Peter F. Rempel, one of the first two Mennonite settlers, now seventy-six years of age. He is still on his original farm and occupies himself by carving hundreds of birds and farm animals and other toys out of wood. He claims one hundred twenty-five direct descendants, most of them living in the Meade community.

At the time he came to Meade, all the land was in the form of vast ranches. Only a few small ranch houses dotted the landscape at great intervals. The ranchers had homesteaded, but were glad to sell to the Mennonites who came to establish their families and settle down to growing wheat and raising families. Rempel moved to Meade in September of 1906 along with the Jacob B. Friesen family, both from Jansen, Nebraska. The Mennonites introduced winter wheat into this part of Kansas, and later also introduced motor power in farming. It is claimed that the Loewen Brothers used the first wheat combine east of the Rocky Mountains. The mammoth machine had a 30-foot cutting bar and was pulled by a steam engine. Wheat is now the chief cash crop on all Mennonite farms in the area with cattle second. In recent years oil and gas booms have come to the southern half of Meade County where the Mennonites are located. Almost all of their land is now leased for oil or gas.

Rural Industries

Nowhere else in the United States or Canada has the writer found so many shops and industries located on farms as in the Meade, Kansas community. Almost all of these enterprises are operated in addition to farming. They provide a useful service to the community, steady
employment to the farmers and their growing sons, and provide supplemental cash income for the families. To the casual observer it may appear as though the garage or machine shop on the farm is used exclusively for the mechanical work done on the individual farm, but upon investigation one finds complete sets of machinery, and completely-equipped places of business equal to the smaller shops found in towns and cities. If one is present during the week, he discovers that they are well patronized by customers from near and far.

One of the earliest of the machine shops established was that of George J. Rempel who lives four miles east and three south of Meade. He came to Meade in 1906 with his father. In 1924 he married Marie Friesen, daughter of Abraham H. Friesen. In 1927 he moved on his present half-section of land and began his general auto repair work a year later. He started in auto mechanics by working in his father's repair shop draining crank cases in old model-T Fords and learning the trade of blacksmithing. As cars began to appear and horses disappear, he shifted from blacksmithing to mechanics. At the present time Rempel has a fine large concrete-block structure, fully equipped to do all kinds of motor overhauling and repairing on tractors and cars. He employs two boys in addition to himself. Besides the work on the garage, the family farms three quarter sections of land, most of it in wheat. The Rempels have a family of thirteen children. Herman, 22, and John, 19, help their father; Willie, 21, is in voluntary service in California while Margaret, the oldest daughter, spent some time in voluntary service at the MCC Brooklane Farm, Maryland. Although not all families are as large as Rempels, families of five to eight children are common throughout the Meade community. The high birth rate of Mennon-
ites in the Meade area is also reflected in the large number of children in churches and Sunday school on Sunday morning.

Other rural shops and small industries on farms are Dick Klassen's and Alfred Friesen's repair shop; and Henry L. Friesen's machine shop; Dick Friesen's auto repair shop; and the Friesen Brothers windmill company, operated by Cornie and Henry. This company specializes in erecting the Fairbury windmills and doing general household plumbing. The Friesens with Pete Bartel are now engaged in drilling wells.

Henry L. Isaac has a splendidly-equipped and well-kept wood-working shop in which he specializes more in cabinet work and general finishing. Peter J. Rempel and sons, Henry and Edward, build houses and farm buildings; Klass H. Reimer and his boys engage in the carpentering and building business; Henry K. Friesen operates a fleet of gasoline and oil bulk transports and hauls grain in season.

Another interesting establishment is the Classen Country Store which was started in August, 1949. At first only books were sold, later a line of groceries was added. Now the thriving little store also sells gas and has a pick-up truck which is used to make deliveries to and for his customers. The store is in the open country about a half mile from the Meade Academy. People leave cream at the store and Dave Classen takes it to town three times a week. The Classen Country Store thus becomes a genuine farmers' service center. The Singer Sewing Machine Company picks up and delivers machines for repairing at stated intervals. The gross business is about $2,000 a month, far beyond what the size of the space would indicate. The store provides fresh fruits, frozen meats and vegetables, and in the summer time becomes the watermelon center for the community bringing in truckloads at a time. Following a dual industry as all the other repair shop and contractors mentioned do, Dave Classen farms in addition to carrying on his regular business.

A Village Pattern

Among the interesting discoveries that the visitor makes is a village which might be called the Loewen-Friesen village. In this quaint settlement live H. F. Isaac, Henry L. Isaac, Isaac L. Friesen, Mrs. A. H. Friesen, one of the first settlers, Mrs. John L. Friesen, Isaac W. Loewen and Dan C. Loewen. All of these people are in the same family or kinship group. All of them are primarily dependent on farming, but a number of them specialize in some side line. Isaac L. Friesen operates a modern dairy and furnishes grade "A" milk. He is being assisted by his nephews, Lawrence and Leroy Friesen. Henry L. Isaac has a newly-equipped cabinet shop with a full line of machinery and is reputed to be a highly skilled craftsman. He started in 1932 by filing saws; gradually he got into wood working. That he is mechanically inclined is demonstrated by the ingenious toy ferris wheel which he made of scrap parts and operates with a clock spring. He made his own jigsaw out of a sewing machine, a model-A Ford water pump and some model-T Ford parts.

Isaac Loewen, another member of this village and the father of eight children, operates a farm on a rather large scale. He too, manifests a mechanical genius. Twelve years ago he bought an old 1926 model, 15-foot Case combine for $42.50. The owner thought of it as good only for junk. Loewen repaired the combine and has used it ever since. He installed an automatic oiler and greaser with parts from an old Hart Parr tractor. He put on two old B-29 airplane tires and an electric lift that can be controlled by the tractor driver by merely pressing a button. His entire combine can be greased automatically by means of tubing from a central location. Isaac Loewen generally has about ninety head of cattle, around 700 acres in pasture and 420 in cultivation. He has an automatic lift for his silage so that he need not climb into the silo and throw it out by hand. Other farmers may operate on a larger or smaller scale but Loewen's farm program is somewhat typical for his area.

Church and School

At the present time there is the Emmanuel Mennonite Church and an Evangelical Mennonite Brethren Church. The attendance at services, whether morning, afternoon or evening, is good. Christianity for these people is important and taken seriously. The register board in the Emmanuel church indicates also a high per capita Sunday school giving. On Sunday, March 18, there were 265 present with an offering of $65.16 or about twenty-five cents per person as the average contribution. On the following Sunday the attendance was 261 and the offering $84.50 for an average of about thirty-two cents. This compares favorably with the six to ten cents as the average per capita giving in most Mennonite Sunday schools.

The seriousness with which the Meade Mennonites take the matter of Christian faith and training of their youth is found manifested in the establishment and maintenance of the Meade Bible Academy whose principal at the present time is F. B. Klaassen. Four teachers are employed—Anna Regier, Andrew Claassen, and Henry and Eldona Wiebe. In the Academy all four years of high school training are provided. In addition, a specialized course in Bible and Sunday school teacher training is conducted in the evening. This course is open to all adults as well as students of high school age. Of interest is a random selection of statements from the Meade Academy student's creed. Here are several samples.

"I will not allow myself to become angry.
"I will not worry. If a thing can be helped, I will help it. If not, I will make the best of it.
"I will plan for at least a half-hour of quiet, for reflection, for prayer, for real communion with Christ.
"I will do somebody a good turn that is not expecting it of me.
“If any person does me wrong, I will not bear him a grudge. I will try to forget it.

“I will be more honest, square and prompt than business requires, more kind than charity requires, more loyal than friendship requires, more thoughtful than love requires.”

Not only have we an interesting insight as to the ideals of the Meade Academy; we have an argument for parochial education which can provide moral training and ethical ideals as well as the acquisition of mental discipline.

The Future

As Christian communities go, the Meade area seems destined to a bright future because the people put the church and her Lord very much at the center of their living and thinking. There are, however, evidences of change present which promise to make themselves felt in the future. There is pressure for expansion and the large families require additional land for the establishment of the newly-married young people. In 1939 seven or eight families moved to De Ritter, Louisiana where they settled on cut-over timber land. The price was low and it was felt that a new community might be established. By 1941 all of the families had returned, concluding that Louisiana was not the place for them. Early in 1924 five or six Meade families moved to Mexico where most of them remained and eventually assimilated with the Old Colony Mennonites.

A Double Standard?

If one will clear his mind and recognize the full implications of Scripture, he will see that this observation contains the solution to the problem of war; a solution based on this double standard of ethics: the one a measure of personal relations and the other of impersonal. In areas of fellowship the Christian is never to resist an evil person or hold malice in his heart; while as one officially delegated by the state to execute the decree of judgment against those who refuse to stay within the bounds of justice, he is not to meet the one with the one who dead the instant death of a hundred thousand people. As the bombs fall, the Christian bomb handler has a personal love in his heart for those about to die, wishing that he were dropping Bibles for their salvation rather than lethal sticks for their destruction. If he personally hates those whom he is killing, he is no longer a good citizen of heaven; God requires love from the heart under every conceivable situation; and he refuses to be the one who destroys the government has decided that unrighteousness has reached that place where it can be stopped only through such armed resistance, that he is no longer a good citizen of this earth, for the first mark of a good soldier is obedience to his commanding officer.
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The Child of Bethlehem

Christmas highlighted the Voluntary Service program in the seven camps served. The Redley Mennonite churches sponsored carol groups which sang in the Christmas program and followed with carolling throughout the camps. A Christmas film "The Child of Bethlehem," vividly portraying the Matthew and Luke accounts of the birth of Christ and his life until the age of twelve was also shown. The children of the camp participated, too, in singing Christmas carols. Large audiences attended, and together Mexican, white, negro and gypsy worshipped this Child of Bethlehem. Approximately two hundred health and sewing kits, a project sponsored by the children's paper, Words of Cheer, were given as Christmas gifts to the children and another approximately two hundred given by_Mennonite women's organizations in Redley were given to the mothers. Short-term voluntary help was used during the Christmas vacation in assisting in recreational and evening programs, decorating and equipping club rooms, and assisting, in recreational and social programs with children and adults.

The total Christmas program seemed very significant in that it brought the spiritual message of Christmas to the people, drew the various nationalities and creeds together in common worship and also increased the ties of confidence between the migrant peoples and the Voluntary Service unit.

As heretofore indicated, many migrants will again come to the San Joaquin Valley, and to the west Fresno County area, for the cotton picking season this year. One is gratified to note the increasing interest and action on the part of growers and public bodies in providing better services. For immediate needs, the Department of Health is developing extension services and the public school system is also planning extension services in recreation. In one community an $800,000 bond issue has been voted to provide a modern school with a vocational department.

There will be need for MCC's program in this area for some years, particularly in its work with children, home counseling, religious education, and social activities with young people. It is sincerely hoped, too, that the church will respond and provide the camps with pastoral services, Sunday schools and a place to worship.

With normal progress the mechanical picker will probably largely replace labor within a few years. The migrant who has depended on picking cotton for his sustenance should therefore be assisted in rehabilitating himself into meaningful and permanent vocations. Agencies such as MCC can perform a significant service in motivating these people to become stable and reliable Christian citizens and becoming valuable members of a Christian community.
What of Mennonite Broadcasting?

Usually it is assumed that we Mennonites are historically "Die Stillen im Lande." Yet that is not true when one considers our origin in Switzerland, Holland, and South Germany. Our fathers in the faith were urgent in season and out of season, travelling incessantly proclaiming their new found conviction resulting from fresh Bible study. Thousands of Europe's people listened to these travelling Anabaptist or Mennonite ministers; and large sections of the population accepted the interpretations of the Bible as proclaimed by our fathers.
Then several centuries of persecution silenced this witness. The whole movement was driven underground and the conviction began to take root in the minds of surviving Mennonites that God wanted them to be and remain "die Stillen im Lande" (the quiet in the land). This conviction rooted itself deeply, and we have still not quite overcome it, even though we have now had a full century of more or less "freedom of speech." However, we are now waking up, and realize that we can speak; and that we ought to speak. Brother Shelly's article, telling us how we already do speak from the house tops, is revealing and encouraging.

I would suggest that our Board of Publication make an attempt to get together with Boards of Publication of other Mennonite Conferences, and plan for some sort of concerted effort to establish a "Mennonite Hour" of international outreach.

G. C. Board of Missions —John Thiessen

CONFERENCE BROADCASTING

It is much to the credit of various Mennonite congregations and groups that they have seen and are using the evangelizing possibilities in radio. It may not be to their credit that they have sometimes rushed into broadcasting before counting the cost. I do not refer only to the week-after-week money cost of keeping a program on the air, but to the talent, hard work, and prayer required to make the program a real success. It is a discredit to the Gospel and to the church which preaches it to go on the air with music of poor quality and with sermons poorly prepared. There is a lot of radio technique which must be mastered by those who plan and broadcast the programs. One has the feeling that we have perhaps too many programs.

One does not like to discourage local enthusiasm and initiative. But there ought to be some way to make considerable radio experience and know-how in Mennonite circles available for coaching and approval. The time may have come when recorded programs, or at least recorded music, should be made available by official bodies which will see to the maintenance of standards. The Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities at Elkhart is conducting a study of needs and opportunities in broadcasting. It would seem to me that, since the dominant motive is evangelism, conferences or mission boards should carry the chief responsibility for any extensive system of Mennonite broadcasting.

Menn. Publ. House —Paul Erb

UNITED EFFORT NECESSARY

Mennonites could well afford to contemplate sponsoring a high-class radio hour or even operating a station of their own through joint efforts of the various Mennonite schools and colleges, or the united efforts of the various mission boards or through an existing agency such as the Mennonite Central Committee which serves a Mennonite and non-Mennonite constituency throughout the world. The air waves are cluttered with cheap programs. What is needed is more high-class programs minus the sickening commercials which stuffify, exaggerate and deceive.

Bethel College —J. W. Fretz

Although a compelling argument could be made for a national, and even an international, Mennonite Central Committee radio broadcast, it is doubtful if sufficient financial support and a common agreement on a program could be obtained to insure the success of such a venture. Perhaps the best approach at the present time would be to have a central agency such as the M.C.C. produce disk recordings which could be offered at a nominal price to any local Mennonite group which would be willing to sponsor the program in its area of the country.

Menn. Research Foundation. —Melvin Gingerich

This Is My Story

AS TOLD TO J. W. FRETZ

I WAS born in Russia in 1897 and remained there until 1923 when I emigrated with a large group of about 3500 people. Many were forced to return to Russia when they got as far as Latvia. I accompanied a group of refugees to St. John, Nova Scotia hoping to be admitted into Canada but there I was rejected on account of my eyes. I was returned and came to Germany where I remained until 1925 when I went to England and from there tried to qualify for admission to Canada. In 1929 I was again approved but when I came to St. John, Nova Scotia I was again rejected. Upon returning to Germany I worked for a publication house and established a home. In 1939 I was called to Berlin to work for a Hilfskomitee. In 1941 I was suddenly inducted into the army and became an interpreter until 1943 when I was captured at Stalingrad.

A completely new chapter in my life began when I with 15,000 other German soldiers became a prisoner of war. We were housed in an old unheated factory which in winter often had a temperature of 20° F below zero. Food was poor and rations scarce, consisting mostly of salty fish and 400 grams of bread but no water. Prisoners melted snow whenever possible. This starvation diet resulted in an increasing number of deaths daily.
WHERE HAVE ALL THE LOVERS GONE?

By Vincent Harding


Reflections on the Nonviolent Movement in America

I speak Americans for your good. We must and shall be free I say, in spite of you. ... And wo, wo, will be to you if we have to obtain our freedom by fighting.
—David Walker (Boston Negro), in his APPEAL, 1829.

Do to us what you will and we will still love you. . . .
We will soon wear you down by our capacity to suffer.
—Martin Luther King, Jr., STRIDE TOWARD FREEDOM, 1958.

A black man has the right to do whatever is necessary to get his freedom. We will never get it by nonviolence.

Will They Learn?

Sometimes it seems far more than a decade and sometimes it seems no longer than a fiercely stretched and searing day since a young, frightened and eloquent black preacher stood in the churches of Montgomery, Alabama, and urgently called a determined Negro populace to fight evil with love. As those tens of thousands began their long walk of protest against the deeply entrenched injustice and humiliation of segregated busses, they were challenged with these words:

Our actions must be guided by the deepest principles of our Christian faith. Love must be our regulating ideal. Once again we must hear the words of Jesus echoing across the centuries: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you. . . ." In spite of the mistreatment that we have confronted we must not become bitter, and end up by hating our white brothers. . . . If we fail to do this our protest will end up as a meaningless drama on the stage of history, and its memory will be shrouded with the ugly garments of shame.

In these ardent, moving words were the convictions that had been delivered up out of the man’s own dark and solitary nights of turmoil and search. They were the words that struck responsive chords in the minds and spirits of his Negro listeners, and as he spoke, his words repeatedly brought forth impassioned outbursts of hope from trembling lives. Soon each intonation, each line was heard throughout the wounded and broken communities of the South. Soon they seeped into the weary ghettos of the North, finally pouring out to a world half cynical, half wondering if this might indeed be the way.

In the minds of black and white men alike grim visions and somber dreams were thrown against these words of hope. Memories of Nat Turner, images of the carnage at Shilo and Antietam, sounds of hateful, fearful mobs, pictures of black bodies swaying in the winds on lonely country roads or above exultant, guilt-torn crowds—all these seemed too much to forget, to forgive, to overcome.

Still the black preacher preached on, and the people marched, and the court finally ruled on their behalf. And when the deaths continued, when the oppression seemed more devious but no less unrelenting, the young man born in the South adopted the Indian saint as his own and cried out,

We will match your capacity to inflict suffering with our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. We will not hate you, but we cannot . . . obey your unjust laws. Do to us what you will and we will still love you. Bomb our homes and threaten our children; send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities and drag us out on some wayside road, beating us and leaving us half dead, and we will still love you. But we will soon wear you down by our capacity to suffer. And in winning our freedom we will so appeal to your heart and conscience that we will win you in the process.

Soon a generation even younger than his own heard the call and moved into the battle. Their language and convictions were not as outwardly Christian as the prophet of Montgomery, but their personal commitment was no less complete. As they sat at the counter and rode the buses, as they fell beneath the billy clubs and sang in the jails, they too were hoping that this preacher of love was right and they were willing to risk their lives on the gamble—at least for a time. A new society might be worth a man’s life.

Then in the midst of the tumult, among the community of white, hoping, wondering men—especially in the leader’s own Southland—a question was raised,
a haunting, agonizing question: "Will they learn to hate before we learn to love?" The image of "they" was legion and yet one, and almost impossible to define: smiling, patient, loyal, devious, annoyingly shrewd, lazy, uncouth, happy, sad, fearful, and black. All of these, but not hateful, not yet. And the "we"? "We" were ruling, cringing, domineering, fearful, superior, confused, patronizing, conservative, and white. All these, but not loving, not yet.

It was a self-protective, anxious question, but it was also a question that revealed a painful courtship of hope. For it was surely true that some of the questioners dreamed of a day when their unclaimed Montgomery brother would be proved right, when the crushing shell of their whiteness and their customs and their possessions would be penetrated by the piercing shafts of love, and they would be "won" indeed. Passively, most often too passively, they waited, asking, almost fearing the answer, "Will they learn to hate? Will they?"

Now at the end of a decade of deaths and burnings, of victories and scaring overturnings, now with the echoes of Malcolm still in our ears and the flames of Watts dancing in the recesses of our minds, now the answer seems to be in. They have learned to hate and we have not learned to love; and the only real question seems to be, when will the ghettos of Atlanta and Birmingham hear the cries, "Burn, Whitey, Burn!"

After a ten year walk on the brink of hope is this our final answer? Has nonviolence lost its way in the American racial revolution? This essay pretends to no definitive answers, but represents rather a series of reflections which might provide a path toward some truth. Reflections are first in order on nonviolence in the Freedom Movement. Reflections are no less fitting on the anguished question concerning "we" and "they." Finally, reflections have no meaning without some attention to the grounds for future hope, resignation or despair.

I: The Paradox of Success

As it began to be organized in Montgomery, this latest phase of American nonviolence grew up in paradox, no fertile ground for firm answers. (Among the first of paradoxes, of course, was the blooming of such a flower in the Cradle of the Confederacy, at the heart of the most militant section of the nation.) Only a moment's reflection on Montgomery suffices to force to the surface some of those fateful dilemmas that continued with the movement. For instance, all of the rhetoric and many of the convictions of those early days were framed against the background of that sublime fanaticism: "Love your enemies." When these words were originally spoken to the long aching hearts of an oppressed and noble people there were only two promises connected with them. One was acceptance as a son of God. The other was the cross. Through the life of the first Galilean speaker the two promises became coterminous.

In Montgomery, different promises were often made, promises of "victory" of "winning" the enemy, of achieving desegregation, of creating "the beloved community." Gandhi was joined to Christ for social relevance, and nonviolence became a "tool" in the civil rights campaign. In the minds of many men it was seen as one means of achieving some very tangible and necessary goals. It was an experiment with struggle, even in Montgomery, and it was clear that a majority of those who tried it were ready to turn to other means if it did not work.

For a time in the South it "worked." But even where tangible successes came forth they too were hedged in by paradox, and Montgomery was again a classic example. One aspect of the paradox of success there was partially resolved in advance by Martin Luther King when he spoke not of a boycott against the bus company, but of non-cooperation with evil. He said this was an imperative. No such delicate distinctions were made, however, by the walkers on the city's streets. Most of them had read neither Thoreau nor Gandhi (and they did not understand their Christ to have spoken of bus companies). They knew only America and its profit-oriented world. "Hit them where it hurts," some said, "in the pocketbook." Somehow, though they hoped for a different reality, they often believed that the withholding of money was a surer weapon than sacrificial love. It was the cash register that changed men, not the heart. The tension between the hope of love and trust in economics was painful, and whenever it was relaxed it was most often love that lost. What else could one expect in a society so fearfully proud of its material possessions?

Even more difficult, perhaps, was the fact that when the buses were finally desegregated the action did not come through the initiative of a converted white community, nor even through the power of the dollar. It came rather by the fiat of a federal court, with its ultimate appeal to the coercive, destructive power of the government's armed might. (More will be said later about this strange ally in the cause of love.)

What would have happened if the courts had not come to the people's aid after a year of non-cooperation? King himself remembers that it was near the end of the protest, when the legal harassment of the city grew serious, when the car-pool was threatened with disarray, when the length of the struggle seemed interminable—it was then he says that he was able "to feel the cold wind of pessimism passing through" his followers. What would have happened without the courts? Would the winds have extinguished even the guarded hope in love? Experiences elsewhere strongly support such a guess.

Is this then the natural fate of nonviolence when faced with a prolonged struggle? Is it possible that a mass, nonviolent movement cannot be maintained in Amer-
During the Race Riots, Detroit, Michigan, June, 1943.
ica? Are thousands (to say nothing of millions) of men and women and children too many, too variegate, too individualistic to submit to the self-discipline and group discipline required by nonviolence? Both Gandhi and King believed that a dedicated core of true believers could serve as the spine for the fluid crowds when times of disappointments came. And with sharp intuitions King knew that many discouraging times would come, for he realized how different were the tasks of winning independence from a society and integration into one. (How much easier it is to demand land and control in the nebulous West or in the all too specific heart of Harlem than to break down every steel-bound, fear-bound wall through the power of creative, disciplined loving.)

Where then was the solid center of believers in the North, in the South? Could it be that the movement was never prepared to “experiment” with nonviolence for the long years that might be required before a truly new and united community of respect and love could be built? Could it be that the necessary dedication to truth and to poverty that Gandhi assumed was hard to imagine among black men who had been forced for centuries to use a mask as a way of life, who lived in an image-oriented, public relations-dominated society, and who had tasted the tempting affluence of America? Or was it simply that the hope for the “beloved community” was an impossible one from the beginning, no less chimerical than the Marxist dream of the New Society? And even if it is more than a dream, can love be used as a tool, even for good ends? Can its results ever be predicted, be guaranteed?

Perhaps Martin Luther King was involved in an irresolvable dilemma when he first called men to follow the commands of Christ as a means of achieving integration. It may be that the Negro boy sitting in the debris of Watts saw more clearly than he knew when he said, “I’m tired of hearing about the good old Jesus Christ . . . The cross is a sign of death, that’s all there is to it. Jesus Christ hung from it.” What is the future of nonviolence in America or in the world without a cadre of those who will face the cross—and its equivalents—as a beginning and not as the end?

II: God Is Nice, But . . .

Among the strange and paradoxical elements of the attempt at nonviolent resistance in our midst are more perplexing than the activities of the federal government, especially in its role as the deus ex machina for many men. After Montgomery, against the background of a relatively sympathetic Supreme Court, the Movement turned again and again to the hope of federal power. President Eisenhower was castigated for moral neutrality and apparent unconcern. Men wept as they waited until troops seemed the only alternative in Little Rock. The late John F. Kennedy was repeatedly taken to task for playing too shrewd a game with his narrowly won power and his great popularity. Criticism was widespread against his failure to speak out with clarity and precision until after Birmingham. And from the outset of Lyndon Johnson’s assumption of presidential power the pressure was on him to use that massive weight on the side of civil rights and integration. Meanwhile Congress was being constantly assailed for its staunch refusal to deliver national legislation that would help to secure the rights of black men and their allies to life, liberty, and the pursuit of power.

Throughout the cities of the South nonviolent demonstrations often seemed more precisely aimed at Pennsylvania Avenue and Capitol Hill than at the Alabamas, Greenwoods, or Shreveports where they were taking place. At times it appeared that the demonstrators and their leaders did not really live in the hope their nonviolent rhetoric proclaimed. Decades of disappointment, duplicity, and suffering seemed to have produced a certain skein of hopelessness in their attitudes toward the local white citizens, officials, and police.

There were exceptions, of course, but by and large the approach seemed to be a short-circuited one that leaped quickly and brilliantly beyond the seemingly impenetrable consciences of a segregationist, fear-ridden populace to the power inherent in the national government. The placards were to be read in the White House. The marches were timed for Huntley-Brinkley and Telestar. The assistant attorney general—after the first hard grueling months—was often on call to deliver the prisoners if jail got too long or too hard.

All this was understandable when hope was discounted. When little but repression was really expected of “the white man” then other allies were needed. The consciences of influential northern liberals seemed less impervious, and their complaints seemed helpful upon reaching the White House or various congressional offices. All of this fitted into a pattern of pressure and dependence upon the federal power, but it may have compromised the integrity of the power of nonviolence. It may have by-passed the stubborn, frightened southern opponents in the understandable search for quicker, less painful results. Meanwhile, an enemy who might have been waiting in terrified, flailing anticipation of love was left to laugh and cry alone in his fear.

In 1964 the results of such strategy began to come in. Apparently the pressure on Washington and the appeal to the world had worked. Suddenly the movement was besieged by a president who operated with as great a flair for publicity as any civil rights lieutenant; who made and carried his own placards, who moved quickly and often ruthlessly with great power whenever it pleased him, or so it seemed. The marchers and field workers were overwhelmed by money, by registrars, by national legislation, by a war on poverty, by a chief executive who seemed ready to burst out with the music as well as the words to We Shall Overcome.
A repentant white Southerner had seen the light. What more could be desired? Here was federal power, often with a vengeance. If some persons felt that the appearances and the labels were often more impressive than the actuality, they still could not deny the seemingly ubiquitous reality of the federal presence. Here were the "results" that the Movement had so long sought.

The great majority of television-prone barriers that were such obvious targets for nonviolent demonstrations and protests now seem to have been broken down by the actuality or the threat of federal force. In the minds of many financial contributors the battle is done and money flows into the civil rights coffers far more slowly than at any time in the last five years. Young heroes of the Movement are drifting back into school, moving reluctantly toward the army, or simply wandering, like the remnants of a victorious but forgotten crusade. Officials are turning to the service of the Great Society. Is that the natural resting place for a movement that began as an experiment with Christian love, became a syncretistic appeal to "all men of good will" and then a tool in the struggle for power? Is it natural that it should have been hired into the national consensus to sing the paeans of a greatness created by fiat, television, and money?

The results are in, and in many ways they are impressive, but at the same moment a strange, almost inexplicable malaise has settled down like a spangled shroud over the Movement. Somehow it all seems so overwhelming. The heavy-breathing octopus of government initiative seems to have sucked the life out of so many protests and creative actions. Is this the end of the nonviolent aspects of the Movement? Could it be that nonviolence has passed and we are left no nearer to the beloved community than we were ten years ago? Segregation remains at the core of the American way of life. Unemployment figures arouse little compassion and are countered by contracts for ammunition, helicopters, and napalm. "Desegregated" schools are shields for the continued alienation that both Negroes and whites endure, and the churches remain the last public—but increasingly irrelevant—bastion of fear.

Is this what was bargained for? Is it possible that dependence on federal power, a conservative, manipulative power, has actually sapped the clan vital of nonviolence? Could it be that the movement that began with a promise to match "physical force with soul force" may well have found too easy a way out in matching instead the physical force of the federal government against the terror of Al Lingo's state troopers? Could it be that the movement that promised to encounter the "enemy" with tough, protesting, forgiving love may have escaped the hard and costly encounter by appealing to Washington in the showdown? Is it possible that the movement that sang "God is on our side" was really more happy with the national guard around it, and thus may have chosen the lesser part?

In the process many a strategic battle has surely been won, but no one seriously speaks any longer of "redeeming the soul of the South" or of America. Has the task been given up as hopeless or have the victories been confused with redemption?

Dare we even raise such questions? Do they suggest unbelief? Who is to say that there was not a spirit at work among us, created by the truly nonviolent minority, a spirit which accounts for victories yet unseen? Who is to say that all is known when we describe laws and cash registers and troops? Was there no tortuous movement of conscience beneath the surface of expediency? Did the gallant songs from Parchman jail, the blood on Birmingham's street, the death of William Moore and his brothers—did they produce no fervent tumult in the lonely nights among judges, police, and presidents? Perhaps our myopic bondage to the perspectiveless present bars us from the vision of miracles such as these.

Nevertheless we are bound and the appearances are what they are. And they seem to suggest that the task of redemption through suffering and dogged loving has been given up without sufficient effort. Perhaps the marchers and the singers have now accepted the chilling conclusions of the black poet, LeRoi Jones, when he speaks with evident conviction of "the rotting and destruction of America." Or, do they look with less despair (but no more hope) to Bayard Rustin, that veteran of the struggle, as he says:

Hearts are not relevant to the issue: neither racial affinities nor racial hostilities are rooted there. It is institutions—social, political, and economic institutions—which are the ultimate molders of collective sentiments. Let these institutions be reconstructed today, and let the ineluctable gradualism of history govern the formation of a new psychology.

III: Farewell, White Brothers, Farewell

Such questions lead to reflections upon the future of a movement once called nonviolent, now often nameless, indescribable—like some rage. What is its direction, what are its goals? In a sense it is Rustin who has articulated what many persons believe to be the newest (yet very old) goals of the Movement. Through this attack on institutions Bayard and Malcolm's heirs, Martin and Muhammad's followers would all see a common greater vision: to bring to America's Negroes a sense of manhood, a conviction of true human dignity.

How, specifically, shall that be achieved? Is there possibly a role for nonviolence here yet? In a society that so often equates manhood with the capacity to use physical, destructive force against animals and men, this is a difficult matter. For many Negroes believe that America will recognize their manhood and their dignity more quickly through the sniper's sights.
of Watts than through the prison bars in Jackson. (Thus one reputable Negro professional will soon produce a book that goes beyond the Deacons for Defense in its call for the formation of a Mafia-like protective police force among Negroes to face the federal government with a grim alternative.) Only if Negroes—and whites—in America find some more transcendent standards of manhood could the situation be different. Under such conditions of thought nonviolence is surely passe and has no role in the new phase of the Movement. For it suggests another standard by which to measure a man. The vision of nonviolence suggests that it is a man's commitment to truth, to love, to life that makes him truly man and not his readiness to "defend" himself. It affirms that manhood is to be found in the ever deepening and interdependent life of the loving community rather than in the traditional violence and personal isolation of romantic frontier individualism. Whether nonviolence can ever deeply dent the American image of manhood is a moot question.

And what of dignity? It is not surprising that the means of achieving dignity are now equated with political and economic power. It is not surprising, but it is so very disappointing in the light of history's verdict on power. Still even the voice that once spoke of winning the enemy through enduring love now says "political power may well ... be the most effective new tool of the Negro's liberation"; and one wonders what struggles against the hardness of our hearts led to this new path for him. One wonders if his words reflect a loss of hope for any deeper way to dignity in the midst of a society of men and women whose capacity to coil themselves around power and privilege seems greater than any capacity to receive the sword of love.

Clearly power has become the theme. Even though we have been greatly disillusioned by the uses of federal power, even though a library of volumes and unknown graves mark the exploitations of private power, still there is an infatuation with political and economic force. "We must have jobs and income, not simply for what they mean to our families and our spirits but for the lever they give us." So goes the cry. "We must have the capacity to influence those political decisions that concern us. We need the power of self-determination in the ghettos of Harlem and Chicago and Detroit no less than the black men of Africa and the nonwhites of the rest of the world. The white man is the same the world over and we do not trust him. Power alone can change our situation, can bring us the dignity of real men."

This is the new theme in the Movement. (And those who are waiting yet to be loved by "them" need to recognize the current preoccupation. It is a direction that no longer offers any significant attention to the needs of "our white brothers" for redemption, but rather focuses on the needs of "our black brothers"

for dignity. It has evidently appeared that both cannot be done at once. In some ways the new fascination appears racist and in some ways it is. As such it may simply indicate another way in which we have "succeeded," another way in which the Negro has broken into the mainstream of American thought.) But here again the question must be raised: Are these really the things that bring dignity to a man, important though they may be otherwise? Do the spokesmen for such goals consider the members of the power "structures" in our cities and nation, the wheelers and dealers, to be persons of dignity and true manhood? Do the worshippers of power assume that Negroes would use economic and political levers in a more humane and compassionate way than others? How can this happen unless at the same time something is changed within the human spirit?

The continuing problems of socialist nations reveal to us the human factor at the heart of the issue. New institutions and control over them—no matter how benevolent their intent—do not produce either humanity or dignity. The greatness and awesomeness of nonviolence was that it promised to reform not only the evil system and the men who ran that system, but it essayed a change in the nonviolent resister himself. Is such a hope in vain? Or is it too much a threat, too frightening to realize that we might have to experience change no less radical than the society and the men we face on the line? Perhaps the devotees of nonviolent change desired more of the pie-as-is than anyone knew. Perhaps the burning ship was not so bad at all if you could travel first class and dance with anyone you please.

Perhaps it was not their fault. Perhaps there simply is not present in America any philosophical, moral or righteous grounds for an understanding of new men or new society. Could it be that bad?

IV: In the American Style

Whatever the causes, there now appears solid reason to believe that "they" have at least forgotten about loving, and at most may have learned to hate. If this is true then it may be that there is no hope for us at all save a possibly slower "rotting and destruction" than Jones expects.

Have "they" really learned to hate? How hard it is to hear such words. How terrifying to live under such a cloud. Have they? While Martin King once spoke of enduring and wearing down the whites with love, now a different set of voices can be heard in every section of the land, sections where even the brave warrior of southern streets dares not walk when the "next time" becomes now and fire burns the land. In such places Malcolm is still echoed and revered for saying "I'm against anyone who tells black people to be nonviolent while nobody is telling white people to
be nonviolent . . . Let the Klan know we can do it, tit for tat, tit for tat.” In Los Angeles a young man reflects on the experiences of Watts’ riot and says:

It was the best thing that ever happened. You come to the Man and try to tell him, over and over, but he never listens. Why, the Man has always been killing. He first drove the Indians out. Now my arm’s almost been bit off. I’ve got to bite back. The riot? There’ll be more of the same until the Man opens up his eyes and says “We’re going to give it to you because we’re tired.”

Thus the capacity to endure suffering is exchanged for the bitter resolve to wear out the deaf and blind “Man” with the capacity to inflict violence.

Why is it that such voices seem more dominant in America today? Have “they” really learned to hate? Perhaps they knew all along. Perhaps they were waiting, too, to see if consciences would truly be moved, to see if deep changes in the society would be made voluntarily, to see if love might well prevail. Perhaps they knew their hate too well, knew its fearful debilitating consequences, and waited, hidden from us, at the other end of the brink of hope. Perhaps they did not try hard enough, perhaps they did not wait long enough, perhaps they should have entered the non-violent movement more deeply, perhaps there should have been a movement for their concrete jails.

However much we yearn for it to be different, they are waiting no longer. They are rising up, and it must be known and it must be affirmed that their response is no new hatred, learned at our feet. It is as old as man, old as the first slaveship rebellion, old as Walker’s Appeal and Nat Turner’s rusty sword, old as the Deacons for Defense and Negroes With Guns. It is a response more human than black, a reaction to humiliation, exploitation, and fear. So it is not that “they” have learned to hate, rather they were human all along, just as “we” are, and they knew the arts of hate, knew them well. They were only waiting with cool, masked hope to see if Martin King would make any significant change in the American way of life.

In their eyes he did not. If there were changed consciences they could not see them. What they saw was force and pressure and the power of law, of money and of guns. Meanwhile they were still unemployed, still given atrocious schooling, still kept out of the Man’s communities, still humiliated by social workers and coerced by police—in spite of all the highly praised laws. Periodically they were still being swept off the streets into the patronizing, isolated job corps camps or into the burning jungles of Vietnam. They had neither the words nor the concepts but they knew the truth was being spoken by the man who said:

The unintegrated Negro is the symbol of our democratic failure and the unemployed Negro is the most conspicuous evidence we have of the breaking down of the economic machinery. I do not believe there is any chance that the private, self-adjusting economy can provide today’s unemployed Negro with a job, the traditional means to dignity and self-respect. Tax cuts and war on poverty notwithstanding, most Negroes now without work are not likely to be taken up into the private economy again.

When the hopelessness within them seemed to give a vivid witness to such statements about their society and their future, then they gave vent to their anguish in the American way. (Perhaps they do not hate us. Perhaps more than anything else they despise us. Perhaps they are blind in their rage because we did not learn in time, and if we did learn, then did not resolve to act in ways radical enough to save them from decay. Did they not want us to love? Is this the madness of it all? Is this why the heat, the seeming hate is so intense? Are we like lovers in some limbo, acting out the urgings of death, repressing the surgings towards life and never never reaching far enough and long enough to touch the fevered hand, the atrophied heart on the other side? And where other broken seekers in other kinds of worlds would then take to the long silence of meditative night and slow dying, is it that we turn instead to violence and shall at least burn together?) Is this the anguish imbedded deep within the meaning of the young man’s soliloquy in Watts?

If it is, then what more than failure could we have expected of nonviolence in such a land as ours, when faced with such terrible pain and humiliation? What could we expect of nonviolence in a nation that had come to being in the midst of armed revolution? What could we expect of nonviolence in a nation that had realized its Manifest Destiny over the unburied bodies of the natives of this land? What could we expect when the savagery of Civil War seemed required to bring freedom to four million men in the land we believed chosen by God as the world’s last best hope?

What could we expect of nonviolence in a nation that had bombed some enemies into submission, atomized others out of existence and now lives easily with the threat of complete annihilation of all who would seek seriously to oppose or dominate us? What could we expect of nonviolence in neighborhoods where frightened policemen recorded their fear in fierce words and quick guns? What could we expect of a society that defines manhood as the state of being willing to “fight for your rights”?

Violence to the enemy is built into the American grain far more deeply than nonviolence. Negroes in Chicago and Los Angeles and Atlanta consider the Man to be their enemy. They have seen the economic, educational and residential walls being built stouter and higher against the majority of them. They attribute this either to the malignant purpose or the careless disdain of the Man. Why should they not turn to
violence if they believe that he will listen to nothing else?

When will the violence come south? If some observers are right it has begun in the North because the cities of that promised land were once considered pinpoints of hope in a racist society. Something more than despair was expected where hundreds of laws were on the books and where newspapers daily and fully condemned the white South. Now the moment of truth has come and many Negroes have discovered that their hopes are being dashed more cruelly because they had hoped for more. Northern residential segregation is more humiliating because it is denied. Northern unemployment is more difficult because the food-producing land has been left behind and the signs of other men’s affluence are even more obvious. Northern schools are more offensive because they have been “desegregated” in some places for a long, long time.

The North claimed to offer more, partly because it just was not the South. So its frustrations are greater, and TV simply helps to make all of it breathlessly vivid. Thus the argument goes.

If this is true then we need wait only long enough in the South for our city officials, newspaper editors, and chambers of commerce to announce to the world our new image. Soon we too will claim to be fully liberal, desegregated and great havens of economic opportunity for all men. We too will no longer have any racial problems. We will have gathered all our Negroes from their diaspora throughout the cities and placed them in concentrated enclaves. Then we will chide the rural areas of the South and ask for federal action on behalf of those wonderful Negroes. When that day comes we can expect our own explosions, explosions that will make us long for Birmingham and Albany.

Five hundred Negroes participated in an integration march in 1962 at Albany, Georgia. One hundred twelve were jailed for “parading without permit.”
For as long as Negroes expected us to act like Southeners, clinging to official segregation, practicing informal desegregation, waiting for "them" to love, we could escape. Once we claim to be as good as the North, our nakedness will be seen. For in the eyes of black sensitized men we shall be as bad, as frustrating and as provocative as Chicago or New York. Then the burning will begin. Such seems to be the price of progress in our America.

We say it is madness for them to choose violence. Their minority status in a hostile nation would make their destruction certain. But they find it hard to hear us when any night's newcast brings to them glimpses of the American style in the world. Is their madness any greater than ours when the nation attempts the same approach in a world where "we" are in a minority? Is our destruction any less certain? The voice of conscience from Montgomery once proclaimed to Negroes that the use of violence to achieve justice would cause their "memory to be shrouded with the ugly garments of shame." The nation seems little concerned about the way future generations will judge its concern. Why should the Negroes care more?

V: Shall We Overcome?

Perhaps such harsh reflections can lead us to one of the deepest insights for the present moment. It may well be that in a society of violence it is no longer a matter of our learning to love the Negro, but our learning to love. Perhaps we shall find no solution for the explosive problem in our own midst until we exchew violence as a way of life in international affairs or keep the Negroes out of the army and away from TV sets. For who can tell the black, indignant men that violent solutions are no real solutions while he has television or can join the military forces? Who can speak of the need to love those who are hating him when our national policy is at least to frighten and at most to destroy those who hate us?

Can the American Negro—so very American—change his heart before the rest of us? Once Martin King and a host of other men deeply hoped for this. Once they thought the Negro might bear some Messianic possibilities for our nuclear-ringed world, but the evidence is not with them now. We have not learned to love soon enough, and Negroes have not chosen to be the suffering servants of the society on a long-term basis (most of them had no desire for this on even the briefest terms). Now we must do our own loving and it may be too much to require, for now it must include Negro and Chinese and Castroite Cuban and a variety of intermediates. Indeed the "we" must now be expanded to encompass both the black and white non-lovers and haters. Perhaps this is what it really means to overcome, to overcome even our we-ness and our they-ness on a scale no less than the measurements of the globe. Have we given up all hope that such a day could possibly begin to appear?

So we return again to hope. Perhaps the problem is lodged deeply in that direction. Is it possible that our capacity to hope is now as far from us in America as our sense of moral absolutes? The conquest of non-violence depends both on hope and upon truth. It speaks of love and goodness, of evil and wrong as if such things were real, as if amoral meant immoral. Could it be then that the failure (how sad a word!) of nonviolence in our own generation is a sign of our multiple loss: loss of hope, loss of nerve and loss of any truth outside our own small, quaking lives? The ultimate vision of nonviolence is the beloved community. Where shall we find our model in the midst of America's age of personal isolation and corporate fear? Where shall we find it in the midst of our non-families? Where shall we find it when we protect ourselves against the majority of the human community with never sleeping silos of concentrated hell?

Perhaps it was all too wild a dream in the first place, this hope of redemption. Perhaps it was a child's fantasy in the sleep of night, or another Negro folk tale dredged up from the long dead age of faith. But if it was, then who shall preserve us from the day, from this age, from the sudden blaze of fiery light?

Speak to Us of Love, But not Much

In the midst of our endless, almost involuntary, hopeless search for "them," for the black brothers who once held hope for us all, there is something raging within that turns us instinctively to glance toward the man who preached the tender words so very long ago.

Now ten years older, a thousand years sadder, the wounds of evil upon him, he still seems to search for grounds of hope—sometimes desperately. As he moves—such burdened moving—from East to West, from ghetto to cotton field, searching for his followers, we cannot stifle a sudden, urgent call, a call to him.

"Speak to us of love; speak of hope; speak of brotherhood," we say. And all we hear is the anguish of his troubled words describing, protesting napalm and gas and death in Vietnam.

We are angry; and in our anger's rigid, fearful strength we push to keep him in his place, his place of civil rights, his place of nonviolence, his place of love for us.

"Speak to us of love, not of fighting for our freedom agains them," we say.

What must he think as a billion of the humiliated "them" gather in watchfulness under the strange darkness of his visage? What range of almost bitter sadness and weighted laughter must the somber shades of flesh and blood conceal?

What must he think?

Who will save us from the breaking in of fire, of light?
H. R. Voth: Ethnologist

By Fred Eggan

H. R. Voth as Mennonite missionary is a controversial character and in recent years has been blamed for many of the difficulties experienced by the Hopi Indians of Third Mesa — unfairly in my estimation, as I hope to show. But H. R. Voth as ethnologist was an important figure in the development of anthropology around the turn of the century, and his collections of Hopi material culture, his reports of Third Mesa ceremonies and other aspects of Hopi life provide an unrivalled corpus for the serious student. Of his contemporaries only A. M. Stephen, who resided at First Mesa beginning in the 1880s, and J. W. Fewkes, who represented the Bureau of American Ethnology, made comparable observations on Hopi ceremonial life and culture. How the Reverend H. R. Voth became an ethnologist, after having established the first mission among the Hopi Indians since the Pueblo Rebellion in 1680 drove out the Franciscans, will be the major theme of this paper.

Heinrich R. Voth was born in the village of Alexanderwol in southern Russia in 1855. His parents were part of a German Mennonite colony which had been offered sanctuary by Catherine the Great, and the young Voth grew up in the village, learning both Russian and English in addition to his native German, and preparing for a life in the church. The Mennonites were an outgrowth of the sixteenth century Anabaptist movement which repudiated war and emphasized the rebaptism of adults as a result of personal conviction. Adherence to pacifism and nonresistance led to frequent persecutions, and in the 1870s the Russian colonies were severely tested. As a result, the congregation to which the Voths belonged removed to Kansas in 1874 and started a new colony near Newton.

Voth was the only member of the colony who spoke English. He taught school for two years before attending Wadsworth Academy in Ohio, and later the Saint Louis Medical School, where he spent a year learning the elements of medicine in preparation for missionary work. His first assignment was to the Cheyenne and Arapaho in what was then Indian Territory, and later Oklahoma. These Plains tribes, fresh from military defeat and subjection, had only recently been established on reservations, and they were not easy to work with. Voth spent most of the decade of the 1880s with the Arapaho, learning to speak the language, collecting Arapaho tales (some of which he published much later), recording Ghost Dance songs as well as carrying out his mission duties, and maintaining a voluminous correspondence in German with the Mennonite Conference. The Dawes Act of 1887 which allotted the reservation lands to individual Indians, interrupted the mission work.

In 1891 Voth took a six month’s leave of absence to visit his old home in Russia, and during his absence the Mission Board decided to establish a mission among the Hopi Indians, and asked him to take up the new assignment on his return. En route back to Kansas Voth married Martha Moser, a former mission worker, in Dalton, Ohio, his first wife having died earlier. With the president of the Mission Board, Voth made his first visit to the Hopi country in the autumn of 1892, and the following spring the board decided that a mission station should be established.

Voth and his family proceeded via Holbrook to Keams Canyon by means of a Mormon freighting outfit and stayed with Superintendent Collins and his wife, old friends from Indian Territory. After visiting all the villages, Voth decided on Oraibi, the largest Hopi community, as the best location for his mission. Oraibi, with over 800 Hopis, was already too large for the land base immediately available, and the villagers were sharply divided on the question of sending their children to the new boarding school established a few years earlier at Keams Canyon, some twenty miles to the east. Initially all Hopis opposed the school, since it disrupted the initiation rituals and training essential to the continuation of the elaborate Hopi ceremonial system. In 1890 the government had brought a group of Hopi leaders to Washington, and the trip “convinced” most of them that they had no choice. Lololoma, the Oraibi village chief and leader of the Bear clan, was opposed by the “traditionalists” led by Yokioma, the Kokop clan chief and Lumahongyoma, the Spider clan leader. The resulting factional quarrel led to the division of the ceremonial system, and the ultimate splitting of the village into two almost equal parts when Yokioma led his followers off to found Hotevilla in September, 1906.

Voth, initially unaware of the turmoil ahead, rented a Hopi house while he started construction of his mission station on land provided along the wash, a mile away from...
the village, and began to learn the Hopi language. It took almost two years to master the language, and after the mission was built he and his wife began to hold meetings in the streets and plazas. As they became more proficient in Hopi they entered into every phase of Hopi life, becoming acquainted with the various families, aiding the sick, and attending the ceremonies. In a retrospective account of their decade as missionaries from 1893 to 1902, Voth reported that under the Hopis’ "outward filth and degradation there were splendid lovable natures, immortal souls to be saved." But it was mainly he and his wife who prepared the way: "If we could have made the gate a little wider, the road a little less narrow, we could have had many converts, but as it was, none came to a full decision for Christ."

In the spring of 1901 his wife died in childbirth and Voth decided to leave the mission field, at least temporarily. He had become increasingly interested in Hopi ceremonial life as the rituals followed one another in order throughout the solstitial year, and through the interest of George A. Dorsey he began to prepare collections for the new Field Columbian Museum in Chicago. He remained a year longer, initiating his successor, the Reverend J. B. Epp, into the language and work, and began the church on Oraibi mesa that became his monument. J. B. Frey soon came to help with the mission, and a few of the Hopis accepted Christianity and were baptized. By 1905 the factional disputes in Oraibi were reaching a climax. Epp had returned bringing a wife, but opposition to the mission work was so great that he had to leave for a while.

In the 1920s Voth characterized the Hopi reservation as one of the most difficult of mission fields. In thirty years the converts numbered only about forty in all—an average of a little more than one a year. He added: "Of course we hope for more in the future but even as it is—it pays!" Today the mission sits along the wash with a school for children, and the congregation of the Mennonite church in New Oraibi is not much larger than in the 1920s. Voth’s church on the mesa was rehabilitated during the war but was later struck by lightning, a sign to the Hopis that their deities were still opposed to the Mennonite intrusion. It still stands as a gaunt reminder of an important period in Hopi history.

In recent years the Mennonites have come under severe criticism from Laura Thompson in her Culture in Crisis, A Study of the Hopi Indians (1950), in which she explains the "breakdown in the ceremonial organization in the Mennonite-dominated villages through the undermining of the authority of the priesthood, the conversion of the chief priests, and the subsequent lapse of the ceremonies they led"—and in general the upsetting of the organic balance of the social system. This overstates the influence of the Mennonites and neglects environmental factors such as pressure on land, limited water supply, and the new alternatives provided by the government. Alfred Siemens, a young Mennonite scholar from British Columbia, has provided a more balanced view. In "Christ and Culture in the Mission Field," published in Mennonite Life (April, 1962), he reports on his personal assessment of the Mennonite missionary activities:

The first Mennonite missionary to the Hopi, H. R. Voth, was an aggressive evangelist and anthropologist. He gathered many Hopi artifacts, made intensive studies of their customs, vocabulary and religion, and wrote carefully and voluminously about them. But he, as had the Catholic fathers before him, also antagonized them. The present missionaries feel they are still the objects of a resentment that was aroused by pioneer missionaries. [p. 84]
tagged along. In 1894 a new school had been built at the foot of the mesa, and the government was using Navajo policemen to round up the children. Lololoma, the village chief, had given his promise that the children would attend the new school, but the conservatives refused and hid their children as long as possible. The friction between Lololoma and Yokoma intensified as children were caught and taken to the school where they were bathed and given new clothes and new names. Elizabeth’s parents, Qoyawayma and Sevenka, were conservatives and Yokoma and his followers often visited Voth to discuss their problems and get his advice. Later, when the conservatives were imprisoned in Alcatraz after the founding of Holtevilla, Voth remained their means of communication with their families until they were released.

During the 1890s Voth began a systematic study of Hopi social organization and ceremonies in order to understand better their religious beliefs. He attended funerals and inquired about their conceptions of the afterworld, and of good and evil. The Kachina cult particularly interested him because of the initiations of the children and the masked dances which occupied the winter and spring periods. He began a collection of the dolls which the Kuchinas presented to the girls on particular occasions. He also began to sort out the bewildering variety of Hopi deities who were associated with various aspects of nature and culture, and represented on the altars set up in the Kivas for the calendric ceremonial performances.

“The religion of the Hopi,” he wrote, “is preeminently a product of his environment. Being surrounded by a harsh and forbidding desert, awe inspiring in its solitude, stern and inhospitable, he is strongly modified by its subtle influences, and his altered nature shows itself in his daily life and in his attitude towards those unseen but real forces of nature which determine and go to make up what we call religion.”

As Voth became more knowledgeable about Hopi life he was called on for advice with regard to reservation problems — trading posts, schools, Navajo incursions, missions and the scope of his correspondence widened. J. W. Fewkes wanted comparative data from Oraibi for his First Mesa accounts, but Voth was reluctant to let Fewkes publish his material for fear of weakening interest in his own proposed accounts. In a letter to Superintendent Collins as to the effects of the ceremonies on the teachings of the government schools, Voth stated that “As a whole the ceremonies are devotional and serious,” but the obscene sideshows of the clowns were degrading and filthy, and the whipping of the children at initiations was a serious problem. He asked whether the government might not prohibit certain features of the ceremonies. Voth was a member of the Indian Rights Association and was concerned with both policy and appointments. In 1897 he wrote that the Hopi had reached a crisis and that much of the good work was at a standstill. “We are getting discouraged.”

Later in 1897 these interests began to take a new direction. Dr. George A. Dorsey was Acting Curator of Anthropology in the Field Columbian Museum, established after the World’s Fair of 1893. He visited the Hopi reservation en route from a summer’s field trip to the coast of British Columbia and discovered Voth. Dorsey was the first Ph.D. from Harvard’s pioneer anthropology department, and had been put in charge of developing exhibits and making new collections for the growing museum. He was a sophisticated administrator; during the next decade he brought together a remarkable staff at the museum and raised large sums of money from Chicago financiers and industrialists to support museum activities.

Dorsey immediately borrowed some 400 specimens from Voth, including a collection of kachina dolls and a large number of stone implements and weapons, as well as some twenty-four masks that he had accumulated. Voth specified that these were a “loan,” since missionaries were prohibited from trading and he had recently been denounced as a “Russian Jew trading with Indians all the time.” He wrote Dorsey that “Neither the collection as a whole nor any part of it is for sale as long as I stay here, I am making it to aid in my studies. If I leave this work the collection will probably be for sale and those stone articles will then be subject to your order.”

The documentation that Voth provided for his collections was both complete and perceptive, and he had a passion for accuracy that greatly impressed Dorsey. Dorsey returned in December of 1897 to see the Oraibi Soyal ceremony, the keystone to the Hopi ceremonial calendar, which Voth had observed annually since 1893. Dorsey had earlier provided Voth with a camera and typewriter, and he soon proposed to Voth that he come to Chicago and prepare a series of exhibits on Hopi culture and a set of monographs on the major ceremonies. Voth was tempted but he was unwilling to leave the mission even temporarily until a successor was available. In the meantime he began a correspondence with Dorsey which continued over the next decade and a half, covering a wide variety of topics of mutual interest. Dorsey had interested Stanley McCormick, a member of the prominent McCormick family in Chicago, in supporting the Hopi exhibits, and Voth was given funds for both collecting and planning exhibits. All of his publications from 1901 until 1912 were brought out under the auspices of The Stanley McCormick Hopi Expedition.

The death of his wife and the needs of his children were important factors in Voth’s decision to leave the mission field temporarily in 1901. He had reconstructed several Hopi altars from his photographs and measurements for the Field Museum and with Dorsey’s guidance, had prepared a manuscript on The Oraibi Soyal Ceremony which was published in March, 1901. Voth had the confidence of the Hopi chief priests and was allowed to witness the kiva rituals, despite the growing seclusiveness in the village and the opposition of some members. In December Voth’s account of The OraibiPowamu Ceremony was published. These two volumes alone would make his reputation as an ethnologist; they were soon followed by a series of further accounts of ceremonies and of other aspects of Hopi life, which provide...
an unrivalled corpus on the Hopi.

His correspondence with Dorsey reveals Voth's growing ambivalence. He notes that "no other white man will ever get in Oraibi what I now have," and goes on to say that he ought to be working full time but cannot: "I am a missionary here and have to be loyal to my calling and to my Board."

With the completion of the *Se Jama* manuscript, Dorsey again asked him about working full time. "My idea would be to add you permanently to the staff of the Museum, giving you ultimately the position of Assistant Curator of Ethnography."

Voth still temporized but the new publications resulted in criticism at home. Late in 1901 he wrote Dorsey that "People have heard that I was again working for the Museum, and now a storm of prejudice against me has been fanned and is blowing through our churches, I have explained about these publications and have an understanding with the Mission Board... but it will take my personal presence in Kansas to fully explain what I am doing."

He went on to say that on January 1, 1902 he would have been in mission work for twenty-five years and "I shall on that date consider my official connection with the Mission severed. I can then do work easier—though I have a right now to do it."

Dorsey urged him again to take a position on the staff of the Museum but Voth, while expressing his appreciation of Dorsey's confidence in him, replied that he was not yet ready to sacrifice the position he held among the Mennonites and would prefer to continue his researches at Newton—"this our people would excuse and understand."

A few months earlier he had begun the Oraibi chapel on the mesa, and he was well along on his description of the Snake and Antelope ceremonies and the women's *Ongiie* ceremony, both published in 1903. He was soon to start *Traditions of the Hopi*, published in 1905, stories he collected in the vernacular and without an interpreter.

While working at Newton, Kansas, in August, 1904, Voth received a letter from John F. Huekel asking if he would help the Fred Harvey Company design and build a Hopi House at Grand Canyon, where the new El Tovar Hotel was soon to open. Huekel was the son-in-law of Fred Harvey and had entered the company in 1898, founding the Indian Department in 1902. Voth wrote Dorsey asking if he should help out the Fred Harvey people and evidently received an affirmative reply, since he reported two months later that "our Hopi House—a large structure—progresses nicely."

Whether Voth contributed to the "large amount of museum quality crafts" shipped to Grand Canyon in 1904-5 is not clear from the records, but in his spare time he was more than busy reading proofs on several manuscripts in press at the Museum.

In the spring of 1905 Dorsey wrote Voth that Stanley McCormick would probably not support further work with the Hopi and suggested other expeditions that he might want to consider: Brazil, the Rio Grande Pueblos, the Amur River, the Interior of Labrador, German East Africa, or German New Guinea. "I have faith in your ability to go into a tribe... make scientifically complete and valuable ethnological collections, and prepare a report on the same," Dorsey wrote, and he asked Voth to think about it. The salary was tempting, one hundred and sixty dollars per month and expenses, and the time varied from two to five years each.

Through Dorsey, Voth had become a founder of the new American Anthropological Association and was beginning to attend meetings. He was tempted but decided that his family and business interests had to come first.

Five years later he received word from C. L. Owen, Assistant Curator of Anthropology at the Museum, that they wanted him to construct four altars, two to three shrines, and a representation of a Hopi spring to add to the nine altars and representations originally constructed. Voth replied that he would like to do it, but since he now had another occupation he asked to do the work at home. He estimated that it would take eight months and Owen authorized him to go ahead.

After Voth completed the task and had installed the altars in Chicago he made a survey of what still needed to be done. In a letter to Dorsey, he said:

Before I left last spring (1912) I suggested certain work with the Hopi Collections to Sims and Owen:

1. Continuation of the series of Hopi altars.
2. Reproduction of shrines and springs.
3. Overhauling of (Drum) Flute Altars now that I have the measurements.
5. Preparing publications on Ni­man and Oraibi Flute cere­monies. I have many splendid photographs.
6. Working up and publishing songs—the records of which I procured for you some years ago.
7. Publication on Kachinas—masks, dolls, etc.
8. Further study in the field, especially of songs and the Kachina cult, of which we know extremely little.

Voth's last monographs were also published in 1912 by the Museum.
In the Preface to the *Oraihi Marau Ceremony*, Dorsey states that

Through the renewed generosity of Mr. Stanley McCormick, the Field Museum of Natural History resumes investigations among the Hopi Indians of Arizona. The services of Mr. H. R. Voth, who has made that tribe the object of special studies, have again been secured to construct additional Hopi altars and prepare further papers on Hopi ceremonies and customs, and to add new ethnic features to the Hopi collections.

But the Marau monograph had been left over from the 1905 group of publications and *Brief Miscellaneous Hopi Papers*, which followed, was composed of odds and ends.

Later in 1912 Voth again wrote to Dorsey saying he had not had an opportunity to round out his Hopi work and suggesting that he would be glad to do further work at home if the Museum were interested. Dorsey apparently never replied and was soon to leave the Museum. In 1915, during the war, Berthold Laufer, Dorsey's successor, wrote to Voth asking if he had any manuscripts for publication and expressing a hope that they might be able to continue with the construction of altars and other projects.

But Voth had not as yet put his notes and photographs of the Oraibi Flute ceremony together and the matter was apparently dropped.

What can one say about Voth's role as ethnologist and as missionary? The answers may be found in the H. R. Voth Collection at the Bethel College Historical Library in Newton, Kansas, and in the journals in the possession of his daughter; the correspondence I have consulted at Bethel College and in the Field Museum provides an outline of his career and indicates some of its contradictions. As a Mennonite missionary the Reverend Voth stood for pacifism and nonresistance to authority and for individual decision with regard to religion. Hopi converts were forbidden to watch Hopi ceremonies once they were baptized or to take part in any ritual activities, a policy which cut them off from their relatives and often forced them to move from conservative villages. When his own Mennonite communities turned on him Voth experienced a similar ostracism at first hand, but it did not cause him to rethink the mission operations.

As Voth became more interested in the Hopi in terms of their culture he began to systematically study their ceremonies and collect ceremonial objects. Hopi ceremonies are in the hands of societies which require initiation for admittance to the secret and sacred portions of their rituals, and Voth initially gained access to the Kiva rites through cultivating the friendship of the priests and through learning the Hopi language. Where there was opposition to his presence he sometimes forced his way into a kiva, justifying his intrusion on the grounds that he had permission...
from the chief priests of the ceremony. Without their confidence in his activities he would never have received the information that he was given. More serious were the inter accusations that he had "stolen their secrets" and published them for all to read.

In 1913 Voth was hired by the Fred Harvey Company to install three altars in the Harvey House at Albuquerque, and so authentic were the reproductions that First Mesa Hopis are said to have asked for their return, in the belief that they had been stolen and sold. Twenty years later a number of Hopis from Third Mesa were taken to the Field Museum, once he was free of any connection with the exhibits.

Later, Panimptiwa, one of the critics of Voth, assumed the leadership of the Powamu ceremony at Oraibi when his elder brother died. Not knowing the details of the procedure, Titiev reports that he was forced to follow Voth's account, which was translated for him by his son Taiyavesa, the author of Sun Chief, as one of the Powamu performers, an accusation which resulted in his being excluded from ceremonies until Mischa Titiev could secure statements from the Museum which cleared him of any connection with the exhibits.

For some reason Voth never studied the major men's societies, Wowochim, Tao, Ahl and Kwan, which were collectively concerned with initiation into manhood and intimately associated with the dead and the underworld. The factional disruptions of the 1890's and early 1900's were such that tribal initiations were not held on Third Mesa until 1912, but Voth must have been aware of their significance. Nor did he ever solve the problem of who the kachinas were, since he had early rejected Fewkes' hypothesis of ancestor worship. Hence he missed the significance of the equation of the dead with clouds and masked dancers, and their relationship to rain and crops. For all his interest in Hopi religion he never attempted to understand it in its own terms because he had already defined it as false.

Voth excelled as an ethnologist. The details fascinated him and he was never content until he had everything in place. The account of the Powamu ceremony, which Dorsey and Voth did together, is relatively brief and Voth kept adding more data until Dorsey wrote him that we "don't need to wait until the subject is exhausted" before publishing. As their collaboration continued the Hopi provided an inexhaustible supply of ethnological detail, built up over a millennium and more of addition and accumulation, as new groups joined the early settlers on Black Mesa. For Dorsey and the Museum he was an ideal investigator, one who could make collections, interpret them, and put them on exhibit for the general public. But as time went on he kept repeating what he had already done until he had practically all the Hopi altars on display. As an ethnologist of Hopi life he had no peers but the task of interpretation has had to be carried out by others, and particularly by Mischa Titiev for Third Mesa.

Why Voth never became a permanent member of the staff of the Field Museum, once he was free of his obligations to the mission, is more difficult to understand. We have provided some of the reasons above but only a detailed study of his journals will provide the full evidence. He did have the task of looking after his children from at least two marriages, and he undoubtedly had property in Kansas, and probably also in Oklahoma. His reference group, first and last, was the Mennonites, and he maintained his relations to them until the end.

Laura Thompson's accusation that the Mennonites undermined the authority of the priesthood through conversion of the chief priests which led to the subsequent lapse of their ceremonies does not hold up under scrutiny. Neither Voth nor his successors ever converted a major leader; the closest they came was the conversion of Charles Frederick, the younger brother of the village chief. The priests who gave up their ceremonies did so for quite other reasons, as Titiev's account of Old Oraibi (1944) clearly shows, nor did the Mennonite influence "render difficult the implementation of any federal policy which fosters self-government," as she also claimed. The Indian Service bureaucracy (of which her then husband, John Collier, was Commissioner) didn't require assistance from the Mennonites to make self-government difficult.

In this brief essay we have tried to illuminate the Reverend Voth as Mennonite missionary and H. R. Voth as ethnologist, or perhaps better, ethnographer. We haven't been able to reconcile the two "persons," and indeed, Voth himself seems to have been unable to choose one role or the other or to integrate the two in a meaningful way. Despite his inability to make up his mind, or possibly because of the tension created by his two roles, Voth has left us with a remarkable series of studies of Hopi life and culture which form a foundation for all future studies, and for which we can be exceedingly grateful.

Note on sources. I am indebted to the Bethel College Historical Library at North Newton, Kansas for permission to utilize the Voth Archives, and to Dr. John M. Janzen, a former student, for his kindness in making a preliminary survey of their contents. I have also made extensive use of the files on the Dorsey-Voth Correspondence and other materials in the Field Museum archives, Voth's extensive photographic collection of some 1500 negatives, the majority of which pertain to the Hopi, have been made more available through the efforts of Professor Emil Haury.

This article was originally published as an introduction to a catalog of artifacts collected by Voth and now deposited in the Heard Museum, which kindly granted permission to reprint Eggan's essay in Mennonite Life: Barton Wright, ed., Hopi Material Culture: Artifacts gathered by H. R. Voth in the Fred Harvey Collection (Flagstaff: Northland Press, 1979).
Lecture for a Limited Audience

by John Ruth

Preacher Christian Halteman, of the Salford Mennonite congregation,
Wrote, in 1782,
On Easter Sunday, no less:
"There are two kinds of people in the world."

Two centuries later, as I preach in the same congregation,
I remember how, as I studied in the university,
A philosopher told me such thinking was embarrassingly too simple.
So did an anthropologist, several types of psychologist,
A sociologist, a historian and a theologian.
Also a European writer who came through and said
(Being quoted complete with accent for the next half a month),
"The executioner is the bond of the community of man."

A friend at a party did agree that there were two kinds of people,
For about thirty seconds, but then amended it to three:
Bad men, liberated men, and women.
There might be—it was conceptually possible—
Some bad women, too,
But you couldn't be sure which ones they were,
Because they had all been so immemorially victimized
That for the next while, at least,
Moral categories were not useful in this case.

Talking about "two kinds of people,"
My friends told me, was potentially dangerous:
A Cain-and-Abel type of dichotomy:
And we need as few oversimplifications as we can get
For the next century or so.
Or at least until we can get the computer fully humanoid.
It's necessary to realize, they said,
If you expect to be taken seriously in today's global milieu,
That there are innumerable types of people.

Having experienced this stimulating intellectual interchange,
It tickled me to remember how much gall old Christian Halteman had.
You've got to live in a small township like Upper or Lower Salford,
To believe what he did, or believe that some people can believe it.
As Shakespeare once wrote:
"Home-keeping youth have ever home-bred wits."

There are two kinds of people, this preacher said.

Now Christian had an ancestor, Hans Haldeman,
Oh, about a great, great-grandfather,
Who was branded in Switzerland with the Bernese seal,
And expelled into Burgundy with pus running down his back,
Because he wouldn't go to communion in the right church,
And he wouldn't fight for his country.
(His people also insisted they would tell the truth without an oath.)
His expulsion was done at the recommendation of some concerned clergymen.
The only valuable export Switzerland had then was soldiers,
And when you refused to respect the military system,
You were unravelling the fiber of Christian society.

The difference between kinds of people
That made a difference to Hans Haldeman—
Christian's great-grandfather—
Was that there was a kind of fellow-Christians of his
Who claimed a God-given responsibility
To have a red-hot iron applied to his back.
Maybe that's where those Haltemans got their habit of oversimplification,
Because Hans must have been sorely tempted to believe
(In the heat of the process)
That either he was a different kind of people than these fellow-Christians,
Or else that he and they were believing in two different Gods.
Being a monotheist, certainly, he must then have thought—
Well, you draw the conclusion.
It was very confusing for Hans,
And of course quite painful.

I trust he prayed, "Father, forgive them,"
But, as he felt the kiss of the iron,
Could you blame him (or his descendant Christian of Salford,
Hearing about this, or reading about it in the Martyrs' Mirror)
For thinking that there might just be two kinds of people:
Those who believe in a God who says you can kill
If you're morally certain it's necessary,
And have checked with your bishop first if there was sufficient time.
And those who believe in One who says,
"Thou shalt not kill, and there's no fine print to that"?

Two kinds of people, not psychologically, but theologically.

What I seem to be trying to say is: it's a fact
That there are people in the world who will use a sword
On human flesh,
Or an M-16 or an Enola Gay,
If there are good enough reasons,
And then there are people who won't do such things for any reason.

That second category does exist.

I've never seen a systematic history of it from Crowell or Macmillan's
(Well, yes I have, but it was a history of pacifism.
Christian Halteman, the farmer-preacher, never heard about pacifism.
He didn't say there were two kinds of philosophies,
Or two kinds of ethics.
In his parochial way, he said there were two kinds of people.
I can't remember any documentaries on the phenomenon as such,
Not even on PBS.
And you know, they could do something like that, even on commercial TV.
A few good-looking actors, some helicopters and a haystack or bedroom scene—
You can make any theme interesting.
I even saw the Holocaust done that way once.
You could have a name narrator,
And use Joan Baez's voice on the music track.
As little as I read about this phenomenon in the *New York Times*,
I do pick up, in odd pages, evidence that in every war
(And sometimes it's not even a war, just some kind of polarization)
The strange species, the second kind of people, appears,
In of course statistically insignificant percentages.

They just won't fight.
Sometimes they'll even carry guns, but won't shoot,
Or they'll shoot, but never hit anything.
Stonewall Jackson complained about people like that around Harrisonburg, Virginia.
In World War I, one man used to go “over the top,” day after day, in France,
With his rifle held flat against his chest.
He shook hands, once, with a German soldier.
He knew only two German words—*Mann* and *Liebe*.
He said them both, and the German smiled before walking away.

On the streets of Tashkent, I talked with a Russian,
In the 50th year of our comrade Lenin,
Who told me that though he served in the Soviet Army,
He would have died before killing anyone else, even an enemy.
He was a Baptist. Think about that,
Some of you liberals who think you own Peace.

This species, I insist, exists internationally.

Now I don't necessarily mean the people you always see on marches.
At the Washington Moratorium in 1969 I met a lot of anti-types.
One young gang with a flag was chanting:
“Six-seven-eight, Smash the state!”
“You're planning,” I yelled, “to bring in peace that way?”
“That's where it's at, man!” one of them hollered back.
And marched on like any Prussian.

So I found my Falcon and drove back home to Lower Salford,
And there I read again this crude sermon by Christian Halteman,
My predecessor in the Salford pulpit,
Who had the gall to say there were all of two kinds of people in the world.

Now, just how ignorant, though, is that?

I mean, there are some people who categorically won't kill,
And the rest of them will.
It's what you might call binary.
It's a funny line to draw, I suppose,
Because there are Christians on both sides of it,
And Buddhists, I imagine, and atheists, and even Republicans.

Certainly, there were masses of Christians who went on the Crusades,
When the *Papa* of the Church said you could enjoy killing,
But I'll wager there were a few who wouldn't have gone
Even if you'd have threatened to kill them,
Or if *Papa* would have damned them to hell for cowardice.

(I wonder what would happen today, if an American evangelist announced
A “Crusade for Christ” in, say, Saudi Arabia.)

I once saw an arresting cartoon:
A victorious Crusader enhorised—the holy cross on his banner—
Had a paynim down on his back on the ground.
As the point of the Christian's lance quivered over the pagan's nose,
The latter gazed upward with sincere attention.
"Tell me," he begged, "about this Christianity of yours.
I'm terribly interested."

As I said, there are two kinds of Christians
(And, I often hope, two kinds of Moslems, etc.—
If you are out there, please write me before Pakistan gets the Bomb),
And I don't mean Fundamentalists and Modernists.
The dividing line I'm talking about runs right through both their ranks.
Most of them, when a war heats up,
Either say that the Sermon on the Mount must after all be seen as an ideal,
Or, if they hold to Scriptural Innerrancy,
That it doesn't completely apply yet:
What it is is a glimpse we can have of the beautiful Kingdom that some day,
If we take Jesus as our personal Savior now, and are born again,
We'll inherit;
Where it will actually be natural to live like the Beatitudes
(Loving your enemy will be academic; there won't be any.
All evil will be removed by Divine Fiat).
In the meantime we must be wiser than serpents,
And as harmless as is consistent with common sense.

So both Fundamentalists and Modernists, on this point, are in the same church.
They both carry rifles on both sides of all the wars.

What I'm saying is that there are millions of this kind of Christian,
But that there are also a few like Christian Haltman, the other kind of people,
Who say you have to live by the Sermon on the Mount
And accept any consequences.
Luther called them Schärmer, fanatics,
People who think the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, already in time:
A species of naivete, often mainly rural.

Now, as a student of world reality,
I find that every ethnic group claims folk wisdom on this matter,
And has short-story writers.

Many of them seem to feel that if they could just share their secret,
Play their zithers, sing their song,
Do their dance on the world stage,
It might charm us all into World Peace.
When somebody from one of the ethnic groups does something good,
And the media ask them how they did it,
They often say, "Well, I guess it's because I'm a, an ____________________ ."
And then they name their group.
Others, who feel no ethnicity,
Explain that they were following out their correct ideology.
Some say it was their sex.
And some, of course, give all the credit to the Lord,
Right on Phil Donahue.

Some people feel that it's the poets who will bring in peace.
Schiller wrote, and Beethoven heard music for, "Alle Menschen werden Brüder."
They sing this all over the world, in concert halls.
And for the moment, apparently, feel as moved by it as if they believed it.

The confusing thing is that in the crunch,
Ethnics, ideologues, believers and poets
Seem to rest their case as much on their bullets
As on their songs, their ideology or their Lord.
And all those groups have both kinds of people in them:
The kind that can use a weapon on other people,
And the few that absolutely can't.
(Catholics handle this in part by calling the latter saints,
Which allows them to be viewed as spiritual freaks,
Beautiful but not normative.)

It's funny, it seems that all the ethnic groups
(I should know—I'm Pennsylvania Dutch when it helps),
If they get a crack at cultural ascendancy,
Directly extrapolate from this to divine favor,
Or at least historic destiny, or something,
And then to keep this status, they do what Jesus himself wouldn't—
Rig threat-displays to keep boundaries sacred:
"Stay on your side of that line, friend,
Or I'll be forced to,
Reluctantly, after due deliberation, anticipatory expiation, legislation,
Or prayer, as the case may be,
Fry your hide.
(Nothing personal: it's simple deference to Nature's First Great Law
Of self-preservation)."

Now the small percentage of the other kind of people
(Too small to show on most graphs)
Refuses to be serious about these sacredest boundaries.
Conscientious, ethical Gypsies, you might call them,
With cousins on all continents.
They dream that they have property that moths can't eat,
And that thieves have no motive for stealing.

When the recruiters' posters go up, and the bands march,
The politicians and generals,
Thinking, as they do, of the greatest good for the greatest number,
Simply can't depend on this type of people.

The Pentagon, of course, is safe, as is the Kremlin:
There aren't enough of these people
To compromise the viability of the international order.
There are probably not enough of them, in any significant county,
To elect, in a fair vote, the dog-catcher.

But they do exist.
To use a phrase of Immanuel Velikovsky's,
These people amount to "more than zero."

Now then,
In addition to the people who are glad to have an excuse to kill,
And the people who are willing to kill if they have to
(Which are both subdivisions of an admittedly asymmetric category),
There exists this other species,
Who are willing to die if they have to,
But who can never,
By the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Air Corps,
The local high school band,
The Pope, or Commissar,
Their priest or minister or rabbi or psychologist,
Or Satan himself,
Be made willing to kill.

A phenomenon is a phenomenon.
Christian Halteman was on to something.
There are definitely two kinds of people.
Dying to Be Pure:
The Martyr Story

by Melvin Goering

Dirk’s Exodus invites Mennonites to ask a fundamental question. What does it mean to be a Mennonite (individual or institution) in North America in an urbanized, interconnected, professionalized, information age? What does it mean to be Mennonite, when one is immersed in the “secular” culture? The play does so by retelling a particularly gripping martyr story. The retelling gives power to familiar Mennonite theological and ethical themes. By so doing, it portrays a perspective with which to compare contemporary Mennonite practice.

The comparison reveals a great dissonance between the theological and ethical features of Dirk’s Exodus and the lives of an increasing number of contemporary Mennonites. The theological assumptions and social context of Mennonites at the end of the 20th century are so different from the world of Dirk Willems, a comparison raises doubts whether the martyr stories can provide guidance for the 21st century. The theological framework implicit in Dirk’s Exodus is in increasing contradiction with the lived experience and the needs of the contemporary culturally immersed Mennonite. The martyr stories provide dramatic images of a heroic past but do not provide culturally immersed Mennonites with an integrated “theology” for the 21st century. The problems contemporary Mennonites face require stories which provide a framework for being “faithful” in the midst of culture. Dirk’s Exodus is not such a story.

I will address these issues in three ways. First, I will draw attention to a radical shift in social and cultural patterns of Mennonite life which have created a gulf between the traditional theological assumptions and the contemporary social and cultural context.

Second, I will examine some of the major messages which Dirk’s Exodus and the martyr tradition portray as models for Mennonite living and note their inability to address the contemporary need. Third, I will offer hints on the type of stories that would be helpful.

Mennonite Cultural Immersion

Some form of two kingdom theology has been central to the way in which Mennonites have seen themselves. Loyalty to the kingdom of God and the church and separation from, indeed, opposition to “the world” have been guiding principles for social structures and individual life. Increasing numbers of Mennonites are becoming immersed in societal institutions in ways that challenge the assumptions of two kingdom thought.

Social Context

I grew up during the 40’s and 50’s in central Kansas. The distinction between the Church (more broadly Mennonite life and values) and the World (more broadly anyone not a Mennonite) was prominent. The boundary between the two communities was relatively clear, though always subject to challenge and changing rapidly by the 50’s. Members of the church community had little need for sustained interaction with social institutions beyond the transaction of business—selling wheat and buying groceries. Many of the socially accepted behavior patterns served to decrease the chances for interaction. If one could not dance, play cards, drink, participate in athletics, attend movies, etc., one was less likely to have social interaction with “the world.”

Mennonites even developed psychological character traits which were functional and necessary in such a homogeneous ideological-cultural context. These traits have become so integral to the Mennonite personality they often go unnoticed. Others notice them very quickly when the traits persist well beyond the social context in which they were functional.

First, there is a lack of openness to outsiders. This reinforces the cohesion of the group and decreases the chances of a successful challenge to one’s beliefs and actions. From the standpoint of the outsider, however, it often appears to show an arrogance and superiority, a moral smugness which puts down the life of the other person.

Second, purity of belief and action is very important. One demonstrates membership and loyalty to the community by showing a lack of compromise with other positions.

Third, a rhetoric of superiority often covers a sense of inferiority. There is a need to convince the primary group that it is not “wrong,” even though it is different from the dominant culture. The more interaction with the majority culture, the more the inferiority is felt, and the more the habit of assuming superiority comes through—often in the form of subtle put downs of others.

My experience with the Mennonite Congregation of Boston in the late 60’s provided a vivid contrast to my Kansas youth. Members were primarily professionals (or budding professionals) who lived and worked in “secular” institutions. The meetings served as time for reviving memories, since most had come from more traditional Mennonite backgrounds. In many ways, we had little in common, except some need to connect with our past. In some ways the meetings functioned more as a family or class reunion than a traditional religious organization—though rela-
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gious elements were certainly emphasized.

Contrast the early experiences of the young Mennonite growing up in Moundridge in the 40's and 50's with the young Mennonite growing up in Boston in the 60's. In the 40's in Moundridge nearly all interaction took place within the context of Mennonite dominated settings: home, elementary school (one or two rooms with nearly all teachers and students Mennonite), church, work (family farming or small town business). In the 60's in Boston, nearly all interaction was outside the context of Mennonite dominated settings. One might spend 2 hours a week in a Mennonite social or institutional context, at best.

By the 90's the children of the urban congregations of the 60's are adults. They do not have the common "Mennonite experience" from Inman or Freeman to define their identity as Mennonites. They have been raised and shaped by the institutions of American mass culture. They are children of parents who had great motivation to succeed in their chosen professions—and have often done so. To be a successful professional means adopting the values and standards of the profession and "playing by those rules." Often the professionals judge themselves by the upwardly mobile standards of the culture and implicitly teach their children to be conscious of those images. The Mennonite heritage becomes a quaint part of the parents' tradition but certainly not one that fits with the world in which the children live. It is precisely the children of the urban professionals that are most difficult to recruit to church related institutions. Such institutions are a symbol of the parents' history, but they do not have sufficient prestige for modern life. The church college may have launched the parents into the world, but once there, the world has a variety of "better" options for success.

An increasing number of Mennonites are caught in a lived contradiction. They have an inherited theological framework which is not consistent with the reality they live each day. The framework is grounded in a clear distinction between the church and the world, between good and evil. It is a framework that reinforces and is compatible with a life pattern in which Mennonites live in semi-isolated communities. They no longer live in such

The first generation of urban professionals could "live off" the heritage, much as the Boston Congregation noted above. By the second and now the third generation, in some cases, that heritage of shared memory is no longer present. Even more important, the illusion of the separation of church and world can no longer be sustained. Urban Mennonites are committing their lives and energies to the care and sustenance of secular institutions or "church related" institutions seeking to care for the world. Many Mennonites have crossed a fundamental "Rubicon." If Mennonites ever were living for the "church" in the church/world distinction, they are increasingly living for the world, its values, its institutions, and its benefits—at least sociologically speaking.

Church Related Institutional Context

Some Mennonites feel less "compromised" by the culture if they work within a church related institution. Many of these institutions were formed, in large part, to provide education, health care, or social services for those within the church. Others were formed more explicitly to serve the needs of others. Whatever the motive for creation, church related institutions of higher education and service became major avenues by which the broader culture and the Mennonite culture came into a new relationship.

The Mennonite mental health experience provides an instructive illustration. Mennonites did not begin work in the mental health field to bring more humane and just treatment. They found themselves assigned to mental hospitals as a result of their sense of Christian obligation to avoid "taking up the sword." Once involved, they soon realized expressions of individual love for the patients was not enough. It was the institution, the system which needed correction. The realization led to at least two types of response. First, there were efforts to expose the conditions in the mental hospitals. Second, alternative mental hospitals were begun. Mennonites were not yet ready to enter the political process and reform the existing secular institutions. Establishing alternative models allowed some psychological distance from full involvement in the institutions of the world.

The establishment of Mennonite mental hospitals provides an interesting
transitional response. It shows increasing awareness of three elements. First, Mennonites have some obligation for the injustices in the systems of the world. Second, institutional/systems approaches are required to address some problems. Three, professional secular wisdom may be critical to deal with problems, even those within the church. The church/world distinction was becoming more blurred.

After nearly 40 years of operation in a highly competitive environment, there are some who wonder whether Mennonite mental health facilities (and many other Mennonite institutions) have any distinctive features to warrant their continuation—at least their continuation as church related.6 In order to remain viable they are required to use the best in care and techniques as defined by the variety of accrediting agencies and the standards of the professional organizations in the field. In order to receive favorable governmental funding and regulation, political involvement and lobbying become essential. The facilities have become culturally immersed in ways that make the question of mission a central question for Mennonite Health Services as well as the individual hospitals. One could trace a similar movement in education and other church related institutions.

The transition from "church based" service, such as Mennonite Disaster Service (MDS), to active participation and involvement in the social service structures of government demonstrates a qualitative change. MDS style service allows one to move from a protected church base, following the requirements of faith, to speak to human need without being required to be accountable for the social structures which may have created the need. It is still within a general framework of two kingdom theology. One is not responsible for the broader social structure, but one is responsible to the church. Such responsibility requires one to feed the hungry, clothe the poor, and comfort the lonely.

When caring for the hungry, poor and depressed means providing new models of social structures or working within the social service structures, service assumes a different foundation. The individual has now taken responsibility for the social structures of society. One is now immersed in, shaped by, and required to be accountable for the social order. One has begun to care for the world in a new way.

Developing alternative models of social agencies and structures is something of an intermediate step which quickly leads to immersion. Anyone who has worked in a Mennonite higher education context or seen the struggle for a sense of unique mission in the current mental health field should recognize the shift and the difficulty.

More and more Mennonites and Mennonite institutions are living in the heart of society and culture, not in isolated rural or urban enclaves, but as individuals, families, and institutions attempting to be effective, successful, useful, and even faithful in the midst of the world. Where are the stories which provide models for this new interaction between church and world?

Authority, Ethics and Institutions

Mennonites have emphasized an individualistic ethic in the context of a history of opposition to authority and institutions. Now they find themselves in positions of authority within institutions attempting to deal with secular social realities. They are no longer developing activities or institutions to serve only the church. A common religious commitment cannot be assumed. The lack of a positive view of authority (power) and leadership coupled with an individualistic ethic creates dissonance as people work and act in contexts where groups of diverse populations attempt to address social, structural, and political problems.

General Conference Mennonites have a deep distrust of authority and institutions. After all it was the institutional authorities of the church and state which sought to eliminate the Anabaptists. The very identity of Mennonites has been shaped through opposition to the established religious and governmental authorities and institutions.

This long tradition of opposition creates a psychological dilemma. Mennonites often feel most comfortable in standing over against an idea, leader, or institution. This historic expectation results in an internal conflict for those Mennonites who are in positions of authority. They are in a role that is not valued by the tradition. They are in a role which comes with few positive guidelines on how it can be filled without contradicting the religious and ethical dictates of the tradition. Mennonites have some sense of how to be accountable for their personal lives, but far less sense of how to be accountable for institutional life.

Such a view of authority and institutions makes Mennonites very good at saying "no" to what is, but much less adept at establishing sound alternatives among those who do not accept their version of Christianity. It fosters a critical negativity without a corresponding sense of responsibility. One cannot lead an institution by saying "no." Good leaders see the positive opportunities in a situation and work to incorporate others into the vision of what might be.

Mennonites often have a reflexive response to authority and leadership. Authority and power become confused. Anyone in authority seems to rely on the use of power. The exercise of power seems to contradict an ideal of self-sacrifice. Yet power is an integral element in social roles, especially leadership roles in institutions.

Equally important, authority implies a social context in which a different ethical style is required. Leading a group often entails coordinating diverse perspectives. One sometimes must take a position that is not "pure" but allows the group to move forward. Thus institutions and their leaders become morally suspect, by the very nature of the context in which they must operate.

Anyone who has been in a leadership role in a Mennonite institution has seen this historical consciousness in action. When I moved from a faculty position to an administrative position, one of the faculty members said, "It is good to see some who are willing to make the sacrifice." The context and tone made it clear. A person in administrative authority in an organization, even a church related organization, inevitably is assuming a morally tainted role.
The traditional ethical admonitions of the Mennonites are applicable to the individual or to the relationships among believers. There are few indications of how one lives among those who are not believers, other than avoidance. Even so-called Mennonite institutions are no longer “just for believers.” It is this mixed situation which cries for a new response.

With those within the Church one can appeal to a religious framework. To those outside, one can justify one’s personal action on the basis of a religious framework. Such a religious stance is often admired, even if socially unpopular. As soon as the person begins to use the religious foundation to tell others how to run societal affairs, a negative reaction is more likely to be evoked.

This transition has taken place in the Mennonite positions on governmental policy and issues of peace and social justice. Mennonites are no longer content to avoid participation in public policy. Mennonites have become increasingly activist. Mennonites make pronouncements and take public policy stances with an eye to affecting the actions of governments and societies. These positions are expected to be effective in securing a better world, not just a better church. In important ways, there has been a rapid movement away from the call “to be in the world but not of it” to a call “to be in the world and to transform it.” The new involvement in public policy reflects a new sense that governmental and societal structures are a part of the responsibility of the Mennonite.

Historic Mennonite ethics have had sharp edges. The world was fairly black and white, with a minimal number of gray areas. Such an ethic is more suitable for individuals than for institutions. If movies are sinful, one can avoid movies. If killing is wrong, one can avoid killing.

Institutional ethics are more openly complex. Seldom do all participants in the institution agree on the correct behavior or position. The leader, however, is charged with preserving and fulfilling the mission of the institution. To wait for agreement would be to destroy the college or the church or the business. Therefore, when institutional leaders take action, it often appears to compromise some ethical universal and often does so at the expense of individuals either within or without the institution. The choice is seldom between good and evil, but among evils or among goods. From a traditional Mennonite perspective, persons in such complex contexts cannot continue to be faithful or ethical. Withdrawal to the realm of the personal is required.

At the end of the 20th century, Mennonites find themselves with a deeply rooted psychological and religious distrust of societal authority and institutions coupled with an ethic developed largely for the individual or the community of believers. At the same time Mennonites are increasingly called to live within and to provide leadership for societal institutions or church related institutions that wish to be effective in the larger society. Mennonites find themselves with a highly developed individual ethic, but one whose sharp edges are not very functional in a world of systematically interrelated institutional settings, especially in contexts where diversity of belief and action are the order of the day — yet Mennonites are increasingly living in such contexts.

This prelude leads us back to Dirk’s Exodus, one important illustration of the martyr tradition. Will the martyr stories provide guidance for a people immersed in culture, for persons living in the contexts noted above? Will the martyr stories provide guidance for a people in need of a positive vision of authority and institutional ethics?

Messages of the Martyrs

The martyr stories are gripping tales of humans struggling with life and death issues — literally. Dirk’s Exodus brings the story of one such martyr to life in a special way. In so doing it portrays many messages typical of the martyr tradition. I will mention five especially relevant to the Mennonite context of increasing cultural immersion.

Two Kingdom Dualism

Martyr stories dramatically portray two kingdom thinking. The Inquisitor believes in one kingdom and Dirk to the other. One cannot participate in the structures and politics of the civil state or the state religion and be loyal to Christ. In part the dramatic tension of the play has less to do with the potential loss of life than it has to do with the struggle for loyalty between the two potential kings seeking the allegiance of Dirk and others like him. Dual citizen-ship is not an option. Two kingdoms are a presupposition of the martyr tradition in Mennonite thought.

INQUISITOR: Then whose side are you on? Do you support King Philip, emissary of God? Or are you with that rebel, William of Orange?

DIRK: “I am a disciple of Jesus Christ, not of any worldly king or prince.”

Good and Evil: A Sharp Dichotomy

Dirk is clearly the symbol of good. The Inquisitor is the symbol of evil — a religion gone wrong. Typically the martyr stories present a very sharp, clean, separation between good and evil. The options are not ambiguous. Good and evil do not reside in the same person in some tangled web. There are some doctrines, beliefs and actions that are right and some are wrong. Evil is associated with those persons and institutions who care for the civic, social, cultural, and religious welfare of the people. Good is associated with those who embody beliefs and actions which separate them from those typical demands of society, those who follow Christ.

Rejection of Earthly Authority and Institutions

Dirk rejects the appeals to consider the teaching of the established church. He rejects the appeals to accept the commands of the civil authorities. It is precisely the rejection of civil and religious authority and institutions which is required in order to be faithful. Look what religious and civil institutions did to the early church. Look what religious and civil institutions did to the Anabaptists, so shuns the martyr tradition. The use of the Bible is, in part, an effort to affirm a direct relationship to a source of authority without need for civil authority or religious institutions.

Purity Over the Prudential

The Mennonite martyr tradition places a heavy emphasis upon remaining pure. There is no room for compromise or for accommodation, either to save one’s life or to provide for the continuing needs of family, friends, community, or church. Personal purity of belief and action are of paramount importance. One could save one’s life, but to do so would require compromise.
and accommodation to outside forces. Such persons are weak and less faithful. The effect of one's behavior on others is much less important than the effect of accommodation upon one's relationship with God. There is no room for a utilitarian ethic.

The drive for purity justifies a strict discipline within the church, a separation of oneself from those who do not share the same beliefs and actions, and a lack of involvement with the evils and injustices of the world. It also fosters one of the more interesting psychological features of Mennonites. It seems that Mennonites are only feeling good when they feel bad. If purity and perfection are required, even those Mennonites within the church can always feel "bad" because they are not living up to the ideal. One is never allowed to feel good about accomplishments, lest one show pride. One must always remain humble and unworthy.

Even the traditional opposition to war is based on a need to remain pure or faithful. Historically Mennonites do not refrain from participation in war because they have a better alternative to eliminating evil and injustice in the world.12

Preaching and Pronouncement, Not Dialogue

Martyrs project a clarity of belief, a sense of being correct against all odds. They are right and they know it, no matter the degree to which they are in a numeric minority. For those in agreement with them, their behavior shows courage and faithfulness. To those in disagreement, the behavior often shows an arrogance and a moral smugness.

Sincere dialogue implies the possibility of error in one's position. If there is doubt, would one give up one's life? Just as a martyr, as a model Christian, does not accommodate to the social context so a martyr does not entertain alternatives on the psychological or personal level—at least that is the way it is portrayed.

DIRK: But I have read what the Bible says of Jesus' teachings, His life and His death. It is clear beyond doubt.13

One can profess a position or witness to another person if one has the truth in one's possession. Martyrs provide a witness, not a serious quest for truth or the meaning of faithfulness in conversation with those outside the church. If you have the answers you evangelize, if not you dialogue.

Individual over community

Martyrs are individuals. They make decisions for themselves, not for a community. The ethics of martyrdom is an individualistic ethic, however important the believing community may be in shaping their lives and convictions. Mennonite martyrs seldom provide a social ethic or way to resolve issues of social justice.14 Faithfulness is a relationship issue between the individual and God in the drama of the moment.

Each of these messages reinforces a perspective that assumes a required chasm between the Mennonite life and the social and cultural context of the nonbeliever. They are messages that presuppose a life in which individual ethics can be separated from institutional ethics, where God's call does not include a need to be faithful for social institutions, where the political and social forces are not a part of the domain of the Christian.

The messages do not speak, in other words, to the problematic of the 21st century culturally immersed Mennonite. The messages call people to psychological patterns which do not foster cooperative institutional life, certainly not institutional life with those outside the church. Contemporary Mennonites need stories that provide guidance on how to be faithful while immersed in secular culture, in secular institutions, and in church related institutions immersed in secular life. Contemporary Mennonites need stories that assist with the development of character patterns able to have conviction in the midst of openness, to be effective without giving up ethics, etc.

The critic might suggest the important point has been missed. The martyr stories are essential just now as a clarion call for renewal. The description of the contemporary Mennonite trends is correct. The wrong conclusion has been drawn. Culturally immersed Mennonites do not need stories to help them live in the new contemporary context. Mennonite cultural immersion simply shows the problem to be solved. Urban Mennonites need martyr stories to call them back to faithfulness, since they have lost their way in the labyrinth of church related and secular institutional life.

First, to suggest a need for renewal

The Mennonite immersion in the world reflects a theological awareness that the Christian God is not only the God of salvation but the God of creation.

Christians are called not just to assure their own salvation but to care for God's creation as well.

Whatever the history of the movement toward Mennonite cultural immersion, it is an opportunity for a theological correction.
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is to agree with a fundamental premise. The historic perspective implicit in Dirk’s Exodus and the cultural immersion of Mennonites are in tension, any contradiction.

Second, even those professionals most inclined to see the tension seem unwilling to alter their cultural involvement with church related or secular institutions in order to be more consistent with the tradition. It would require a reorientation of values. It would require a shift in identity.¹⁵ Mennonites would be required to pay greater heed to the Amish and Church of God in Christ for models, rather than the educated professionals in institutional leadership positions. Intentional communities with a greater degree of self-imposed isolation would become more prominent. Such a renewal is unlikely. What does that mean for those who are not willing to accept such a version of renewal? Are they no longer “true Mennonites?”

Third, the transition to involvement with institutions and secular systems grew from the recognition of a genuine need and a realization of a weakness of the traditional Mennonite position. Individual love of neighbor is minimally effective in situations where institutions and systems shape the lives of people. The CPS experience in mental hospitals and other service efforts drove Mennonites to this realization. Institutions are sometimes the only vehicles which allow love and care to be delivered. Political involvement is sometimes the mechanism for bringing positive change to the sick, the elderly, and the oppressed. Genuine love of neighbor as your self in the modern context requires the incorporation of systematic, institutional, political approaches.

Fourth, there is a dark underside to the traditional position, seldom acknowledged by Mennonites but often pointed out by others. A social consciousness that focuses on believers tends to become self-centered. Remaining “theologically pure” implies a focus on oneself in contrast to a giving of oneself to meet the need of others, even at the expense of one’s own purity. Promoting justice for the poor in the broader community can become an endeavor in which one “compromises” some ideals in order to achieve the possible. Promoting a more peaceful world, not just avoiding personal participation in war, requires deep involvement in social and political movements that soil the purity of intention and idea with the reality of action. Avoidance of such involvement, implicit in the assumptions of the martyr tradition, places purity of self above the cry of the poor and oppressed.

Fifth, the extent of the cultural immersion has exposed the inherent contradiction in two kingdom theology. One can deny the contradiction when life is lived in self-imposed isolation from the broader social systems. When nearly all of life is lived in such systems, the fact becomes obvious. Going back to the isolated community will not solve the inherent dilemma. It is now too apparent.

Sixth, the Mennonite immersion in the world reflects a theological awareness that the Christian God is not only the God of salvation but the God of creation. Christians are called not just to assure their own salvation but to care for God’s creation as well. Whatever the history of the movement toward Mennonite cultural immersion, it is an opportunity for a theological correction.

New Stories

Dirk’s Exodus performs an important service. It calls people to a social, cultural and theological life which is consistent with the life lived by an increasing number of contemporary Mennonites. By doing so in a dramatic public arena, it focuses the discussion on the central dilemma of modern Mennonites. Can the Mennonite religious tradition, developed through years of opposition to the “world,” transform itself and retain distinctive characteristics which differentiate it from others while still maintaining some continuity with the tradition? Or does the growing cultural involvement of Mennonites, both in Mennonite institutions and in secular institutions inevitably mean the end of the heritage? Is there a Mennonite “identity” and role beyond the demise of two kingdom theology?

Addressing the questions will require creative thought, whatever the ultimate answer to such questions. Mennonites will need different stories to focus the future. The stories need to be authentic to the heritage. They need to be stories which assist Mennonites to obedience with flexibility, beliefs without dogmatism, faithfulness within culture, ethical leadership within institutions, love and justice within social structures, conviction in the midst of ambiguity, dialogue without arrogance, care without condescension, openness without...
disintegration. It will require stories that encourage responsible caring for God's creation—the world. Dirk's Exodus and the martyr tradition which it portrays is not such a story.

I use the phrase, "urban Mennonite" and "culturally immersed Mennonite" to identify a growing number of Mennonites who live and work in social settings in which most of the social interaction is with those who are not Mennonite; and/or in "church" institutions in which the standards for professional competency are set by regional or national agencies with minimal regard for Mennonite beliefs; and/or in institutions serving the common needs of society, not the church.

Most contemporary North American Mennonites fit into one of these categories. The tradition has been most rapid and startling among those Mennonites with a strong rural heritage who, until recently, lived in relatively isolated communities (the 1874 migration).

For a more detailed historical/anthropological analysis of many of the themes noted in this paper see J. Lawrence Burkholder's book, The Problem of Social Responsibility From the Perspective of the Mennonite Church (Elkhart, Indiana: Institute for Mennonite Studies, 1989).

A recent respondent at "Dialogue '92," offered a contemporary version of the "two kingdom" assumption in talking about health care. "Personally, I do not think we can change the system. The world's systems will never be redeemed. I think our job is to create alternative systems."


While culturally immersed Mennonites have lost the social context where such behavior is useful, they often retain a psychological profile of a minority culture—traits that served well in rural Kansas but do not serve well for institutional and individual life immersed in the broader culture. They are displayed most often in transitional settings where an institution seeks to be Mennonite and the majority of institutional members are Mennonites but they are trying to serve a broader population of those outside the Mennonite tradition.

Clearly children growing up in Freeman and Inman are children of contemporary mass culture as well as in the 1960's, compared to the 40's, but with a less obvious domination, and more room to continue to feel distinct from the rest of society.

The Mennonite who grew up in Freeman and becomes successful in a secular institution in a large city may wonder whether they have "sold out" in some way. They may have qualms about authenticity or integrity with their religion. The Mennonite who grew up in Buhler and becomes successful in a secular institution often develops a sense of being a "failure." The really good professionals are at Carleton or Harvard. "I am at a small unknown church college. Therefore I am not O.K." This feeling of inferiority has profound effects on the life and culture of Mennonite institutions.


The current discomfort among many at the way in which the religious right is moving its agenda into the political process illustrates the point.

Allen Kreider's article, "The Relevance of Martyrs' Mirror to Our Time," in the September 1990 issue of Mennonite Life suggests a number of messages provided by the martyr stories. The Martyrs' Mirror is praised as "arguably the most important book produced by the Anabaptist- Mennonite tradition." Kreider claims a long list of virtues which any Christian should adopt to be a faithful servant in the modern era—all illustrated by the martyr tradition.

Despite the proliferation tendencies, the Martyrs' Mirror is a valuable source for the theology of suffering. The fact that the Mennonite church devoted itself to the collection and illustration of stories of horror indicates more than a morbid psychology. It indicates a profound belief in a theology of the two Kingdoms, the Civitas Dei and the Civitas Diaboli of St. Augustine, with an eschatological rigor which went beyond Augustine. J. Lawrence Burkholder, The Problem of Social Responsibility From the Perspective of the Mennonite Church (Elkhart, Indiana: Institute for Mennonite Studies, 1989), 47.


In Dirk's Exodus the author makes room for shades of grey, seeds of doubt, especially in the character of the Inquisitor. Those who tortured and burned the Anabaptists were never given such ambiguous features in my youth. They were symbols of an evil religious and civic kingdom.

The traditional position has been modified a great deal in some circles. Through the Korean war the Mennonites focused on the political implications of their religiously based positions of nonresistance. Since the Viet Nam era, Mennonite pacifism often blends with a political discussion of the most appropriate public policies to achieve a peaceful world. The shift is one of degree, but the shift in degree has become a shift in kind. I remember a conversation with a faculty member at Bethel who found it difficult to understand the discussions of the Gulf War. The position of some of the Mennonites seemed to be based on political and pragmatic reasons, but when challenged they were not open for discussion. What sounded like prudential political discussion, was not. When I suggested that the real driving force in the positions were religious, though heavily camouflaged, he understood why open discussion was so difficult.

Dirk's Exodus (Topeka: TK Printing, 1992), 133.

I suspect the popular term, "Shalom," was seldom used by Mennonites prior to the mid to late 20th century, or at best, was used to describe the life of the "true believers." It is not uncommon to hear Mennonites in the 1990's suggest the Mennonite concerns for social justice is a defining characteristic. Historically Mennonites have not been concerned for social justice. They have been concerned for the church, the community of believers. Social justice was the domain of the princes and popes.

INQUISITOR: You would disun all Chris­ tendom and allow the infidel Turks to over­ run all of Europe? Who would defend you Dutchman then?

DIRK: Let God see to the defense of His people. Followers of Christ must trust God and live by the law of love.


There was a time when faculty members at church related colleges found their professional identity in the college. Increasingly, faculty now find their identity in the discipline of study. Earlier one was more likely to modify the standards of the discipline to accommodate the mission of the church related college. Now the pressure is to modify the church related college to accommodate the needs of the discipline. I suspect a similar phenomenon is taking place among professionals in all church related institutions.
Mennonite Bibliography, 1946

BY MELVIN GINGERICH AND CORNELIUS KRAHN

This Mennonite Bibliography is a new feature of Mennonite Life. Annually in the April issue we plan to present a list of all significant books, pamphlets, and magazine articles that deal with Mennonites and related groups. Magazine articles will be restricted to non-Mennonite publications, since the historical libraries of Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas; Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana; and Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio; keep complete files of all Mennonite periodical publications and are accessible to everyone.

We invite our readers to call our attention to publications falling under the above classification that we may have omitted, in order that we may include them in our next annual bibliography.

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS
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The Very presence of CPS volunteers brought change as they refused to be conformed to the conditions and worked to treat the patients in more humane ways. As one volunteer noted, “Here in the hospital with its almost cynical disregard of human values, I’ve experienced how love and understanding can touch even the most irrational among us.” (p. 71)

Sometimes the new ways were appreciated, but often the presence of the volunteers was an unwelcome intrusion, whether to other attendants, doctors who did not seem to care, or the local veterans groups.

The volunteers used their eyes, ears, and writing skills to record their experiences, especially the terrible conditions they found. These observations became the material from which professional journalists in Cleveland, Baltimore, Life magazine, and elsewhere wrote exposés that resulted in the ouster of a few hospital superintendents, some reform, and began to build some political capital for legislative action. In one investigation in Virginia, “sixteen of the 33 men in the CPS unit testified at the hearing.” (p. 73) In some cases they were able to secure the high visibility of national figures, such as Eleanor Roosevelt, to assist the communication process. They became
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advocates for the patients and for reform, as is well illustrated in one Connecticut unit, where the administration cooperated in a public relations effort within the community.

The isolation of the units and the lack of training were problems for the CPS participants. Sareyan gives a detailed account of a group at Philadelphia State Hospital who established a clearinghouse where other conscientious objectors could share ideas they found effective in dealing with patients. By June 1944 a monthly periodical, The Attendant, appeared. Mental health professionals served on an advisory board. Articles were provided by regular and CPS staff on various patient care issues. Within a year The Attendant had been introduced to every hospital and training school in the country.

These early information, public relations, and educational efforts developed by CPS groups grew. Films and radio dramas were produced, often using professional actors. Such efforts were continued and expanded through the Mental Health Foundation, successor of an earlier CPS program. A national campaign encouraged newspapers to change their style sheets to use new terms to replace some of the more derogatory labels used to describe the mentally ill. A national mental health week was established. Numerous additional informational and educational activities matured after the war, often with the continued efforts of former CPS personnel.

As with most stories, the interest is in the details which Sareyan develops. Many of the details will be new and interesting. It is a moving story of human response in unwelcome circumstances. Few, if any, of the CPS personnel would have chosen to work in state institutions. Once there, they altered the landscape of mental health in ways that few could have predicted.

One might have wished for a more systematic structure on which to hang the details. One might have wished for less reliance on these activities in which the author was personally involved for a more systematic development of his thesis. One might have wished for a book more directly focused on outcomes rather than processes that assume outcomes, especially in the claims about the changing of public perceptions. Nevertheless, Sareyn’s book is well worth reading for anyone who is aware of the CPS experience, is concerned about mental health treatment, or wants to read an inspiring story of ordinary people who were able to translate their religious faith and values into practical action.

Melvin Goering
Chief Executive Officer, Prairie View, Inc.
Newton, Kansas


Russian Mennonite historiography has deep roots, with a fine array of late nineteenth and early twentieth century works. It continues to develop on at least four fronts: general syntheses by James Urry, Walter Sawatsky, and the writers in the Gerhard Lohrenz Festschrift have provided useful interpretive schemes; literary studies by Al Reimer, Peter Pauls and other have offered poignant historical narratives; archival research aid has made a quantitative leap forward with the publication of Ingrid Epp and Harvey Dyck’s The Peter J. Braun Mennonite Archive, 1803-1920. There is a fourth approach that is promising to rewrite Russian Mennonite history from the “bottom up.” Taking the reader into the heart of Mennonite society in the larger Molotschina and Chortitz colonies are recent works by Helmut Huebert, Ted Regehr and others. Recent translations of the Echo Verlag series and work by William Schroeder and Delbert Plutt have directed readers into the heart, too, of several sub-colonies. John Friesen’s Against the Wind is another useful addition to this developing genre.

This is the story of the Baratow and Schlachtin colonies begun in 1872 by 74 landless Chortitz colony families. Friesen follows the development of the four villages of Baratow-Schlachtin from their beginnings when land was purchased from Prince Repnin, the colony structure of Chortitz was replicated, and a market-driven economy established. The narrative moves quickly into the difficult trials of the revolution in the 1910s, famine in the 1930s and evacuation in the 1940s. The work is heart-felt and insightful; this is a personal voyage for the author whose parents left Baratow-Schlachtin in the 1920s. The work ends with a look at the “remnants of community past,” a description of the current state of the former colony. Reference to the recent letter from Canadian Mennonites to the priest of the Selenopole Ukrainian Orthodox church sanctioning his use of the former Mennonite church building for religious services is especially moving.

The book is the product of a wide reading of both primary and secondary sources. It brings to the task a variety of fascinating sources, including materials from Jacob Redekop’s 1966, Brazilian-published, Es war die Heimat: Baratow-Schachtin, and documents and aerial photos from the Captured German War Documents archive in Washington. Friesen also relies on secondary sources to develop the context of Baratow-Schlachtin: indeed, the work demonstrates a penchant for context, including national and global economic changes and the wider Mennonite commonwealth in Russia. There is an even an expressed concern about the lives and feelings of the Ukrainian peasants who were displaced by the Mennonite colonists, and an allusion to inter-ethnic cultural exchanges, such as the time Mennonites “learned from the settlement patterns” of their Ukrainian neighbors.

The central themes of the book are well-rooted in Mennonite historiography. Anyone looking for evidence that Mennonites have a special knack for “institutional completeness” can find it here: it was with remarkable speed that the Chortitz-based church and the orphans and fire insurance structures were established on the new colony in the 1870s and Mennonite structures recreated after the invasion of the German forces in August 1941. The book follows another Mennonite theme in its focus on the development of a farm economy.
The imperative of the frontier—"the plain had to be broken"—is much in evidence here. Friesen brings his expertise as a Senior Planner with the Manitoba Department of Agriculture to bear on this text; there is a welcome focus on Mennonites and physiography that has drawn the attention of American environmental historians like Donald Worster and Pamela Lynn Rice-Kerberg.

Readers may be disappointed that so much of this slim volume is devoted to the wider Mennonite story; several of the chapters have fewer paragraphs dedicated to Baratow-Schlachtin than to the general story of Russian Mennonites. Readers may also have concerns about the numerous approximations in the book: assertions such as "the market was frequently saturated" and Mennonite Brethren members "worked very well with the main line Mennonite church" beg for elaboration and specific detail. Could more detail of "social stratification" to which Friesen alludes be attained in the Peter Braun archival sources? Could there have been more stories of everyday life during collectivization and evacuation through extensive oral interviews, both from descendants of the community and from the "one Mennonite woman still living in the village"? Could the spirit of the community have been developed more thoroughly be examining possible letters by the Schlachtin-Baratow colonists in the Mennonite newspapers—Die Friedensstimme, Der Botshaffer, Die mennonitische Rundschau—to which Friesen alludes? There is a chapter on inter-village life, but could another, crucial layer of the Mennonite experience have been uncovered by examining family and kinship ties, household activity, street life and the lives of women? One senses that women played important roles, but they are either hidden in the household or are shadowed by their men: the wife of Count Baratow, of Jacob Epp, of "ambitious young men" are fleeting and mostly nameless figures.

The book serves its readers well in providing a system of footnoting, a bibliography, a rich photograph section, an array of detailed maps, an index, aerial photographs, and several useful appendices. The book will be especially welcomed as an addition in the English language to the expanding story of the sub-colonies that were begun during the nineteenth century and often charted a somewhat different pattern of settlement, community formation and emigration than those of the main colonies.

Royden Loewen
Chair of Mennonite Studies
University of Winnipeg
Winnipeg, Manitoba


World War I ranks among the most wrenching events in American Mennonite history. Most Mennonites had migrated to the United States believing that they would be allowed to practice their nonresistant religious beliefs without undue pressure from the state. Previous American wars had posed some dilemmas for nonresistant Mennonites, but none so fundamentally challenged Mennonite belief systems and way of life as did World War I. This was a "total war," a war that demanded full cooperation of all citizens, whether soldiers or civilians. It was a war fought for highly idealistic reasons, and as such its advocates had little patience or understanding for persons whose religious or moral beliefs prevented their participation. Finally, it was a war against perceived German aggression, and thus all German-Americans—particularly pacifist ones such as the Mennonites—came under particular scrutiny and pressure.

How American Mennonites held up under and responded to this difficult situation is the subject of Gerlof D. Homan's book American Mennonites and the Great War: 1914-1918. While not the first book written on the topic, Homan's book is the first thoroughly-researched account of the American Mennonite experience during World War I, and as such makes a significant contribution to Mennonite historiography.

Homan begins his account by examining the Mennonite peace witness prior to America's entry to the war in 1917. He acknowledges the common criticism that American Mennonites had allowed their peace teaching simply to become part of the tradition handed down from generation to generation rather than a vital part of their Christian faith. Simultaneously, Homan rejects the commonly-held corollary that most "pre-World War I era Mennonites neglected their concern for peace." (p. 37) He cites publications by Christian Burkholder, John F. Funk, H. P. Krehbiel and others as evidence that a concern for nonresistance was an active part of Mennonite thought at the time.

Despite this real concern for Christian nonresistance, Mennonites were in no way prepared for the pressures of World War I. They apparently did not recognize the magnitude of the crisis bearing down on them, and lacked the knowledge or willingness to express their concerns and beliefs to the government as it laid plans for mobilization. Furthermore, Mennonites did not act in concert with each other when they did approach government officials. The lack of a well-developed inter-Mennonite voice in 1917 hindered American Mennonites from clearly expressing their views regarding war and military service.

It seems that most Mennonites simply expected the government to deal generously with them and to respect their traditional beliefs. Thus, the Selective Service Act of 1917, which offered no provision for full conscientious objection, came as a severe shock to them. Unable to articulate a clear response to government policy, Mennonites found themselves victimized by circumstances they inadequately understood and were unable to control.

Without any other option, many young Mennonite men found themselves bound for military camps in 1917 and 1918. Once there, they found themselves face to face with a system that did not understand or appreciate their beliefs, and that tried in every way to sway them to participate fully in the war effort.
The government had made no adequate provision for conscientious objectors. Such persons were left to the lesser-than-tender mercies of camp commanders and other draftees who scorned them as mentally deficient “slackers” who would change their views if offered enough persuasion or pressure to do so.

Unsympathetic draft policies were also the beginning of the problem. Mennonites also found themselves caught up in an unprecedented wave of patriotism and vigilantism. Public pressure for full support of the war effort caused difficulty for many Mennonites who were willing to offer such support. Mennonites who spoke publicly against the war, who refused to buy Liberty Bonds, or who simply continued to speak German found themselves the objects of harassment, imprisonment or sometimes even threats of physical harm.

Homan shows that there was no single Mennonite response to these difficult situations. Faced with a military draft, some Mennonites were “absolutists,” who held firmly to a strict conscientious objector status. Others compromised by accepting noncombattant positions with the military, while a much smaller group became outright combatants. In response to vigilante pressures at home, some Mennonites doggedly held to a strict nonresistant position, while others found ways to compromise or fully cooperate with the demands of the war effort. It is to Homan’s credit that he describes all these varied responses rather than offering an idealized account of only those who upheld every letter of the nonresistant doctrine.

In his ability to describe this variety of Mennonite responses to World War I, Homan’s account is far superior to J. S. Hartzler’s work Mennonites in the World War or Nonresistance under Test (Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1922). Whereas Hartzler seemed interested only in showing how Mennonites lived up to their nonresistant ideals—whether all of them did or not—Homan is willing to acknowledge the typically human variety of responses in the face of trying circumstances. Homan is also more balanced than Hartzler in his treatment of various Mennonite groups. Hartzler’s account focuses almost exclusively on the response of the “old” Mennonite Church, and virtually ignores the existence of other Mennonite groups. Homan, on the other hand, roams widely across the Mennonite spectrum, citing examples from at least fourteen distinct Mennonite groups.

While Homan does a fine job of describing the variety of Mennonite responses to the war, one group might have received more thorough treatment. Several hundred Mennonites and at least one thousand Hutterites left the United States and fled to Canada, where there was less pressure to serve in the military and participate in the civilian war effort. To leave one’s homeland and flee to another country for reasons of conscience is a strong statement, one with ample precedent in Mennonite history. Yet this response merits only a few scattered passages in the book, only one of which reaches a single paragraph in length (p. 158). I was disappointed that Homan chose not to recount individual stories of these “draft dodgers” in the same way that he did conscientious objectors and noncombatants in the military camps.

In the aftermath of the war, Mennonites responded by embarking on a variety of ambitious relief projects. They did so in part, as James C. Juhnke has noted elsewhere, both out of genuine concern for suffering in the wake of war, and also to prove that Mennonites were contributing members of society rather than simply “slackers.” Whatever the motivation, many Mennonites volunteered to serve in relief units in Europe and the Middle East. These relief units resulted in unprecedented inter-Mennonite cooperation, a situation out of which Mennonite Central Committee came into existence in 1920, and from which countless other inter-Mennonite projects and organizations came into existence. Homan notes the irony that “a senseless and cruel conflict so much decried by most Mennonites...helped launch...one of the most important, most energizing, most exciting events in modern Mennonite history” (p. 173).

Homan’s research is thorough and well-balanced. He uses a wide variety of secondary sources, both relating to the war in general and the Mennonite experience in it. His primary research includes extensive use of contemporary newspaper and Mennonite periodical literature, United States government records, minutes of Mennonite organizations, correspondence collections, interviews and memoirs. The book is written in a clear and well-organized style. Editorial errors are infrequent, but a few did manage to find their way into the final manuscript. The name of the Ebenfeld Mennonite Brethren Church in Hillsboro, Kansas, is consistently spelled “Ebenfels” throughout the book. The statistics documenting responses to the draft in the Alexanderwohl and Berne congregations on pages 183-184 also seem incorrect. According to my calculations and if the raw numbers given are correct, the statistics for Alexanderwohl should read 59 percent absolutist (rather than 33 percent), 27 percent noncombatant (rather than 47 percent) and 5 percent regular service, with an additional 9 percent fleeing to Canada. For Berne the figures should be 13 percent conscientious objectors (rather than 18 percent), 76 percent noncombatant (rather than 74 percent) and 11 percent regular combatants.

Despite these isolated problems, Gerlof Homan makes an important and valuable contribution to our understanding of American Mennonites in a difficult and trying time. His work should be considered a standard against which to compare future studies of the interaction between Mennonites and the state.

Kevin Enns-Rempel
Archivist, Center for Mennonite Brethren Studies
Fresno, California


This is an English translation of Amische Mennoniten in Deutschland: ihre Gemeinden, ihre Höfe, ihre Familien (1992) to which has been added an “Introduction to the Ge-
The editors have provided a short but helpful explanation of the terminology of Amish and Mennonite (p. 9). It may surprise some readers that in Europe the term Amish was rarely if ever used by the followers of Jacob Amman or by the civil authorities, both German and French, to refer to this particular branch of Swiss Anabaptists. I question the wisdom of the author when he excluded from his account information concerning "Reistish" ("non-Amish") Mennonites when they lived in close proximity to the Amish (e.g., p. 99). Even recognizing that the two groups did have separate church organizations, a greater contribution to Mennonite history would have been made if persons with such similar beliefs and such similar ethnic roots in the cantons of Switzerland would have been treated in the same volume. The definitive history of the interaction between "Amish" and "Mennonites" in Europe remains to be written; Guth's book will prove a rich source for factual details on the "Amish," but not fertile ground for an interpretation of that interaction.

The method of documentation is the weakest element in this fine book. In some rare instances (p. 57) the author provides an exact archival reference at the dossier level. In most instances we only learn that some or all of the facts in an entire section were based on a broad category of records in particular archives (e.g., p. 207). The researcher who desires to confirm the information presented will most often need to undertake much effort to identify the sources; fortunately, Guth has provided the name of the town where the archives is located and/or the town where the ancestor in question lived.

The physical properties of the book are adequate, but to this reviewer the cover color of light plum (purple-red), while pleasing in itself, does not quite evoke the world of these Amish Mennonites. A color more dignified and lasting would have pleased future generations, rather than this current one befitting ephemeral trends.

This book has become the standard reference work for family historians whose ancestors were Amish Mennonites in what is now modern Germany and parts of France and who, if they did so, immigrated to North America in the nineteenth century. It has accomplished for those Amish, both immigrants and those who remained in Europe, much of what Amish and Amish Mennonite Genealogies did in 1986 for the eighteenth century immigrants to North America. In the 1986 volume the reader hoped for more documented ties to Europe, and in the Guth book the reader seeks for more documented links to North America. I hope that both volumes are being retained electronically so that future editions may correct and add to the rich treasury of genealogical data found in them, and perhaps accomplish cross-references.

Family historians will use this fine compilation out of choice and necessity for many years in the future, until a new edition or another author builds on the foundation created by Hermann Guth. The cause of historical and genealogical studies of Amish and Mennonites owes a debt of gratitude to the editors, publishers, translators, and especially to Hermann Guth and to his wife and collaborator Gertrude Guth.

David Rempel Smucker
Lancaster Mennonite Historical Society
Lancaster, Pennsylvania