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Whether or not their Anabaptist ancestors practiced a radical, "third-way" approach to the economic structures of their own day, their present-day Mennonite descendents, economists and sociologists argue, are fully and almost uncritically entering the economic realm of this one. The point seemed so evident to a Vancouver, British Columbia newspaper reporter in the late 1970s he posited that "if God were a capitalist, the Mennonites would be his favourite people." While the economic preferences of the almighty God probably remain beyond human measurement, Mennonite economic activity and attitudes would be easier to explore if more scholars would exert themselves to do it. Yet even a cursory examination of the available literature, as this brief paper will argue, should be sufficient to demonstrate that they largely have not.

This disengagement has been particularly pronounced among Mennonite historians. Given the more withdrawn stance of traditional Mennonite nonresistance -- in a world where two-kingdom theology reinforced an ancient commitment to agriculture and pronounced Mennonite membership in such modern economic enterprises as labor unions as sin -- Mennonite historians may have had valid reasons in the past for turning their attention elsewhere. Yet with the rapid acculturation -- indeed, in some sectors, even the assimilation -- of many Mennonites into the mainstream of their societies, this older Mennonite stance of withdrawal from a sense of economic responsibility for their societies finally may be coming under question. Whether or not Mennonite withdrawal from an acceptance of economic responsibility was tenable in the past, it certainly is not now.

It is necessary to begin with two brief caveats. Any discussion of such a potentially broad topic as Mennonites and economics demands a synthesis that is both difficult and doubtlessly inaccurate in parts. In even referring to "Mennonites," of course, one has to offer
uneasy generalities from a number of disciplines about a bewildering complexity of Mennonite groups on both sides of the Canadian/US border. For example, in the very least, the following comments about the acculturation of Mennonites are simply inaccurate when applied to the vast number of Anabaptist/Mennonites in the various plain and Old Order groups in North America. The broad level of generalizing engaged in here by itself demands an admission that the summary and conclusions posited here remain clearly speculative and open to correction and critique.

Secondly, many of us who are engaged in the work of Mennonite history do so while committed to a kind of two-kingdom theology of our own. As Mennonite scholars in both senses of the word, we remain committed to our work as professional scholars, interested in advancing knowledge for its own sake and remaining within the acceptable professional practices of our discipline. But as Mennonite historians, we also work in part to help create a usable past for our church. It is primarily in fealty to this second kingdom, this second obligation, that I write here, a fealty that may explain some of the “oughts” and “shoulds” that crop up in this analysis.

**Mennonites and Economics: A Sketch of the Recent Historiography**

In 1990, convinced that “Mennonites until recently have not engaged the issue of economic involvement and responsibility,” a number of Mennonite scholars, led by people such as Calvin Redekop, Victor Krahn and Samuel Steiner, hosted a conference at Conrad Grebel University in Waterloo, Ontario called “Anabaptist Faith and Economics: Breaking the Silence.” Though the editors of the collection of conference papers admitted that the title was “a bit overstated,” a findings committee nonetheless concluded that Mennonites both in Canada and the US “faced a crisis” in their efforts to integrate their faith commitments with their economic practices.³

A survey of the recent historiographical literature on Mennonites and economics suggests that the conference was right in both ways. On the one hand, perhaps “breaking the silence” was exaggeration as some attention has certainly been paid to economic issues by historians of the North American Mennonite experience. For example, the able authors of both the Mennonites in Canada (MIC) and the Mennonite Experience in America (MEA) series proceeded with eyes firmly cocked on salient economic issues. In his portrayal of the Canadian Mennonite experience from 1920 to 1940, for instance, Frank Epp underscored the economic pressures underlying some of the many moves of Canadian Mennonite immigrants and measured something
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of the economic devastation of the Great Depression. T.D Regehr was even more mindful of economic developments among Canadian Mennonites in his volume on the 1939-1970 period, devoting an entire chapter to the lure of new economic opportunities that did much to transform Canadian Mennonite society in the years after World War II. Similarly, Richard MacMaster examined the impact of such matters as land prices on Mennonite migration in the Pennsylvania frontier, and Theron Schlabach adeptly explored the interplay between land prices and internal migrations among Mennonites in nineteenth century United States while documenting the perils of prosperity faced by certain Mennonite entrepreneurs. Even while retaining a predominant focus on intellectual developments, Paul Toews, author of the fourth MEA volume, noted the transformation of Mennonite occupations and the selective economic adaptations of the “old order” groups in post-World War II American society.

On the other hand, the broad sweep of North American Mennonite historiography over the past quarter century has placed economic analysis at best as a secondary theme. An exploration of economic emphases in two key journals of Mennonite scholarship north and south of the Canadian-US border demonstrates this point. As a representative and foundational journal for work on US Mennonites, I examined the content of the Mennonite Quarterly Review (MQR) for the past quarter century, from 2003 back to 1979. Excluding research notes, book reviews and book review essays, the MQR offered upwards of 600 major articles on some aspect or another of Mennonite history, theology, literature, sociology and assorted other disciplines. Yet even defining the term “economic analysis” generously, only 28 of those articles, or four percent of them, included much of it, except fleetingly, in their considerations or purview. The articles that placed economic analysis in a more central consideration included examinations of such matters as Mennonite economic relations in Russia, theological aspects of Mennonite economic understandings, some treatments of labor and entrepreneurship among the Old Orders, and even one piece, in a quarter-century of the MQR, by a genuine economist. In contrast, of the 240 or so major research articles in the equally-interdisciplinary Journal of Mennonite Studies, (JMS) emanating from Winnipeg, about 35, or 14 percent, drew on economic matters as key components in their analyses. For examples, one could explore treatments of Mennonite business and labor relations by scholars such as T.D. Regehr and Janis Thiessen, examinations of economic forces behind Mennonite migrations by Delbert Plett and Karen Pauls, or some of the work by James Urry, who always seems to keep a trained eye on economic aspects in his work on the Mennonite colonies in Russia. In addition, in its opening issue in 1983, the JMS offered one of the few extant
historiographical analyses of Mennonites and economics, this one by
the economist, the late Roy Vogt.\textsuperscript{15}

Even this cursory and admittedly unsophisticated survey of the
recent literature reveals two salient points worth noting: first, that
Mennonite historians on both sides of the US-Canada border have not
paid much attention to economic issues; and second, that the inatten-
tion has been especially prevalent among Mennonite scholars in the
United States. This second point invites some deeper exploration. In
spite of their shared inter-disciplinary focus on Mennonite matters,
the JMS and MQR appear quite distinctive journals, and we might at
least speculate why. Many of the key Mennonite migrations to Canada
occurred much later than those of Mennonites in the US, and in Canada
key aspects of the acculturation process, such as the transition to the
English language and the slow erosion of ethnic consciousness, have
occurred much more recently. As a result, the JMS appears to be much
more the province of social historians than its US counterpart; the
Canadian journal is replete with analyses of such matters as changes
and continuities in Canadian Mennonite ethnic subculture, immigra-
tion patterns, gender roles, educational systems, language retention
and loss, and the like. And, of course, many scholars in this busy group
of social historians seem eminently fluent with economic analyses. In
contrast, the communities of scholars contributing to the MQR reflect
their own interests and needs as Mennonite academicians living in
the United States. That journal seems to a great degree dominated
by intellectual historians and theologians, who are at best consumers
rather than producers of social history and as a result seem less able or
interested in incorporating economic analysis into their work.

Perhaps the difference between these two journals and their respec-
tive scholarly communities is also reflective of the relative positions
and degree of tension that both communities experience with regard
to their respective societies. Once again, this is a matter that is itself
expressive of their different historical experiences, as scholars such
as John Redekop and J. Denny Weaver have noted. As citizens of a
state that is much more accepting of religious pluralism, much less
inclined to portray itself as divinely inspired and without a stultifying
and idolatrous civil religion, Canadian Mennonites have a much more
positive view of their state than do their US counterparts. As a result,
Canadian Mennonites are much more willing to accept government
funding, enter into joint ventures with their state, and also enter more
openly and eagerly into channels of political participation.\textsuperscript{16} The Chair
in Mennonite Studies at the University of Winnipeg, a state-sponsored
university, is an office that would be inconceivable in any such state-
funded university in the United States. In contrast, Mennonites in
the United States -- and particularly the more highly educated among
them—still retain a sense of "over-againstness" with their state, which translates into an inherent suspicion of things like joint Mennonite-state programs or even Mennonite political activity. Is it any surprise, then, that their principle scholarly journal accordingly reflects such needs and concerns, and has shown less interest in matters like economics than in the airing out of Mennonite intellectual and historical positions vis-à-vis the American state?18

Moreover, such stresses may well also reflect the different historical heritage of Mennonite societies in the US and in Canada with regard to matters like the acceptable and permissible degree of Mennonite economic participation in business, labor unions and other economic structures. Nearly seven-eighths of Canadian Mennonites are descendents of the Dutch-Russian Mennonite stream, which, Leo Driedger and J Howard Kauffman have argued, historically has been much more open to business entrepreneurship and city occupations, and have correspondingly been much more prone to urbanization than the Swiss-South German stream. This latter stream, more subject to heavy persecution, fled to upland mountain valleys in Switzerland and began to make the fundamental connection between spiritual purity and agricultural pursuits that proved so influential in the Mennonite story in North America. In the 1990 census data, almost three quarters of the Anabaptist church members in the US are descendents of this Swiss Mennonite grouping, and this has also heavily influenced the more withdrawn way that especially US Mennonites have historically approached economic issues.19 It was particularly these Swiss Mennonites who, in line with older, more traditional conceptions of nonresistance, developed the stronger injunctions against Mennonite participation in economic structures like labor unions and who sought to strengthen the separate Christian community – ideally located in rural areas and linked to agriculture – as the definition of normative Mennonitism. "The nonresistant Christian can have no part in the struggle for economic power, either on the side of labor or that of capital," declared the Mennonite Church historian and ethicist Guy Hershberger in 1944 in his monumentally influential book War, Peace and Nonresistance, and his own Swiss-descended church moved repeatedly to write such prohibitions into Mennonite disciplinary code.20 Hershberger and academic allies such as the respected US Mennonite sociologist Winfield Fretz were instrumental leaders in what scholars have termed a "Mennonite Community Movement" in the US, beginning in the 1930s and accelerating after World War II, that sought to refasten the church to agrarian pursuits and orientations as a last-ditch defense against sweeping socio-economic change.21

In all their paeans to the virtues of the Mennonite rural community, however, certainly Hershberger and Fretz must have realized that their
work was more prescriptive than descriptive of Mennonite realities in both the US and Canada in the postwar years. The prevailing historical and sociological realities -- in a time of massive acculturation of Canadian and American Mennonites into the mainstream of their societies -- were profoundly different and largely immune to all the prescriptive sociology and usable pasts that such scholars could offer. Efforts like the Mennonite Community Movement -- or the massive construction of rules in places like the Franconia and Lancaster Conferences of Pennsylvania -- appear as textbook examples of “defensive structuring,” desperate rearguard actions to stave off acculturation. Partly as a result of this era of socio-economic change, and the futile efforts of church leaders to alter it, much of the newer work on Mennonites and economics in both the US and Canada is emanating recently once again from the hands of scholars like Mennonite sociologists and economists, and possesses, as in previous years, a distinctive edge of advocacy.

For example, while the history and practice of Mennonite mutual aid was a particular interest of scholars like Fretz and others in the old Mennonite Community movement, after some decades in obscurity that topic has garnered some interest once again. In a collection of essays edited by Willard Swartley and Donald Kraybill, scholars from disciplines ranging from theology and ethics to sociology to history explored the subject from a variety of angles, all hoping, in the words of the editors, “to prod fellow Christians of every stripe to build communities of care where members bear each others’ burdens.”

Equally to the point is emerging new work on Amish and Mennonite entrepreneurs. For example, in *Mennonite Entrepreneurs*, the sociologists Calvin Redekop, Stephen Ainlay, and Robert Siemens posit a deep and underlying unease between a communal and utopian Anabaptist heritage and the grasping, materialistic, individualistic realm of modern business enterprises, and explore the efforts of modern Mennonite entrepreneurs to navigate this tension. That there is this tension, or ought to be, seems to be a focal point of these analyses, and nowhere does this tension come into sharper focus than in Redekop et al, *Anabaptist Faith and Economics*. Indeed, the unthinking and even eager headlong rush of many Mennonites into the competitive world of modern economic life appears so disturbing to the scholars in this volume that key passages assume in places the tone of a jeremiad. Writing with a self-confessed “urgency,” for instance, the editors claim that contemporary Mennonites have become so face-to-face with the contradictions of remaining “in” but not “of” the economic world that “they have lost their innocence.”

It is in such advocacy that the greater integration of economic issues by Canadian social historians and the “over-against” tone characteristic of some of the American work might be joined most fruitfully. For if
the economists and sociologists are right— that there is a clash between fundamental Anabaptist/Mennonite charter values and the emerging market systems of the modern (and even postmodern) worlds — then those of use committed to creating scholarship in the service of the church ought to renew our acquaintance with labor issues and integrate economic emphases into our analysis more than we have previously. If Mennonite scholars have outlined a basic conflict between the church and the market, economists of all stripes have begun to suggest which side is winning, and the implications seem potentially dire. In other words, even in an analysis focused on something as seemingly abstract and safely academic as Mennonite historiography, in other words, it is necessary to grapple with the issues raised by the catchall phrase of “globalization.”

The Challenge of Globalization

For the twenty-five years since the end of World War II, with US corporations dominating global markets, levels of economic inequality in North America had gradually but unmistakably eased. In their postwar social contract with labor, corporations had shared some of their profits with their workforce, to the point where workers may have been blue-collar in occupation, but in economic status vast numbers had joined the great expanding middle class.

In the early 1970s, however, the gap between rich and poor gradually widened once again through much of the rest of the century. Economists point to a number of reasons for this development, but a key one had to do with new initiatives by North American corporate managers. Their deal with labor held as long as profits rolled in, but by the middle 1970s, foreign competition had become too adept to allow American financial dominance to continue. From 1969 to 1979, the value of American imports doubled, and in industry after industry, European and Asian corporations established significant beachheads in US markets. Frustrated managers began to focus instead on cutting costs instead of raising prices. A tight labor market in the later 1960s led to wage increases, further squeezing corporate profits. And as corporate profits stagnated, the great postwar contract began to unravel.

US corporations responded to the profit squeeze by taking two different courses in opposite directions, one internal and one external. Inwardly, the American and Canadian economies witnessed a centralization of control over production by fewer and more powerful corporations. This had been a century-long trend that began in the days of Rockefeller and Carnegie. But now, driven by tighter corporate
profit margins, it accelerated, and individual businesses increasingly reshaped themselves into ever more hierarchical chains of command; through the postwar years, economic power became increasingly centralized. These inward developments both fed and were in turn were fed by a set of trends focused outwardly. Aided by technological breakthroughs like satellite technology and the computer revolution, corporate managers discovered they could “outsourcing” the production of their goods, or parts of their products, to overseas subsidiaries that promised to build them cheaper. Corporate managers could reallocate their capital into different regions of the country, or into different countries altogether, letting it flow to wherever labor was cheapest and the hand of governmental regulation lightest. Total US investment abroad jumped from $50 billion in 1965 to $124 billion in 1975 and $424 billion in 1980. Again, this was no brand-new development; Henry Ford had set up assembly lines in Europe as far back as 1911. But the process inexorably accelerated in the 1970s, when corporate managers increasingly began to look abroad to recover declining domestic profits. The process was facilitated by the trajectory of a growing “permissive technology” that increasingly allowed them a global focus and presence. Through such developments as the telephone, the jumbo jet, containerized shipping, then the laptop, the cell-phone, and finally massive computer systems, corporate heads sitting in New York or Tokyo could manage global corporate systems and track the productivity of every spindle or loom thousands of miles or oceans away. Over the past thirty years, US corporations have globalized their production to a degree production that it no longer made sense to call them American businesses at all. They became multinational corporations transcending the national boundaries of particular states. Increasingly they only took on a national coloration when, chameleon-like, they appealed for tax breaks or special favors from one national government or another.29

It was altogether a multifaceted development of Byzantine intricacy with far-reaching, even revolutionary implications, and the process resists easy condensation. Struggling to name it, social scientists finally came up with the imprecise, catchall “globalization.” Whatever its name, in the very least, the process signaled the destruction of the old social contract and the arrival of a new set of relationships between corporations, their labor force, and the particular communities where they decided to locate. Simply put, globally oriented corporations quickly obtained the upper hand, and took their business to wherever the corporate bottom line — their sole moral consideration — demanded they go. In the United States itself, often the profit-driven dictates of corporate mobility meant relocating plants from older industrialized areas where organized labor had been strong and wages high, to
non-unionized, "right-to-work" states in the south — or, even better, overseas — where fatter profit margins beckoned.30

Soon the cumulative impact of thousands of such decisions began to register job loss totals of staggering size. From 1963 to 1982, one analyst counted the closure of 100,000 manufacturing plants employing over 19 workers, a full fifth of them located in the industrial Midwest. During the 1970s alone, losses ran at about 900,000 manufacturing jobs per year, resulting in upwards of 22 million lost jobs by the early 1980s. Individual lives reflected the impact. By the mid 1980s, suicide rates were twice the national average in the Monongahela Valley south of Pittsburgh — and not far from the gentle Mennonite town of Scottdale — which had lost 20,000 jobs because of the closure of the steel mills. In nearby Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, only 700 steelworkers labored where 15,000 had worked a few years before, and the town's population dropped 35% in a half-dozen years. Property taxes fell dramatically and city administrators laid off half of the police force and firefighters. Disturbing trends developed among laid-off workers and the communities where they lived. Social workers saw increases in the rates of such things as domestic violence, alcohol and drug abuse, mental health problems and other indices of social trauma. Economists noted other "ripple effects." The US Chamber of Commerce estimated that a community lost an average of two service-sector jobs for every three jobs lost in manufacturing, an impact that often snowballed when other local manufacturers, discerning an unfavorable business climate, moved as well. As population and tax revenues fell, schools declined. At the same time the social needs of the unemployed — for food, health care, social welfare services and the like — put additional economic pressures on local governmental structures for increased aid.31 Given the advantages that increased mobility gave international capital, the political scientist Jeffrey Lustig argues "private corporations have acquired the power to issue birth certificates and death sentences to entire communities."32

**Mennonites and Economics: The Challenge Ahead**

This is the economic world that, as the pace of acculturation accelerates, the Mennonite people of North America have begun to enter. It would seem imperative for historians of the Anabaptist-Mennonite experience to begin to do the necessary scholarly groundwork to interpret this world to their people. Such a globalized world is certainly fraught with peril for individual Mennonites, who are as vulnerable as any other citizen of the globe to the possible social and economic dislocation wrought by the increased mobility of international capital.
In very many ways, of course, this is not a new development. A variety of Dependency School theorists, for example, have argued quite convincingly that much of the unfair share of the world's wealth enjoyed by western nations has come their way through five hundred years of imperialism that actively and functionally underdeveloped much of the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{33} The fundamental issue here may simply be that, in a world where the power of corporations is increasingly multinational while the ability to regulate them is largely confined to individual nation states, an increasing number of North Americans, Mennonites among them, are becoming the victims rather than the happy beneficiaries of unjust global economic trends. In the very least, this underscores the need for the church's scholars — sociologists, economists, and even historians — to help it understand and navigate its way through such a world.

To some degree, such a reinterpretation has already begun. After a long discussion of Anabaptist/Mennonite principles in light of the world debt crisis, for example, the economist Norman Ewert simply posited that "if the market mechanism cannot guarantee justice for the poor, we as Christians must work towards justice."\textsuperscript{34} Even while bearing much Mennonite suspicion for their money-making, "worldly" activities, many Mennonite entrepreneurs have struggled for decades with how they might remain faithful Mennonite Christians and successful businessmen. Calvin and Benjamin Redekop have recently put together a collection of such accounts,\textsuperscript{35} and the variety models they provide — of entrepreneurship driven by faith commitments and acts of conscience — may well be usable for the wider church. Indeed, it is precisely such entrepreneurs, several of the church's more talented sociologists have argued recently, who are engaged in much of the creative and path breaking work necessary to help the church negotiate its way in the capitalist marketplace. In spite of clear evidence that such entrepreneurs remain as committed to Anabaptist charter values as other Mennonites, in a church that is rapidly acculturating and acting "entrepreneurial" in a wide variety of ways, they still effectively function as "the scapegoat(s) behind which everyone else's entrepreneurial attitudes and activities lie protected."\textsuperscript{36}

For a people whose Anabaptist ancestors stressed such virtues as the simply life and the good of the community over that of the individual, the increasing supremacy of free-market economics, and the devastation they promise to much of the world's poor, seemingly pose their own challenge to Mennonite charter values. Most of all, perhaps, the rethinking required in an age of globalization ought to be the province of the church's theologians. To date, few of them seem to be taking up such questions with the insight of J. Lawrence Burkholder. "Anyone acquainted with the dynamics of post World War
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II Mennonite life knows that there are no more ‘islands of sanity,’” he writes, “if by that we mean semi-isolated communities protected from the forces of modernity.”37 No matter how simply we live, no matter how hard we might try to extricate ourselves from wider patterns of injustice, we cannot do so. One could make a very good case that the advantageous position in the North American middle class enjoyed by many Mennonites is made possible by a huge unseen reservoir of cheap labor; an army of unemployed or underemployed people whose very existence keeps a tight labor market from exerting an upward pull on wages and thus causing inflation. If one doubts this, it is only necessary to watch how quickly the US Federal Reserve raises interest rates, thus slowing the economy and increasing the unemployment rates, every time it seems like a tight labor market might bring substantial wage increases for the working poor. To take another example, there is a reason why middle-class people in North America can afford to buy sneakers stitched together in Malaysia or soccer balls sewn together in Pakistan. The people who produce these items are paid a tiny fraction of their actual value, thus rendering them affordable to middle-class people. The emerging dynamics of the globalized world call into question a wide variety of traditional Mennonite theological positions on economics and politics. In such a context, for example, Mennonites might cast a more skeptical eye at the old but periodically resurfacing call that they should abstain from voting.38 Whether or not we physically pull the lever at the ballot box, we “vote” every time we purchase a pair of shoes or a loaf of bread or pay our taxes or send our children to school.

In an era when Mennonites are fully entering the global capitalist economic order, it is high time, Burkholder argues, to rethink the very concept of Anabaptist/Mennonite discipleship. “Mennonite ethics,” he states, “must be restructured to illuminate and guide business decision making, as traditional Mennonite perfectionism cannot handle the ambiguities of the economic world. Mennonite ethics must come to terms with power, preferential love, and compromise.”39 May God help us, historians and all others, in this task.
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