The story of the Mennonites is inextricably interwoven with educational developments although the relationship is both theoretically uncomplicated and sometimes sociologically confusing to the outsider. Of extant philosophical systems during the development of early Mennonite education, idealism, realism, neo-Thomism, etc., Mennonites have firmly adhered to a strict Judeo-Christian metaphysics with the adjunct educational implications of maintenance and perpetuation. As will be pointed out in the early section of this discussion, there are only occasional inferences of the acceptance of any other theory and this preference has tended to establish the direction for Mennonite studies of education as singular in intent and scope. Any confusion that may arise from a study of Mennonite education originates in the fact that conservative Anabaptist groups have conceptualized education as a means of assuring cultural preservation among the young. Only the knowledgeable student of Mennonite life will be aware of the many acute differences among Mennonite orientations, and a limited unravelling of these divergencies may be helpful before the “state of the art” can be analyzed.

Setting the Theoretical Stage

European beginnings reveal at least a mild enthusiasm for education among Anabaptists, and it was among the Mennonites of Prussia that the conviction was born that parents should provide at least elementary instruction for their children in order to perpetuate the German language and acquaint their children with the Bible and Mennonite distinctives. Instruction consisted of reading, writing, arithmetic and religion with much emphasis on memorization, drill and penmanship. Frederick the
Great, being of a liberal turn of mind, granted the greatest freedom of religion to his subjects including those of private education. Similarly, among Hutterites in Europe there was developed a well organized system of compulsory education even though they were living in an age when illiteracy was the common lot of the average man. While it is difficult to ascertain the extent of educational developments among the Amish in Europe, the fact that the Old Order people today foster an independent system of education may be an indication that they recognize the need for consistency and synthesis in the enculturation process and thus sponsor private schools so that their children will inculcate the same insights in that institution that they encounter in the home and church environments. A lack of this emphasis may have contributed to the demise of the Amish in Europe for it is only in North America that they may be identified.

The role of education in the establishment of Anabaptist communities in Russia and North America is easily delineated. The earliest American settlements invariably started parochial primary schools, but with the coming of the Pennsylvania school law of 1834, private schools began to give way and were practically eliminated by the middle of that century. The first Mennonite educational institution established in America was built in Germantown, Pennsylvania, in 1702 with an unlikely population comprised of both Quakers and Mennonites. Five years prior to that the two communities worshipped together in a common building, but the Mennonites soon recognized that if they were to maintain their identity they must have their own school and house of worship. Thus their first church house, a log structure, built in 1708, also served as a schoolhouse for many years. Further west in America, where frontier conditions prevailed, more recent immigrants established traditional church schools with the one having the longest life being the Gemeindeschule of the Zion Mennonite Church in Donnellson, Iowa. It opened in 1853 with Christian Showalter, a recent arrival from Germany, as the teacher. Today, the Mennonite Church alone (Old Mennonite) sponsors fourteen high schools and eighty-one primary schools.

After settlement in Russia, where the Mennonites colonized in a relatively backward civilization, they developed an extensive educational system of their own design. The first teachers were usually farmers, craftsmen or herdsmen who were ill-prepared and poorly paid, and the schools operated for the most part out of teachers' homes. By law the responsibility of school supervision lay with the elders and spiritual leaders of the community, but often the teacher was left completely in charge. The first educational reforms were introduced by Johann Cornies through an organization called The Society for Christian Education which directed the building of the first secondary school in 1820. New teachers
with Prussian background were hired, bringing with them educational innovations from Europe featuring the ideas of one Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, Johann Amos Commenius (Komensky) and others. By 1843 Cornies had laid the foundation for future Mennonite schools through a newly established Agricultural Commission which was granted considerable control over the school system by the Russian authorities. Some of the significant developments that came about included the erection of model schools, creating of school districts, compulsory attendance, licensing of teachers, a planned curriculum and teacher conferences.

The educational theories of Pestalozzi and Commenius foreshadowed the progressive education movement in North America under the leadership of such educational philosophers as John Dewey. Central to the movement were these presuppositions: truth is relative, education is the sum total of the child's experience, and insight, which is individualized, is the sole objective of learning. While it is intimated that the German interpretation of these ideas penetrated the teachings of the Russian Mennonite context, there is no evidence that they influenced in any way the educational philosophy of Mennonite education in North America. In fact, even research on the educational philosophy of Mennonite schooling is non-existent, possibly because the traditional notion of cultural maintenance was so entrenched.

Most educational progress in Russian colonies came about in Molotchna, while the more conservative leaders in Chortitza, in particular the two daughter colonies, Bergthal and Fuerstenland, resisted many innovations, especially the introduction of the Russian language which they felt threatened their way of life. Generally the Russian Government was pleased with the content and direction of Mennonite schools and allowed instruction in religion and the teaching of German in ten of a total of thirty hours per week. In the last fifteen years before World War I, Mennonite schools proliferated in Russia and by 1920, with a population of approximately 110,000, the Mennonites in Russia operated:

1. 450 elementary schools with about 16,000 pupils and 570 teachers (this included a school for the deaf);
2. 25 secondary schools, two of which were considered business schools, with about 2,000 pupils enrolled and 100 teachers;
3. two teacher-training schools each with an approximate enrollment of 60 students;
4. one eight-year business school for boys with an enrollment of about 300;
5. a girls' gymnasium with 150 enrolled; and
6. four Bible schools.

The Mennonite exodus transpired for a variety of reasons, some of which were related to educational matters. Although Russian was taught
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in Mennonite schools as early as the 1830s and many more used it by the 1860s, the Russian State Department actually kept a close watch from 1881 on, demanding that all instruction be in Russian except for religion and German language instruction. Russian teachers were provided for Mennonite schools where Mennonite teachers were not qualified. The "straw that broke the camel's back", however, was not directly related to schooling; it was the passage of the universal military service law of 1874. It is because of the seriousness of the military considerations that severe doubt must be raised regarding any suggestion that the Mennonite exodus had much to do with educational philosophy and no writer mentions it. Russian Mennonite schools may have been forward-looking in nature, but the marriage of primary progressivist educational concepts to the underlying desire for ethnic preservation had evidently not come about.

The coming of the Russian Mennonites to North America meant a transplant of their educational concerns along with other distinctives. In Marion County, Kansas, three schools were built in 1877 with the rationale "... because we always had schools in the old country...". The chief purpose of instruction was consistent — to teach children the German language and to make them acquainted with the Bible. For this reason the Bible was also used as a textbook. Similar reasoning was evident in other American settlements, depicted by the Swiss German Mennonites whose diligence was manifested in the first school they organized in the home of Rev. Joseph Graber just two years after their arrival in Dakota Territory. In Manitoba, Mennonites enjoyed complete school autonomy guaranteed by Federal Government promises, a situation that lasted until 1878 when a census revealed that one-third of all Mennonite children were not registered with the public school board and were officially in private schools. They worried little about government support for their schools because they felt that financial support implied governmental intervention. By 1907, governmental interference in Mennonite schooling was indeed evident when the Roblin government requested that private schools fly the country's flag while in session. Objections and concerns were quickly raised, and the clouding of the horizon of private schooling in Manitoba was suddenly a reality.

The Mennonite rationale for a strong educational thrust is well summarized in a statement by a Kansas Conference of preachers in 1877 when some seventy spiritual leaders drafted and accepted the following recommendations:

1. Where Mennonites are in the majority in a school district, and are in a position to exert a deciding influence, it is suggested that they organize school districts; but no recommendations are made in the matter of taking out citizenship papers.
2. Where it is impossible to wield a controlling influence in the public schools, Mennonites are urged to organize their own church schools.

3. The conference recommends the learning of the English language as well as the German for a double reason: (i) in order to facilitate communication with the American neighbors; and (ii) so that they may help to extend the Kingdom of God among the English speaking people.

4. It is the opinion of the conference that in the matter of financial support the entire congregation in which the school is located is under obligation to assume this task as a common burden.

**Diversity of Educational Opinion**

Some conservative groups among the Anabaptists, and Mennonites more particularly, have consistently avoided more than a minimal emphasis on schooling. Hutterites and Amish, for example, are usually satisfied with minimal literacy, and do not necessarily connect schooling with the attainment of Biblical awareness. One of the reasons why the Amish migrated to Canada in 1952, for example, was because there were no rigid school attendance requirements beyond elementary education. They could even have their own schools if desired. The Holdeman people have also shown an equally lukewarm attitude toward schooling, and did not build their own schools in the United States until 1947. By 1969 they operated three in that country and soon thereafter built several in Alberta.

Several divisions erupted among the Russian Mennonites having to do with schooling, and after migration to Southern Manitoba, efforts by the government to modernize Mennonite schools were particularly resisted by the Old Colony and Sommerfeld groups, some of whom expressed their displeasure with government regulations by migrating to Mexico on March 1, 1922.

**Developments in Secondary and Higher Education**

Accounts pertaining to higher education among Anabaptist groups in Europe are scant, but these quickly pick up with reference to Mennonite settlements in the 18th century in Russia and the United States, and with respect to later settlements. The Russian situation, before exodus, has already been mentioned, intimating a dual concern for the establishment of Bible schools as well as forms of secondary education. On arrival in North America all three of the larger Mennonite bodies were soon involved in setting up institutions of higher learning — The General Conference Mennonite Church, the (Old) Mennonite Church as well as the Mennonite Brethren. The Bible school movement, F. C. Peters claims, has been largely a Mennonite Brethren phenomenon.

Prior to 1900 a comparatively small number of Mennonites secured a
higher education, and those who did attend college or university were frequently lost to the church, tending to settle in non-Mennonite communities as teachers, physicians or lawyers. Thus they united with other denominations. A leader who sought to reverse this trend was Henry A. Mumaw who established a number of schools such as the Elkhart and English Training School (later the Elkhart Normal School) in 1882, the Elkhart Institute of Science, Industry and Art in 1894, and the Elkhart Normal and Business College in 1898. Other efforts followed soon after with names like Bluffton College in Ohio, Goshen College in Indiana and Hesston College, Bethel College and Tabor College in Kansas becoming familiar landmarks. Although we are not so informed by historians, it is entirely conceivable that young people left their Mennonite roots because of not being able to cope with the philosophical or value disparity encountered in state institutions. Mennonite institutions were established to offset the trend of student attrition and it was assumed that Mennonite youth would choose these first. Many did, but when some of them found that Mennonite schools failed to present a juxtaposing of divergent ideas to their liking, they too left the Mennonite fold.

Developments in higher education were not without controversy, spurned perhaps by the intense desire to “do what was right by our children” that dominated many of the early initiatives. In Gretna, Manitoba, a schism developed over the location of the Gretna-Altona high school, a situation which was only partially satisfied by the building of two schools, one in each community. Later, in Saskatchewan, in 1950, the board of Rosthern Junior College battled with the problem of having to release a very popular teacher, and, more recently, the release of the principal of the Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute in Winnipeg has caused considerable consternation. Still, most Mennonite leaders assume that their own schools are absolutely essential for the preservation of Mennonitism, and equate the loss of Mennonite identity with a failure to provide private schooling.

Other Educational Developments

Only a narrow interpretation of the concept of education will allude to schooling, and the history of Mennonites reveals a much broader educational concern. In addition to establishing forms of primary instruction, Mennonites in virtually every locality have concerned themselves with setting up high schools, colleges, Bible schools and seminaries and the sponsoring of Bible conferences, Sunday School conventions, the Christian Endeavour, Bible lecture courses, instruction in Catechism, young people’s conferences and publication. In tracing the history of the General Conference Church, Samuel Pannabecker treats the development of education and publication as simultaneous developments while J. C. Wenger notes that the first Old Mennonite press was set up near
Harrisonburg, Virginia, by Joseph Funk in 1847. During the first century and a half in America the church utilized the services of commercial printers to turn out books or religious literature. The first book printed in America on education in 1770 was written by a Mennonite, Christopher Dock, who taught in Pennsylvania. John A. Toews admits that Russian Mennonite history in the nineteenth century was marked by an almost incredible literary sterility, but was redeemed somewhat by the appearance of P. M. Friesen’s Die Alt-Evangelische Mennonitische Bruederschaft in Russland, 1789-1910. Begun in 1886, it describes not only the history of the Mennonite Brethren, but “constitutes the best collection of source materials on Russian Mennonite history in general.”

Not only have Mennonites been actively engaged in beginning and promoting a wide variety of educational endeavours, these have not been promoted without simultaneous evaluation, amendment or even occasional dissolution. It is to a study of Mennonite research in education that we then logically turn the discussion.

Current Mennonite Studies in Education

The vast majority of studies about Anabaptist groups still flow from the pens of individuals with Mennonite names with only a very few exceptions. The tendency to prefer historical studies is strong, particularly among earlier works, although recent efforts reveal a much broader line of query.

Early Studies in Mennonite Education.

A search for entries identified as writings about Mennonite education utilizing several university retrieval systems invariably turns up the same ones. One of the best sources is Donovan Smucker’s bibliography of Anabaptist groups in Canada which contains some thirty references to Mennonite education (relying on the index) of which half clearly indicate an historical base. Original studies of Mennonites in North America, according to Smucker, show a combination of history and theoretical orientation with the first model for the study of Mennonites originated by Ernst Troeltsch in 1911. This model was later amended by sociologists at the University of Chicago with more recent studies still relying on variations of Troeltsch’s original paradigm. The most definitive contemporary sociological study of Mennonites by Kauffman and Harder utilizes an adaptation of this model.

A choice of the historical channel as a means of understanding and interpreting Mennonite education has not necessarily been the case when Mennonite authors have addressed themselves to other Anabaptist groups. The third and fourth sections of Donovan Smucker’s annotated bibliography, dealing with Hutterites, Amish, Holdeman, Old Order and
Old Colony Mennonites, contain ten specific educational studies, none of which have an historical perspective. Seven of the studies are clearly authored by Mennonites; two of these offer a purely sociological frame of reference featuring concepts like socialization and "boundary maintenance"; four are descriptive studies; and one has to do with Amish academic achievement. The three items not authored by known Mennonites pertain to a descriptive study of the educational system of several Hutterite colonies, a study of English school teachers among Hutterites, and legal entanglements regarding Hutterite schooling.

Theses and dissertations furnish a fertile source of Mennonite historical educational studies, and in Canada the work of Isaac I. Friesen, one of the first theses in education produced by a Mennonite author, is much referred to. Not surprisingly, Friesen began with the Reformation, explained Mennonite beliefs, customs and folkways and then dealt with schooling specifically. About the same time, 1937, Ernest H. Reid completed a thesis featuring a comparative approach where Mennonites of Manitoba were one of six ethnic groups under study. In the fifties, three thesis writers are frequently cited: John J. Bergen and Peter G. Klassen described education among the Mennonites in Manitoba and recounted the school struggles of that settlement, and Peter Frank Bargen wrote of the Mennonites of Alberta with some references to education. Bergen later followed up his graduate studies with a doctoral dissertation on the problem of school reorganization in rural Manitoba, while Klassen expanded his research interests to include Mennonite education in Western Canada. Later graduate theses appear to reflect approaches other than history, paralleling the broadening scope of the social sciences in North American studies.

Theses reflecting American Mennonite educational history appeared in the United States as early as 1920 when J. F. Moyer wrote on the religious education in Mennonite Churches and Gustav Frey followed, in 1923, with a study of higher education in the General Conference. Similar to the Canadian pattern, descriptive and historical recount of Mennonites continued as the major thrust of graduate work in the United States until at least the nineteen sixties when more variety was evident.

Recent Approaches to Mennonite Education Studies

The increasing sophistication of the social sciences over the past several decades has not been without impact on Mennonite educational studies. Although several studies, of at least the magnitude of a thesis, still contain at least one initial historical chapter, generally the scope of research has taken on increasing specificity. Topics covered include student achievement, values and socialization, family life and self-image and religious education. A few educators have even analyzed educational
dissensions in some detail as a means of ferreting out the circumstances and underlying rationale responsible for conflict.

Reflecting the continuing interest in Mennonite education from an historical perspective are theses like that of Margaret Martin who traced the development of physical education in Mennonite colleges,\textsuperscript{53} and other writings like that of Sarah Harder who penned a series of six articles outlining the beginning of a Mennonite settlement in the LaCrete-Fort Vermillion area of Alberta.\textsuperscript{54} Herself a schoolteacher, Harder treated the school problem as a focal point of writing describing the Old Colony and Sommerfelder resistance to public education as a reason for their constant withdrawal from "crowding civilizing forces around them."

Analysis of schooling among Mennonites has proliferated to the extent that space permits reference to only selected works in an illustrative way. Standardized tests, often the pride of educational psychologists, have been freely applied to minority and Anabaptist schools with a comparative objective, e.g. results among the Amish showed that the children performed significantly higher in spelling, word usage and arithmetic than a sample of pupils in rural schools. They scored slightly above the national norm in these subjects despite having only small libraries, limited equipment, no radio or television, and teachers who lacked college training.\textsuperscript{55}

Donald Kraybill cites the beginning of serious assessments of ethnic education as 1962,\textsuperscript{56} which would indicate that studies of Mennonite education in that vein would be right on target, time-wise. At that time, studies were undertaken to ascertain the proportion of Mennonite students in non-Mennonite institutions, a concern no doubt propelled by the worry of creeping assimilation.\textsuperscript{57} More than a decade later, Kraybill could report on several additional studies examining the role of the church school in relation to public education in a vein "without the use of statistical tables and sociological jargon."\textsuperscript{58} Three studies that specifically analyze Mennonite schooling include that of Bernhard Wiebe, who studied self-disclosure and perceived relationships of Mennonite adolescents in senior high schools, and included among his findings that the combined Mennonite adolescent population discloses more to mothers and best friends than to their fathers, and Mennonite adolescent girls disclose more than boys do to their mothers.\textsuperscript{59} A second work is that of Ernest Hess who was concerned with the influence of Mennonite schools on students in Lancaster County and discovered that attendance at Mennonite schools had some effect on religious beliefs, attitudes, behaviors and values of youth, but these factors were also affected by other variables such as amount of education, participation in a church assignment or parental religiosity.\textsuperscript{60} John Taddie dealt with a comparison of academic achievements of Mennonite pupils attending parochial schools with
those in public schools in Lancaster County; he found no statistically significant results and attributed this to the possible intervention of other factors such as home or cultural differences unique to the groups studied rather than the effects of the school program.61

A further sampling of studies illustrating the focus of Mennonite educational research includes efforts by Donald Kraybill and William Hooley. Kraybill studied religious and ethnic socialization in a Mennonite high school and found that the school environment made a significant difference in student attitude in only one area—avoidance. Regular students expressed a greater increase in avoidance than transfer students, and this suggests that the ethnic school is most effective and has the greatest influence on students from family backgrounds compatible with the school's values who attend the school for more than one year.62 Hooley compared the values and attitudes of Mennonite youth in a church related high school with a group in a public school and found that those youth who attended a Mennonite high school for at least two years, especially females, were more aligned with Mennonite ideals than were youth who attended public institutions.63 These findings appear to complement each other in a limited fashion, at least, and imply that further investigation could be fruitful.

Illustrative of the kinds of ethnic longitudinal studies undertaken by Leo Driedger is an article depicting Old Colony Mennonite life over a period of some twenty-two years in Saskatchewan.64 Educational findings revealed that at the end of the period, 1977, all parochial schools had been closed and children were being bussed to nearby towns. In addition, a number of youth were attending high schools and a few went on to university. When this occurred, the natural course of assimilation motivated them to pull out of membership in the Old Colony Church. Congruently Rudolf Helling found that Old Colony Mennonites lack a workable acculturation model, for they utilize technology freely but discourage social innovation and patterns of consumption. They try to control the use of technology as patterns of interaction with outside and personal behavior within the colony, relying on the fast disappearing German school for cultural maintenance.65 In examining higher education in 1967, Driedger contended that Manitoba Mennonites have moved from conflict with the notion of education beyond high school to accommodation. In a later comparison of Mennonite and other German students he found that a greater percentage of Mennonite students in that same province held more positive attitudes toward their ingroup and participated to a greater extent in the institutions of that group than do other German students within their own group.66 Correlatively, Augsburger discovered that the influence of parental control patterns upon behavior and personal and social development among freshmen
from several Mennonite colleges was higher with students whose parents practiced indirect and consistent control than those whose parents practiced direct and inconsistent control. A related probe seeking out the same objective with regard to church control was not substantiated.67

An example of cultural conflict studies emanates from the situation of the Holdeman people of Alberta who have attracted a great deal more attention than they desired since 1978 when a landmark decision was handed down outlining a fourth category of private schools for the province. Writers of both Mennonite and non-Mennonite background have analyzed and speculated about the decision, incited by Holdeman at Linden, who pulled their children from the public school system and began a private school. When the public sensation had died down the Holdeman found themselves operating a government-approved school that received no financial support from outside sources and featured non-certified teachers. While the Linden setting involved only about 120 students ranging from grades one to ten, the legal decision actually gave approval to a half dozen such schools in Alberta. Analysts of the case include a John Bergen who observed that only "determined groups with strong convictions can be expected to make the effort where no public financial support is available for any part of the capital and operational expenditures, while at the same time its members are required to pay all taxes in support of the public schools which their children are entitled to attend."68 Further analysis by Elmer Thiessen and Roy Wilson produced the conclusion that "... a greater degree of pluralism in education is philosophically more defensible than the present system of education in Canada."69

ANALYSIS OF MENNONITE EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

Although Mennonite studies have shifted from a purely historical focus, current writings have tended to perpetuate the same concerns of cultural and religious transmission of values and beliefs. This has given rise to educational studies grounded in the structural-functional sociological theory and accounts for attention given to socialization practices and values retention. Some congruity in results may be identified even though there is some evidence that the maintenance of established life patterns may be dissipating among Mennonite youth. Daniel Charles et al, for example, found that there is a continuing positive identification with the Mennonite Church among Lancaster Mennonite high school students but a decreasing acceptance of rituals and practices.70 While this compares nicely with the work of Kraybill and Hooley cited earlier, it does not exactly jell with Augsburger's findings that church control patterns are ineffective among college freshmen. The logical explanation might be that regional differences may account for slight disparities and additional
research is needed; however, this would do little to fill the void of other required Mennonite educational studies.

There are at least two kinds of educational research lacking in Mennonite studies pertaining to both theoretical and practical concerns. With the exception of being able to identify some element of infusion of German educational philosophy into Russian Mennonite schooling, we have no evidence that the many educational ideologies that have infiltrated North American education have even remotely affected the Mennonite situation. Besides the progressive education movement, which held the attention of North American educators for most of this century, there has been Existentialism, Neo-Freudianism, Neo-Marxism, philosophical analysis and cultural approaches to educating, none of which appear to have drawn the attention of Mennonite educational writers. Was there indeed no such effect on Mennonite schooling? Did the teaching techniques and methodologies, based on entirely new concepts of human nature and epistemology, and rampant in public systems, remain safely outside the walls of Mennonite schooling? Did the philosophy of perennialism, the original mainstay of Mennonite socialization, continue unhampered in Mennonite circles? If the answer to these questions is even mildly affirmative, it may help to answer why, according to some studies, the retention of Mennonite youth is presently at lower levels than in previous decades.

On the practical side, a number of Anabaptist groups have successfully manoeuvred the acceptance by government of non-certified teachers and locally-produced curriculum materials, notably the Amish, but when these are utilized to any great extent achievement comparisons with public school achievements are no longer valid. Unless applicable formats of research for comparison are forthcoming that will affirm the isolationist intents of Mennonite education, not every school will be able to match the record of the Old Order East Penn Valley School in Berks County, Pennsylvania, which has effectively worked against individualization, innovation, politicalization and secularization.7 Little has been written that implies a preventative stance in Mennonite education with implications for content and methodology; most studies have implicitly assumed that assimilation is not inevitable and can effectively be thwarted. Except for a minority of Mennonites endowed with a slightly more evangelistic zeal than has been the Mennonite mainstay, the Mennonite universe is "unfolding as it should." If sociologists and historians eventually discover that boundary maintenance among Mennonites is no longer effective they will be hardpressed to find explanations in Mennonite educational research. In the meantime, some consolation may come from the words of E. K. Francis, who has suggested that Mennonites are being absorbed into Canadian society not through assimila-
tion, but by acculturation whereby a minority group adjusts as a group, not individually, to the larger society.72
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