From Victimization to Empathetic Solidarity: Peace-Building and Human Rights Advocacy in Anabaptist-Mennonite Origins

Andrew P. Klager, *University of the Fraser Valley*

Introduction

To fully appreciate the theoretical underpinnings of contemporary Mennonite approaches to human rights as a condition for effective peacebuilding, it is important to consider the original concerns of early Anabaptists. They helped inspire subsequent, more sophisticated contributions of Mennonites to the field of peace and conflict studies. In this sense, I wish to explore the ways in which the trend towards conflict transformation and a 'just peace' among Mennonite practitioners is rooted in the many appeals to magisterial and clerical authorities for the protection of human rights by early sixteenth-century Anabaptist leaders. Early Anabaptists understood that human rights abuses encouraged violence as the most attractive option for reacquiring one's rights and dignity, a scenario that Anabaptists largely sought to mitigate. This understanding, so central to conflict transformation and 'just peace' theory, is reflected in the preamble of the United Nation's

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which acknowledges that "the inherent dignity and…equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."[1]

As a framework for analyzing the manner in which early Anabaptists encouraged peaceful coexistence through human rights advocacy, the definition of "human rights" in the *Mennonite Encyclopedia* will become operative, *viz.*, "Human Rights are those basic rights which, when afforded by one person to another, indicate a belief in the other's full humanity. Where a person or group denies these basic rights to others, that denial indicates a belief that the others are less than human," listing specifically "the rights to life, self-determination, and personal security."[2] The Anabaptists, who formed a part of the radical wing of the sixteenth-century Reformation, were severely persecuted and dehumanized from the outset. This included at least four thousand executions in the sixteenth century alone, often accompanied by inhumane prison conditions and the cruelest of torture techniques.[3]

These experiences formed the basis of promoting more universal human rights in empathetic solidarity with other socio-economic and religious outcasts. The elements of memory and co-suffering are important since it underscores why, as Marc Gopin observes, Mennonites humanize the Other by "travel[ling] the globe in search of the defenseless, keenly aware of their own history as defenseless strangers. In a certain sense," Gopin continues, "each time [Mennonites] work toward securing the legitimacy of Otherness and the identity of a threatened group, they reaffirm the spiritual depth of their own experience."[4] Specific examples of this empathetic solidarity through the device of memory abound. The inward-looking interests of North American Mennonites who became aware of Mennonite hardships during the Great Famine in Ukraine in the 1920s propelled the outward-looking global focus of Mennonite Central Committee's (MCC) relief, development, and peace work today. MCC also established the Peace Section Office in Washington in 1968, which, Duane Friesen remarks, operated under the understanding that "Mennonites should not only be willing to testify to [the] government when our own interests are at stake but 'we should also be willing to testify when the rights of others are involved.'"[5]

An early Anabaptist understanding of human rights seems to have centred around three areas, reflected in the organization of this analysis: (1) religious freedom, voluntarism, or self-determination, reflected in the separation of church and state; (2) anti-clericalism or anti-elitism as a driving force behind the fundamental socio-economic rights of peasants; and (3) the connection between human rights and peacebuilding.

Free Will and Religious Voluntarism

The Anabaptist appeals for the right to religious self-determination for all human beings regardless of religious preference were born in the crucible of their own persecuted existence. Believers' baptism was, for early Anabaptists, the outward sacramental expression of free will and religious voluntarism, which sought to undermine paedobaptism's monopolization of natal religious affiliation in Catholicism's favour. However, the Anabaptist teaching on free will had primarily soteriological implications, *viz.*, whether or not a person responds to divine grace and nurtures the ethical component of salvation that the Magisterial Reformers seemed to bypass. For example, Arnold Snyder notes that the forerunners of radical reform and the earnest critique of paedobaptism, Andreas Karlstadt (1486-1541) and Thomas Müntzer (*c.*1489-1525), "agreed that God's grace opens the possibility of response for the sinner (freedom of the will) and that faith means believing and accepting God's gracious offer of pardon through Christ. All this means," Snyder continues, "that infant baptism was a rite that no longer made sense theologically, for infants do not make personal faith decisions, nor are they visibly regenerated after choosing to live new lives."[6] This meant that the salvific import of free will forced Anabaptists to seriously consider the appropriate attitude towards and manner in which one should approach the religious Other, including diverse Christian splinter groups, Jews, and Muslims. It is important to further note that believers' baptism as the visible expression of one's religious preference and attendant break from Christendom marked Anabaptists for persecution and made them a conspicuous target of sectarian violence. Indeed, the defiance of credobaptism was enough of a disruption to the socio-economic and political order that, as Ervin Stutzman remarks, "Reserving baptism for adults was viewed by authorities as civil disobedience, since infant baptism was the occasion to register newborns on the civic register."[7] This sense of vulnerability, in turn, inspired Anabaptists to entreat the governing authorities to more resolutely and universally enshrine religious freedom.

In this manner, free will became a central anthropological principle of early Anabaptism. Such influential Anabaptist leaders as Hans Denck, Pilgram Marpeck, Peter Riedemann, Menno Simons, David Joris, Melchior Hoffman, and Balthasar Hubmaier all taught the freedom of the will as an alternative to the general opinion of the Magisterial Reformers.[8] For instance, according to Melchior Hoffman (*c.*1495-1543), the progenitor of Anabaptism among the Dutch, the baptismal act of civil disobedience takes place "when a bride with complete, voluntary, and loving surrender and with a truly free,

well-considered betrothal, yields herself in abandon and presents herself as a freewill offering to her lord and bridegroom."[9]

However, the Anabaptist teaching on free will was perhaps no clearer than in Balthasar Hubmaier's (*c.*1480-1528) two treatises *Von der Freiheit des Willens* (1527). With their strong Nominalist undertones and verbatim passages from Erasmus' *De libero arbitrio* (1524), these two seminal works testified "to the freedom of the human being to do good and evil."[10] Although Hubmaier's treatises primarily addressed his opponents in Nikolsburg, Luther himself was no doubt a target as well. For example, Hubmaier's concern for morality sprung from his optimism in the human ability to perform good works *via* the partially undefiled image of God in each human being,[11] so that when (as Luther does) "one says there is nothing good in man, that is saying too much."[12] Specifically, Hubmaier challenges Luther's doctrine of *sola fide* by claiming that those who say, "Faith alone saves us and not our works," are spewing out only "half-truths."[13] For Hubmaier, the consequences of the Lutheran position are fourfold: (1) neglect of Christian responsibility promotes the debauched clerical behaviour that originally ignited the Reformation,[14] (2) sin is stripped of its culpability since it is not committed voluntarily,[15] (3) God is vulnerable to mockery for expecting conformity to commandments that we cannot willfully obey,[16] and (4) God, not the delinquent human being, is guilty of our disobedience and sin.[17]

More germane to our particular inquiry, the Anabaptist teachings on free will formed the basis of their appeals for religious freedom for themselves, other freethinking radical reformers, the Magisterial Reformers, and even those outside the Christian faith. Robert Kreider is clearest on the connection between free will and freedom of religion when he remarks, the "concern for freedom of conscience and religious association was implicit in [Anabaptist] teaching."[18] Although admittedly not as generous as post-Enlightenment conceptions of the right to religious (or non-religious) self-determination, the Anabaptist embrace of free will as the anthropological basis for religious voluntarism implies the inevitability of religious diversity. As the least tolerant option, this religious heterogeneity may be overcome through persuasion rather than violent coercion, but free will was also often affirmed as the foundation of interreligious peacebuilding. For instance, Hans Denck (*c.*1500-27), the Bavarian Anabaptist and Humanist, taught that the human will is free to reject or embrace God's salvific offer because "God does not wish to compel us."[19] But Denck added that humans should emulate God's refusal to coerce in the earthly realm, so that "no one shall deprive another – whether heathen or Jew or Christian – but rather allow everyone to move in all territories in the name of God."[20]

Similarly, Kilian Aurbacher (*fl.* 1530s), a preacher from Austerlitz, wrote to the prominent Strasbourg Reformer, Martin Bucer (1491-1551), that it is "never right to compel one in matters of faith, whatever he may believe, be he Jew or [Muslim] Turk … [since]…Christ's people are a free, unforced, and uncompelled people… ."[21] Hubmaier's 1524 trilogy on religious self-determination, which included *An Ernest Christian Appeal to Schaffhausen*, *Theses Against Eck*, and *On Heretics and Those Who Burn Them*, exhibits a profound conviction that violent persecution of so-called heretics is without justification. Hubmaier was convinced that the religious voluntarism that free will sanctioned meant that "a [Muslim] Turk or a heretic cannot be overcome by our doing, neither by sword nor by fire."[22] In an ironic twist, Hubmaier further claimed that "the inquisitors are the greatest heretics of all, because counter to the teaching and example of Jesus they condemn heretics to fire."[23]

Moreover, some early Radical Reformers recognized the need to humanize the Other, which is central to contemporary conflict transformation and human rights theory. Hans Umlauft (*fl.* 1530s), either a priest or monk turned shoemaker and Anabaptist from Regensburg,[24] implored Stephen Rauchenecker, the recipient of his 1539 letter, to "[r]emember that we are humans and just as human as you and your kind, created after the image of God" since "God is a God of the heathen also and not a respecter of persons… ."[25] Umlauft also tells Rauchenecker that Christians should "judge no one" and not "claim God for ourselves in a partisan spirit" by thinking "that all other people who do not share our views or belong to our group are nothing but pagans."[26] Umlauft is so charitable that he also advises Rauchenecker to "listen carefully to the saying of Christ that many from the east and from the west (who have been called [Muslim] Turks and heathens) will come and sit at table with Abraham in the kingdom of God."[27]

So, in some sense, everyone – regardless of their religious affiliation – can taste salvation, especially due to the salvific properties of sharing in Christ's suffering and persecution. For example, Hans Hut (*c.*1490-1527), perhaps the greatest Anabaptist preacher of South Germany, Moravia, and the Tyrol, believed that even if one's free will does not lead to baptism by water, the "true baptism" by blood through exposure to persecution was nevertheless instituted before the time of Christ "since the beginning." Therefore, this true baptism by blood is accessible to anyone whose religious identity – even faith traditions that fall outside of Christianity – invited discrimination and persecution as the "baptism of all tribulation [that was] poured over [Jesus]" when he manifested his "love toward all men [as] an example, even unto death."[28]

As a further warning, Menno Simons (1496-1561) underscores the inevitability of violence in the absence of affirming the peaceful

co-existence of different religious communities. He also emphasizes the *eternal* ramifications of religious intolerance if persuasion alone is powerless to convert so-called heretics. "[T]hen it would be heathenish," Menno observes, "yes, ungodly and tyrannical, would it not, to crowd us out of life unto death, from heaven into hell, with the sword and violence!"[29] What's more, Menno's co-labourer in the Netherlands, Dirk Philips (1504-68), draws a clear connection between the Anabaptist sensation of suffering under the yoke of persecution and the experiential wisdom to withhold such sectarian violence against other religious communities. "[T]he true Christian," Philips maintains emphatically, "must be persecuted here for the sake of the truth and of righteousness, but they persecute no one because of their faith."[30] This, of course, represents an antithetical – and more life-giving – response to heresy to that of the inquisition that Hubmaier denounced so forcefully above.

The Socio-Economic Rights of the Peasants

It has become axiomatic in Anabaptist scholarship to account not only for the indebtedness of early Anabaptist leaders to the magisterial religious reformation, Erasmian humanism, and German mysticism, especially as it is expressed in the *Theologia Deutsch*, but also to the socio-economic demands of Swiss and South German peasants that underpinned the German Peasants' War (1524-26).[31] Not only did these peasant revolutionaries often provide protection to Anabaptist enclaves against their Austrian Habsburg aggressors,[32] the credibility of their petition for increased rights and self-determination was enhanced by Anabaptism's religious justification for these demands.[33]

More specifically, Anabaptist teachings on mutual aid, economic sharing, and the community of goods were the result of an anticlerical impulse that reflected the peasants' refusal to acquiesce to the ecclesial taxation system that diverted funds away from the local parish priest and the poor to instead finance distant bishoprics, lavish building projects, privileged university students, or wealthy monastic communities. Instead of easing the financial burden of local priests and underwriting their theological training to better prepare them for the spiritual oversight of their parishioners, the economically, spiritually, and intellectually impoverished rural priests galvanized an anti-clerical sentiment that included the retention of taxes to benefit local interests. The countryside surrounding Zurich, where Wilhelm Reublin (1480/84-*c.*1559), Johannes Brötli (*c.*1494-1527), and Jakob Hottinger (*fl.* 1523) implemented Anabaptist reforms in Witikon, Hallau, and Zollikon respectively, was an especially important setting for related advocacy.[34]

These included a fair living wage for local priests and an equitable distribution of excess funds among the poor. Such Anabaptist socio-economic demands reflect the content of the very influential Twelve Articles, which peasants from the Memmingen assembly presented to the Swabian League in 1525. For instance, Article Two reads:

> …The word of God plainly provides that in giving rightly to God and distributing to his people the services of a pastor are required. We will that for the future our church provost, whomsoever the community may appoint, shall gather and receive this tithe. From this he shall give to the pastor, elected by the whole community, a decent and sufficient maintenance for him and his, as shall seem right to the whole community. What remains over shall be given to the poor of the place, as the circumstances and the general opinion demand. Should anything farther remain, let it be kept, lest any one should have to leave the country from poverty… .[35]

Anabaptists themselves manifested these peasant-inspired rights to human dignity and self-determination in various forms: the censure against surplus profits that belong *de jure* to the poor, the agreement to hold property privately only if it is also offered openly to those in need, holding all things in common among the Moravian Brethren, and mutual aid and economic sharing. For example, in the account of his interrogation, it is said that Hans Hut "persuaded no one to sell his goods, …[but] that whoever had a surplus should help the needy."[36] Similarly, Menno Simons lambasted those who

> go about in silk and velvet, gold and silver, and in all manner of pomp and splendor; ornament their houses with all manner of costly furniture have their coffers filled, and live in luxury and splendor, yet they suffer many of their own poor, afflicted members…to ask alms; and poor, hungry, suffering, old, lame, blind, and sick people to beg [for] their bread at their doors.[37]

Bernard Rothmann (*c.*1495-*c.*1535), the disgraced Münsterite Anabaptist theologian, rebuked the wealthy who "eat and drink the sweat of the poor,"[38] and Georg Schnabel, the Hessian Anabaptist preacher who later recanted, captured the essence of economic sharing and mutual aid when he wrote, "Concerning the community of believers and their material goods we say that everyone willingly helps his poor brother in his need out of his surplus."[39]

Taking the economic responsibility of a true Christian a step further, the Moravian Brethren leader, Peter Riedemann (1506-1556),

argued forcefully that "God ordained that people should own nothing individually but should have all things in common" to fulfill the human right of equal living standards.[40] Riedemann astutely observes also that humans have not yet possessed the sun and air because they are "too high for him to bring under his power, otherwise – so evil had he become through wrong taking – he would have drawn them to himself as well as the rest and made them his property.[41] These sentiments reproduce those of the third to fifth of the Twelve Articles, which seek to trade serfdom for freedom; permit equitable access to wild game, fowl, and fish in common territories for consumption; and grant that forest resources be "free to every member of the community to help himself to such firewood as he needs in his home."[42] As these socio-economic directives were meant to guarantee basic human rights, Anabaptist leaders sought to undermine systemic injustice for all of society and then, having failed in this effort, reluctantly limited their efforts to the pure church. This intrinsically promised the local peasants the right to personal security, to which we will now turn our attention by exploring the conditions for sustainable peace.

The Connection between Human Rights and Peacebuilding

The human rights of self-determination and life – specifically in the form of religious freedom and socio-economic justice – represent the social conditions that reinforce the parallel right to personal security. In this sense, the historical seeds of more contemporary Mennonite concerns for conflict transformation and a 'just peace' also appear in early Anabaptist literature. At the core of conflict transformation and 'just peace' theory is the belief that the institutional codification of socio-economic justice and cultivation of social change through equitable access to resources, decision-making, economic opportunity, and democratic processes provide the conditions for a greater possibility of reduced violence.[43] The negotiations that Anabaptists and peasants participated in through written appeals represented a step in the process towards a more profound social change to *transform* rather than merely *resolve* interreligious conflict in early modern Europe. As John Paul Lederach observes, "To break this cycle [of violence], negotiations move to find what is doable, focus on those steps and solutions, especially where violence can be halted, and defer deeper transformation to later timeframes."[44] But this process is flawed, Lederach reminds us, if the post-accord period is not brief and temporary, which should instead move very rapidly but incisively and meaningfully toward implementing concrete social change that convinces even the most pessimistic.[45]

In this manner, beyond a mere armistice of indefinite duration between peasants and magistrates, some Anabaptist leaders believed that the codification of religious freedom in Europe and attendant affirmation of religious diversity would provide the social change – or the transformation of interreligious conflict – necessary for the cessation of inter- and intra-religious violence. Hans Denck, for example, wrote that "security will exist…in outward things, with practice of the true gospel that each will let the other move and dwell in peace – be he [Muslim] Turk or heathen, believing what he will – through and in his land, not submitting to a magistrate in matters of faith."[46] Further, this vision of the peaceful coexistence of different religious communities was exemplified in the Anabaptist refusal to support insurrection in the face of persecution; in point of fact, Leopold Scharnschlager (*c.*1485-1563), the associate of the Tyrolean Anabaptist leader, Pilgram Marpeck (*d.* 1556), assured his magisterial overlords in his "Appeal for Toleration" (1534) that Anabaptists do not intend to preserve their "faith with violence and military defence; but with patience and suffering even to physical death… ."[47] This personal appeal, in turn, led to a more universally applied condemnation of violence to overcome religious dissent, which could be avoided by affirming the human right to religious self-determination. As Dirk Philips argued, "[N]o [church] may have dominion over the consciences of people with an external sword, nor compel the unbeliever to faith with violence,"[48] which was mitigated by the relatively more charitable soft discipline of the ban.[49] Therefore, interreligious peacebuilding was engineered under the conviction that patience and respectful persuasion was preferable to violent coercion and an eschatological framework that endorsed the premature and unauthorized practice of "destroy[ing] the wheat along with the tares," as Hubmaier reminds us.[50]

Anabaptists similarly recognized that the socio-economic peasant demands – enriched by their religious capital and politically jarring reforms – had the potential to transform conflict by addressing the economic rights of peasants through redistributive policies. For example, Menno Simons reviled the "Lords and princes [who] daily seek new ways and means to increase their dominions, taxes, tolls, and rents." Indeed, these are precisely the forms of exploitation that the German peasants opposed so vehemently and sought to overturn through insurrection. These lords and princes "tax and toll," Menno continues, "grasp and grab, without mercy and measure; they suck the very marrow from the bones of the poor."[51] Further, he denounced "knights and soldiers in their wicked service and bloody deeds…and preachers, priests, and monks [who] continue in their salaries, income, and cloisters."[52] In their place, Menno upholds the example of Zacchaeus and entreated all lords, princes, soldiers, and clergy – among

other equally as avaricious demographics and vocations – "to consider with an understanding heart this history and narrative touching Zacchaeus…[who] was rich, and one half of his wealth he gave to the poor."[53] Similarly, the Moravian Anabaptist, Ulrich Stadler (*d.* 1540), averred that the true community (*gmain*) of saints "must move about in this world, poor, miserable, small, and rejected of the world, of whom, however, the world is not worthy. Whoever," Ulrich further contends, "strives for lofty things [of this world] does not belong." As an antidote to this pride and cupidity, therefore, Stadler instructed his readers to embrace communal living and an equal distribution of wealth and property, so that they may live "peaceably, united, lovingly, amicably, and fraternally… ."[54]

A further peacebuilding import of these redistributive policies lies in their ability to palliate violence-inducing frustration, hopelessness, and desperation by genuinely empowering the poor, marginalized, oppressed, exploited, and voiceless. For some Anabaptists – particularly the Moravian Brethren – human rights were therefore based equally on individual dignity and inchoate socialist principles, the latter of which, Stadler advised, should not be undermined by individualist impulses wherein "each member withholds assistance from the other." "Where, however," Stadler continues, "each member extends assistance equally to the whole body, it is built up and grows and there is peace and unity, [as] each member takes care for the other. In brief, equal care, sadness and joy, peace are at hand."[55] Here, we have the mutual concern for individual rights and corporate responsibility in embryonic form to build peace. Division and violence, therefore, result from individualistic and selfish impulses, much as the German peasants experienced at the hands of their feudal lords, princes, and clergy. In this sense, "The strong will not work for the community but for himself and each one wishes to take care of himself…[so that] the whole body is divided."

Riedemann therefore observes that the community of goods is the appropriate response to the commandment, "[N]o one should covet someone else's possessions,"[56] which therefore builds peace from both ends: it prevents the individualistic accumulation of wealth by those who hold a monopoly on power and takes away the reason to engage in violent insurrection by those who are powerless, exploited, and voiceless. When we therefore consider Luther's conflation of Anabaptists and the violent German peasants or *Schwärmer* in his well-known condemnation of both,[57] Scharnschlager's opposition to the desperate violence of the powerless – for reasons of faith or material needs – as mentioned above clearly applies. In this sense, although Riedemann is clear that "Christians should not take part in war, nor should they use force for purposes of vengeance,"[58] the emphasis for Moravian

Anabaptists especially is on the community of goods as a redistributive practice that reduces the desperation that fuels such vengeance. Further, even if Riedemann's instructions to turn the other cheek are directed toward the faithful, there is nonetheless in this injunction to neither "avenge yourself nor go to war"[59] an implicit conviction that those in positions of power have created the unjust conditions that invite the possibility of this vengeance. The community of goods and economic sharing therefore undermine the unjust conditions and desperation that lead to violence.

Conclusion

When we consider the connection between peace and justice, then, it becomes apparent that the protection of human rights is not the only admirable pursuit. Mennonites, as a historic peace church with a profound relief, development and peacebuilding pedigree, provide a model of an ethno-religious community whose behaviour was shaped by religious persecution and economic hardship. These painful memories induce empathy for victims of injustice today, that is, the disempowered, voiceless, and marginalized.[60] This empathy is transmitted inter-generationally, preserved through Mennonite heritage programs and genealogical investigation.

As a wider application, therefore, conflict analysts and peace practitioners should internalize the historical narratives of different religions and ethnicities that include similar human rights restrictions to those that Anabaptists endured. These initiatives hold much promise of encouraging the humanization of the Other, whether through education, inter-faith dialogue and forums, problem-solving workshops, and mediation training. Such a promise can be realized if guided by an attitude that translates personal or community suffering into the mitigation of universal suffering.

Notes

1 "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights," *United Nations*, 1948, accessed 20 June 2012, http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/.

2 Duane Ruth-Heffelbower, "Human Rights," in *The Mennonite Encyclopedia: A Comprehensive Reference Work on the Anabaptist-Mennonite Movement*, eds. Harold S. Bender and C. Henry Smith (Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1989), 5: 399.

3 Paul Schowalter, "Martyrs," Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online, 1953, accessed 21 January 2013, http://www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/M37857.html.

[4] Marc Gopin, "The Religious Component of Mennonite Peacemaking and Its Global Implications," in *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 240.

[5] Duane K. Friesen, "Mennonites and Social Justice: Problems and Prospects," in *Mennonite Life* (March 1982): 20 (Minutes, MCC Peace Section Committee, 8 June 1966).

[6] C. Arnold Snyder, *Anabaptist History and Theology: Revised Student Edition* (Kitchener, ON: Pandora Press, 1997), 88. For more on free will as a corollary of baptism, see John D. Rempel, *The Lord's Supper in Anabaptism: A Study in the Theology of Balthasar Hubmaier, Pilgrim Marpeck and Dirk Philips*, vol. 33 of Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History (Waterloo, ON: Herald Press, 1993), 45; Rollin Stely Armour, *Anabaptist Baptism: A Representative Study*, vol. 11 of Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1966), 56, 97-99.

[7] Ervin Stutzman, *From Nonresistance to Justice: The Transformation of Mennonite Church Peace Rhetoric, 1908-2008* (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 2011), 31.

[8] See Andrew P. Klager, "Mennonite Religious Values as a Resource for Peacebuilding between Orthodox Christians and Muslims," *Peace Research: The Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies* 43, no. 2 (2011): 139-145. Cf. Thor Hall, "Possibilities of Erasmian Influence on Denck and Hubmaier in their Views on the Freedom of the Will," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 35, no. 2 (April 1961): 149-70; Gordon D. Kaufman, "Some Theological Emphases of the Early Swiss Anabaptists," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 25, no. 2 (April 1951), 96; Robert S. Kreider, "Anabaptism and Humanism: An Inquiry into the Relationship of Humanism to the Evangelical Anabaptists," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 26, no. 2 (April 1952): 139; Garry Schmidt, "Early Anabaptist Spirituality: History and Response," *Direction Journal* 34, no. 1 (2005): 30, 32f.

[9] Melchior Hoffman, "The Ordinance of God, 1530," in *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers: Documents Illustrative of the Radical Reformation*, eds. George H. Williams and Angel M. Mergal, vol. 25 of The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1977), 187.

[10] Balthasar Hubmaier, "Freedom of the Will, I," in *Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*, trans. and eds. H. Wayne Pipkin and John Howard Yoder, vol. 5 of Classics in the Radical Reformation (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1989), 429. Cf. Hall, "Freedom of the Will," 149-70, esp. 160-64.

[11] Balthasar Hubmaier, "A Christian Catechism," in *Balthasar Hubmaier*, 348. See also 361.

[12] Ibid., 360.

[13] Hubmaier, "Freedom of the Will, I," 428f.

[14] Ibid., 447.

[15] Ibid., 441.

[16] Balthasar Hubmaier, "Freedom of the Will, II," in *Balthasar Hubmaier*, 460f., 466.

[17] Ibid., 461f. See also 363, 468, 489.

[18] Kreider, "Anabaptism and Humanism," 139.

[19] Hans Denck, "Whether God is the Cause of Evil," in *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers: Documents Illustrative of the Radical Reformation*, eds. George Hunston Williams and Angel M. Mergal (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1957), 97. Cf. Hall, "Freedom of the Will," 149-70, esp. 156-60.

[20] Hans Denck, "Commentary on Micah, 1527," in *Anabaptism in Outline: Selected Primary Sources*, ed. Walter Klaassen, vol. 3 of Classics of the Radical Reformation (Waterloo, ON: Herald Press, 1981), 292.

[21] Killian Aurbacher, "Hulshof, 1534," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 293.

[22] Hubmaier, "On Heretics and Those Who Burn Them," in *Balthasar Hubmaier*, 62.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Werner O. Packull, *Hutterite Beginnings: Communitarian Experiments during the Reformation* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 147.
[25] Hans Umlauft, "Hans Umlauft to Stephan Rauchenecker, 1539," in *Sources of South German/Austrian Anabaptism*, ed. C. Arnold Snyder, trans. Walter Klaassen et al., vol. 10 of Classics of the Radical Reformation (Kitchener, ON: Pandora Press, 2001), 283.
[26] Umlauft, "Hans Umlauft to Stephan Rauchenecker, 1539," 283f.
[27] Ibid., 284.
[28] Hans Hut, "The Mystery of Baptism," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 170.
[29] Menno Simons, "Foundation of Christian Doctrine, 1539," in *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*, ed. J.C. Wenger, trans. Leonard Verduin (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1956), 201f.
[30] Dirk Philips, "The Congregation of God," in *The Writings of Dirk Philips (1504-1568)*, eds. and trans. Cornelius J. Dyck, William E. Keeney, and Alvin J. Beachy, vol. 6 of Classics in the Radical Reformation (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1992), 374.
[31] See Arnold Snyder, "Anabaptist Spirituality and Economics," in *Anabaptist/Mennonite Faith and Economics*, eds. Calvin Redekop, Victor A. Krahn, and Samuel J. Steiner (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994), 4; Werner Packull, "The Origins of Swiss Anabaptism in the Context of the Reformation of the Common Man," *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 3 (1985): 36-59; James Stayer, *Anabaptists and the Sword* (Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1972); James Stayer, Werner Packull, and Klaus Depperman, "From Monogenesis to Polygenesis: The Historical Discussion of Anabaptist Origins," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 59 (1975): 83-121.
[32] Snyder, *Anabaptist History*, 70.
[33] Snyder, "Anabaptist Spirituality and Economics," 4f.
[34] Ibid., 4-11.
[35] "The Twelve Articles of the Peasants of Swabia, 1524," accessed 21 January 2013, http://personal.ashland.edu/~jmoser1/peasantarticles.htm.
[36] "Interrogation of Hans Hut, 1527," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 233f.
[37] Menno Simons, "Reply to False Accusations, 1552," in *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*, 559.
[38] Bernhard Rothmann, "Restitution, 1534," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 234.
[39] Georg Schnabel, "Defence and Refutation, 1538," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 237.
[40] Peter Riedemann, *Peter Riedemann's Hutterite Confession of Faith*, ed. and trans. John J. Friesen, vol. 9 of Classics of the Radical Reformation (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1999), 119.
[41] Peter Riedemann, "Account, 1542," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 239.
[42] "The Twelve Articles of the Peasants of Swabia, 1524," accessed 21 January 2013, http://personal.ashland.edu/~jmoser1/peasantarticles.htm.
[43] From John Paul Lederach, "From Conflict Resolution to Conflict Transformation and Strategic Peacebuilding," (presentation, Kroc Institute of International Peace Studies: Teaching Peace in the 21st Century – 3rd Annual Summer Institute for Faculty, University of Notre Dame, June 2011).
[44] John Paul Lederach, *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 46.
[45] Ibid., 51-63.
[46] Hans Denck, "Commentary on Micah, 1527," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 292.
[47] Leopold Scharnschlager, "Appeal for Toleration, 1534," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 294.
[48] Dirk Philips, "The Congregation of God," in *The Writings of Dirk Philips (1504-1568)*, 375.
[49] Cf. Ibid., 374.

[50] Hubmaier, "On Heretics," 62. For the Anabaptist preference for persuasion over coercion, cf. Killian Aurbacher, "Hulshof (1534)," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 293, and Menno Simons, "Foundation of Christian Doctrine, 1539," in *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*, 201f.

[51] Menno Simons, "True Christian Faith, 1541," in *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*, 367.

[52] Ibid., 369.

[53] Ibid., 367.

[54] Ulrich Stadler, "Cherished Instruction, c.1537," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 235.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Riedemann, *Hutterite Confession of Faith*, 120.

[57] John S. Oyer, *Lutheran Reformers Against Anabaptists* (The. Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964), 135. Cf. *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. eds. J.K.F. Knaake, G. Kawerau et al., vol. 30 of III Band (Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1883-1966), 513.

[58] Riedemann, *Hutterite Confession of Faith*, 134f.

[59] Ibid., 135.

[60] See Robert Herr and Judy Zimmerman Herr, "Building Peace in South Africa: A Case Study of Mennonite Program," in *From the Ground Up*, 76. Cf. Gopin, "The Religious Component of Mennonite Peacemaking," 235f.