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Sociology is a relatively young discipline beginning roughly a century ago, with founders such as Karl Marx, Emil Durkheim and Max Weber, followed by Ferdinand Tönnies and Georg Simmel, most of them located in Germany. European society was emerging from feudalism and traditionalism because of industrialization and urbanization. Increasingly there was a need to better understand the influence of industrial capitalism upon society, how social solidarity functioned, the influence of these changes on economic, political and religious ideology, and the need to assess the processes of revolution, industrialization and urbanization. What was happening to the foundation of European civilization?

Karl Marx (1818-1883), living in Germany and England, was dismayed with the plight of proletariat families seeking to eke out a miserly living working in the factories, and soon decided that capitalist bourgeoisie were extracting work from the masses without a fair return. He searched for overarching macro explanations of what would happen in the future. He predicted that much conflict and necessary revolution would result.

Emil Durkheim (1858-1917) in France experienced some of the aftermath of the French revolution, which swept away tradition leaving much chaos and disruption. In contrast to Marx, he wanted to understand better how social solidarity, traditions and religious ideals were formed in the first place. He focussed on how communities, religion and social structure came to be. He decided that society was created by humans to function as a solid anchor to ward off meaninglessness, normlessness and anomie. Institutions and social structures were formed to cradle traditions, culture and beliefs. Durkheim's concern with social solidarity seemed to be a response to the revolutionary change in France.
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At first, Max Weber (1864-1920), teaching in Germany (the home of the Protestant reformation), was interested in the link between Protestant religion and economic capitalism, seeking to find what caused such major social developments. Later he became increasingly interested in the sources of authority (traditional, legal, rational, charismatic), and the processes of bureaucratization and rationalization. While Marx was concerned with macro change, and Durkheim with social solidarity, Weber pursued multidimensional processes and change of ideology, technology and society.

The point of our review is that early sociology grew out of situations in Europe where traditional society was changing, industrialization and urbanization were in process, and the need for social insights and solutions was pressing. Ferdinand Tönnies' concern with gemeinschaft and gesellschaft is similar to that of Durkheim; Georg Simmel's multi-faceted work on urbanization and conflict deals with concerns of Marx and Weber.

The Chicago School and American Sociology

Although American sociology started not only in Chicago, few sociologists would dispute that the University of Chicago had one of the first and, in the earlier years, the most influential departments of Sociology. It is today still among the top departments in the USA. *The American Journal of Sociology*, the oldest, began in 1895 located at the University of Chicago. Albion Small, Robert Park, George Herbert Mead, Louis Wirth, and Ernest Burgess were greatly influenced by European sociologists as they searched for theories and methods to study urban phenomena in Chicago. Chicago in the early 1900s was the gateway to the American west; an exploding pluralist metropolis, seeking to find its way in the industrial boom. Minorities of many varieties, contrasting slums and goldcoasts, delinquent gangs, white collar crime, hobos, religious missions and halfway houses were studied, resulting in research and many books. The search for social theory and methods of research was on.

Early American sociologists, similar to European sociologists, were interested in what was happening to tradition, culture, communities, social institutions (such as the family, religion, economics and politics), in a changing industrial environment such as the city. Some were more interested in structural change, others in processes and conflicts. And always, they were faced with finding ways and methods of collecting information, and developing theories to guide their research, or help explain their findings.

Out of this research came Robert Park's minority assimilation theory which influenced American sociology for more than fifty years. When immigrants enter a new country, or minorities come into contact with the
city, Park predicted that they will lose their identity and assimilate. Znaniecki's study of Poles, and Wirth's study of Jews in Chicago, on the other hand, seemed to suggest that minorities could persist. However, Park's assimilation theory seemed to be more influential. Minorities, race and ethnicity were of interest to many of the Chicago school.

Ernest Burgess began to study the solidarity of the family, developing theories and methods to measure happiness, and changing family structures. Burgess is perhaps best known for his concentric zone theory, to explain urban growth patterns.

While Louis Wirth researched the Chicago Jewish ghetto, he also turned to study urbanization as a way of life. Some have criticized Wirth and others of the Chicago School, for their rural biases which were overly concerned with sociological, spatial, community and social institutional factors. Like Durkheim, there is a decided concern with disorganization, and the implicit assumption that too much industrial urban change will destroy cherished values and norms. Many of the Chicago School studied both group structures, as well as change factors.

George Herbert Mead, in his *Mind, Self and Society* laid out an understanding of social psychological phenomena, which provided a basis for understanding of the social development of the self. His concern tended to build also on some of the work of Simmel and Weber. The psychological changes which result as individuals move from traditional to industrial environments, have always been considered an important mini-structural part of sociology from the beginning.

This too short introduction shows that both in Europe and America, sociology grew out of the needs of society as it moved from traditional folk and rural villages and communities to fast-changing industrial cities. A better understanding of structural institutional change, as well as the processes of change were needed.

Beginnings in the Sociology of Mennonites

If early European and American sociologists were concerned with change in their communities and societies, we would expect the same for minorities such as the Mennonites. Mennonite roots began in Europe where sociology was born, and in North America Mennonites find themselves moving from rural communities to many Chicago-like urban environments. We would expect such a sectarian group to be concerned with separation, ethnicity, maintenance of community, conflict, urbanization, family solidarity, socialization, ideology and identity.

Interestingly, while Mennonites were confined to rural settlements, struggling as pioneers to survive, and unaware of, or hostile to, a conceptual or intellectual understanding of their social milieu, non-Men-

However, Mennonite sociologists too were tooling up for the task. In 1941 Winfield Fretz completed a Ph.D. in the Department of Social Ethics at the University of Chicago. While Francis was pursuing his Mennonite research in Manitoba in the early fifties, John Hostetler completed his Ph.D. in anthropology in Pennsylvania (1954), Paul Peachey finished his Ph.D. in sociology at Zurich (1954), Calvin Redekop did an M.A. at Minnesota (1954), and a number of Mennonites soon completed degrees in sociology at the University of Chicago (Leo Driedger, M.A. in 1955; Calvin Redekop, Ph.D. in 1959; and J. Howard Kaufmann, Ph.D. in 1960). Since then many more Mennonites have taken degrees in sociology, most of which we are about to review.

Most scholars of Mennonites have been interested in issues similar to the interests of the early European and American sociologists. Our review of the literature will seek to summarize some of these. To what extent do Mennonites fit into Troeltsch and Weber’s sect-church typology? Are Mennonites a religious group, or have they become an ethnic group increasingly confined to a specific language and culture? Mennonites are obviously a minority group, and what kinds of conflicts are involved in majority-minority relations? To what extent does social change such as acculturation and urbanization affect Mennonites in the many countries to which they have migrated? What methods of study such as qualitative and survey research have been and can be used? To what extent have scholars studied Mennonite family solidarity and socialization? What is the Mennonite ideology, and to what extent are they perpetuating or losing their identity? We now turn to a review of these questions of social theory, method and content.

**Analysis of Contemporary Sociological Research of Mennonites**

The most efficient method of analyzing the material is to classify the research according to the motifs of theory systems around which the studies have been done. Though the following categories are not necessarily definitive, they provide a framework.

I. **Sectarian Theory**

It is to be expected that the first sociological thinking and research
on Mennonites would focus on the sectarian theme. This is the result not only of the overpowering dominance of the sect-church theory popularized by Weber and Troeltsch, but because of its prevalence in sociology of leading universities such as Yale and Chicago. H. Richard Niebuhr's *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* is only one example of a vast literature produced around this theme.

The first concerted application of sectarian sociology to Mennonites was Edmund Kaufman's *The Development of the Missionary and Philanthropic Interest Among the Mennonites of North America* (1931). In chapter two, "The Sect Cycle and the Non-missionary Mennonite Mind," Kaufman utilizes the "classic" sect cycle theory propounded by persons such as Elsworth Faris, Robert Park, J. L. Gillen and others (p. 33ff). Kaufman proposes that the sect cycle runs parallel to missionary or outreach interest on the part of the Mennonites. No revisions or critique of the sect cycles are offered.

Although C. A. Dawson calls his study *Ethnic Groups in Western Canada* (1936), his treatment of the Mennonites is in actuality a study of the Mennonites using the "sect" conceptualization even though it is not specifically defined anywhere. The classical definitions or theories of sectarianism as proposed by Park are used as the framework of the study. The other groups as well as the Mennonites are described in terms of settlement, invasion, displacement and secularization.

Although Francis does not discuss the sectarian aspects of Mennonites extensively, he does characterize them as a sect in his *In Search of Utopia* (1955: 256). He proposes that originally all Anabaptist groups conformed to the sect type. In subsequent articles, he refers to the Mennonites as "religious groups" (1948) indicating that either he was less interested in the original phases, or that the sect conceptualization was not relevant. In his most recent work (1976) he does refer to the Mennonites as a sect, but with little further elaboration. In any case, Francis was one of the first non-Mennonites to study Mennonites sociologically.

Paul Peachey's historical analysis of the Anabaptist movement in Switzerland published in 1954, examines the social origins of the Anabaptists, *Die Soziale Herkunft der Schweizer Täufer*. This study does not bear directly on the classical economic disinheritance theory of sect origins alluded to above, but Peachey concludes that the Anabaptist movement was not an expression of the Peasants' Revolt and must be interpreted as the result of a religious impulse, not as the forerunner of modern socialism. Peachey's study can be used as well to refute the "disinherited" origins of sectarianism.

In 1955 W. E. Mann wrote *Sect, Cult, and Church in Alberta*, under the direction of S. D. Clark, both interested in sect theory. Mann describes the emergence of sects and cults, but the work is not analytical,
nor does he go beyond a description of Mennonites and Hutterites in Alberta.

Inspired to a large extent by Francis' sociology of Mennonites, a new generation of sectarian studies followed. The first of several was Calvin Redekop's Ph.D. dissertation "The Sectarian Black and White World" (1959). Redekop reviews the sectarian literature, produces eight researchable propositions on sectarian theory, and applies them to the Old Colony Mennonites. The conclusions of the dissertation include a rejection of the economic disinheritance source of sectarianism proposed by Niebuhr, a rejection of the sect cycle theory on both analytical and empirical (Old Colony) grounds, and a call for a redefinition of the sect typology.

In subsequent writings (1961, 1962, 1969, 1973, 1974), Redekop proposes an alternative definition of the sect, suggesting that the "sect-church" typology is historically limited, pejorative, value-loaded, and static. More dynamics based on reaction to social disorganization and religious decay, but determined by the interplay of religious movement and environment, are proposed as an alternative (see especially 1959, 1969, 1974).

In 1962, Leland Harder produced a Ph.D. dissertation entitled "The Quest for Equilibrium in an Established Sect: A Study of Social Change in the General Conference Mennonite Church." Harder accepts the traditional definition of sects, as refined by J. Milton Yinger (p. 11ff). He defines the Mennonites as an "established sect," and then applies a "structural" analysis to sectarians. He concludes that assimilation of certain values and practices exacerbate the inner tensions of separation versus integration, which cause disequilibrium and ultimately the demise of the "established sect."

Using the Old Colony in his anthropological study, "Blumenort: A Study of Persistence in a Sect" (1972), Edward Van Dyck accepts the traditional definition of the sect and seeks to establish the causes for persistence and change in the Old Colony. His framework is derived from Festinger's "Cognitive Dissonance" theory. He proposes three types of dissonance: ideo-structural, sectarian, and existential. In order to solve the dissonances which inevitably appear, Van Dyck proposes that a cyclical process of persistence in the sect emerged: revitalization, encroachment, dissonance, division, and isolation. Van Dyck proposes that a split within a sect is the most efficient way to handle and dispense with the dissonances that inevitably emerge.

A major study of the Russian Mennonite Commonwealth period by James Urry (1978) titled "The Closed and the Open: Social and Religious Change Amongst the Mennonites in Russia (1789-1889)," describes and analyzes the social and intellectual changes of the Mennonites in Russia.
in the so-called golden period. It is cast in the framework of a closed order intent upon maintaining a self-perpetuating system, resisting the "open order" introduced by intellectual enterprise and economic and cultural contacts. Although there is no explicit reference to sectarian theory, the "Black and White" sectarian motif proposed by Redekop is implicitly used. It can also fit the modernization theme.

II. Ethnic Theory

The analysis of the ethnic aspects of Mennonites is a relatively recent development. The pioneering in this area was done by E. K. Francis, whose works were referred to above. C. A. Dawson's earlier work on ethnic communities does not develop ethnic theory.

Beginning with the works published in 1945-46, in an article entitled "The Russian Mennonites: From Religious to Ethnic Group," (1948), Francis proposed that the Mennonites were transformed in a relatively short time from a religious into an ethnic community, identified historically, biologically and culturally. Francis proposed that the ethnic community deterred assimilation. In a major book published in 1976 titled *Inter-Ethnic Relations*, Francis presents a full-blown analysis of the nature of ethnicism, and its manifestations. His analysis of the formation of ethnic groups and classification makes a major contribution to the approaches that can be taken in the study of ethnic behaviour. Mennonite studies are included.

Mennonite scholars were slow to adopt the ethnic theme. In 1964 Calvin Redekop and John A. Hostetler published an article using the works of Everett C. Hughes on the socialization process as central in ethnic group survival, a theme later expanded by Hostetler and Kraybill (see below). In 1966, Redekop and Hostetler collaborated to expand Wirth's work on the attitudes of both host society and minorities in determining the fate of an ethnic group. This orientation is now becoming increasingly accepted and was developed further by Redekop (1969).

Paul Peachey (1968:247) is concerned about the "Identity Crises Among American Mennonites" as they are involved in "fusion of belief and history". Peachey believes that Mennonites have become an "ethnic" community rather than a religious one; a "religious movement . . . can undergo mutation into an ethnic group."

In 1969, Calvin Redekop produced a book titled *The Old Colony Mennonites: Dilemmas in Ethnic Minority Life* where he expands the "paradox of pluralism" where some groups wish to assimilate but are rejected while others who wish to remain separate are forced to assimilate. The volume is an extensive treatment of the Old Colony Mennonite quest for survival, a major contribution to Mennonite sociology.

Brief accounts of Mennonite-non-Mennonite relations in British

A major sector of ethnic research and theorizing begins with the contributions of Leo Driedger and his various collaborators. Many of Driedger’s ethnic/minority writings are comparative in nature and provide information on various aspects of ethnic identity and survival. Hence only those pertaining directly to Mennonites can be mentioned. In 1975, Driedger proposed a typology of Ethnic Villagers and Metropolitan Remnants to discuss the developments of Mennonites moving to the larger city of Winnipeg. Driedger concludes that the “Metropolitan Remnant” based more on a New Testament model of the church, was more likely to help the Mennonites survive in the city. “Ethnic Identity: A Comparison of Mennonite and other German Students” (1973), co-authored with Jacob Peters, compares identity and institutional completeness of other German speaking groups with the Mennonites. Mennonite religious and cultural identity was comparatively high, supported by institutional completeness. Driedger’s sophisticated methodological procedures and variety of materials collected about Mennonites in Winnipeg, compared with other groups, provide many insights common to many groups. Many of the theories proposed by various scholars regarding ethnic and minority groups have been tested by Driedger, using Mennonites as well as other groups. For Mennonite sociology, his “identity ladder” schema, and the ethnic villagers as the urban remnant are his most innovative contributions.

Alan Anderson in a dissertation titled “Assimilation in the Bloc Settlements of North Central Saskatchewan” (1972) includes extensive descriptions of ethno-religious settlements including the Mennonites and Hutterites (1977). He used ethnic origin, language, religion, customs as distinguishing factors. Anderson concludes that boundary maintenance is related to the rate of assimilation, anticipating Francis’ separation of primary from secondary ethnic groups. Hence, the Mennonites and Hutterites, concerned with preservation of their way of life, were more likely to survive than other groups who did not have this characteristic.

III. Minority Group and Conflict Theory

Sectarian and ethnic theory are closely related to minority and conflict studies. It is interesting that relatively little has been done in this area, either by Mennonite or non-Mennonite scholars.

In 1931, Emerson Lee Deets published an article on “The Origins of Conflict in the Hutterische Communities” which describes opposing family and community objectives which the outside world represents.
One of the first, focussing on social distance, was conducted by Roy Just in 1952 titled “An Analysis of Social Distance Reactions of Students from Three Major American Mennonite Groups.”

The Hutterites have provided the best opportunity for study of minority conflict. John Hostetler’s many intensive studies (1955, 1963, 1964, 1967, 1971, 1974) of the Amish and Hutterites, deal with minority survival amidst a changing modernizing society. Stress and conflict in education and technology are described, but there is little discussion and analysis of the inter-group nature of conflict. Most of the analysis is focused on the “defensive structuring” of the minority with no reference to the mutual interaction of the two minority and majority systems.

Minako Kurokawa has produced a series of important studies on conflict in the Mennonite society with the modernizing environment (1969, 1970, 1971). Kurokawa found alienation and conflict as well as personal feelings of inadequacy and mental stress. Since the major conflict is between communally-oriented and individual-oriented cultural complexes, the individual Mennonite cannot make the change without experiencing considerable trauma.

An MA thesis completed in 1965 by Maclcie focused on the defector in the Hutterite community and her conclusions include the observation that defection is “related to the cohesion of the colony of origin and the status held in its stratification system.” Marlene Mackie produced a Ph.D. dissertation in 1971 on “The Accuracy of Folk Knowledge Concerning Alberta Indians, Hutterites and Ukrainians: An Available Data Stereotype Validation Technique.” Using an open-ended question and semantic differential technique, Mackie, in a subsequently published article, “Ethnic Stereotypes and Prejudice: Alberta Indians, Hutterites and Ukrainians” (1974) concludes that stereotypes are not only built on false information, but rather on cognitive needs to “map” the ethnic group environment. Mackie reflects the growing conviction that “If there are distinctive cultures and if a culture’s distinctive values are worth defending, then there must be some differences perceptible to others.”

Marvin Riley’s “Farmers’ Attitudes Toward the Hutterites: A Study in Intergroup Relations” (1968) is probably the most sophisticated study of attitudes toward an Anabaptist-Mennonite group. Using Robin Williams’ idea that religious variables increase intolerance, Riley interviewed 166 farmers who were in close contact with Hutterites. Attitudes towards Hutterites were related to agreement with Hutterite values, a definition of the Hutterites as an economic or religious group, an assessment of the general community sentiment toward the Hutterites, and the church preference of the respondent. Riley’s study appears to have been well formulated and conducted, but few references to his studies have been made.
In 1970, Leo Driedger published an article on “Louis Riel and the Mennonite Invasion” which suggested that the Mennonite successes in Manitoba grew out of the displacement of the original people who live in the area. Two years later, in a follow up “Native Rebellion and Mennonite Invasion: An Examination of Two Canadian River Valleys” (1972), he repeats the same thesis, and discusses the possible conflict between Mennonite ethics and the displacement of the Indians and Metis from Manitoba. Driedger calls for a greater focus on conflict in ethnic minority relations. He is beginning to pursue conflict studies with his “Ethnic Prejudice and discrimination in Winnipeg High Schools” (1981); “Individual Freedom and Community Control” (1982); “Community Conflict: Bargaining and Oppositional Networks and Strategies” (forthcoming); and Identity in Conflict: The Mennonite Quest (forthcoming). The second and third deal with Mennonite excommunication and nuclear conflict. The last is a book summarizing some of Driedger’s work on identity and conflict over the past ten years.

John Janzen, an anthropologist, has produced some interesting analyses of Mennonite regions in central Kansas comprising congregations and their respective communities. In one paper titled “The Allocation of Human and Material Resources in Central Kansas Mennonite Communities” (1976), Janzen traced the linkages between the material and human resources which were influential in developing a “unique, and apparently viable, approach to life on the North American Plains.” In a more substantive paper titled “Schism and Renewal in Three Kansas Mennonite Parishes” (1975), Janzen uses anthropological concepts of “dual organizations” and “permanent factional systems” to propose that there are five points of conflict visible in the “Frisian/Flemish” “permanent factionalism:” odds between means and ideals; gaps in perception; ambiguities of rules; different tempos of change; and differentiation built into the organization itself. He claims schisms over fundamentalism in these communities are both internally and externally included (1975: 4).

In his Old Colony Mennonites: Dilemmas of Ethnic Minority Life (1969), Redekop places the Old Colony struggle for survival in the framework of the aggressive secular society, and in the final chapters a typology of minority conflict is presented. Minority status is proposed as a situation where the minority’s desired status in society “conflicts with the intentions of the dominant society . . . for differential or unequal treatment . . . (1969: 236). More recently in Strangers Become Neighbours: Mennonite and Indigenous Relations in the Paraguayan Chaco (1980), the Mennonite society’s attempts to live an enclavist life are described as being frustrated by the Indians’ dependency on them, and the Paraguayan infringement. In the competitive context of three major systems of peo-
ples struggling for survival and even supremacy, a theory of "ethnic peoplehood" is proposed which places the concept of societal conflict into the framework of ethnic groups attempting to project a future from their present and past concept of self-direction and culture. Redekop's last book especially explores conflict in more depth than previously found in Mennonite writings.

IV. Community Sociology

The Mennonite community has been a major focus of Mennonite sociology. In large part deriving from the Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft frame of Tönnies, and first applied to the Mennonites by Charles P. Loomis, this approach has informed many Mennonite studies. Beginning in 1957, in a text authored with Beegle, entitled Rural Sociology: The Strategy of Change, Loomis describes the Hutterites as a social system which is Gemeinschaft-like in structure. In a recent article in the Mennonite Quarterly Review (July, 1979), Loomis published his diary which he kept while working on an Old Order farm in Lancaster County. In this article the community/folk character of the Amish is described from firsthand experience.

J. Winfield Fretz undoubtedly can be considered the leader of the first Mennonite community research beginning with "Mennonite Mutual Aid: A Contribution Toward the Establishment of a Christian Community" (1941), his Ph.D. dissertation. Fretz's work is highly descriptive and he is deeply concerned about the preservation of the rural Mennonite gemeinschaft. Fretz has produced a voluminous literature which describes the Mennonite community in many settings, including Kansas, Minnesota, Mexico, Paraguay, Ontario, Manitoba, and many others. The most comprehensive is Pilgrims in Paraguay (1953). His interest in migration and colony settlements resulted in a study of group settlements in Paraguay, published in 1962, Immigrant Group Settlement in Paraguay. Although Fretz attempts to test hypotheses regarding group settlements, no theoretical framework is presented from which the hypotheses are derived. Fretz has also studied the Mennonite family extensively.

In 1953, D. Paul Miller produced a Ph.D. dissertation on "An Analysis of Community Adjustment: A Case Study of Janzen, Nebraska." Mainly a descriptive study, it documents the way a Russian Mennonite community acculturated as it deepened its roots in the area.

John A. Hostetler has been the most prolific in community studies. Beginning with his first edition of the Amish Society (1963) and even before that in articles, Hostetler described the Amish and Hutterites as Gemeinschaft-like communities. In the third edition of Amish Society, Hostetler expands his orientation to suggest that the Amish can be viewed as a commonwealth, a sectarian society, a folk society, and as a "little community." The Gemeinschaft conceptualization also informs
Hostetler's writing about the Amish and the Hutterites. Hostetler is concerned with survival of the Gemeinschaft-like community, and attempts to give the reader an inside view of how the "little community" conceives of itself, and how it makes adjustments in order to thrive and survive. The responses to change and modernization are some of Hostetler's major concerns. He does not promote a theory of minority-majority relations or conflict, nor does he use the social systems—boundary maintenance schemes, although he has used them at points where he collaborated with C. P. Loomis. Hostetler's analyses of the Hutterites are concerned with conflict of Mennonites with the larger world. Taking a two-pronged approach, evaluating "the social problems of communal living," and "the strategy of Hutterite survival," Hostetler views the Hutterites as confronting enemies within as well as without. But an interaction of social systems or conflicting sub-groups or minority-majority relations is not explicitly stated. His stress on the significance of socialization as the secret of perpetuation and survival will be discussed later.

Leland Harder has produced a number of community studies. His study of the Steinbach, Manitoba, community and its churches (1970) compares the many Mennonite groups. An undated and unpublished volume of 360 pages entitled The Sectarian Commitment deals with the patterns of faith in the Mennonite Church. The survey was conducted by Harder and seventeen students and focussed on nine Mennonite congregations in Elkhart County, Indiana. Although this study belongs also in the "Denominationalism" research category, it is mentioned here because it is in a sense a community study as well, since it describes the churches in their community setting.

Theodore Jentsch's dissertation is also pertinent in a discussion of community studies, for it contains a description of the East Penn Valley Mennonite community. The demographic, educational, occupational, and economic aspects of the community are described and related to a theory of transition from antagonism to assimilation. But since its main contribution is to community change, it will be discussed later.

John W. Bennett, an anthropologist with a long-standing interest in Mennonites and Hutterites, did a community study of the "Jasper Region" which included six Hutterian colonies. Interested especially in the economic aspects of the Hutterite society, Bennett nevertheless also concerned himself with issues of social differentiation, social control and technological change. Bennett says "Hutterian society is what it is: A Christian body practicing communal living" (276), and the emphasis on community changes, especially as they are fostered by economic factors, make a contribution to understanding how a community perpetuates itself.
V. Social Change: Acculturation, Urbanization, and Integration

Community sociology is also closely related to social change. Many scholars have concerned themselves with assimilation, acculturation, and change. Mennonite scholars especially have often been concerned with the potential dissolution of the Mennonite community.

Joseph Eaton's famous article "Controlled Acculturation: A Survival Technique of the Hutterites" (1952), has been generally used as a benchmark for research on Hutterite change. Eaton describes the institutionalized techniques that Hutterites developed to control cultural and technological change. Bennett and Hostetler have proposed that although the basic conceptualization is correct, there is considerable variation in the way acculturation is controlled.

As early as 1951, John A. Hostetler studied cultural and social change among the Amish, "Evidences of Cultural Change Among the Amish". Another article discussed "Old World Extinction and New World Survival of the Amish" (1955). Although to a large extent descriptive, Hostetler proposes numerous propositions such as one in "The World's War Against the Amish" (1964) that "Amish society will thrive or perish depending on the extent to which it can provide community and personal fulfillment for its members." One of the earliest and most sophisticated studies in social change is John A. Hostetler's doctoral study, later published, entitled The Sociology of Mennonite Evangelism (1954). This study utilized survey research methods to document the changes taking place in one Mennonite group with respect to evangelism. It provides information on splits, defections, and other characteristics of Mennonites and correlations with factors such as education and occupation.


Leland Harder's research and writing can be identified with social/cultural change. Beginning with an article in 1962 "Mennonites and Contemporary Cultural Change", Harder has concerned himself with secularization and acculturation. One of the strengths of Harder's research is use of empirical data to describe the process of acculturation and
secularization. It is the "structural disequilibrium" model which seems to guide most of Harder's research. "An Empirical Search for the Key Variable in Mennonite Reality" (1971) demonstrates his concerns.

Bennett's (1967: 269) studies of the Hutterites mentioned before, could also be classed under this heading. Starting with Joseph Eaton's controlled acculturation, Bennett proposes that the adoption of technology must be linked with the Hutterite attempt at maintenance of inner stability. Restriction on clothing symbolizes the traditional values of the society; the technological adaptations are left to the individual colony. A doctoral dissertation completed in 1967, "Factors of Social Change and Social Dynamics in the Communal Settlements of Hutterites, 1527-1967," by Karl Peter analyzes the Hutterite socio-cultural system using a typology of change and adaptation based on five stages related to the community of goods and community of love. He also describes in subsequent publications how the Hutterites retain their basic value and behaviour system while adopting many traits from the outside society.

Victor Stolzfus has studied the Amish society from the stand-point of adaptation to the encroachment of the economic institutions of the host society. Focussing on land resources and survival among the Amish, Stolzfus describes how the Amish adjust to economic pressures of need to avail themselves of commercial credit. With the church and community values and norms operating on the one hand, but with the ever-increasing pressures and needs to adapt to prevailing economic practices, the Amish family needs to determine what worldly elements it is going to adopt in "Brotherhood Economics in the Corn Belt" (1981). In his "Reward and Sanction: The Adaptive Continuity of Amish Life," (1977: 318), Stolzfus maintains that there is a dual system of rewards and sanctions which speaks to the question of how the Amish are able "to obtain the social geographical space to preserve and nourish distinctly different values."

Jentsch's (1973: 240) dissertation discussed under community studies can also be included here, for it presents an extensive theoretical sketch on cultural and social change among the Old Order Mennonites. Using the social theories of Nisbet and David, Jentsch concludes that "The Mennonites are able to withstand the pressures of the surrounding culture and impede the rate of social change by thwarting those processes postulated by Nisbet, (i.e., Innovation, Individualization, Politicization, and Secularization)."

Beginning around 1967 with "Developments in Higher Education among Mennonites in Manitoba," Leo Driedger presented a considerable amount of data and theory on social change. Although he has dealt with migration and ethnic identity, his most extensive work in the area of change is in urbanization (1975, 1978, 1982). The nature of Mennonite
urbanization and its consequences have been analyzed and Driedger and associates conclude that the Mennonites can survive in the urban areas if they adopt a strategy of mission and outreach. In “The Anabaptist Identification Ladder” (1977), Driedger presents the thesis that Mennonites need the range of conservative to liberal organizations and institutions so that the secularizing member can find a more liberal group or institution with which to identify rather than leave the group entirely for greener pastures elsewhere. The very large urban Mennonite population in Winnipeg has provided Driedger with opportunities to study the urban change process and compare Mennonites with many other urban ethnic and religious groups.

Paul Peachey’s interest in Mennonite urbanization is evident in his Ph.D. dissertation (1954) which traces the development of Swiss Urban Anabaptism. In 1962 he produced an article “Some Trends in Urban Church Studies,” and his work The Church in the City (1963), includes in part “Mennonite Urbanization and City Evangelism.” Peachey feels that the Mennonite church will need to experience a “new incarnation” if it wants to speak to modern man.

In 1971, Robert Hardwick conducted an intensive study of the consequences of urban sprawl on a Mennonite community in the Newport News, Virginia area. He compared the community in 1940 and 1971 using another Mennonite community as a control, which had not experienced as much urbanization. The problem was to determine the relative influence of Mennonite and non-Mennonite friends or networks in the acculturation process. He concluded that non-Mennonites in the networks do not have as “liberalizing” an effect on Mennonites as would have been expected; Mennonite networks were more influential in determining acculturation. Networks include 1) connectedness (the degree to which ego’s friends are acquainted with each other), 2) role component — the number of role settings in which ego and each friend interact, and 3) cultural composition, the extent to which ego incorporates persons of different subcultures into his own group. It is clear that network theory must be included in future research.

A recent study by Hugh Laurence, “Change in Religion, Economics, and Boundary Conditions among Amish Mennonites in Southwestern Ontario” (1978), starts with Victor Turner’s theory of social change and adopts some of Maurice Godelier’s ideas. Laurence proposed a theory of social change derived from Thomas Kuhn’s model where he suggests that the “Ideal” of the Amish Mennonites is the development of internal traditions reinforced by boundary institutions. This interactive model recognizes the importance of both the external and internal systems.

The relationship between religious forces and the economic have not been dealt with in an extensive manner. Several economists have
approached the subject (Nofziger, Rempel, Vogt) but very little sociological research has directly focused on this topic. A recent exception is Hildegard Martens' "The Relationship of Religious to Socio-Economic Divisions Among the Mennonites of Dutch-Prussian-Russian Descent in Canada" (Ph.D. dissertation, 1977). In this work, Martens, using the traditional sect to denomination framework, indicates how the increasing economic differentiation and division into social classes is associated with increasing secularization and loss of conservative faith. Occupation, income, education and other variables are used to indicate the movement from "sect" to "denomination."

A recent doctoral dissertation (1978) by David Appavoo, also discussed under community studies, provides a mass of empirical data about Mennonites in Markham, where he poses six hypotheses, and a battery of tests. In summary, Appavoo concludes that in spite of considerable acculturation their commitment to peace and non-resistance has remained strong.

Robert Graber wrote a Ph.D. dissertation in 1979 titled "The Socio-cultural Differentiation of a Religious Sect: Schism Among Pennsylvania German Mennonites". He hypothesized the firmly bounded splinter groups would be more pious, have older leaders and be of lower socio-economic status; however, it was not confirmed by this data. The significance of this study is that it is a comparative analysis of schism and division across the Mennonite spectrum. Most studies heretofore were analyses of individual schisms.

VI. Survey Research

The most ambitious and comprehensive survey research yet conducted by Mennonite sociologists of Mennonites is the Kauffman-Harder "Church Membership Profile," which was published in 1975 as Anabaptists Four Centuries Later: A Profile of Five Mennonite and Brethren in Christ Denominations. This is clearly the most extensive study ever undertaken in the Mennonite community and presents the reader with a vast amount of empirical and quantified data. In fact there was so much data that it was difficult to publish it all in one book, so that the volume lacks theoretical context. Often the data and scales are presented without sufficient analyses. Driedger and Kauffman (1982) and others have used the data to explore other topics; it should have been exploited much more than it has. Some critics have felt that not enough integration of empirical data and conceptual work was done to try to explain how the many factors influence Mennonite life. Nevertheless, it remains the most ambitious survey study to date.

Leland Harder (1961, 1971, 1981) has also collected survey data on the General Conference Mennonite Church for three decades, so that enormous amounts of longitudinal data in both USA and Canada have been
made available in three *Fact Books of Congregational Membership* (1961, 1971, 1981). These studies include information on age, sex, marital status, place of residence, educational and occupational status, ex-members, and the like which is comparable over the three decades. Unfortunately, Harder again has not analyzed the data extensively, nor have he or others provided a conceptual context for the data. Here is comparable data which needs to be exploited. It is unique in that it is longitudinal, so that social change can be traced empirically over time.

Raymond Currie, Leo Driedger and Rick Linden did a National survey of Mennonites in Canada for MCC (Canada), focusing on the use of alcohol, but the study included data on doctrinal beliefs, attitudes on various social and family issues as well. Some of this has already been published by the three collaborators, "Mixing Mennonite Drinking Norms: Abstinence or Moderation?" (1979), "Property of Norms as Predictors of Alcohol Use Among Mennonites" (1980), and "Dualistic and Wholistic Views of God and the World: Consequences for Social Action" (1983), while other papers are in the making, including the importance of friendship ties and the extent of Mennonite divorce and intermarriage.

Alan Anderson's (1972) survey of eight ethno-religious groups in Saskatchewan, including the Mennonites and Hutterites is a good example of a regional provincial survey, and a number of publications have grown out of this (1977, 1978). Survey research is of course a type of methodology used for social inquiry, and we have discussed the content of many studies which used survey research often in smaller locals (Anderson, Appavoo, Currie, Driedger, Linden, Harder, Hostetler, Just, Kauffman, Kraybill, Kurokawa, Lawrence, Mackie, and others). Survey research of Mennonites has begun more recently, and it will likely increase since it has been a popular form of data collection in American sociology for a long time.

**VII. Family Studies**

The family forms a central axis in Mennonite society and community. It has received considerable attention in Mennonite community study, but few have focused research on the family as such. Winfield Fretz produced numerous descriptive articles on Mennonite family life, beginning with an article published in 1951 titled, "Sociological Aspects of Divorce Among Mennonites." A similar study published in 1957 describes the factors contributing to change in Mennonite families including size, roles in marriage and new family functions. Numerous other more popular articles have been produced by Fretz through the years.

John Hostetler's "Amish Family Life — A Sociologist's Analysis" (1961), is a summary of his M.A. thesis entitled "The Amish Family in Mifflin County, Pennsylvania," which deals with patterns of authority, relationships between parents, parents and children, as well as dif-
ferences between families in the community. His interest in how traditions are transmitted is indicated in an article titled, “Old Order Amish Child Rearing and Schooling Practices: A Summary Report” (1970). His analyses of the Amish and Hutterite families are presented in strictly functional terms suggesting, for example, that “procreation, nurture and socialization are the major functions of the Amish family” (1980: 147).

The major contribution in research and theorizing on the Mennonite family comes from the pen of J. Howard Kauffman; one of his earliest scholarly works in 1965 was entitled, “Authority and Freedom in Mennonite Families.” Kauffman has consistently been concerned with authority and control of behaviour in Mennonite families, and how the Mennonites can maintain their sectarian norms, yet become more democratic. Kauffman’s major work, his Ph.D. dissertation, “A Comparative Study of Traditional and Emergent Family Types among Midwest Mennonites” (1960), shows his interest in the effect traditional or emergent characteristics have on successful child development, marital success, acceptance of Mennonite values and the like.

Karl Peter, whose work on the Hutterites was mentioned before, also contributed to the description of the Hutterite family, in an article titled “The Hutterite Family” (1971). Peter describes the socialization role of competition, motivation and expectations, adolescence and other factors in his study. It is a strictly functional analysis, indicating how various statuses and roles contribute to the functioning of the larger Hutterite system.

More recently Anderson and Driedger (1980) compared the Mennonite family with eight other rural ethno-religious groups, each in their respective bloc communities. Mennonite intermarriage was almost non-existent. Rural families in general were strong, and the Mennonite family compared well. Driedger is interested in Mennonite intermarriage and divorce, as illustrated in his most recent two articles. These studies show that while Mennonite intermarriage was almost non-existent before World War II, it is increasing significantly in urban areas (1983); and although divorce is still very low, it too has increased recently (Driedger, Vogt, and Reimer, 1983).

VIII. Socialization

How Mennonites have transmitted their faith to the next generation has been of great interest. Most research has dealt with this topic, but only indirectly, mainly when the family and the community are discussed, the two major bearers of the heritage. But John A. Hostetler and his collaborators have made a considerable contribution beginning with a monograph, published in 1965, titled Education and Marginality in the Communal Society of the Hutterites. As the result of an extensive and intensive research project, supported by the Office of Education of the
U.S., Hostetler produced a mass of data on types and forms of socialization. In another report entitled “Amish and Hutterite Socialization: Social Structure and Contrasting Modes of Adaptation to Public Schooling” (1969), Hostetler continues to evaluate the effect of formal schooling on Hutterites and Mennonites. Numerous other articles expand this theme. For Hostetler, the socialization process is an orderly way of integrating the various elements of society, its values, beliefs, norms, symbols and behaviour, into the ongoing life of the colony. The “character” of the community, for Hostetler, following Malinowski, is “an organized system of purposeful activities” as well as the “recognized” purpose of the group. Hostetler does not depend upon psycho-social theories of socialization, restricting his focus to the sociological aspects of transmitting culture. Remaining largely descriptive, Hostetler defines Amish and Hutterite socialization as “benevolently authoritarian” (1971:107).

A Ph.D. dissertation by Donald Kraybill in 1975 titled “Ethnic Socialization in a Mennonite High School” continued the research of Hostetler by focusing on more progressive Mennonites in Lancaster County. Using a sample of Lancaster Mennonite parents and children, and comparing them with a sample of non-Mennonites in the same area, Kraybill developed information on self-perceptions, attitudes towards traditional Mennonite teachings and practices. Using Siegel’s concept of “defensive structuring”, Kraybill developed an elaborate research design to test these variables. Kraybill concludes, among other things, that the ethnic high school does not effectively change student attitudes toward orthodoxy, ethnicity, and ethnic ritual. The school does, however, “perform defensive boundary maintenance functions in the Mennonite subculture by decreasing the assimilationist tendencies . . .” (1977:348).

IX. Ideology, Identity and Phenomenology

Sociology of Mennonites has focused predominantly on the classical sociological theme of maintaining a communitarian society in the face of individualistic modernity. Relatively little attention has been given to another classical theme, identified with scholars such as Marx, Mannheim and Berger, concerned with the sociological dynamics in the formation of particular ideologies or identities.

These sociology of knowledge models have been more influential among historians of Mennonites than sociologists. Recent historians of Anabaptists such as Stayer, Packull, and Klaus Deppermann borrow heavily from sociological understanding. In the interpretation of more recent Mennonite identities, R. Sawatsky in his Ph.D. dissertation “History and Ideology: Mennonite Identity Definition in History” (1977), is strongly influenced by this sociological tradition. The major revisionist historical study of American Mennonites now in progress and under-
taken by J. Juhnke, P. Toews, T. Schlabach and R. McMaster is similarly looking to these models for interpretive keys.

Very interestingly, New Testament studies are currently utilizing sociology of knowledge approaches. See Harold Remus' "Sociology of Knowledge and New Testament Studies" (1982). This is of major importance to Mennonites because this study has played a crucial role in Mennonite self-identity. Possibly major inter-disciplinary work on Mennonites can be done around the theme of ideology and identity.

Leo Driedger is one of the very few Mennonite sociologists who have probed "ethnic identity," but most of his published works on cultural identity (1975), self-identity (1976), identity and social distance (1977), identity in the Canadian mosaic (1978), Jewish identity (1980), Ukrainian identity (1981), did not involve Mennonites. "Ethnic Identity of Students of Mennonite and German origin" by Driedger and Peters (1973, 1976) is one of the few focussed on Mennonite identity. Quite recently Driedger used Peter Berger's "sacred canopy" in his "Fifty Years of Mennonite Identity in Winnipeg: A Sacred Canopy in a Changing Laboratory" (1980a), and he framed his "Nomos-building on the Prairies: Construction of Indian, Hutterite and Jewish Sacred Canopies" (1980b) around Berger and Luckmann's social construction of reality. Ideology, identity and phenomenology have not yet greatly entered the social studies of Mennonites, and need to be explored much more deeply in the future.

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

Because of space and time considerations, this survey is less than a complete presentation of the major Mennonite works of sociologists. It is not possible to survey the many studies in such a short space. Nevertheless, we feel the survey so far provides us with the rough outlines of the sociological work which has been done on Mennonites in recent times. In this section we will attempt to provide an evaluation of the research and suggestions for future work.

A. General Observations.

Although not all anthropologically trained Mennonites have been surveyed, it is clear that few of them have focused on Mennonites. There are a considerable number of Mennonites trained as anthropologists, but few have adopted Mennonites as their subject of study. On the other hand, most Mennonites who are sociologically trained at the Ph.D. level have studied the Mennonites in some form or another. Those who have not studied Mennonites identify less with the Mennonite church.

On the other hand, there are practically no non-Mennonite anthropologists who have studied Mennonites except John Bennett and
Robert Hardwick. Non-Mennonite sociologists are more numerous, but most of them have come to the Mennonite theme by way of comparative research, such as Anderson, Deets, Mann and Young.

The research thus far has concerned itself mainly with substantive Mennonite issues; comparison with other groups is limited. When Mennonites are compared with other groups, it is in the context of inter-group attitudes or perceptions, or Mennonite survival in the larger "hostile" society. Schermerhorn's concern with comparison to promote scholarship has not yet been greatly developed in Mennonite research.

Sociological research of the Mennonites reflects the paradigms which prevail at the time in the social sciences generally and in sociology in particular. The major works reviewed show various perspectives used in research. Sectarian research has by and large given way to inter-systemic and conflict research, reflecting the prevailing theories of the day. This should be expected, but it shows that while many Mennonite scholars are concerned with their own tradition, they often do reflect the dominant emphases of the schools which they attended.

The general and pervasive finding is the interest among sociologists of Mennonites in the maintenance of the Mennonite normative community. Almost all the studies reviewed concern themselves with isolating the basic features of the Mennonite community, and the discovery of the forces which tend to disrupt or undermine the persistence of the community. In this regard, Driedger, Harder, Hostetler, Carl Janzen, John Janzen, Kauffman, Kraybill, Redekop and others stand out.

A corollary observation is that where Mennonite scholars have not dealt with survival, they have focused on the minority-majority context and the factors involved in the struggle for existence. We suggest that it is the "minority" position or status of the Mennonites which determines to a considerable degree the orientation of the research and writings. This is less the case for non-Mennonite scholars, but even Jentsch and Appavoo reflect the "defensive" position to some extent. In the comparative research which Driedger has conducted, the defensive stance of the Mennonites comes through only casually, and hence would be an exception. Redekop's analysis of the Mennonite-Paraguayan-Indian inter-relationships would be an example of a more "external" approach.

Most of the research conducted by Mennonite scholars utilized the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft framework in some way. In the Community, sectarian and change works, the concept of "quality" of social relationships is evident. The rural-urban dimensions, the movement from sect to church, the acculturation process of the Mennonite community and other themes point to an underlying concern with the "primary" nature of the Mennonite community. The loss of Mennonite cohesion or identity is
almost universally defined as being a movement from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft; a movement from traditionalism to modernization.

None of the writers (Hostetler, Fretz, Driedger, Redekop, Kaufman, Harder, Jentsch) have satisfactorily settled the question of whether Mennonites are a Gemeinschaft group, a sect or what. Some don’t seem to consider such classification important. Hostetler in his revised edition of *Amish Society* cannot decide how to classify the Amish. E. K. Francis’ analysis of the Mennonites as primary ethnic groups may be the best approach, but he also utilizes the Gemeinschaft dimension. Redekop defines the Mennonites as religious ethnic minorities.

A second and overriding scholarly theme is the loss of identity and cohesion of the Mennonite community (whether sect, ethnic group or minority). Understanding the relations with the environmental systems, the push and pull factors, the dynamics these pressures create, the directions they take and many other issues are present in most of the research activities. Leading sociological theories regarding inter-group relations have been used too little. Theories of Park, Wirth, Bogardus, Herberg, Francis, Yinger, Dynes, Pope, Simmel, Berger, Porter need to be applied to Mennonites more vigorously. Some use of the sect theories of Weber, Troeltsch, Niebuhr, and minority theories of Louis Wirth and Francis are exceptions.

There may be reasons for trends thus far: 1) The Mennonite community is not so easily classified as sect, ethnic group or minority. Mennonites may be a unique group as Jews, Hutterites and Doukhobors seem to be. How can such groups be adequately studied? E. K. Francis has not succeeded in providing a final designation, and without clear classifications or definitions, it is difficult to go beyond description and conjectures.

2) Lack of definition inhibits theorizing. For example, if the Mennonites are not an ethnic group as generally applied, then it is not always possible to classify them with other research in ethnic comparisons. A survey of comparative research in which Mennonites are included reveals that Mennonites (or Amish or Hutterites) are often compared with Ukrainians, Italians, Jews, etc. (cf. Anderson and Driedger in Ishwaran, Reitz, Mackie in Goldstein and Bienvenue et al). While this is comparative research, are they comparable?

3) The above two factors show the need for new theories when Mennonites are studied. While sectarian and community perspectives have been used we need to look at other approaches. This has lead to some creative ventures such as use of cognitive dissonance, structural disequilibrium, reward-sanction, social ecology, resource utilization and nomos-building for analyses of Mennonite behaviour.

A minimal amount of scientific survey research has been conducted
on Mennonite demography. Numerous surveys have been commissioned by various church organizations and agencies, but many were not well developed. The major exception is the Kauffman-Harder study criticized by some. Surveys on a larger scale are limited, although the Driedger, Currie, Linden studies (1980, 1983) were a systematic study of all of Canada. Almost all the research has been done using a community analysis approach usually involving participant observation.

This response seems to have integrity. It also reflects a philosophical and methodological concern about the effectiveness of statistical research in the past which can become reductionist and nominalist in its perceptions. It is apparent that most researchers have intuitively felt that to study the Mennonite community one has to start with understanding the whole. A sense of depth verstehen is required. Most research on Mennonites can be characterized as qualitative rather than quantitative, although many use some quantified data. The basic objective is not to postulate a testable hypothesis for which masses of data are marshalled, but rather to present the texture and context of the phenomenon and the attempt to explain its meaning or significance.

Much of the comparative work has been done by non-Mennonites, although there have not been that many in the category. Mennonite sociologists have not been greatly involved in comparative explorations, although there are indications that this interest is awakening.

B. Suggestions for Future Research

1. Community Research. One of the surprising observations to emerge from this survey is that there has been little sociological documentation of Mennonite communities in the traditional manner. While the works of Fretz, Hostetler, Redekop, Driedger, John Janzen, and others approximate community studies, few approach the thoroughness of Robert Lund, Dollard, W. Lloyd Warner, Robert Redfield, Loomis Vidich and Bensman, to name just a few. More studies would help us to understand the way in which Mennonite societies express the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft reality. Many other studies reported in this analysis show the way (Jentsch, Laurence, Van Dyck, Bennett and others).

2. Ethnicity and Religion. The issue of how religion and ethnicity are related is far from solved. Many Mennonites seek to divest themselves of sub-cultural trappings in order to adopt main line Protestantism and civil religion as well as national loyalty and identity. The ethnic dimension may be more important to Anabaptist-Mennonite identity than many think.

Recently, a revival of pride in ethnicity and the Mennonite heritage has emerged. More sociological analysis is needed as evidence. The studies of Appavoo, Laurence, Francis, Jentsch, Urry and other non-Mennonite scholars appear to be most interested in this problem.
3. Religion and Economic Forces. The debate between Christianity and Marxism, Weber and Marx, capitalism and communism, which is pervasive in scholarly work, is also making some inroads among Mennonites. Scholars take positions on how Mennonite faith and economic practice interact. The Russian Mennonite saga seems to have created reluctance to look at Marxism, although younger scholars are beginning to pursue such possibilities. The crucial question of how Mennonite society has been influenced by economic factors, such as the struggle for land and resources, has not been systematically studied. Some of the major forces affecting the dissolution of the Mennonite society are the pressure of economic realities, or the drive to “make it” in the large society, or “having made it” as the Dutch Mennonites illustrate. The many Mennonite communities provide marvelous opportunities for such studies. Smucker (1976) has proposed that the Mennonites present us with at least three models of economic life, all derived from the original Anabaptist-Mennonite tradition.

4. Mennonites and Urbanization. Apart from the theological and religious importance of the city for the Mennonite heritage, the urbanization of Mennonites has some serious implications for its survival and vitality. It is true that Driedger, Harder and Kauffman have done some important work on the urbanization issue, but we need to further conceptualize the process as Peachey began to do earlier. What happens to the original Mennonite community when individuals move to the city? How does the city effect Mennonite identity? The influence of modernization, the role of technology, and the resulting social networks must be studied more. Studies so far have mainly documented the degree of urbanization. In the future it is necessary to arrive at a depth understanding of urban communities and networks in contrast to former traditional perceptions of human life and history.

5. Mennonite and the Intellectual Quest. Although successful socialization has been central to Mennonite survival, and although the socialization process is discussed in much of the research, little theory and research has focused directly on the role of formal education and Mennonite intellectual life. Mennonite historians have been more preoccupied with education and the intellectual quest. Very few sociologists or anthropologists have focused on the significance of the educational quest for Mennonite life.

The sect approach has received a little attention in regard to intellect, but little theory has developed. The Kauffman-Harder study has isolated education as a variable, but the causal connections between the intellectual domain and social-cultural life has been lagging. What influence have educational institutions had on the Mennonite community? How effective is the control of education for the maintenance of the
community? Is the total control of the Hutterite school an imperative for survival? Is the relinquishment of control of formal education influential in assimilation? These questions need to be answered, and it is possible that cross-group comparisons might be possible. Driedger has taken some initiatives along this line, but a solid theoretical approach to the subject is still waiting to be done. The anti-intellectual attitudes which Mennonites have held for generations have had some impact, but the analysis is still undeveloped. How was the Mennonite sacred canopy formed and what adjustments are required in the Mennonite construction of reality today?

6. Anabaptist-Mennonite View of History. Finally, inquiry might be directed into exploring the causes of the emergence of the Anabaptist-Mennonite view of history and reality, and how Mennonites rationalized it. This might best be achieved by comparing the Mennonite phenomenon with other relatively similar groups on crucial variables. Little has been done from the perspective of the "sociology of knowledge." There may now be enough evidence available that such a project could be launched.

This would involve not only sociological research and data, but also the contributions of social historians and other social scientists who have written about the Mennonites. It is becoming increasingly clear that the Mennonite movement did not emerge in a vacuum, but was influenced by many sociological forces. The shape and form the movement took may to a large extent be the result of a dialectic relationship between the "remnant" and the hostile world. This research may have to be done by Mennonite scholars, since it would require an intimate knowledge and understanding of the subtle nuances of the Mennonite "sacred canopy." Verstehen is required.
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