

Growing but Also Gifting: MCC as an Incubator for New Approaches to Relief, Development, and Peace¹

**Paul C. Heidebrecht, *Conrad Grebel University
College***

Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) has grown dramatically over the past century. By many typical measures—geographic scope, size of operating budget, and the number of volunteers, staff, and partners—MCC is now impressively large in comparison to many North American faith-based organizations with much larger constituencies. These measures, however, significantly underestimate the reach and impact of MCC over the past one hundred years because MCC has also spun off an astonishing number of independent organizations. Many of these continue to thrive, and have developed in interesting and unanticipated ways. In this article, I will attempt to demonstrate that the MCC story is enriched by the inclusion of the stories of numerous institutions that no longer bear MCC's name. This more expansive history has significant implications for MCC as it embarks on a second century of organizational learning and change.

Arguing that MCC's impact goes beyond projects and programs branded with its logo may seem rather obvious when looking at trends in MCC's global programs. For a number of decades, MCC, like many nongovernmental organizations, has emphasized a

partnership approach that focuses on building the capacity of local grassroots organizations.² This is reflected in a growing roster of program and project partners, and fewer programs and projects that are implemented directly by MCC. For example, in countries like Bangladesh where MCC has historically relied on a large number of operational staff and service workers, many projects have been spun off into independent ventures in recent years. In other contexts, MCC has gradually shifted its approach toward building relationships with a diverse range of local partners including churches, church-related agencies, and other civil society organizations.³ It is also important to note that MCC captures and celebrates the impact of these partnerships through its regular reporting and communication channels. Less well documented is the impact of the extended family of spin-off organizations that are now further removed from MCC, along with the organizational context and culture that created this phenomenon. In my view, the conception of MCC as an incubator conceiving, nurturing, and growing a remarkable range of new ideas and programmatic initiatives is a crucial lens that nuances and complements other frames of reference such as MCC as a partner-driven agency.⁴

Methodology

The genesis of this project goes back more than a decade to when I attended a conference marking MCC's ninetieth anniversary. The conference included papers pointing to the way "MCC has been a key player in and a catalyst for the creation and establishment of numerous other inter-Mennonite institutions and ventures." These were subsequently published in the book, edited by Alain Epp Weaver, that grew out of this conference, in a section titled "Birthing New Programs: MCC as Incubator of Pioneering Projects."⁵ My interest in the phenomenon of MCC as a spin-off engine deepened when I joined Conrad Grebel University College as the inaugural director of the Kindred Credit Union Centre for Peace Advancement. Situated in Kitchener-Waterloo, the epicentre of Canada's tech start-up scene, one distinctive feature of the centre is its incubator for new peacebuilding initiatives. Of course, incubators to support new businesses can be found in virtually every university and medium-sized city in North America, so Grebel's incubator is clearly a product of its time. In contrast, MCC's pattern of incubating and then spinning off organizations struck me as more exceptional and worth investigating. How and why did MCC test and lay the groundwork for a good idea to take root, only to let it go?

This article attempts to answer this question by referencing thirty-five MCC spin-offs. I err on the side of breadth rather than depth in order to tease out some patterns in what I think is an underappreciated phenomenon. This approach is informed by publicly available organizational histories, discussions of these spin-offs in other accounts of MCC's own history, and interviews with fourteen past and present MCC leaders. Yet the examples discussed are far from a comprehensive list—my starting point was a spreadsheet compiled by Frank Peachey, the overseer of MCC U.S.'s archives in Akron, Pennsylvania, that included almost one hundred and forty organizations started by MCC in Canada, the US, and overseas.⁶ In addition to enriching the already broad range of literature on the overall history of MCC,⁷ my aim is to inform the thinking of those entrusted with MCC's future direction. Beyond this narrow audience of stakeholders, I think MCC also provides an interesting case study that can contribute to social innovation theory and practice, an emerging field focused on the process of sparking new solutions to deeply rooted social challenges that encompasses everything from social entrepreneurship to social change movement-building.⁸

History

This overview of MCC spin-offs clusters the selected examples into categories in order to highlight three distinct rationales for spinning off independent organizations: funding, expertise, and impact. I also discuss some peripheral cases that, while not fully qualifying as MCC spin-offs, nonetheless trace their lineage to MCC in a demonstrable way.

Access to New Funding Channels

Several of the dozens of countries where MCC has worked over the past century merit closer examination. For example, many MCC projects in Bangladesh have been spun-off into independent ventures in recent years. However, in order to keep this project manageable, my research has focused primarily on the North American context, which also includes a diverse array of initiatives that became independent from MCC. Several of these were able to tap into new funding channels as a result of their newfound autonomy.

An obvious example to consider in this category is the Canadian Foodgrains Bank (CFGB), an ecumenical partnership striving to end global hunger. Alongside MCC Canada, CFGB now includes fourteen non-Mennonite church agencies.⁹ CFGB was formed in 1983 as

an evolution of the Food Bank program, which MCC Canada had created in 1976 to enable farmers with grain surpluses in western Canada to contribute to efforts addressing famine overseas. From its inception, CFGB began to leverage significant matching funds from the government of Canada. This approach stood in contrast to the historic position of MCC—concern over being co-opted by government agendas had led MCC to limit its reliance on grants from the Canadian government (and avoid them altogether from the US government).¹⁰ In recent years, CFGB has received up to \$4 in government funding for every \$1 contributed by member agencies, significantly amplifying the scale of all of their food assistance project partnerships. For example, in 2020, virtually all of the government funding received for MCC Canada projects came through their partnership with CFGB, amounting to \$8.5 million out of the more than \$30 million that CFGB was able to secure from Global Affairs Canada.¹¹

A less well-known case of a significant MCC-birther organization that grew by leveraging government funding is More Than a Roof, a non-profit addressing housing and healthcare needs in British Columbia. More Than a Roof started in 1984 as an MCC BC program called the Social Housing Society, and became independent in 2003. Building on an initial twenty-six unit supportive housing complex in Vancouver, More Than a Roof now manages thirteen properties with over one thousand subsidized housing units for families, singles, and seniors in six cities throughout the province. As their name suggests, More Than a Roof is also a housing-based healthcare provider offering mental health support and addiction recovery services. As with Canadian Foodgrains Bank, More Than a Roof's mission and vision continue to be rooted in explicitly Christian faith values, even as it serves clients "purely on the basis of need" and "without regard to religion, ethnicity, race, nationality or sexual orientation." In 2020, it dwarfed MCC BC by bringing in \$14.3 million in revenue, and had total assets valued at \$130 million.¹²

Numerous other social service organizations established by MCC across Canada are sustained in large part by funding agreements with federal, provincial, and municipal governments. Examples include Craigwood Children, Youth and Family Services, initially established by MCC in 1955 in the village of Ailsa Craig, Ontario, as a farm to rehabilitate "delinquent" boys.¹³ *Communitas Supportive Care Society* traces its roots back to two group homes established by MCC BC's Mental Health Committee in Rosedale, BC, in 1975.¹⁴ The Independent Living Centre of Waterloo Region, the first independent living centre for people with disabilities in Canada, was founded by MCC Canada in 1982.¹⁵ *Momentum*, a community economic

development organization in Calgary, began operations as MCC Alberta's Employment Development program in 1991.¹⁶ Carmel House, a group home for at-risk youth in Saskatoon, was established by MCC Saskatchewan in 1995.¹⁷ Mennonite Community Services of Southern Ontario was incorporated in 2010, assuming responsibility for MCC Ontario's Low German programs in Alymer.¹⁸

Requiring a Different Kind of Expertise

In other cases, offshoots were spun off relatively quickly, rather than remaining as MCC programs, given their focus on activities and impacts that required a different kind of expertise in order to flourish. For example, during the Second World War, approximately 3,000 Mennonite, Quaker, and Church of the Brethren conscientious objectors were assigned to Civilian Public Service units to work as orderlies in dozens of mental hospitals across the US. Twenty-six of these units were operated by MCC. In response to the "deplorable conditions" that volunteers witnessed, MCC formed a Committee on Homes for the Mentally Ill, which was tasked with planning, building, and guiding the operation of psychiatric hospitals in the US.¹⁹ This led to the establishment of Brook Lane Farm in Leitersburg, Maryland (1949),²⁰ Kings View Homes in Reedley, California (1951),²¹ and Prairie View Psychiatric Hospital in Newton, Kansas (1954).²² All three grew dramatically after incorporating with their own local boards—Brook Lane in 1959, Kings View in 1957, and Prairie View in 1963—and began to contract with local governments in order to provide a broader range of mental health services. Brook Lane Health Services now employs more than 550 staff, including licensed psychiatrists, psychologists, psychotherapists, and counsellors at four locations. Kings View Behavioural Health Systems employs 520 staff at twenty-nine locations, and Prairie View employs 370 staff at five locations. Apart from the direct contributions made by the hospitals that MCC helped to establish, they were markedly different from the facilities where conscientious objectors had volunteered. The American Psychiatric Association recognized both Prairie View and Kings View for their leadership in progressive treatment.²³ MCC and its supporting churches have also been publicly recognized for helping to reform US mental health care as a whole through the subsequent work of numerous individuals who had been part of Civilian Public Service units.²⁴

If the provision of mental health care in the US in the 1940s and 1950s was an unlikely yet organic outgrowth of MCC's mission, so too was MCC's role in the emergence of the recycling industry in several Canadian provinces in the 1970s and 1980s. For example,

MCC Ontario operated a drop-off recycling program from 1976 to 1984 for steel cans, glass, and newspapers, which eventually led to Canada's first curbside "blue box" recycling program run by the city of Kitchener.²⁵ Perhaps the most unlikely example of an MCC spin-off is the Tire Recycling Atlantic Canada Corporation (TRACC) in Minto, New Brunswick, which now recycles more than a million used tires a year by turning them into products ranging from landscaping materials to safety equipment.²⁶ TRACC was first established in 1997 when MCC Canada—as the only church-related candidate—successfully bid on a contract from the governments of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to divert tires from landfills.²⁷ As with global food assistance, affordable housing in BC, and mental health in the US, recycling efforts were able to scale dramatically once government funding was accessed in a more ambitious way. At the same time, spin-offs in this sector did lose their faith-based identity and thus may have a more tenuous connection to the MCC family tree.

There are also examples of MCC spin-off programs that maintained strong connections with MCC and MCC's Mennonite constituency. These include MTS Travel, which originated as MCC's travel department in 1947 and was incorporated separately in 1955;²⁸ Mennonite Disaster Service (MDS), which traces its origins to grassroots church efforts in Kansas and Manitoba in the early 1950s, and operated as MCC's North American disaster response program until being separately incorporated in 1993;²⁹ and Roots of Justice, Inc., a non-profit established in 2012 "to carry forward and broaden the work started by MCC U.S. in the Damascus Road Antiracism Training Process."³⁰

Extending Impact by Cultivating Ecosystems

Within a Canadian context, a third pattern evident in the history of MCC spin-offs is that the impact of key programs was enhanced by seeding and nurturing an ecosystem of local organizations rather than scaling up or diversifying these programs. For example, the story of MCC's involvement in the emergence, in the late 1970s, of the private sponsorship system for refugees in Canada is well known.³¹ MCC's role in collaborating with constituent congregations to enable many thousands of refugees to resettle in Canada in the years since has also been celebrated.³² Less well known is MCC's role in starting a number of complementary organizations that have provided language, job, legal, and other supports for newcomers. These usually started as programmatic partnerships with local Mennonite congregations, and MCC's key contributions came

through administrative services and the injection of human labour, typically through seconded service workers. This led to a flurry of refugee program spin-offs in the 1980s, including the Edmonton Mennonite Centre for Newcomers in 1980,³³ Mennonite New Life Centre in Toronto in 1983,³⁴ Compass Refugee Services (formerly the Mennonite Coalition for Refugee Support) in Kitchener-Waterloo in 1987,³⁵ Centre for Newcomers Society of Calgary (formerly the Calgary Mennonite Centre for Newcomers) in 1988,³⁶ and Global Gathering Place in Saskatoon, also in 1988.³⁷ In addition to providing an anchor for a growing and diverse range of service organizations and government programs in these cities, MCC went on to play a leadership role at a national level, most recently through the Canadian Refugee Sponsorship Agreement Holders Association.³⁸

A second instance of this phenomenon of ecosystem-building is related to the role that MCC played in helping spark the contemporary restorative justice movement. Growing out of programmatic experiments such as victim-offender reconciliation as an alternative or complement to the criminal justice system, MCC fostered system-wide conversations that spread these initiatives to other regions, and informed academic research and teaching that has been influential far beyond MCC. Crucially, MCC also sparked the emergence of complementary organizations in order to extend the reach and availability of restorative justice practices. Examples here include Community Justice Initiatives, established in Kitchener-Waterloo in 1982;³⁹ Initiatives for Just Communities, established in Winnipeg in 2010;⁴⁰ Mediation Services, established in Winnipeg in 1992 through an amalgamation with the Community Dispute Centre,⁴¹ and Saskatoon Community Mediation Services, established in 1989.⁴²

As in the case of refugee support, in addition to helping to grow local ecosystems of agencies, professionals, volunteers, and government partners, MCC has long been involved in restorative justice advocacy at a national level through the Church Council on Justice and Corrections. Interestingly, this council was also the vehicle for a concerted effort to scale up another MCC experiment in restorative justice, Circles of Support and Accountability (COSA), a program that holds sex offenders accountable for the harm they have caused while assisting with their re-entry into communities at the end of their sentences.⁴³

The greatest impact of MCC's role as an incubator—most striking in the case of refugee resettlement and restorative justice, but also evident in other examples—may be the significant social innovations that came to follow new programs and subsequent ecosystems of support. More than giving birth to new organizations, MCC spawned initiatives that, in the words of Frances Westley, founder

of the Waterloo Institute for Social Innovation and Resilience, came to “challenge and, over time, contribute to changing the defining routines, resource and authority flows or beliefs of the broader social system.”⁴⁴ Put more simply, social innovations are new approaches to old problems that have durability, impact, and scale. Crucially, while these transformations can be sparked by institutions, they can never be confined to a single institution. Thus MCC’s history of serving as an incubator for spin-offs rather than focusing on growing their own programs appears, in retrospect, to be a brilliant strategy for achieving its vision.

Edge Cases

It is important to note that the framing of MCC as an incubator for new organizations does not apply to every new initiative that MCC played some kind of role in establishing. After all, incubation implies a level of intentionality in nurturing or developing something new that will then go on to a life of its own. Business incubators provide a wide array of practical supports, such as work space, mentorship, and funding. Therefore, while it is significant to note the crucial role that MCC played in the emergence of other well-known Anabaptist-Mennonite organizations such as MEDA (Mennonite Economic Development Associates),⁴⁵ CPT (Community Peacemaker Teams, formerly Christian Peacemaker Teams),⁴⁶ and MPC (Mennonite Partners in China),⁴⁷ MCC was just one of several stakeholders in each of these cases, and they were all independent from the outset. It would seem that, more than administrative support or funding, the involvement of MCC—and the clear distinction between these initiatives and MCC’s own programs and approach—brought MEDA, CPT, and MPC a kind of legitimacy and credibility within MCC’s constituent churches and support base. One more recent example is MennoHomes, an affordable housing provider in Kitchener-Waterloo that emerged in 2001 less than a year after MCC Ontario convened a working group that eventually grew to upwards of forty social service, business, and political leaders.⁴⁸

The MCC story also includes one prominent example that has often been confused with a spin-off: Ten Thousand Villages, the fair trade retail arm of MCC that provided a link between many project spin-offs in Bangladesh (as well as partners in other countries) and their North American customers.⁴⁹ This confusion was accentuated after the renaming of SELFHELP Crafts of the World in the 1990s. The brand awareness for Ten Thousand Villages in markets beyond regions with a significant Mennonite church presence has been

significant. Many customers who purchased products from these stores would not have been aware of the connection to MCC.⁵⁰ Although Ten Thousand Villages also developed its own organizational identity as distinct from that of MCC, there have been various shifts in the degree of functional autonomy from MCC over the years. As was the pattern for many program spin-offs, MCC created separate governance bodies to oversee Ten Thousand Villages in both Canada and the US that they called “boards,” but in Canada this body was never vested with the legal authority of an actual board, and all staff were technically employed by MCC. Ten Thousand Villages did incorporate as a non-profit in the US in 2012, yet it still retains deep financial ties with—if not dependence on—MCC U.S.⁵¹

Other edge cases include several ecumenical advocacy coalitions and agencies in Canada that MCC played an instrumental role in founding. Along with the Church Council on Justice and Corrections (established in 1972) and the Canadian Refugee Sponsorship Agreement Holders Association (established in 2011), these include Project Ploughshares (1976)⁵² and KAIROS: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives (2001).⁵³ Unlike the Canadian Foodgrains Bank, these coalitions were fully independent from the start and did not rely solely on MCC for their birth. Also important to consider are MCC initiatives that were able to land at a previously existing institutional home. These include the Horn of Africa Project that was housed at Conrad Grebel University College’s Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies from 1984 to 1990,⁵⁴ and International Conciliation Services, which laid important groundwork for the Center for Justice and Peacebuilding to emerge at Eastern Mennonite University in 1994.⁵⁵

Implications

This remarkable extended family tree raises two questions. First, what generated MCC’s incubation capacity? Second, how can this creativity be sustained in MCC’s current context? It should be clear by this point that there is no such thing as a typical MCC spin-off story. Different historical moments and geographic contexts matter, and the small number of rationales I have introduced—accessing new funding, developing a different kind of expertise, and building an ecosystem—lack nuance. That some MCC programs moved toward independence and others did not can almost appear random or accidental rather than being a strategic approach or at least a consistent outcome. Interpersonal dynamics and administrative complexities lie beneath the surface of every story. The more I talked to people involved in the development of MCC programs that were

eventually spun off, the more it became clear that the personalities of the individuals involved mattered enormously.

It may be an obvious point to make, but throughout its history MCC has attracted and empowered lots of creative and resourceful people with big personalities and a bias for action—the “movers and shakers” in the Mennonite world, to quote Esther Epp-Tiessen.⁵⁶ I find that it is often assumed that Mennonites with an entrepreneurial bent were drawn to an organization like MEDA rather than MCC. However, if, as Howard Stevenson, a leading theorist of entrepreneurship at the Harvard Business School, has argued, entrepreneurship is simply “the pursuit of opportunity without regard to the resources currently controlled,” and an entrepreneur is someone whose “reach exceeds their grasp,” then MCC has been full of entrepreneurs. Specifically, MCC has been full of *social* entrepreneurs focused on creating social or community value and not just private value.⁵⁷ This may offer a more significant explanation for MCC’s historical bias toward spinning off new organizations than the three rationales discussed above.

Is this still the case? For understandable reasons, MCC has shifted its staffing model from relying on large numbers of volunteers or service workers who move in and out of the organization relatively quickly (and often on more than one occasion) to relying on long-term employees with professional expertise. As a result, there are fewer pathways into MCC and, just as significant, many more alternative pathways for the changemakers in MCC’s constituency who are interested in making a difference in their community. According to many theorists of institutional innovation, the primary hurdle that mature organizations like MCC face is overcoming barriers to the flow of knowledge into and out of the organization, barriers that are more easily overcome when people are coming and going on a routine basis.⁵⁸

In addition to offering a big tent for Anabaptist-Mennonites who wanted to make a difference, historically MCC has served as a big tent for a wide range of issues of concern. According to Alain Epp Weaver, MCC’s history is marked by a “creative churning of new projects and initiatives.” One implication is that the organizational culture emphasized learning through doing rather than grand plans and overly ambitious goals.⁵⁹ Moreover, the impulse or reflexive approach toward many of the issues raised was to find a new solution rather than gravitating toward an existing approach. Like Anabaptist-Mennonites in general, MCCers have long been fond of alternative, countercultural models. The sheer breadth of MCC’s programs meant it would be inevitable that some of these alternative models, third-way experiments or “demonstration plots for the kingdom,”⁶⁰

would begin to stretch the bounds of MCC's mission. Regardless of constraints like lack of funding, expertise, or an organizational ecosystem, successful programs would have to be released at some point in order for MCC's portfolio of programs to remain both manageable and responsive to new initiatives. The routine presence of this kind of creative tension seems less likely in an era when conventional wisdom insists on organizational focus, not breadth.⁶¹

One historical driver of the view that MCC could or should take action to address all kinds of issues may have been the significant degree of overlap among MCC's leaders and the leaders of Anabaptist-Mennonite churches and agencies in other sectors. Board members, administrators, and staff were closely connected and even shared, and institutional agendas were more fluid. In recent years, the borders between Anabaptist-Mennonite organizations have become less permeable, while at the same time the borders between MCC's constituent churches and their surrounding communities have clearly become *more* permeable. As noted above, it is no longer safe to assume that the first impulse for these churches when seeking to address an issue in the world is to start by collaborating with others within the Anabaptist-Mennonite community. To use an expression from political scientist Mark Zachery Taylor, until recently I think that MCC has been able to leverage the "creative insecurity" of Anabaptist-Mennonites.⁶² Taylor's theory is that when people have a greater sense of "otherness" or opposition to their surrounding culture, their creative energy is amplified by a shared focus on tensions and threats from beyond. Put the other way around, organizational creativity will diminish when we are more secure in our broader context, because we then tend to become preoccupied with internal tensions and threats.

In light of this changing context, does viewing MCC as an incubator nuance and complement other ways of framing the organization as a service-placement or partner-driven agency, or is it best viewed as a relic of the past? As MCC enters its second century, the crucial question is not whether it can continue to incubate new spin-offs. After all, there are now lots of incubators to be found around the world—organizations whose sole purpose is to support start-ups. The crucial questions are: How can MCC's organizational culture foster ongoing learning and creativity in order to remain faithful to its mission in a new context? How can MCC continue to innovate? I think that lessons from a century of incubating new organizations can be relevant to these questions. Indeed, MCC's history resonates with theologian L. Gregory Jones's research into contemporary exemplars of Christian social innovation. One of Jones's key insights is that "to be healthy, any institution—but especially a spirit-filled

institution—needs to produce way more goods than it has the capacity to capture value from.”⁶³ Thus, in the words of long-time MCC worker Harold Miller, MCC would continue to be well-served by practicing “a vulnerability to open-ended, un-owned results.” This is more than just the “MCC way”; it is, as Miller put it, “a Christian genius.”⁶⁴

Notes

- ¹ This article is based on a paper presented at “MCC at 100: Mennonites, Service, and the Humanitarian Impulse,” a virtual Mennonite studies conference at the University of Winnipeg, on October 1, 2021. A much abbreviated version can also be found in “MCC as Incubator of New Approaches in Relief, Development, and Peacebuilding,” *Intersections: MCC Theory & Practice Quarterly* 8, no. 2 (Spring 2020): 24–25.
- ² See *Intersections: MCC Theory & Practice Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (Summer 2021) for a recent examination of MCC’s focus on “partner capacity building.”
- ³ Apart from a philosophical shift, this partnership approach also reflects the practical challenge of declining numbers of North American volunteers who are available or suitable to serve overseas with MCC.
- ⁴ Another common framing is MCC as a service-placement organization. See, for example, Robert S. Kreider and Rachel Waltner Goossen, *Hungry, Thirsty, a Stranger: The MCC Experience* (Waterloo, ON: Herald Press, 1988); Ronald J. R. Mathies, “Service as (Trans)formation: The Mennonite Central Committee as Educational Institution,” *Conrad Grebel Review* 13, no. 2 (Spring 1995): 117–32; and Alain Epp Weaver, *Service and the Ministry of Reconciliation: A Missiological History of Mennonite Central Committee* (North Newton, KS: Bethel College, 2020).
- ⁵ Alain Epp Weaver, ed., *A Table of Sharing: Mennonite Central Committee and the Expanding Networks of Mennonite Identity* (Telford, PA: Cascadia, 2011), 17.
- ⁶ This internal document included 38 organizations that, as of 2017, were still in operation (16 in Canada and the US and 22 based outside of North America). It also included 101 defunct organizations (19 in Canada and the US and 82 overseas). Unfortunately, pandemic restrictions meant that I was unable to travel to the MCC archives in Akron and Winnipeg to learn more about internal discussions and debates around these organizations.
- ⁷ As with *A Table of Sharing*, another key publication that has informed my perspective on MCC was created to mark a significant MCC anniversary: Esther Epp-Tiessen’s *Mennonite Central Committee in Canada: A History* (Winnipeg: CMU Press, 2013). I have also been inspired by Calvin Redekop’s “Sociological Observations about MCC Structure and Function,” which were motivated by what he thought was “the lack of scholarly and public discussion, analysis, and questioning of MCC’s structure and functioning.” Calvin Redekop, “The Mennonite Central Committee Story: A Review Essay,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 67, no. 1 (Jan. 1993): 98–103.

- ⁸ For a comprehensive overview of the field of social innovation, see Geoff Mulgan, *Social Innovation: How Societies Find the Power to Change* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2019).
- ⁹ “Member Churches & Agencies,” Canadian Foodgrains Bank, <https://foodgrainsbank.ca/about-us/members/>. All online resources accessed Jan. 31, 2022. See also Epp-Tiessen, *Mennonite Central Committee in Canada*, 145–49.
- ¹⁰ See Judy Zimmerman Herr and Robert Herr, “MCC and the Public Purse: History, Theology and Context,” as well as Ron Bietz, “MCC Canada Experience: A Case Study of Government Funding for Development,” and “Statement of Values and Guiding Principles Governing MCC Canada’s Relationship with CIDA and Use of CIDA Funds,” *MCC Peace Office Newsletter* 25, no. 4 (Oct.–Dec. 1995): 1–9.
- ¹¹ “MCC Canada Annual Impact Report 2019/2020 Appendix,” MCC Canada, <https://mcccanada.ca/sites/mcccanada.ca/files/media/reports/canada/fye2020annualreportappendix1.pdf>; “Annual Report 2020,” Canadian Foodgrains Bank, https://foodgrainsbank.ca/wp-content/uploads/woocommerce_uploads/2020/08/annual-report-2020-2ulody.pdf.
- ¹² “About Us,” More Than a Roof, <https://morethanaroom.org/who-we-are/>. Although only 11% of its revenue in 2020 came from government sources, throughout its history More Than a Roof has partnered with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to access significant capital for property purchases.
- ¹³ “Craigwood’s History of Service,” Craigwood Children, Youth and Family Services, <https://www.craigwood.ca/about-craigwood/history/>. 96% of Craigwood’s total revenue of \$6 million in 2019–20 came from federal and provincial government sources. See also Lucille Marr, “Ailsa Craig Boys’ Farm: A ‘Pioneering Institution,’ 1954–1970,” *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 28, no. 4 (Dec. 1999): 419–36.
- ¹⁴ “Our History,” Communitas Supportive Care Society, <https://www.comunitascare.com/about-us/our-history/>. 95% of Communitas’ total revenue of \$28 million in 2019–20 came from government sources.
- ¹⁵ “About ILWR,” Independent Living Waterloo Region, <https://www.ilcwr.org/about-ilwr>. 92% of ILWR’s total revenue of \$8.2 million in 2020–21 came from government sources. In addition to ILWR, MCC Canada staff member Henry Enns also helped to found Disabled People’s International in 1981, the Canadian Association of Independent Living Centres in 1985, and the Canadian Centre on Disability Studies in 1995.
- ¹⁶ Momentum became independent from MCC in 2002, and adopted its current name in 2006. See “Who We Are,” Momentum, <https://momentum.org/who-we-are/>. 49% of Momentum’s total revenue of \$10.5 million in 2020 came from federal, provincial, and municipal government sources.
- ¹⁷ 99% of Carmel House’s total revenue of \$551,000 in 2020–21 came from government sources. See “List of charities and other qualified donees,” Canada Revenue Agency, <https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/charities-giving/list-charities/list-charities-other-qualified-donees.html>.
- ¹⁸ “History,” Mennonite Community Services of Southern Ontario, <https://www.mcson.org/about/history/>. 54% of MCS’s total revenue of \$1.7 million in 2020–21 came from federal and provincial government sources.

- ¹⁹ Emily Jones, “How Civilian Public Service Changed Mental Health Care in the U.S.,” Mennonite Central Committee, <https://mcc.org/centennial/100-stories/how-civilian-public-service-changed-mental-health-care-us>.
- ²⁰ “About Us,” Brook Lane, <https://www.brooklane.org/about-us>.
- ²¹ “About,” Kings View, <https://www.kingsview.org/about/>.
- ²² “About Us,” Prairie View, <https://prairieview.org/about-us>.
- ²³ Titus W. Bender, “The Mennonite Mental Health Movement and the Wider Society in the United States, 1942–1965,” *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 29 (2011): 55. The MCC committee that held the original titles to the three hospitals also played a role in establishing several other mental health centres, and was eventually renamed Mennonite Mental Health Services. This became an independent organization itself in the 1980s, and is now known as Mennonite Health Services (MHS). MHS is currently an agency of Mennonite Church USA, and provides resources and consulting for a broad range of 75 Anabaptist health and human services providers in the US. See “MHS History,” MHS, <https://mhsonline.org/about-mhs/mhs-history/>; and Vernon Neufeld, *If We Can Love* (Newton, KS: Faith and Life Press, 1983).
- ²⁴ Joseph Shapiro, “WWII Pacifists Exposed Mental Ward Horrors,” All Things Considered, National Public Radio (Dec. 30, 2009), <https://www.npr.org/2009/12/30/122017757/>.
- ²⁵ “History of the Blue Box,” Region of Waterloo, <https://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/living-here/resources/Documents/Waste/History-of-the-blue-box-2022-access.pdf>. While these programs are now government-mandated and ubiquitous across Canada, the movement was aided by countless other community initiatives, including the Edmonton Recycling Society, developed by MCC Alberta, that focused on developing new markets for recycled materials as well as employment opportunities. See Bob McKeon’s report for the BC-Alberta Social Economy Research Alliance, “Faith-Based Organizations Engaged in the Social Economy: The Example of Catholic Religious Orders and the Mennonites” (Aug. 31, 2011), 16.
- ²⁶ “History,” TRAAC Tire Recycling, <https://www.tracc.ca/history/>.
- ²⁷ Michael L. Yoder, “Mennonites, Economics, and the Care of Creation,” in *Creation and the Environment: An Anabaptist Perspective on a Sustainable World*, ed. Calvin Redekop (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 85.
- ²⁸ MTS was tasked with facilitating travel for service workers assigned to reconstruction projects in post-war Europe. At its peak in the 1970s, MTS had offices focused on non-profit and religious travel services in ten cities in Canada and the US, as well as Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. See “About MTS Travel,” MTS Travel, <https://mtstours.com/about/index.html>. The office in Goshen, Indiana, became locally owned and managed in 1980, and continues to operate as Menno Travel. See “Menno Travel History,” Menno Travel, <https://www.mennotrav.com/about-us/>.
- ²⁹ This grassroots effort was initially organized outside of MCC under the banner of the Mennonite Service Organization (MSO) before being rebranded as MDS in 1952, and then enfolded into MCC in 1955. See “Our History in U.S.,” Mennonite Disaster Service, <https://mds.org/our-history/>. See also Lowell Detweiler, *The Hammer Rings Hope: Photos and Stories from Fifty Years of Mennonite Disaster Service* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 2000).
- ³⁰ “About Us,” Roots of Justice, <https://rootsofjusticetraining.org/aboutus/>. Regina Shands Stoltzfus and Tobin Miller Shearer discuss some of the other

- reasons why Roots of Justice “left the confines of MCC” in the introduction to *Been in the Struggle: Pursuing an Antiracist Spirituality* (Harrisonburg, VA: Herald Press, 2021), 27–28.
- ³¹ William Janzen, “The 1979 MCC Canada Master Agreement for the Sponsorship of Refugees in Historical Perspective,” *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 24 (2006): 211–22; and Michael J. Molloy, Peter Duschinsky, Kurt F. Jensen, and Robert Shalka, *Running on Empty: Canada and the Indochinese Refugee Movement, 1975–1980* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2017), 75–79.
- ³² Jason Dueck, “Consider it (Re)settled: MCC’s 40 Years of Refugee Resettlement in Canada,” <https://mcccanada.ca/centennial/100-stories/consider-it-resettled>.
- ³³ “Vision,” EMCN, <https://emcn.ab.ca/corporate/vision.html>.
- ³⁴ “About Us,” Mennonite New Life Centre, <https://mnlct.org/about-us/>.
- ³⁵ “Our Foundations,” Compass, <https://compassrefugee.ca/about-us/our-foundations/>.
- ³⁶ “A Rich History of Helping,” Centre for Newcomers, <https://www.centrefornewcomers.ca/history>.
- ³⁷ “Our Story,” Global Gathering Place, <https://globalgatheringplace.com/about-us/>. A related example is the Maison de l’Amitié in Montreal, which actually traces its roots back to 1974.
- ³⁸ “History of the Association,” The Canadian Refugee Sponsorship Agreement Holders Association, <https://www.sahassociation.com/about/history/>.
- ³⁹ “CJI History,” Community Justice Initiatives, <https://cjiwr.com/cji-history-2/>. See also Gary Nyp, *Pioneers of Peace: The History of Community Justice Initiatives in the Waterloo Region, 1974–2004* (Kitchener, ON: Community Justice Initiatives, 2004).
- ⁴⁰ “About Us,” Initiatives for Just Communities, <https://www.initiativesjc.org/wpblog/about-us/>.
- ⁴¹ “About Us,” Mediation Services, <https://www.mediationserviceswpg.ca/about-us/>.
- ⁴² Eileen Klassen Hamm, interview by author, Feb. 26, 2021.
- ⁴³ “COSA,” Church Council on Justice and Corrections, <https://ccjc.ca/practice/cosa/>. See also Robin J. Wilson, Franca Cortoni, and Monica Vermani, *Circles of Support and Accountability: A National Replication of Outcome Findings* (Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada, 2008).
- ⁴⁴ Francis Westley and Sam Laban, *Social Innovation Lab Guide* (Waterloo, ON: Waterloo Institute for Social Innovation and Resilience, 2014), 5.
- ⁴⁵ In the words of J. Winfield Fretz, in the case of MEDA, “MCC served once more as the midwife to assist in the birth of a new organization.” See *The MEDA Experiment, 1953–1978: Twenty-five Years of Experience in Helping “Little People” to Get Established in Their Own Businesses in Over Twenty Countries Around the World* (Waterloo, ON: Conrad Press, 1978), 16. Although MCC facilitated the initial trips to Paraguay by the Mennonite business leaders who became the charter members of MEDA, and MCC’s Executive Secretary Orie Miller drafted MEDA’s foundational documents, MCC’s involvement is not currently referenced on MEDA’s website. See “MEDA history,” <https://www.meda.org/about/history/>.
- ⁴⁶ Kathleen Kern, *In Harm’s Way: A History of Christian Peacemaker Teams* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009); and Perry Bush, “A ‘Creative Tension’:

- Mennonite Central Committee, Christian Peacemaker Teams, and the Justice Imperative, 1984–2006,” in Weaver, *A Table of Sharing*, 310–36.
- ⁴⁷ “Our history,” MPC, <http://www.mennonitepartnerschina.org/cn/mpc/our-history.html>. This originated as an exchange program negotiated by Goshen College in 1979 that became the China Educational Exchange when MCC agreed to collaborate with four other Mennonite church organizations in 1981.
- ⁴⁸ “How We Started,” MennoHomes, <https://mennohomes.com/about/history/>. See also Susan Fish and Cynthia DeWitt, *Start(led) by God: MennoHomes: The First Decade 2001–2011* (Waterloo, ON: MennoHomes Inc., 2012).
- ⁴⁹ Allison Enns, “MCC and Fair Trade: From SELFHELP Crafts of the World to Ten Thousand Villages,” *Intersections* 8, no. 2 (Spring 2020): 30. See also Jennifer Keahey, Mary Littrell, and Douglas Murray, “Business with a Mission: The Ongoing Role of Ten Thousand Villages within the Fair Trade Movement,” in Weaver, *A Table of Sharing*, 263–83.
- ⁵⁰ MCC’s communications efforts have been effective in generating and proliferating various sub-brands in order to effectively connect intended audiences with particular programs. In addition to Ten Thousand Villages, examples include volunteer programs such as SALT (Serving and Learning Together), IVEP (International Volunteer Exchange Program), and TAP (Teachers Abroad Program), resource generation initiatives such as Relief Sales, the Mobile Meat Canner, and a growing network of Thrift stores, awareness-raising resources such as the “To remember is to work for peace” button, and publications such as the *More With Less* family of cookbooks.
- ⁵¹ Ten Thousand Villages Canada ceased operations as an MCC Canada program in 2020.
- ⁵² “History,” Project Ploughshares, <https://ploughshares.ca/about-us/history/>. Project Ploughshares is now a program of the Canadian Council of Churches.
- ⁵³ “Who We Are,” KAIROS, <https://kairoscanada.org>. KAIROS united ten separate inter-church coalitions focused on a range of national and international justice issues—predecessor coalitions that included MCC were the Aboriginal Rights Coalition (est. 1988), formerly Inter-Church Project on Northern Development or Project North (est. 1975); Inter-Church Action for Development, Relief and Justice (est. 1997), formerly the Inter-Church Fund for International Development (est. 1974); and the Inter-Church Committee for Refugees (est. 1981), formerly Refugee Concerns Project (est. 1979). See Christopher Lind and Joseph Mihevc, eds., *Coalitions for Justice: The Story of Canada’s Interchurch Coalitions* (Ottawa: Novalis, 1994).
- ⁵⁴ Ronald Mathies, Harold Miller, and Menno Wiebe, “The Horn of Africa Project: Modeling Alternative Conflict Resolution,” in *Aid as Peacemaker: Canadian Development Assistance and Third World Conflict*, ed. Robert Miller (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1992), 179–98.
- ⁵⁵ “About CJP,” Eastern Mennonite University, <https://emu.edu/cjp/about/>. See also Ronald E. Yoder’s report for MCC: “Visioning Future Structure for Mennonite International Conciliation Work” (Sept. 1993). The Center for Justice and Peacebuilding itself provided a model for several international peacebuilding initiatives that were started by Center alumni with the support of MCC, including the Mindanao Peacebuilding Institute in the Philippines in 2000, the Africa Peacebuilding Institute in Zambia in 2001, and the Korea Peacebuilding Institute in South Korea in 2011, which also operates the Northeast Asia Regional Peacebuilding Institute.

- ⁵⁶ Interview by author, July 21, 2020.
- ⁵⁷ J. Gregory Dees, “The Meaning of ‘Social Entrepreneurship,’” draft paper (May 30, 2001), https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/03/Article_Dees_MeaningofSocialEntrepreneurship_2001.pdf, 2. While Stevenson is a foundational figure in entrepreneurship studies more generally, Dees is widely regarded as spearheading the field of social entrepreneurship.
- ⁵⁸ For a survey of this literature, see Brendan Wylie-Toal, “Open-Innovation in Healthcare: An Analysis of Motivations, Learning, and Program Outcomes” (master’s thesis, University of Waterloo, 2021).
- ⁵⁹ “The Ministry of Reconciliation: A Sermon for MCC’s Century,” *Mennonite Life* 74 (2020), <https://ml.bethelks.edu/2020/07/02/the-ministry-of-reconciliation-a-sermon-for-mccs-century/>.
- ⁶⁰ Esther Epp-Tiessen noted that this was an expression used often by former MCC worker Dave Worth, quoting Clarence Jordan, the founder of Koinonia Farm in Georgia. Interview by author, July 21, 2020.
- ⁶¹ With the embrace of strategic planning processes in recent decades, MCC has, perhaps inevitably, prioritized organizational focus rather than breadth.
- ⁶² Taylor has argued that “countries for which external threats are relatively greater than domestic rivalries should have higher national innovation rates than countries for which domestic rivalries outweigh external threats.” See *The Politics of Innovation: Why Some Countries Are Better Than Others at Science and Technology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 216.
- ⁶³ Quoted from a presentation on May 22, 2018, at a consultation at Duke University organized by Jones to inform his effort to tease out the ingredients that have been necessary for the growth and vitality of Christian institutions. The rationale for this project can be found in his book *Christian Social Innovation: Renewing Wesleyan Witness* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2016), and the consultation informed the subsequent book by Jones and Andrew P. Hogue, *Navigating the Future: Traditioned Innovation for Wilder Seas* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2021). Jones and Gregory Dees were colleagues in Duke’s Fuqua School of Business.
- ⁶⁴ Harold Miller, interview by author, July 21, 2020.