

Church and State: Developments Among 18

Mennonite Brethren in Canada Since World War II 23

Symposium: "Influences Upon Mennonite
Brethren Theology".
November, 1980

Abe J. Dueck
Mennonite Brethren Bible College
Winnipeg, Manitoba

One of the recognized distinctives of the Anabaptist-Mennonite faith since the origins of Anabaptism in the sixteenth century has been its attitude toward the state. Much has been written on the general question of the place of the state in God's economy as interpreted by Anabaptists as well as on such specifics as nonresistance and the question of the oath. Increasingly, the diversity of viewpoints even in the sixteenth century has been recognized, although a conception of Anabaptism as a monolithic entity is perhaps still the bane of Mennonite scholars.

Whatever the ultimate concensus regarding sixteenth century Anabaptism may be, it is clear that the Mennonites in the twentieth century have widely divergent views on the nature and role of government and the Christian's relationship to it. Not only are there obvious differences between various Mennonite denominations today, but there are widely divergent views and practices within many of the Mennonite groups. The Mennonite Brethren Church (MB) is one which has experienced considerable change and inner conflict in this regard, especially since World War II. The nature of the topic makes it easier to study within the context of a particular country, and it may well be that there are important differences between MB's in Canada and MB's in the United States. Not only are the political environments different but most MB's in the U.S. migrated there in the 1870s, whereas most Canadian MB's have come to this country since the 1920s. In a number of respects, these factors and others make separate studies desirable at the initial stages.

The study of MB developments, as distinct from developments among other Mennonites, appears also to have some merit. While MB's are heirs of the Anabaptists on one hand, they were significantly influenced by Pietists and Baptists in Russia and by fundamentalists and evangelicals in general in America. Though other Mennonite groups have also been subject to a variety of influences, it seems clear that the segment of the General Conference Mennonite Church (GCMC) which immigrated to Canada from Russia more or less simultaneously with the MB's and usually settled in close proximity to MB's, was not as open to the above influences and more directly participated in the revival of Anabaptist research and theology in the past generation. Thus a study of this nature may lend itself to some interesting comparisons.

The sources utilized for this study were primarily the official and semi-official publications of the MB Conference as well as a variety of other materials by or about MB's. It is true that political attitudes are often not adequately reflected in such sources available to the scholar. While people may freely share their political

opinions with their neighbors and closest friends, they are often reluctant to express them publicly. In some cases local sources would help considerably to supplement the above material. Articles in periodicals were generally written by a few select individuals and may not have reflected community opinion. Special attention was therefore given to letters to the editors of periodicals.

re type The traditional Mennonite attitude toward the state and toward government has been regarded as strongly separationist or apolitical. This is expressed most clearly in the Schleithem Confession (1527) which speaks of two orders, one inside the perfection of Christ and the other outside the perfection of Christ.¹ According to this conception, the state is there for the world to keep evil in check by means of coercion and violence. Christians have no business becoming involved in such an institution. Christians should cooperate with and obey the authorities to the extent that such action does not conflict with their responsibilities to God; otherwise they should suffer quietly or seek to escape.

re type Scholars have frequently noted, however, that Menno Simons' attitude toward the ruling authorities seemed to diverge somewhat from that of the Swiss Anabaptists.² Menno called on rulers to act justly and to live up to their Christian responsibilities.³ Thus he may have posited the possibility of Christian participation in government. Some suggest, however, that Menno was simply calling rulers to live in conformity with their claim to be Christians without intending to speak to the fundamental question of Christian participation in government.⁴

The history of Mennonites in Europe and North America since the sixteenth century has led to a variety of interesting developments. In Russia in particular Mennonites developed closed settlements or colonies with elaborate systems of local self-government and with relatively little interaction with the central government. A similar practice was carried over to Canada and South America. It was generally assumed that church and society within the colonies were one, and therefore the structure of self-government was never really seen as threatening the traditional separation of the church and the secular state. As Calvin Redekop and others have shown, the Mennonites were deluded and the world began to appear from within, but theological appraisal of what was taking place was never seriously attempted.⁵ It is also true that in later years some Mennonites were elected to the Duma. This should have been recognized as a more serious departure from previous practices. According to John A. Toews, the MB's were not significantly involved even in local government in Russia, although B.H. Unruh "advocated regular political action by Mennonites prior to 1917".⁶

As already indicated, the first MB's in North America came to the United States in the 1870s. At the first conference in 1878 (unofficial) a resolution stated that

members were "not permitted to hold government office or take any part at the polls."⁷ Appreciation was expressed for the protection given by government. In 1888 a resolution stated that "in regard to being a delegate to national political conventions, it is strongly advised that, while we desire to have a good government, members should be careful so as not to defile their conscience. However, the Conference does not want to form a definite resolution in this matter".⁸ Two years later a resolution was passed which, although still asking members to "refrain from participation and involvement in the contentions of political parties," nevertheless permitted them "to vote quietly at elections."⁹ No further statements regarding the subject were made at the General Conference level until 1966.

When MB's began coming to Canada in significant numbers in the 1920s, the issue of voting does not appear to have become a serious issue at any time. Although there were undoubtedly those who felt that voting was an unjustifiable form of participation in the affairs of secular society, the majority voted and it never became a Conference issue. The major issues concerning MB relations with the federal government in the next several decades, as with other Mennonites, dealt with matters pertaining to immigration and nonresistance. These issues generally were dealt with on an inter-Mennonites basis.

On the local level, MB's became increasingly involved in serving on town councils and school boards. As Toews indicates, however, these were viewed as civic responsibilities analagous to involvement in self-government in Russia and were therefore fundamentally different from involvement in partisan politics at the provincial or especially at the federal level.¹⁰ MB's, as other Mennonites, were appreciative of their government and were basically concerned about religious freedom and opportunity for economic advancement.

e type In the period since World War II, however, there have been rapid changes in the attitudes and practices of MB's regarding politics. This period of about 35 years can be divided into two phases. During the first phase (ca. 1945-57), the "traditional" Mennonite position still generally prevailed. During the second phase, there has been a serious breakdown of the traditional position and MB's have moved in a number of different directions. Our purpose will be to analyze these phases and try to draw some conclusions from them.

x type I. "Traditional" Mennonite (1945-57)

This first phase in the post-war era was marked by the continuation of the Liberal government in Ottawa, first under William Lyon Mackenzie King until 1948 and then under Louis Stephen St. Laurent until 1957. National elections took place in 1945, 1949, and 1953. Mennonite Brethren during this period did not seriously contemplate political involvement, especially at the federal level.

The Liberals had, of course, been in power throughout the war period and had provided exemption from military service for the Mennonites. Although difficulties were encountered from time to time, in general things had gone well and Mennonites were truly grateful to their government. Furthermore, the Liberal government had been in power when the majority of MB's came to Canada in the 1920s and that action continued to reap benefits for the Liberals among the Mennonites.

The Mennonitische Rundschau, which is the main source of information regarding MB's during this period, gives ample evidence of the mutually good relations between the Liberal government and the Mennonite people. Advertisements by the Liberal Party during election periods abound. Indeed, during the 1945 campaign, only the Liberal party inserted advertisements in the Rundschau.¹¹ In 1949 an advertisement soliciting members for the Progressive Conservative Party appeared several times, but again the only campaign advertisements were placed by the Liberal Party.¹² In 1953 this began to change significantly when the number of Progressive Conservative advertisements and the number of Liberal advertisements were about equal. In 1957 a Social Credit advertisement appeared for the first time.¹³

type The content of a number of the advertisements is quite revealing. An advertisement placed by the German-Canadian Committee in North Winnipeg on 6 June 1945 was specifically addressed to German readers.¹⁴ It reminded the readers that despite the war the German Canadians had enjoyed freedom, whereas during World War I, while the Conservative Party was in office, the right to vote had been withdrawn and the Germans became, in effect, second-class citizens. It referred to the religious freedom they had enjoyed as well as the freedom to promote the German language by means of newspapers, etc. On that basis the advertisement appealed to German citizens to vote for the Liberal party.

A somewhat similar appeal was addressed to German Canadians during the June 1949 election campaign.¹⁵ The Liberal Party identified itself as the party which brought the Germans and their forbears into Canada, the party which had not discriminated against them, and, more specifically, the party which had allowed 5000 Mennonites to come to Canada in the previous two years. During the 1953 and 1957 election campaigns, although the various advertisements continued, the specific appeal to ethnic Germans or Mennonites on the basis of previous Liberal policies seems to have disappeared. An article reporting on Prime Minister St. Laurent's campaign appearance in Winnipeg, however, did refer to the Prime Minister's stated desire that Mennonites would vote for his party because of its generous orientation toward them in matters of immigration and nonresistance.¹⁶

type Other political comment and information was relatively scarce in the Rundschau during this period. One fairly significant article appeared on the editorial page

on 6 June 1945 and was written by C.F. Klassen.¹⁷ In this article Klassen stated that he respected the stance of many of his brethren who did not participate in elections for religious reasons. Presumably he was referring to Mennonites other than MB's. He then continued, "Many of us believe, however, that as citizens of this country we are obligated to cast our votes for men to whom we can entrust the affairs of state with the least reservations." Stating that he did not wish to evaluate the various parties (none were perfect!), he turned to a discussion of the person of the Prime Minister himself, for whom he had high regard. After a brief biographical sketch and an overview of Canada's recent political history, Klassen stated unabashedly, "There (as Prime Minister) he still stands today and hopefully he will still be there after June 11." Klassen lauded King's policies toward the Mennonites and referred to him as menschenfreundlich. He concluded: "We can be assured that Canada's citizens can confidently entrust him with the reigns of government for the post-war years." Several issues later the Rundschau prominently displayed a picture of the victorious King after his last election campaign.¹⁸

The love-relationship with the Liberal Party undoubtedly focussed on its leader to a large extent. Nevertheless, Prime Minister St. Laurent was also viewed with considerable favor. On 27 April 1949 the Rundschau carried a picture of the Prime Minister and made a few comments lauding his character.¹⁹ His strong opposition to the Communists, his attitude of cooperation with the United States, and his policy favoring a strong Atlantic pact were specifically mentioned as praiseworthy. During the 1957 campaign the editor of the Rundschau stated his desire to have rulers who ruled in a godly or pious (fromm) manner, but he did not wish to recommend any particular political party.²⁰ Nevertheless, he warned against supporting any party of the radical left or the radical right. Otherwise, the Rundschau restricted itself to brief informational reports concerning elections and political developments. Readers of the Rundschau did not comment on the political issues within the country.

The Konferenz-Jugendblatt remained even more aloof from political issues, although it carried pictures of King and St. Laurent in the February-April issue of 1949.²¹ The Mennonite Observer, which was the first English language periodical primarily for MB's, published nothing pertaining to politics except a brief report on election results in 1957.²² Evidently, politics had not yet become a serious issue within the church, or at least was not to be discussed publicly.

There were a few indications that traditional attitudes were being questioned, although the first expressions of this change came through more open channels such as the Canadian Mennonite, which in many ways was an avant-garde paper of inter-Mennonite dialogue. John Redekop, who later became the most prolific contributor to discussions relating to politics in the MB constituency, was one of the first to vent questions concerning political participation in the Canadian Mennonite, although

the approach was still very cautious.

In reviewing this first phase it is evident that Mennonite Brethren, along with most other Mennonites, simply took for granted a moderate form of separation of church and state. Although they voted, they did not contemplate directly participating in government especially at the federal level. Government was evaluated on the basis of the privileges which Mennonites were able to enjoy, especially religious freedom and nonresistance. The specifically Christian character of government or of persons within government was not as much an issue as the repudiation of a Communist ideology. This, it can be assumed, reflected their experience in Russia. Government was necessary for non-Christian society but it was not the responsibility of Christians (certainly not MB's) to become involved in it. Obviously, given the fact that MB's were so new to the Canadian environment and given the tension of the war years, it would have been generally unrealistic to aspire to such positions in any event.

There was, of course, no real theological articulation of this traditional stance at any point in this period because there was no perceived threat. MB educators never addressed themselves to the issue. The theological articulation by the Mennonite scholar Guy F. Hershberger in books such as War, Peace, and Non-resistance would probably have been quite acceptable, although at points perhaps too strongly separationist.²³ To what extent MB's were familiar with Hershberger's writings is hard to judge, but undoubtedly MB educators like J.A. Toews relied considerably on such materials in the shaping and articulation of their position.²⁴

II. Breakdown of the "Traditional" Mennonite Position Among MB's

re type
The second phase, which I have referred to as the breakdown of the "traditional" Mennonite position, comes into focus as a new group of leaders and opinion setters emerged largely in the context of a new generation of Canadian MB's who were educated in North America, spoke a fluent English, and were well acquainted with the Canadian culture and Canadian institutions. The transition took place almost at the same time that English was beginning to dominate in the churches and that young people were aspiring to various new professions such as the legal profession.

Except for the period from 1958 to 1963 and a brief period in 1979, the Liberal Party dominated Canadian federal politics. The Progressive Conservatives under John G. Diefenbaker won the first two elections, the first with a landslide victory and the second resulted in a minority government which lasted only a brief period. Following that the Liberals won under the leadership of Lester B. Pearson in 1963 and 1965, but it was not until 1968 that the Liberals emerged with a strong majority under Pierre Elliot Trudeau. During the last decade there has been a gradual polarization in Canada. The West, where most MB's reside, has usually voted strongly in favor of the Progressive Conservatives, whereas a seemingly unbreakable bond has been forged between the Liberal Party and the French Canadian voters in Quebec. The above

factors and the perceived orientation of leaders like Dicfenbaker and Trudeau must be seen as significant factors influencing MB attitudes.

Articulation of a Theology of Church and State

Whereas in the earlier period no serious attempt was made to articulate a theology of church and state, during this second phase a number of attempts were made. This in itself suggests that the earlier position could no longer be taken for granted or that there was no position—only a practice which had evolved for non-theological reasons, or continued long after the theological reasons were forgotten. An editorial comment in the Mennonite Brethren Herald in its first year of publication in 1961 stated: "An MB philosophy towards politics has been strangely lacking, although our ministers urge us to vote and we traditionally support a 'Christian' candidate."²⁵ It concluded with the comment, "Or, why not campaign yourself?" Perhaps the suggestion to become a political candidate would still have been considered too radical for most of the constituency. Perhaps, like Mennonites in Pennsylvania who voted for pacifist Quakers while refusing to hold office themselves, MB's were simply being encouraged to support misguided Christians who would nevertheless do a better job of running government.

The articulation of the traditional Mennonite position regarding church-state relationships came primarily from John A. Toews, who for several decades was regarded as the major spokesman for the Mennonite heritage among MB's. In an article which appeared in the Voice in 1958, Toews asked, "Does not the basic antithesis between Church and World also extend to the State as a very important part of that World?"²⁶ He then continued by analyzing the biblical position and concluded that "from the records of the Early Church as given in the Book of Acts it would appear that the apostles did not conceive of the government of their day as a neutral agency which merely administered justice but rather as a hostile force, which was part of a sinful world-system and which was arrayed against Christ and his Kingdom."²⁷ The New Testament seemed to "portray a fundamental incompatibility between church and state, and Christians would have considered participation in government as an 'unequal yoke' with unbelievers."²⁸ The Christian method must therefore be to create "islands of holiness in the sea of despair."²⁹ The state, while it existed by divine providence, was basically viewed as belonging to the order of sin with little capacity for positive good. Toews never departed significantly from this conception of the state, as is evidenced by a variety of articles and lectures which he gave, although some modifications undoubtedly took place.

Toews, at least in his earlier statements, made virtually no allowance for

type

distinctions between earlier forms of the state and the modern democratic state.

He referred to a "common misconception among present day Christians" which he described as follows:

It is generally believed that there is a basic difference between the modern 'Welfare State' and the 'Police State' of earlier times, and that as a result of this transformation of the nature of the State the Christian's attitude toward the State must of necessity also change. The modern state, especially in a democratic society, has become so 'christianized' that the church must cooperate with it, even though it formerly separated itself from a pagan state....³⁰

Toews challenged such a distinction and argued that essentially the state is the same. "Is not even the 'Welfare State' dominated by a materialistic and selfish philosophy, where the 'natural' life of man with its physical, social, and intellectual needs is a matter of chief concern, but where the spiritual needs of man are as much a matter of indifference as in a so-called pagan state?"³¹

type

Later Toews seemed more willing to recognize distinctions. In an article in 1965 he admitted that "the government in our 'welfare society' has assumed many functions which formerly belonged exclusively to the domain of the church."³² Such areas (essentially civil service areas) were therefore legitimate areas of involvement. He also distinguished between lower and higher levels of participation in government. At higher levels (federal government) he felt it would be nearly impossible to remain true to biblical convictions. In admitting to possible exceptions, however, Toews probably unwittingly compromised his earlier distinction between the two kingdoms. The new criterion was no longer the fact that the state belonged to the order of sin in principle but rather the pressures for moral compromise in such offices. Areas of meaningful involvement must be discerned; the church was no longer simply an "island of holiness," as he had referred to it earlier. Nevertheless, Toews' thinking remained basically determined by a radical two-kingdom concept.

Essentially compatible with the above view, although with a great recognition of the ambiguities involved, were points of view expressed in several articles by Vern Ratzlaff in the Herald and the Voice. Ratzlaff argued that

the state derives its authority by virtue of the force it commands....Paul (Romans 13) asserts that authority is bestowed by God on the state to be used in the regulation of a sinful society, and bold indeed must be the man who asserts himself to be God's instrument of vengeance on such a society....We certainly admit that 'the state is capable of providing a community of order,' but we also insist that it is 'incapable of providing a community₃₃ of love,' which is the level on which the disciple must walk.

Ratzlaff appealed to the example of the Anabaptists who refused to become magistrates both because that would have required the use of force and because non-Christians could just as readily function in such offices. Some years later, Ratzlaff argued as follows:

Empirically, the state (in whatsoever form—whether the Kaiser Kurios, the Heil Hitler, or the Oath of Allegiance) has shown itself hostile to God. It has recognized that God's totalitarian claim on the life of the believer is not compatible with its own. Under past or present formulations of the 'state,' no state can consciously admit that it is at the basis of its institution not supreme....Hence, an element of totalitarianism exists in every political formulation, although such an element is reached much sooner in some formulations than in others....

There are, then, ultimately the two kingdoms, the two cities—even the theocratic state, that claims it rules as of God, is placing its role as interpreter above that of God as sovereign of history.³⁴

The influence of younger Mennonite theologians like John Howard Yoder is clearly evident here.

The only other major attempt to articulate a theology of church and state to appear in MB periodicals was by John H. Redekop, particularly in two articles, one in 1966 and the other in 1977. In the first, Redekop distinguished two approaches by MB's in the previous two decades. One approach viewed the two orders of church and state as basically in opposition to each other and therefore called on Christians to be separate and non-involved. The other, which Redekop labeled the minority view, believed that God's cause had much in common with democracy and capitalism and therefore presumed that God could be served well by serving one's country. Redekop proposed a third alternative which recognized that "government still rests ultimately on coercion and violence" but that many functions such as education, social welfare, etc., were of a positive nature and therefore could be supported by Christians. Then, in a somewhat Niebuhrian manner, Redekop used the oft-repeated argument that we are a part of society and determine public policy whether we like it or not. He therefore called for a qualified cooperation with government and a Christian witness which would call government to the highest ethic possible.³⁵

The second article, commissioned by the Board of Reference and Counsel of the General Conference of MB Churches, was addressed principally to the question of the Christian in politics. Redekop sought first to clarify his view of the relationship between church and state. God did not create the civil order, he claimed, but permitted it to evolve. The state is a mixture of good and evil and one of its major functions "is to restrain evil so that life in the sub-Christian society is at least tolerable and, more importantly, so that the church can carry out its divine function and mandate."³⁶ Redekop rejected both Lutheran "two regimentism" and Calvinist theocracy as methods of relevant participation and repeated that non-involvement was not

re-type

a real option. Therefore "selective involvement" based on cooperation with non-Christians "in order to serve fellowman provided that in doing so we do not violate our over-riding Christian commitment." The possibility of selective involvement was based on what Redekop referred to as a "qualified two-kingdom thesis," which did not see the two realms as mutually exclusive. All of these assumptions were elaborated on elsewhere.³⁷ Some years later, in an essay in Kingdom, Cross and Community, Redekop elaborated particularly on his view that the modern state has been transformed and therefore the nature of the Christian's involvement needs to be reassessed.³⁸ In 1978, writing on the fourteenth article of the revised Confession of Faith, Redekop reiterated that the state was permitted to evolve because of man's sin to maintain law and order. The state also exists "to promote public welfare".³⁹ Thus it is a mixture of good and evil and the Christian duty is to cooperate with the good wherever possible. He warned against identifying Christianity with any one state or political ideology, against asking governments "to transform into law all our notions of morality" and against the claims of a civil religious state.⁴⁰ Redekop's analysis represents a significant attempt to reconcile elements of John Howard Yoder's position with a positive conception of the nature of modern government.

The above represent the major attempts to articulate a theology of church-state relationships in the MB constituency, particularly in Canada. Other views were obviously expressed, less systematically and often by implication rather than explicitly. The discussion below will reveal some of these less explicit assumptions. Brief reference should be made, however, to the Kauffman-Harder study and its findings on MB attitudes toward the state (Note: the responses include MBs in U.S.A. and Canada). The study revealed that 86% of MB's disagreed with the statement that "the state...is basically an evil force in the world, an opponent or enemy of the church and its program."⁴¹ This percentage was the highest of all the Mennonite groups and would seem to suggest that the MB's have a totally different conception of government than the one commonly attributed to sixteenth century Anabaptists.

Political Participation

Political participation at higher levels of government seems first to have become a serious practical concern for MBs in the middle 60s, and peaked as an issue by the middle 70s. Although MBs took part in serious discussion prior to this time (see e.g. the extensive dialogue in the Canadian Mennonite) and a number undoubtedly ran unsuccessfully as candidates for political parties, the first MB to be elected either provincially or federally was apparently Ray Ratzlaff of Linden, Alberta in 1968. However, in 1962 the Herald already carried an article by Bert Huebner entitled, "Why

Should a Christian be Interested in Politics."⁴² Huebner, who was President of the Elmwood Progressive Conservative Association in Winnipeg, contested the nomination for the party in one of the provincial constituencies, but was unsuccessful. He lamented the fact that traditionally Mennonites were not active in politics.

By 1966 the General Conference of Mennonite Brethren Churches had put forth the first statement regarding political involvement since 1890.⁴³ After a brief historical preamble, a set of basic principles for Christian political involvement was given and then some specific practical guidelines were suggested. The statement contrasted the state as a "sword-bearing authority" with the church as a "Cross-bearing community," but nevertheless allowed for a "middle ground" with significant opportunity for involvement. Such involvement must be "selective," "redemptive," and "prophetic." Specifically, members were called on to pray for government and to focus on the priority of the Kingdom of Christ. The church was not to ally itself with any specific political ideology or seek to defend a particular political system. "Super-patriotism" and "militant nationalism" were to be avoided and Christians were to be "constructively" critical of the political order." Lastly, it stated as follows:

We believe that it is proper for Christians to vote, to exert influence on government officials (provided that neither means nor ends are unchristian), and also under special conditions to stand for political office if neither the attempt to gain the position or the exercise of its functions requires a compromise of Christian ethics (Colossians 3:17).⁴⁴

This carefully qualified statement undoubtedly reflected the considerable unease about such political participation felt by many Conference leaders and others.

An article in the 18 April 1969 issue of the Herald, which focused on the election of Ray Ratzlaff to the Alberta Legislature was the first to deal with the issue as a fait accompli rather than as a merely theoretical question.⁴⁵ Ratzlaff gave his reasons for entering politics, stressing the importance of human relationships and the necessity of exerting Christian influence in society. He was critical of traditional Mennonite tendencies either to migrate when faced with an unfavorable political situation or to engage in civil disobedience. The latter was obviously a reference to developments of the 1960s.

The occasion at which Ratzlaff expressed his views was a Pastors'/Laymen's Conference hosted by MBBC in 1969. The predominance of political issues at that meeting is indicative of the new interest in politics at the time. Several other speakers expressed their own views about political participation. Walter Kehler, one of the first MB lawyers, defended his role in organizational activity for political parties and stated that he had been involved with one political party for about fifteen years.⁴⁶

He referred specifically to the opportunity to create a better society as a significant motive for his involvement.

In Ontario the issue of political participation was obviously also a live one, although at that time apparently only in terms of regional government. Two MBs, Jake Froese and Wilbert Dick, were elected to the regional government at Niagara-on-the-Lake. In an interview Froese indicated that the question of participation was a matter between the individual and God and spoke of his own concern with the issue of land taxes.⁴⁷

Back in Manitoba, the candidacy of Alfred Penner for the PC Party became a concern particularly for the River East MB Church where Penner was a member. A Sunday evening discussion at the church, involving a panel of various resource people, focused on the question of political participation. Penner claimed that "evangelicals have too long stayed out of political affairs." He contrasted the totalitarian government of Paul's day with the modern democratic state and appealed to Old Testament examples like those of Joseph and Daniel as pointing to the need for men of integrity in government. He received some support for his view from Victor Adrian and others, whereas some displayed a more traditional pessimism about government and cautioned against the tendency to become involved simply for pragmatic reasons.⁴⁸

The 1972 federal election may be regarded as the real watershed in terms of MB involvement in politics. In that year the first MB was elected as a Member of Parliament. Whatever claims, implicit or explicit, there may have been that local and provincial government did not impinge on fundamental Mennonite concerns regarding involvement in the state, such as the issue of coercion, such claims could not apply to federal government. Mennonite Brethren were now in top places of authority and had to face the church-state issue head-on.

An editorial by Peter Klassen aptly showed the transformation that had taken place in the MB community, from a hesitant exercise of the franchise to direct participation in government. Klassen endorsed such participation on the basis of a growing awareness of the social implications of the gospel. Canada afforded a unique opportunity for Christians to put Christian principles into action, he stated. Therefore he called for Christians "to support Christian [MB?] candidates who feel called of God to enter the political realm."⁴⁹

Significantly, it was 1972 that the Kauffman-Harder study was carried out. According to the survey, 98% of MBs agreed that Christians should vote and 84% favored political participation (holding government office at various levels).⁵⁰ These figures were not significantly different from the GCMC, but were significantly different from the MC.

When Jake Epp was elected as the MP for the Provencher riding in Manitoba, the

e
type

e-type
Herald gave considerable publicity to the event. It referred to the fact that Epp's home congregation gave its enthusiastic support for his endeavor. Philosophically, Epp was characterized as "very much a free enterprize politician" who believed strongly in the work ethic and believed that political discussions "must finally be related to fundamental principles of right and wrong which have their root in a divine order."⁵¹

Such involvement at the top levels generated considerable discussion in subsequent years, as was reflected by letters to the editor in the Herald. An incident in the Rossmere constituency in Winnipeg heightened the concern of many. John Regehr argued that Jesus stood "above political parties," that politics is divisive for the church, and that the witness of the church is often compromised by such involvement.⁵² In response (Mrs.) Allen Engel, wife of the MLA (NDP) for Woodrow, appealed to examples of political leaders in the Old Testament, and called for more "godly representation [to] keep this an unashamedly Christian country."⁵³ Another generally concurred with Regehr but pled for exceptions because "we know that God has at times called his servants to serve in difficult positions and to do strange things."⁵⁴ Another article accurately summarized the state of affairs under the title, "Mennonites Divided on Political Activism."⁵⁵

By the time of the 1974 election the trend toward increasing political participation had clearly been established, despite the lack of consensus on the theological issues involved. According to the Herald a total of 17 Mennonites were involved as candidates in the election, although only 6 were elected, both MB candidates (both PC's) were elected.⁵⁶ The trend was established clearly enough so that an article in 1975 could be entitled "Canadian Mennonites Leave 400-year Tradition."⁵⁷

e-type
In response to questions concerning the basis for his involvement, Jake Epp stated, "If a Christian feels that it is God's will that he enter politics, where he can give a moral dimension to the public life and specifically his service, then the scruples about Mennonite tradition disappear."⁵⁸ Dean Whiteway (Selkirk), whose background was non-Mennonite, asserted that he had entered politics without scruples. "I believe God leads men into politics and government offices as he leads them into other ministries," he stated. "My 'special' mandate from God is to serve as an MP."⁵⁹

Such developments called for a response by the Mennonite Brethren constituency as a whole. Although the major concern undoubtedly related to the Canadian situation, action to define the Church's position was taken by the Board of Reference and Council of the General Conference. The paper which was commissioned by the Board has already been referred to earlier, and the specifics will not be rehearsed here except as they relate specifically to participation in government. Redekop based his call for selective involvement on his conviction that the function of government had changed, that the distinction between those governing and those governed was becoming increasingly

blurred, and that total non-involvement was not a real option. Nevertheless, he voiced serious concerns about involvement at higher levels of government, citing such issues as party platforms which might create a quandry for Christians and the rigid party control which existed particularly in Canada. He summarized the problems by stating, "I am hard-pressed to cite instances in which elected Christians have consistently brought Anabaptist principles to bear on political issues."⁶⁰

Having warned about the dangers of involvement, Redekop still allowed for the possibility that God would call some to involvement. Again, the primary appeal was to the Old Testament, and Redekop admitted to the difficulty of finding a New Testament basis. He argued that we must not limit God, however, and modern leaders like Robert Thompson and Ernest C. Manning attested to the possibility of maintaining a Christian witness in such a situation. The challenge was to retain a stance of Christian criticism and avoid a mere chaplaincy role.⁶¹

Redekop's position, as qualified as it was, nevertheless marked a significant shift from a position he had defended earlier in an article in the Canadian Mennonite. There Redekop had argued (as a former party member) that usually Christians don't christianize a party; rather the party tends to secularize the Christian. All parties, he said, had elements that were incompatible with Christianity and it would be dishonest to join without subscribing to them. In an unqualified manner he had concluded at that time that a "born-again believer can serve only in local government or as an independent member of the opposition."⁶²

The 1979 and 1980 elections brought more MB candidates into politics and further discussions about the nature and reasons for such involvement. In an interview with the Herald, Jake Epp repeated his conviction that God had placed him in Ottawa.⁶³ He admitted that the issue of party loyalty could be a problem but stated that it was not as crucial while a member of the opposition party. That escape of being a member of the opposition party, of course, was soon to disappear for Epp. Not only was his party elected into office but Epp himself became a member of the Cabinet, the first Mennonite to hold such a position in Canada. In tracing his own development, Epp referred to the influence of his father (an MB minister), Edmund Burke, the Clapham group, and Old Testament biblical heroes who had public roles. He then continued:

Solomon was described as possibly one of the wisest men who ever lived, and yet he was a follower-servant of God. Whenever the people of Israel flourished, economically and politically, why did they flourish? They were following Jehovah and his teachings. When they strayed from that, destruction came upon them. The best formula for a nation is still found in II Chronicles 7:14:...It's an individual thing, first of all, but the faithfulness of the individual has impact on the nation. Then God makes a covenant: I will hear from heaven. I will forgive their sin—again, first

x
type

e-type
of all personal. And then what? I will heal their land. I haven't found a better blueprint yet, than that. And that⁶⁴ basically has been the guideline I have been trying to follow.

Other MB candidates in the 1979 election were John Reimer (Kitchener), Dean Whiteway (Selkirk) and Jake Froese (Niagara-on-the-Lake). All were PC's and only Dean Whiteway lost the election. Thus there were three MBs in Parliament for a brief period. Reimer stated that his interest in public life had been generated by a leading MB minister, and indicated his desire to witness in public life with honesty and integrity, focussing on issues like abortion.⁶⁵ Whiteway's record indicated a particular concern with moral issues like pornography and abortion and their impact on society. Froese, on the other hand, seemed more concerned about issues like economics and law and order.⁶⁶ The premise underlying most of these was probably that a Christian could make a unique impact on crucial issues in society by becoming directly involved in government. In the 1980 election, there were 5 MB candidates, three PC's and two Liberals (Dave Wiebe, St. Catherines, and Jack Suderman, Fraser Valley East). Only Jake Epp was elected.

e-type
By the end of the decade of the 70s, MB involvement in politics could more or less be taken for granted. An editorial in April 1979 summarized what was probably the conviction of most. Although Mennonites had traditionally had "a strong feeling against involvement in politics," this was fortunately changing, the editor remarked.⁶⁷ There was finally a recognition that MBs were part of the political order whether they wanted to be or not and therefore they might as well make their impact in the most effective way. The greater the difficulty the greater the challenge for the Christian!

Political Ideologies and Issues 15

In the period following 1957 particular party ideologies and issues came much more clearly into focus than previously. Whereas in the earlier period the predominant issues were the policies regarding Mennonite immigration, nonresistance, and religious freedom (i.e., very inward-looking), the later period reflects a much broader and more sophisticated approach to the political questions on the whole.

One issue which surfaced quite a number of times was simply whether a candidate was a Christian or not, regardless of his political allegiance and ideology. A letter to the Rundschau in 1962 deplored the fact that Robert Thompson had been omitted in a news feature regarding the other three party leaders, especially in view of the fact that Thompson was a Christian.⁶⁸ The editor responded by publishing an excerpt of an article in which Thompson's role as a missionary and church leader was described.⁶⁹ An advertisement in the same issue referred to Thompson as a man with a

re-type
firm trust in God. A short time later a reader from British Columbia requested that the paper carry reports "about our beloved, Christian MB, Mr. Alexander Bill Patterson."⁷⁰ Party advertisements often exploited this aspect, but whereas Patterson himself was a minister and missionary, advertisements focussing on Lester B. Pearson could only manage a somewhat far-fetched appeal to the fact that Pearson's father was a Methodist pastor. An editorial in the Herald in 1965 called on readers to support men "who honour God, recognize the presence and authority of divine law, and who seek divine direction."⁷¹ A letter to the editor in the Rundschau in 1968 referred to Canada as a Christian land and called on Christians to support the party and candidates which support and defend Christian principles.⁷² In 1972, J.H. Redekop wrote that he heartily supported "Christians who try sincerely to apply Christ's teachings in the realm of public life" and added, "Indeed...I support them even if normally I would not support the party."⁷³ Despite such statements, Redekop in another article warned against voting only on the basis of the religious views of the candidate. What if all voters functioned that way, he asked. Government should not be used as a means to achieve Christian purity in a country.⁷⁴

re-type
Another frequently recurring issue was that of an individual's or a party's orientation toward Communism. Inevitably, this related particularly to the CCF or NDP. The most heated debate concerning the issue is reflected in the Rundschau in 1963. The debate was touched off by an NDP advertisement carried in the 19 December 1962 issue.⁷⁵ The advertisement, sponsored by Erhard Regier, greeted readers and expressed the hope "that the message of the carpenter of Nazareth would be heeded." One reader found it imponderable (himmelschreiend) "how our people have deteriorated since they came from Russia."⁷⁶ The reader claimed that his own father had been murdered by the Communists in Russia; now such people were supported by Mennonites. In response the editor wondered whether the reader was implying that Regier was a Communist. Somewhat caustically he added, "that we regretably didn't realize; but we are grateful for the information."⁷⁷

A series of letters and editorial responses followed. The NDP Party was referred to as anti-American, pro-Castro, anti-religious and as Communists under another guise. In response the editor referred to the positive experience of Saskatchewan under a CCF government, and refused to concede that NDP candidates were Communists. Nevertheless, he warned that "moderate socialists often forget that if Communists take over by force, the NDP will also be liquidated, often first."⁷⁸ Despite repeated calls by the editor to end the debate, readers continued to vent their feelings about the issue and the Rundschau discontinued carrying NDP advertisements. In fact, all political advertising seems to have ceased in the Rundschau at about this time, probably because of the sensitivity of the issue.

The issue of Communism surfaced for a second time as a major issue in 1968 in

connection with Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau and his alleged sympathies with Communism. A smear campaign apparently penetrated many MB churches, and pamphlets alleging that Trudeau was a Communist were widely circulated. An editorial lamented these developments and cited specific evidence against the allegations.⁷⁹ One reader deplored the compromise of the traditional separation of church and state by means of such a smear campaign.⁸⁰

Despite the evidence to the contrary, there was a lingering suspicion that Trudeau was sympathetic to the Communists. Both the Liberal Party and the NDP Party probably failed to win significant support from MB's because of this issue.⁸¹

The question of party ideology in a more general sense received significant attention throughout the period. A number of articles and "Personal Opinion" columns by John H. Redekop dealt with the issues involved as objectively as possible and without a clear stated preference for a particular party. The first such article appeared in connection with the election in June 1962.⁸² Other articles by Redekop appeared on 29 March 1963, 6 November 1964, 28 October 1977, and 27 April 1979.

Redekop analyzed the parties or political ideologies and pointed to some of the implications for Christians. Conservatism was characterized as placing high value on hierarchical authority, order and stability, equality of opportunity rather than equality of wealth and status, personal accountability, human freedom, patriotism, individualism, etc. Its pessimistic view of human nature, its belief in absolutes, its individualism, and its hierarchical view of authority were considered basically compatible with Christianity, whereas its patriotism, materialism, and its somewhat selfish and unhumanitarian stance created tension with the Christian faith. Liberalism was described as more pragmatic and more optimistic in its view of human nature. Its humanitarian and internationalistic outlook and its emphasis on the dignity of individuals were seen as compatible with Christianity whereas its lack of acknowledgement of the depravity of man and its lack of a clear value system was problematic for Christians.⁸³

In general, Redekop decried the tendency of viewing conservative Christianity and conservative politics as fundamentally compatible.⁸⁴ Neither general political ideologies nor specific political parties could be identified as Christian, despite the fact that some parties had sought to identify themselves with Christianity.⁸⁵ Redekop also warned against identifying the NDP with Communism and argued that it espoused some values which were "eminently praiseworthy."⁸⁶ "In fact," he stated, "a strong case can be made that at least theoretically true socialism has close ideological ties with some of the basic values held by the New Testament Church."

Aside from Redekop's contributions, the only other solicited article in the focusing on "how to vote" was an article by John A. Toews in 1965.⁸⁷ Toews

warned against an identification with a particular political ideology and listed the factors of religious freedom, social justice, and international peace as the major ones bearing on the decision of which party to vote for.

Editorials were seldom very explicit in their reference to political issues. An editorial in 1968 called for preaching the message of individual redemption rather than becoming advocates of social change.⁸⁸ Somewhat in contrast, in 1977 the editor stated, "One of the things that troubles me...is that we are far more concerned with power and the protection of our privilege, than we are with justice, human need, and the protection of the rights of the helpless."⁸⁹ Although he agreed that Christians should be concerned about socialists, he was convinced that we should also be concerned about conservatives who might be preoccupied with such things as the removal of restrictions on land use, etc.

When the above is compared with reader responses and candidates' orientations, a somewhat different picture emerges. Several readers responded to Redekop's 1962 article. One felt that the depiction of the NDP as favoring the ownership of all the means of production was unfair.⁹⁰ Another suggested that the political parties had been depicted in too static terms; specific views such as international relations and food aid should be considered.⁸¹ One reader wrote to the Rundschau during the 1965 campaign and described the issues and policies as they related to each of the four parties. He clearly favored the Liberal Party, although largely on the basis of traditional Mennonite reasons.⁹² An editorial by Henry F. Klassen in the same issue warned against voting for parties that promised too much and stated that social welfare programs should only be implemented to the extent that the economy could afford it.⁹³ A letter in the Herald in 1968 called for "law and order" and argued that Canada's national prosperity would depend on the degree to which religious and moral values were upheld.⁹⁴ Another reader objected to this "worshipping at the state's shrine" and warned against the danger of using religion in an idolatrous way.⁹⁵

A relative homogeneity has prevailed with respect to the political orientations of successful MB candidates. The four who have at some time been elected to Parliament all ran for the Progressive Conservatives, and the only other two known candidates who were nominated as party representatives for a constituency were Liberals. Provincially, the only successful candidates have apparently been Ray Ratzlaff (SC) and Allan Engel (NDP). Thus there appears to be an overwhelming tendency toward a conservative political philosophy among MB candidates. The issues that were mentioned most frequently as concerns by the candidates were the presence of an evangelical witness in Ottawa, concern for law, order, and morality (including issues such as abortion, homosexuality, pornography, etc.), and the preservation of the free-enterprize system and economic well-being of the country. Less frequently

mentioned were such issues as peace-keeping, social justice, prison reform, native concerns, refugee problems, etc. The theme of Canada as a Christian nation emerged repeatedly, as was true in letters of readers of the Herald and the Rundschau.

It is interesting to note by way of contrast the political orientations of candidates from other Mennonite groups. A complete catalogue cannot be given, but according to a report carried by the Herald in 1974 there were two Liberals, three NDPs, five SCs, two PCs and one Communist in the list of candidates with a Mennonite background.⁹⁵ Not all, of course, were active Mennonites.

The Kaufmann-Harder study (1972) relating to political party preferences revealed that 39% of MBs in Canada favored the PC, 32% the SC, 23% the Liberals, and 5% the NDP.⁹⁶ Thus there was a strong orientation toward political conservatism among MBs. This was significantly different from the GCMC where the corresponding party preferences were 41% PC, 14% SC, 35% Liberal, and 10% NDP. The combined percentage of MBs favoring the PC and SC parties was 71%, whereas the corresponding figure for the GCMC was only 55%.

Concluding Observations

1. Fragmentation Among MBs Today.

There are today at least three or four discernable positions on the church-state issue among MBs. To some extent the traditional position of seeking to be separate and politically non-involved still lives on, particularly within the older generation. The younger generation, however, has by and large rejected that position and has either sought to apply some of the insights of Anabaptism in a new way or has rejected the validity and application of Anabaptist insights almost entirely. Most of the latter seem to have adopted a modified theocratic, transformationist,⁹⁷ or triumphalist conception which has much in common with Calvinistic-Puritan ideals of a Christian society and which along with a large segment of American evangelicalism is quite conservative in politics and economics and advocates political involvement. It should perhaps not come as much of a surprise that the Mennonitism that developed a state within a state in Russia, found that it had much in common with Calvinism, although it lacked a theology to undergird it.

Among the "revisionist" Anabaptists two types can be differentiated:

1) A group which is quite pessimistic about the possibility of Christian influence through formal political structures and is basically concerned about influencing society from the outside and creating new models as witnesses to society. Seeking to "manage" society is often seen as the least effective way of witnessing to the world.

2) A group which is more open and social-reform minded, frequently leftist in

politics and critical of evangelical theology. Political involvement is viewed as highly desirable, but more as a "revolutionary" force which exposes the many subtle forms of violence within society. Few advocates of this position are found among MBs.

2. "Withdrawal" vs. "Involvement"

MBs have been caught in a false perception of the meaning of their so-called traditional "strategy of withdrawal" and hence also of the options available to them. Redekop best articulates the options of "withdrawal" and "involvement" and, after exploding the myth of withdrawal, is left with making a case for selective involvement, perceived as a middle-of-the-road position on the continuum. However, the categories themselves appear to be theologically and historically deficient, and based to a considerable extent on a Niebuhrian-type analysis. The traditional Mennonite withdrawal becomes a denial of the social meaning of Christian love and to the extent that Mennonites don't recognize it they become guilty of the terrible sin of pride.⁹⁸ The categories that Stayer uses in his Anabaptists and the Sword create similar problems. If the options are limited to "crusading," "realpolitical," and "apolitical" approaches, then the primary question becomes one of degree of involvement.⁹⁹

If the nature of the debate is changed from the "withdrawal-involvement" model to one which focuses on the dynamic of involvement, perhaps the impasse can be broken and we will not have to be caught between the seeming irrelevance of withdrawal and the Puritan temptation to manage society. The problem is not the whether or the how much but rather the how. What posture must Christianity adopt to be true to the gospel? When the question is posed that way the result is not simply a catalogue of those activities which Christians can legitimately participate in. Yoder's discussion of the "politics of Jesus" is one serious attempt to shift the ethical concern toward the nature of involvement and away from the whether.¹⁰⁰ The result is not necessarily a ruling out of participation in government, but it departs significantly from the Puritan conception of such involvement toward a servanthood model which sees the Cross, a symbol of defeat in the world's terms, as the only sure way to victory. There is therefore more concern about method than about ends, more concern about doing the right thing than about making it come out right. At the same time, doing the right thing is the best guarantee that the right ends will be accomplished.

At one level Redekop's assessment of the noninvolvement model is the best confirmation of the inadequacy of his own categories. Redekop repeatedly asserts that noninvolvement is not possible and that "attempted withdrawal cannot be equated with irrelevance." When "withdrawal" is politically relevant, he asserts. This is precisely the point. If non-voting is politically relevant, it does not follow that it

is the wrong kind of relevance. Refusal to vote can be construed as a means of positive witness.¹⁰² Redekop therefore only proves that any stance we take is politically relevant, but he does not prove that exercising the franchise or participation in government is a more positive form of political relevance. If Redekop believed that Christians should vote en bloc, there might at least be a partial basis for his conclusions, but he repudiates any such attempt.

3. Modern Government.

There can be no question that the nature of modern democratic government such as the one in Canada is significantly different from the nature of government in New Testament times, in sixteenth century Europe, or in nineteenth century Russia. The degree of involvement in social welfare and education, the extent of government spending of our tax money, the blurring of distinctions between governed and those governing, etc., are all factors. The nature and the extent to which such issues impinge on a "two-kingdom" thesis, however, requires further analysis. How much change is necessary before active participation in government is desirable? Or does the modern situation lead us to reinterpret the biblical texts bearing on this issue?

4. The Place of the Old Testament.

Anabaptists have generally derived their major ethical principles from the New Testament. Evangelicals, on the other hand, have tended to read the Bible as a "flat book" and derived ethical guidelines more indiscriminately from Old and New Testaments. For obvious reasons, political ethics among evangelicals derives much of its content from the Old Testament. Where active participation in government is advocated among MBs, the tendency toward reliance on the Old Testament is similarly evident. Israel becomes a type for modern-day nations, and Joseph, Daniel, and others become models for government leaders. Without rejecting the relevance of the Old Testament for political action, a clearer analysis of our hermeneutical method is needed.

5. Christian Witness in Society.

There is a strong concern evident among MBs for a positive witness in society at all levels. This concern focuses especially on personal moral issues such as abortion, homosexuality, pornography, etc., and perhaps less frequently on social issues such as prison reform, native rights, etc. There is also considerable concern for a public acknowledgement of the Christian religion as basic for our society and its values, whether this be by means of religious exercises in schools or in some other way. The sentiment that Canada is a "Christian" country was frequently expressed or implied. The problem of avoiding the idolatry implicit in such a statement is a

difficult one. How can we make this country more Christian without falling prey to the belief that a country can ever be Christian? How can we raise the moral level of people in our society without imposing our morals upon them in a way which does violence to the gospel?

6. Vocational Decision-Making.

There was considerable emphasis on personal guidance by God into partisan political involvement, often with a corresponding lack of emphasis on seeking that guidance in the context of the brotherhood, either locally or more generally. In several instances the issue of personal guidance appeared to be used to avoid having to answer fundamental issues. Those who questioned the legitimacy of political involvement were presuming to challenge the guidance of the Spirit of God. It should be noted that several candidates sought and received strong support from their own local churches and that in several instances the references to personal guidance were made by non-candidates. It is nevertheless troubling to see the principle used as one which overrides other considerations and to provide immunity from brotherly advice or admonition.

7. Evangelicalism and Conservative Political Ideology.

Officially the MB Conference has always warned against identifying with a particular party's ideology. In practice, however, MBs have increasingly identified themselves with a conservative political ideology.¹⁰³ In this they seem to have followed the pattern of large segments of American evangelicalism, a tendency which is not as evident among the GCMC. Why is this so? Is a shift in our theology involved and, if so, is it to be viewed positively or negatively? Or is it that MBs are just now beginning to think in terms of ideology rather than in terms of self-interest (privileges such as immigration and exemption from military service)? Under what kind of political ideology are Christian values best preserved? If either a conservative or a socialist ideology best preserves Christian values, is it not the Church's duty to formally promote it? Why should church and state be separate? Should we not organize the way many churches in the United States did in support of the moral majority?

The dilemma of not being able to opt out of society on the one hand (the apolitical option) and not wishing to fall prey to a new Constantinianism on the other hand, is a very serious one facing MBs today. It touches not only the issues discussed above but a range of other issues, including the recent concern about the role of MCC. Unless we come to a clearer consensus as a Church, our witness will be increasingly fragmented.

Endnotes

Abbreviations: Mennonitische Rundschau = MR
Mennonite Brethren Herald = MBH

1. The Schleithem Confession, trans. and ed. John Howard Yoder (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1973), p. 14.
2. See e.g. James M. Stayer, Anabaptists and the Sword, 2d ed. (Lawrence, KS: Lawrence Press, 1976), pp. 309ff.
3. John C. Wenger, ed., The Complete Writings of Menno Simons (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1956), p. 193.
4. Thomas G. Sanders, Protestant Concepts of Church and State (New York: Holt, Rinehard & Winston, 1964), p. 83.
5. Calvin Redekop, "Religion and Society: A State Within a Church," Mennonite Quarterly Review, 47 (October 1973): 339-57.
6. John A. Toews, A History of the Mennonite Brethren Church: Pilgrims and Pioneers (Fresno, CA: Board of Christian Literature, General Conference of Mennonite Brethren Churches, 1975), p. 344.
7. We Recommend...: Recommendations and Resolutions of the General Conference of the Mennonite Brethren Churches, compiled by A.E. Janzen and Herbert Giesbrecht (Fresno, CA: Board of Christian Literature, 1978), p. 79.
8. Ibid., p. 184.
9. Ibid.
10. History of the Mennonite Brethren Church, p. 345.
11. See e.g. MR, 23 May 1945, p. 5 and 30 May 1945, p. 5.
12. MR, 11 May 1949, p. 8 and 18 May 1949, p. 8.
13. MR, 5 June 1957, p. 16.
14. MR, 6 June 1945, p. 8.
15. MR, 22 June 1949, p. 4.
16. "Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent, Q.C., Kanadas Premierminister," MR, 8 May 1957, p. 16.
17. "Unser Premier Minister," MR, 6 June 1945, p. 2.
18. MR, 20 June 1945, p. 4.
19. MR, 27 April 1949, p. 1.
20. "Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent," MR, 8 May 1957, p. 16.
21. Konferenz-Jugendblatt, February-April 1949, p. 62.

22. Mennonite Observer, 14 June 1957, p. 9.
23. Guy F. Hershberger, War, Peace and Nonresistance (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1968). Hershberger virtually rules out any major executive, legislative or judicial position. Cf. pp. 162 ff.
24. See e.g. John A. Toews, True Nonresistance Through Christ (Winnipeg: Board of General Welfare and Public Relations, 1955), pp. 18, 19, 45, 46.
25. "Worldview," 9 February 1962, p. 2.
26. John A. Toews, "Can the Christian Participate in Government?" Voice 7 (January-February 1958): 4.
27. Ibid., p. 5.
28. Ibid., p. 6.
29. Ibid., p. 7.
30. Ibid., p. 4.
31. Ibid.
32. John A. Toews, "Only Partial Participation," MBH, 2 July 1965, p. 8.
33. See e.g., "The Christian and Politics," MBH, 27 April 1962, p. 6; "The Christians Participation in Politics" (Unpublished paper, January 1976); "Involvement in the Political Order" (Unpublished paper, April 1977).
34. "How About Caesar?" Voice 17 (September-October 1968): 8-13.
35. "Church and State: A Fresh Look," MBH, 21 January 1966, pp. 7, 19.
36. "How to be a Christian in Politics," MBH, 28 October 1977, pp. 6-8.
37. Making Political Decisions: A Christian Perspective, Focal Pamphlet No. 23 (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1972).
38. "The State and the Free Church," in Kingdom, Cross and Community; Essays on Mennonite Themes in Honor of Guy F. Hershberger, ed. John R. Burkholder and Calvin Redekop (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1976), pp. 179-195.
39. "The Church and the State," MBH, 6 January 1978, pp. 18, 19.
40. Ibid., p. 19.
41. J. Howard Kauffman and Leland Harder, Anabaptists Four Centuries Later: A Profile of Five Mennonite and Brethren in Christ Denominations (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1975), p. 157.
42. MBH, 27 April 1962, p. 5.
43. We Recommend...; pp. 314-16.
44. Ibid.

45. "Political Life: We Took it as of the Lord," MBH, 8 April 1969, p. 18.
46. "My Political Interest," Voice 20 (October 1971): 13.
47. "Do Political Life and the Church Conflict," MBH, 12 December 1969, p. 23.
48. "Civil Servants or Politicians?" MBH, 11 December 1970, p. 21.
49. "A Time for Decisions," MBH, 20 October 1972, p. 11.
50. Anabaptists Four Centuries Later, p. 161.
51. "First MB in Parliament," MBH, 29 December 1972, p. 24.
52. "Politics Not for Christians," MBH, 24 August 1973, p. 7.
53. "Christian Politicians Needed," MBH, 21 September 1973, p. 9.
54. "Politicians and Students," MBH, 21 September 1973, p. 9.
55. MBH, 21 September 1973, pp. 13, 14.
56. "More Mennonites in Ottawa," MBH, 9 August 1974, p. 15.
57. John Dueck, "Canadian Mennonites Leave 400-Year Tradition," MBH, 28 November 1975, pp. 15-17.
58. Ibid., p. 15.
59. Ibid., p. 16.
60. "How to be a Christian in Politics," MBH, 28 October 1977, p. 8.
61. Ibid.
62. "Should a Christian Join a Political Party?" The Canadian Mennonite, 22 November 1957, p. 7.
63. "Christian Witness Growing in Ottawa," MBH, 27 April 1979, p. 6.
64. Ibid., p. 8.
65. "Thermostats Instead of Thermometers," MBH, 27 April 1979, p. 9.
66. "Canada Needs a Resurrected Morality," MBH, 27 April 1979, p. 10.
67. "A Case for Political Action," MBH, 27 April 1979, p. 13.
68. Letter to the editor by Frieda Penner, MR, 6 June 1962, p. 11.
69. Editor's response by Henry F. Klassen, Ibid., p. 11.
70. Letter to the editor by Jake Sawatsky, President of the Fraser Valley Social Credit Association, MR, 20 February 1963, p. 11.
71. "Promises, Promises, Promises," MBH, 29 October 1965, p. 3.

72. Anna Willms, "Gedanken über die Wahlen," MR, 19 June 1968, p. 15.
73. "Election 72," MBH, 20 October 1972, p. 10.
74. "Pierre and Patriotism," MBH, 12 July 1968, p. 2.
75. MR, 19 December 1962, p. 13.
76. Letter by J.P. Dyck, MR, 20 February 1963, p. 11.
77. Editorial response by H.F. Klassen, ibid.
78. Editorial response by H.F. Klassen, MR, 13 March 1963, p. 3.
79. "Participation in a Smeer Campaign," MBH, 28 June 1968, p. 3.
80. Letter to the editor by Peter Andres, MBH, 28 June 1968, p. 2.
81. See John H. Redekop, "Political Essays," MBH, 24 March 1972, p. 10.
82. "Which Political Party?" MBH, 8 June 1962, pp. 5-7.
83. Ibid.
84. "Evangelical Christianity and Political Ideology," MBH, 6 November 1964, p. 9.
85. "Which Political Party," p. 7.
86. "Christianity and Socialism," MBH, 14 May 1971, p. 10.
87. John A. Toews, "Issues for Christians on November 8," MBH, 22 October 1965, p. 8.
88. Harold Janz, "The Christian Message in a Time of Distress," MBH, 26 January 1968, p. 3.
89. Harold Janz, "Mennonites in Politics," MBH, 28 October 1977, p. 11.
90. Letter to editor by G.H. Enns, MBH, 15 June 1962, p. 2.
91. Ibid., pp. 2, 15.
92. Leser D., "Wie Wähle ich am 8 November 1965?" MR, 27 October 1965, p. 12.
93. Henry F. Klassen, "Wer sollte wählen, und wafur?" MR, 3 November 1965, p. 2.
94. "Religion, Morality, and National Strength," MBH, 31 May 1968, p. 24.
95. "More Mennonites in Ottawa," MBH, 9 August 1974, p. 15.
96. Anabaptist Four Centuries Later, p. 164.
97. See Sanders' analysis in Protestant Concepts of Church and State, pp. 225-280
98. See John Howard Yoder, The Christian Witness to the State (Newton, KA: Faith and Life Press, 1964) pp. 89-90.

99. Anabaptists and the Sword, p. 3.

100. John Howard Yoder, The Politics of Jesus (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1972).

101. "The Christian's Participation in Politics," p. 3.

102. Richard J. Mouw is right in his interpretation of Yoder's position on this point, Politics and the Biblical Drama (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1976) p. 102.

103. In a recent article John Howard Yoder argues that there is a serious problem of definition with respect to terms such as "conservative" and "radical," that "the present order" is never clearly one or the other, and that Christians can never answer with a simple "yes" or "no" to a given system. See "Mennonite Political Conservatism: Paradox or Contradiction," in Mennonite Images: Historical, Cultural, and Literary Essays Dealing with Mennonite Issues, ed. Harry Loewen (Winnipeg, MB: Hyperion Press, 1980), pp. 7-16.