

“Heroes or Yellow-bellies? Masculinity and the Conscientious Objector”

Marlene Epp, *University of Waterloo*

The following is a first-hand description of one particular campaign of the Second World War:

Last week this camp was a seething cauldron of excitement. A rumor had been spread that the first week of February would see us in action. However, beyond the wildest dreams and expectations of the most hopeful, orders were issued that today the zero hour had come. Everyone rushed to their posts and at the close of the first half day, no less than 64,000 trees were pulled, tied and heeled in, before the murderous onslaught. Due to the imminent danger of the attack being blunted, reinforcements were summoned from the Seymour camp, hastily assembled and with a minimum of training, rushed into the fray at the side of their comrades. The field was carried by storm. Tabulations on the last day of January show one million trees torn from their moorings, calmly awaiting shipment to the Island.¹

While the tone of the account might suggest that these are Canadians landing on the beaches of Normandy, they are in fact Canadian Alternative Service workers of the Second World War, embarking on a project of lifting tree seedlings on the mainland for reforestation on Vancouver Island. In an almost amusing account published in the Canadian Conscientious Objector newsletter, *The Beacon*, the conscientious objectors (COs) were likened to soldiers entering battle. The battleground analogy for tree-planting, along with the CO theme song, sung to

the tune of "It's a Long Way to Tipperary," as well as the COs who grew moustaches during the war so as to look more soldierly, are not just coincidental scenarios. They are, in fact, "ironic similarities," often ignored by historians of wartime pacifism, between the soldier in active military service and the nonresistant CO.² The likeness of experience between the soldier and CO that emerges from very different ideological positions is rooted, I believe, in common understandings of gender. It is this convergence that I would like to discuss here, at least in a preliminary way.

Examining the Mennonite CO is not a new topic.³ Analysing the historic peace church position using gender as a category of analysis is relatively new. I came to this topic as several of my paths of research and historical interest converged. On the one hand, my background in doing Mennonite history acquainted me with the themes and narratives of conscientious objection and alternative service, particularly those set in the Second World War era. My keen interest in women's history and my knowledge of the dramatic changes that occurred in women's lives during both world wars prompted me to ask, what did Mennonite women do in the war?⁴ Rachel Waltner Goossen has responded to this question in significant ways for the American setting.⁵ More recently, an interest in theories of gender construction and discourse, when applied to the histories of peace and war, have prompted more questions.

What occurred to me was this: if masculinity and militarism are intrinsically linked, at the level of practice, discourse and personal identity, what sort of gender construction, or deconstruction, occurs for males who resist societal norms with respect to military service.⁶ Were they heroes, 'warriors for pacifism,' if you will, or were they yellow-bellies, cowards, not 'real men.' They were likely both and neither. Within Mennonite communities COs were heroes of the faith (although I think there was also subtle admiration for the rebellious Mennonite soldier as well). In 'the world' the CO frequently had the opposite image, and countering the public image of nonresistant cowardice has been a major effort for the church. Undoubtedly there were contradictions for men whose self-identity as men bore little difference from societal norms, yet whose sectarian identity was very much at odds, especially during war. How they worked out those contradictions, practically and subconsciously, offers a fascinating illustration of how gender shapes self and group identity. My thoughts here are the results of a preliminary investigation and are based on source material that reflects mainly the Canadian situation in the Second World War.

In the past decade both men's studies and gender studies have followed the explosion of women's studies begun in the 1970s. As important and exciting as it has been to engage in the process of discovering, recovering and analysing women's lives, a problematic consequence has been the ongoing sense that gender belongs especially to women, that woman is, to use a 19th century dictum, 'the sex.' So long as male experience was free from gender analysis, men continued to represent the 'universal', the "effective measure of human-

ity.”⁷ All that is “enduringly human” as it has otherwise been put.⁸ Some women’s historians have condemned the shift in emphasis, arguing that men’s history has already been the norm for centuries and that a focus on gender is really just a reversion to androcentric analysis. But in the same way that the study of women has broken down historical stereotypes, separated prescription from real experience, and recognized a continuum of agency and victimization in women’s lives, the study of masculinity also has the potential to reveal men as beings of diversity, and not just a monolith of dominance.

Regardless of whether one approaches the study of gender from a social constructionist or an essentialist point of view, how individuals and communities behave in light of their understanding of male and female roles is fundamental to history. It is so fundamental, in fact, that it is quite often not taken seriously as scholarship. And while men are not as obviously under construction as gendered beings as are women—men are not objectified as ‘the other’—they nevertheless behave in ways that reflect or defy hegemonic cultural definitions of masculinity.

Because women as a sex have been problematized by theologians, scientists, philosophers and others throughout history, we have a great many sources on the nature of and proper societal role for women. It is more difficult to discern a discourse of masculinity from similar sources because male intellectuals did not problematize themselves—except to the point of recognizing perfection! Yet many prescriptive roles for men also exist—as warrior, as chivalrous knight, as lover, as intellectual, as father, as provider, as moral leader. And the list could go on.

Scholars of peace and war have been at the forefront of unravelling the threads of gender that run through their topics. There is a wealth of literature that investigates the links between war and patriarchy, that examines militarism as a “gendered process,” that debates the connections between maternalism and peacemaking, and that asks such provocative questions as Cynthia Enloe does: “Are UN Peacemakers Real Men?”⁹ The historical and theoretical discussion of war has received much greater attention than that of peace, in part because peace is defined as the negative of war, is the feminine absence of that which war represents—the active, heroic, and masculine.¹⁰

Much of the inquiry into gender, war and peace revolves around the dualities of masculinity/militarism and femininity/peacemaking. An extensive feminist scholarship has demonstrated levels of complexity in the impact of war on women’s lives. We know much about women’s activities in pacifist campaigns and also that women were also patriotic supporters of wars. We know that historically, war liberates women to enter the workforce, the military, and become lobbyists for peace. We know that the masculine rhetoric of soldiering undergirds the lifetime self-identity of many men and in fact undergirds the entire system of militarization. But what about peacemaking men? Jean Bethke Elshtain suggested, over a decade ago, that “Pacifist constructions reinforce and reaffirm dominant cultural images of women... but challenge masculine repre-

sentations, calling into question male identity as fighters, warriors, protectors.”¹¹ If this is so, Mennonite COs were not only departing from societal norms as sectarian pacifists, they were also rejecting one of the strongest qualities of being male.

Yet it's not quite so simple. While Mennonite churches offered teachings and guidance to young men on remaining true to nonresistant principles, they certainly did not attempt to relate the theology and doctrine to gender roles. And I think the argument could be made that much of what the Mennonites have modelled during the 20th century ascribes to dominant ideals about gender. Nonresistant teaching may have offered a nonconformist stance with respect to militarism, but it did not counter the male image of 'fighter, warrior, protector'. Ironically, recent research has shown that it was the secular peace movement which offered nonconforming views on gender and war. For instance, Frances H. Early's study of the First World War era reveals that feminist-pacifist activists—male and female—in their campaign to protect the civil liberties of American conscientious objectors, worked hard to counter the ideological linkage between soldiering and manliness.¹² Much of what Mennonitism reflected and reinforced, up to the 1970s, was representative of rigid gender roles and God-ordained hierarchies within the domestic sphere. In this context, young men had to work out the contradiction, in their real lives, between the ideal Mennonite pacifist and the ideal man. COs did this symbolically, by being 'mimetic warriors' while those who entered active military service consciously rejected the effeminate image that nonresistance seemed to represent.

Mennonite discourse on gender, for much of the twentieth century, reflected in large part the ideals of manly and womanly behaviour espoused by fundamentalism, in all its various forms. Both T.D. Regehr and Paul Toews have demonstrated how some aspects of fundamentalism shaped the North American Mennonite response to modernity at mid-century.¹³ Certainly Mennonites, both laity and leadership, embraced many aspects of the fundamentalist message that addressed gender roles. Dress codes, a fear of sexuality, a strict gendered hierarchy in the home, emphasis on biblical inerrancy, and the condemnation of modernism in other cultural matters—all these entered the Mennonite ethos in varying degrees.

Protestant fundamentalism, as a strong theological influence on Mennonites, also promoted what Mark W. Muesse describes as a “hypermasculinity” which attempted to counter a cultural perception that fundamentalist men were emasculated by their religious zeal and repressed sexuality. The exaggerated masculine qualities of the fundamentalist worldview included a militancy of language and also a high degree of competitiveness and aggression, applied most directly to church growth and personal conversions.¹⁴ Another feature of heightened masculinity amongst fundamentalist groups was the predominance of charismatic and authoritarian leaders (male), something the Mennonites could surely boast of until the 1960s.

Yet men of the peace churches inevitably must have experienced a certain contradiction between the messages that fundamentalist theology spoke to their manliness and the nonresistant message that was part of their Mennonite tradition. The "religious machismo" offered by fundamentalism was definitely at odds with the passivity implied in a nonresistant personality. The young Mennonite man who chose conscientious objection came face to face with the gender contradictions inherent in his pacifist position.

In order to narrow the gap in experience between the CO and the fighting soldier, the media and COs themselves used descriptive language and metaphor which likened Alternative Service to the military. The observation by Jean Bethke Elshtain that the CO often saw himself in "mimetic terms as the militant analogue of the violent warrior" seems especially apt when applied to the situation of COs in the Second World War.¹⁵ Many of the images that reflect this metaphor are drawn from sources related to Canadian COs working in the government-operated Alternative Service program, implemented in 1941. One aspect of this program saw about 1,000 COs drafted to camps on the mainland of British Columbia and on Vancouver Island, planting trees and fighting forest fires. The task of fighting forest fires in particular lent itself to images parallel to those associated with the combatant soldier. COs were described as "combatting" fires and "standing on guard" on the west coast. A photo caption of CO fire-fighters read: "Return journey, after several days of battling the blaze. These heroes feel a war weariness of their own."¹⁶ The fact that COs were initially stationed as fire-fighters on the coast because of a perceived military threat did in fact make them part of the military effort from a defensive perspective. It did not really matter that no bomb attack ever occurred. Even the dramatic account of one man's accomplishment felling a snag which measured fifteen feet in diameter at its widest point was thought to be a good story in later years when his children would ask, "Daddy, what did you do in the war?"¹⁷

Those aspects of service that put the CO 'in danger for the benefit of his country' most fittingly removed the stigma of cowardice and gave the CO the sense that he was not passive when his country was at war. This was true for Canadian Alternative Service workers as well as for conscientious objectors in the American Civilian Public Service (CPS) program. The extent to which a CO considered his task of 'national importance' was directly related to the physical challenges and danger involved and the courage required to meet the challenge. One CPSer was eager to leave hospital service for smokejumping, since he felt he had become "soft" after three years of indoor work.¹⁸ Another smokejumper said: "I did not want to jump out of an airplane, ... [but] I needed to demonstrate to myself that I had not taken my alternative service position to escape danger."¹⁹

Fighting fires and felling trees were not the only activities in which COs could exhibit their manly qualities of strength and courage. For some COs, sin was an enemy as threatening as the Nazis. Some camps had strongly evangelical factions which regularly sang hymns such as "Onward, Christian Soldiers" or "Soldiers for Christ," and which proselytized in nearby towns. One article in the

CO newsletter, *The Beacon*, responded to critical editorials which had appeared in British Columbia newspapers attacking the cowardliness of COs. The CO writer said, "We all wish as young men to be numbered among the brave and strong," and challenged COs to be like the biblical Samson, who had to kill a lion bare-handed before he could proceed with his life plans. Rather than killing lions (or Germans for that matter), the writer called on COs to aggressively attack the sin in their lives.²⁰

Other ironic similarities included the occasional interaction between COs and regular army personnel stationed on Vancouver Island. Sometimes they worked side by side on road or forest projects and sometimes CO camps would challenge army camps in sports. There was no hiding the tone of triumph when the COs won over the soldiers in games of softball and volleyball.²¹ Sports activities were important for alleviating boredom and were also a means for the CO to emphasize his virility. The camps far from home also gave Mennonites from conservative groups opportunity to engage in sports activities that were frowned upon at home. Apparently boxing and wrestling were popular past-times and may have been so because they were especially masculine sports which demonstrated aggression and fighting ability. According to one chronicler in *The Beacon*, "In one instance a man spent several weeks recuperating from cracked ribs received in boxing, and in another case the floor of a cabin needed to be replaced because of the vigor of the wrestling matches."²² Surely a 'masculine' culture developed in isolated Alternative Service camps as strong as any army barracks.

To emphasize further their masculinity and, perhaps, look more like soldiers, some COs grew moustaches in camp, a practice which would have been taboo in their home communities. One young man antagonized his parents by growing a moustache, which "makes me look more officious, and that's what a fellow needs in camp here." He obliged them and shaved it off, saying, "I'm sorry my little moustache hurt you so.... I can't see that there is anything unChristian about it."²³

The personal impulse and societal expectation that men protect and provide for their families presented another dilemma for COs and, in some circumstances, drew them away from alternative service and into active service. Some COs felt discomfort over a sense that they were not doing their part to protect the country. But feelings of emasculation were even stronger when men found they were unable to protect their families economically. The small remuneration received by Canadian conscientious objectors in World War II—fifty cents a day—created hardship for some families, particularly after March 1942, when Alternative Service terms were extended for the duration of the war. Although many married women became wage-earners at this time—which in itself deconstructed the gender order—some households had difficulty staying afloat without the support of a father, son, or husband. One young CO in camp wrote to the minister of his home church in a desperate tone, asking "what happened to the promises that were made to us before we left as far as support for our wives

goes or that they would be looked after.”²⁴ A group of CPSers in Michigan engaged in a hunger strike to protest the impoverishment of their families that resulted from the poor provisions for CO dependents.²⁵ Perhaps further undermining a man’s sense of himself as family provider were scenarios in which a CO from Ontario, fulfilling his service on Vancouver Island, earned 50 cents a day while his wife, who was working in Victoria so as to be nearer to her husband, earned 50 cents an hour. The debilitating sense over not doing work of national importance nor fulfilling familial obligations was heightened when female members of CO families were achieving a new sense of autonomy and privilege in civil society.

The poor wages received by COs drew some men away from Alternative Service and into the military. Sheldon Martin of Ontario was called up in June 1942, declared himself a conscientious objector and began Alternative Service in British Columbia on the mainland. Mary Ann, his wife of six weeks, followed Sheldon to B.C. and found work in a shoe factory in Vancouver. After about nine months, Mary Ann developed health problems which required costly treatment by a specialist. In order to pay for his wife’s health care, Sheldon joined the army, where he received \$1.30 a day to start, almost triple his CO wage. He said that had it not been for their immediate financial need, he would have remained in the Alternative Service camp.²⁶ While the number of men who left alternative service camps and enlisted in the military is not high—243 Mennonites had taken this course of action by October 1944—the feelings and dilemmas that prompted their more drastic choice were fairly widespread. And like Sheldon Martin, not all those who entered the military were explicitly rejecting the nonresistant position. Some felt that fulfilling familial obligations were more important than following the official denominational stance. Although few men speak directly about their self-identity as males, a masculine construction that included patriotism, service, bravery, and support of family did indeed shape their action as gendered beings. Their identity as husbands and fathers, and the responsibilities that accompanied those roles, meant that gender sometimes took priority over being Mennonite.

Peace church men were drawn away from the nonresistant position for a variety of reasons. Economic issues, patriotic impulses, the feelings that their energies were not well-utilized in Alternative Service programs all created the generation of “lost sons” described by Ted Regehr. Mennonite men also sought after the image of ‘those daring young men in their flying machines.’ One man who volunteered for the Air Force did so “because flying was considered pretty glamorous: it was well-paid and promotions were pretty good.”²⁷ Similarly, Peter Lorenz Neufeld describes his 1940 encounter, as a boy of 9 years, with one Mennonite war hero:

I was nine in 1940; our visitor, 17. Most of the men were gathered in the field around the fuel wagon for a quick coffee break. Over a nearby hill, bouncing across terribly rough and rocky terrain, roared a little orange truck carrying two 45-gallon gasoline drums. The trucked wheeled by in a skidding curve, showering us with

debris. Tires churning, it backed up to the wagon. Out jumped a husky young man with a cheery 'Hello!' He wrestled the heavy barrels onto the wagon and replaced them on his truck with our empties. 'Good-bye!' Peter Engbrecht was gone again in a blazing streak of dust. As a bomber gunner, he would soon become the RCAF's only ace who was not a fighter pilot.²⁸

The advertising image of the handsome soldier-boy, whose uniform alone caused women to swoon was undoubtedly a factor as well. Dietrick V. Klassen, who died from battle wounds in 1943, was described by his sister as "quite attractive, especially in his uniform."²⁹ One Alberta minister, after criticizing the church's economic neglect of the CO and his family, remarked on the "smarting social letdown" experienced by COs: "His chum of yesterday marched down the street with measured tread and the young lady only too often preferred to hang felicitously on the handsome soldierboy's arm. And the conscientious objector could just go his own way as far as she was concerned."³⁰ And a 1970 study based on questionnaires completed by COs also noted that "if the boys from the camps and boys from the active forces were home at the same time, the girls would pay more attention to the boys in uniform than the others."³¹

Even while standing ideologically outside of society's wartime image of the militarized male, COs consciously and subconsciously found ways of redefining their own experience which allowed them also to be wartime heroes. Those who chose active military service reified their maleness, but in the process were rejected by the Mennonite church, even if secretly admired by some of the laity. Those who remained officially nonresistant could stay within the safe realm of behaviour normative to church teachings yet had to confront the foil this may have created with their own well-entrenched ideas of manliness.

This paper represents preliminary thoughts on a well-worn subject examined from a slightly different angle. Although gender theory is creeping slowly into Mennonite historical analysis, many more questions could be asked of an ethno-religious group that rejects many cultural norms yet has never questioned hegemonic cultural traditions with respect to the ordering of the sexes. (Scholars of Anabaptism have really been the only ones to ask whether Mennonitism has offered new models for gender relations.) Throughout Mennonite history, when faced with the choice between conscientious objection and taking up arms (or training to do so), significant numbers of men opted for the latter. Whether in the American civil war, the Russian *Selbstschütz* or in the Second World War, thousands of men rejected (at least temporarily) the official denominational position. And I don't think this was just due to the denomination's neglect of peace teaching. The vindication of Mennonite soldiers epitomized in Peter Lorenz Neufeld's book, *Mennonites at War*, should be a sign that historians not ignore the 'lost sons and daughters' of the tradition. If we analyze these choices through the lens of gender we may more easily understand them.

The agenda for investigation is large. Could one even ask: Are men of the Christian Peacemaker Teams 'Real Men'? It is probably much easier to be a male and a pacifist today than it was in the Second World War. Not only has a

'men's movement' allowed for a broad-based masculine repudiation of violence, but the secular peace movement has broadened the base of support for men unwilling to enter the military. Does the shift to 'servant activism' or 'active pacifism' in Mennonite peace theology after the Second World War allow for more flexibility in an individual's self-identity with respect to gender. Or conversely, can we also add the feminist movement of the 1960s onwards as an ingredient to explain these shifts in Mennonite peace theology? These are intriguing questions and ones which I hope become acceptable parts of the Mennonite research agenda.

Notes

¹ "Camp GT-1 News," *The Beacon*, 3:2 (Feb./March 1944), 5.

² Jean Bethke Elshtain has pointed out some of the similarities between the soldier and the CO. See *Women and War* (New York: Basic Books, 1987), 203.

³ The following studies provide detailed discussions of negotiating the alternative service program: Hildegard Martens, "Accommodation and Withdrawal: The Response of the Mennonites in Canada to World War II," *Social History/Histoire Sociale* (November 1974), 306–27; David W. Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites and Conscientious Objection in World War II" (MA thesis, University of Waterloo, 1977), and Fransen, "As Far as Conscience Will Allow': Mennonites in Canada During the Second World War," in Norman Hillmer, et al., eds., *On Guard For Thee: War, Ethnicity and the Canadian State, 1939–1945* (Ottawa: Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1988), 131–149; William Janzen, *Limits on Liberty: The Experience of Mennonite, Hutterite, and Doukhobor Communities in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), esp. Chap.9. Studies which focus more directly on alternative service camps include Lawrence Klippenstein, *That There Be Peace: Mennonites in Canada and World War II* (Winnipeg: Manitoba CO Reunion Committee, 1979); E. Morris Sider, "Life and Labor in the Alternate Service Work Camps in Canada during World War II," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 66:4 (October 1992), 580–97. A good study which deals with all pacifist groups involved in alternative service is Thomas P. Socknat, *Witness Against War: Pacifism in Canada 1900–1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), chap. 8.

⁴ See my article, "'United We Stand, Divided We Fall': Canadian Mennonite Women as COs in World War II," *Mennonite Life*, 48:3 (September 1993), 7–10.

⁵ See in particular Rachel Waltner Goossen, *Women Against the Good War: Conscientious Objection and Gender on the American Homefront, 1941–1947* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

⁶ I first examined the intersection of gender and conscientious objection in my article, "Alternative Service and Alternative Gender Roles: Conscientious Objectors in B.C. during World War II," *BC Studies* Nos. 105 & 106 (Spring/Summer 1995):139–158.

⁷ Gillian Creese and Veronica Strong-Boag, "Taking Gender into Account in British Columbia," *BC Studies* Nos. 105 & 106 (Spring/Summer 1995):9.

⁸ Joy Parr and Mark Rosenfeld, *Gender and History in Canada* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1996), 17.

⁹ See for instance: Cynthia Enloe, "Bananas, Bases, and Patriarchy," in Jean Bethke Elshtain and Sheila Tobias, eds., *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics, and Social Theory* (Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1990), also "Beyond 'Rambo': Women and the Varieties of Militarized Masculinity," in Eva Isaksson, ed., *Women and the Military System* (Hertfordshire: Harvester-Wheatsheaf, 1988), 71–93; Enloe, *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); and, Betty A. Reardon, *Sexism and the War System* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1985); Miriam Cooke and Angela Woollacott, eds. *Gendering War Talk* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); An important contribution to the study of war and gender is Margaret R. Higonnet, et al., *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987). The collected essays in this study emphasize the dynamism in gender systems, whereby the cultural perception of gender identity alters in response to social phenomena such as war and is subsequently restructured in response to new conditions prevailing in peacetime.

¹⁰ Enloe, *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. 64.

¹¹ Elshtain, *Women and War*, 139.

¹² Frances H. Early, *A World Without War: How U.S. Feminists and Pacifists Resisted World War I* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997), chap.4.

¹³ See Paul Toews, *Mennonites in American Society, 1930–1970: Modernity and the Persistence of Religious Community* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1996); T. D. Regehr, *Mennonites in Canada, 1930–1970: A People Transformed* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996).

¹⁴ Mark W. Muesse, "Religious Machismo: Masculinity and Fundamentalism," in *Redeeming Men: Religion and Masculinities*, ed. Stephen B. Boyd, W. Merle Longwood, and Mark W. Muesse (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 90.

¹⁵ Elshtain, *Women and War*, 202–03.

¹⁶ From Klippenstein, *That There Be Peace*, 42.

¹⁷ "GT-4 News," *The Beacon*, 2:10 (Oct./Nov. 1943), 26.

¹⁸ Joe Coffin's story, in *CPS Smokejumpers, 1943–1946: Volume III Life Stories*, 1995, p. 4.

¹⁹ Ivan Holdeman's story in, *ibid*.

²⁰ "Editorial," *The Beacon*, 2:4 (April 1943), 2. Critical press coverage of the COs was especially strong in the Fraser Valley where there was also a growing population of Mennonites. Criticism was directed at the Alternative Service workers but also at what was perceived as a Mennonite "land-grab" in the Valley. Articles included: "Valley Boards of Trade Urge Ban on Mennonite Land Grab," *Vancouver Daily Province*, 19 June 1943; "Mennonites Protest Criticism—Organize to Buy Loan Bonds," *Chilliwack Progress*, 12 May 1943.

²¹ "Q-2 Chips," *The Beacon*, 2:5 (May 1943), 14.

²² Sider, "Life and Labor in the Alternate Service Work Camps..." 593.

²³ "John" (Lake Cowichan, BC) to "Dear Father" 12 Feb. 1944, and "Dear Father and Mother" 1 Feb. 1944, and "Dear Mother" 13 Feb. 1944. In Mennonite Archives of Ontario, Mennonites in Canada files (1940–WWII-Alternative Service).

²⁴ B. S. to J. B. Martin, 1 Mar. 1943. Mennonite Archives of Ontario, J. B. Martin Collection, Hist.Mss. 1.34.1.1.1.

²⁵ Goossen, *Women Against the Good War*, 50.

²⁶ Interview by the author with Sheldon and Mary Ann Martin, 9 May 1994. Historian Rachel Walther Goossen, who has studied gender and the American CO experience also found that some COs left Civilian Public Service (the American equivalent of Alternative Service) and opted for

combatant service to better support their families. See Waltner Goossen, "The 'Second Sex' and the 'Second Milers': Mennonite Women and Civilian Public Service," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 66 (October 1992), 531.

²⁷ Mark Epp, "Mennonites in Military Service during World War II" (Unpublished research paper, Mennonite Heritage Centre, Winnipeg, 1986), 21.

²⁸ Peter Lorenz Neufeld, *Mennonites at War, A Double-Edged Sword: Canadian Mennonites in World War II* (Deloraine, MB: DTS Publishing, 1997), 15.

²⁹ See entry for Dietrick V. Klassen, in Neufeld, *Mennonites at War: a Double-Edged Sword*, 27.

³⁰ J. W. Nickel, "The Canadian Conscientious Objector," *Mennonite Life*, January 1948, 27.

³¹ From Jake P. Krause, "Their Experience and Opinion," (Unpublished research paper, 1970), Mennonite Archives of Ontario, Mennonites in Canada Files (1940–Conscientious Objection), 15.