# Building Sanctuary

## The Movement to Support Vietnam War Resisters in Canada, 1965-73

Jessica Squires

UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

# Contents

Preface / vii

Acknowledgments / xiii

Abbreviations / xvii

Chronology / xix

Introduction: War Resisters in Context / 1

1 "We Help Them Because Their Need Is Great": The Canadian Anti-Draft Movement / 18

2 Transnational Connections: US Groups and Other Canadian Groups / 47

3 Deserters: Treatment, Tactics, Identity / 69

4 Opening the Border: 1969 / 112

5 The Limits of Left Nationalism: The Campaign to Open the Border / 142

6 Hegemonic Reflections: Inside and Outside the Movement / 177

7 "Last Chance to Get Landed": Immigration Department Strategies, Anti-Draft Movement Responses, 1971-73 / 201

Conclusion: A Contested Refuge from Militarism / 228

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

Appendices / 232

Notes / 239

Bibliography / 308

Index / 324

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

# Preface

The first decades of the twenty-first century witnessed a surge of interest in the "long sixties."[1] The sixties continue to hold meaning for those who lived through them and for a new generation of Canadians seeking fresh interpretations of later developments that bear a striking resemblance to the events of that famous decade. While researching this book, when I was asked about my research topic, I frequently replied that it was about Canadian support for Vietnam-era American war resisters. Often – in fact, almost always – upon hearing this, the questioner would tell me that he or she had known a draft dodger while growing up or had been acquainted with a war resister. Similarly, people whom I have talked to about this book and who later describe my project to someone else tend to say that it is about "draft dodgers." They transformed my analysis of Canadian support for resisters into a study of the war resisters themselves. This may seem like a minor distinction, but I think it says a lot about the strength of the myth of Canada as a haven for war resisters. This myth is so strong that the support dimension of the story is easily dismissed; after all, part of the myth is that Canada has always been such a haven. There is an assumption that support for the war resisters would have been automatic, homogeneous, and unproblematic from all levels of society and that no movement to support resisters should have been necessary. I share Daniel Francis's view that to interrogate and question myths is not to suggest that there is no truth to them.[2] Rather, the aim is to unravel, question, and fill in the gaps – to make the picture of the myth as complete as possible. This research shows that the experience of war resisters in Canada in the late 1960s and early 1970s, during which time the haven myth was entrenched, was actually

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

the product of a complex and varied set of relationships, actions, and interactions by and among various individuals, institutions, and groups.

In addition to the government and private fonds and contemporary and movement publications reviewed here, this research uses archived interviews as well as interviews that I conducted with several anti-draft activists and war resisters. The interviews help to provide an accurate picture of the culture of the anti-draft movement. Indeed, the interviewees discussed a range of motivations, experiences, and perceptions. They recounted different experiences crossing the border and within Canada, different perceptions of the interaction between Canadians and Americans, and different depths of involvement in anti-draft work. The interviews also serve as an effective means to fill in the gaps in the record. They corroborate, or interrogate, the documentary record of the development of the anti-draft movement, presenting a personal counterpoint to the more general political dimension of the story and providing a voice to those directly involved.[3]

Decisions about terminology had to be made, especially for two significant elements of this study. These decisions were rendered more complex by their relationship to the hegemonic tensions present in the very history I am telling. First, I use the term "anti-draft movement" throughout the work. I decided to use this term for several reasons. Primarily, it serves to differentiate the movement to support American war resisters from the antiwar movement. It is also, in large measure, how the movement described itself, as several groups named themselves "anti-draft programmes." The term "anti-draft" provokes certain questions. By 1965, Canada had not seen conscription for twenty years, and "draft" was largely an American term for conscription. Did the notion of a Canadian anti-draft movement imply that the movement was an importation, or an imitation, of an American idea? The earliest use of the term "anti-draft" to describe a group in Canada was in 1965, by the Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA)'s Anti-Draft Programme. American war resister Mark Satin's involvement in this group largely explains the use of the term. However, their use of the term also implies that SUPA activists perceived that it was useful to oppose a policy of the American government as part of general activities in favour of peace. The term describes a movement whose unstated goal was to undermine the American Selective Service Program – the legal name of the program that ran the American military

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

draft – by helping young American men avoid its talons.[4] Additionally, its explicit self-identification as a Canadian "anti-draft" movement seeking to have an impact on American government policy is a reminder of the international linkages within the movement and the internationalist outlook of many of its activities.

The second question of terminology revolved around the use of the expressions "war resister," "draft dodger," and "deserter." During my research, I encountered many Vietnam-era war resisters, especially at two "Our Way Home Reunion" conferences in Castlegar, British Columbia, in July 2006 and 2007. Some of them advocated rejecting the terms "deserter" and "draft dodger" because of their negative connotations. Instead, they advocated the use of "war resister." Others, however, wanted to use the terms "deserter" and "draft dodger" as an act of reclaiming the terms and changing their connotation. Some pointed out that the terms describe fairly well what the men were doing. "War resister," on the other hand, is more inclusive of the many women (and men) who came to Canada in the period not to avoid the draft or military service but out of a more general rejection of American policy and life.

The fact that the Canadian government treated draft dodgers and deserters differently in the immigration regulations until May 1969 complicates this discussion. Government officials probably profited from the negative connotations evoked by the words "dodger" and "deserter." War resisters at the time also contested the terms they used to describe themselves. Furthermore, anti-draft groups treated deserters and draft dodgers differently because they had different needs, both perceived and real, upon arrival and later as they required continued immigration counselling. These terms help account for important historical distinctions.

I use all three terms. I use "war resister" when the draft status does not matter to the story and when discussing war resisters as a larger group, including women and others whose decision to emigrate was not related to military status. I use "draft dodger" and "deserter" when discussing individual experiences, approaches anti-draft groups took to various kinds of immigrants, and political campaigns and debates centred on the question of deserter status in particular. "Draft dodger" refers to Americans who evaded the American Selective Service Program in some way, either by leaving the United States and going to Canada or Sweden, or by some other method. A deserter in this work is someone who has enlisted in, or been

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

drafted into, the American military forces and subsequently decided to leave his post. I have avoided the terms "draft resister" and "draft evader" both because of the vernacular use of the term "draft dodger" in the period and because the terms "draft resister" and "draft evader" are mainly useful to differentiate between anti-draft tactics in use in the United States, an issue that does not form a part of this study. A war resister, for the purposes of this volume, is any American immigrant who came to Canada to avoid complicity in, or out of opposition to, their government's actions in Vietnam.

A final consideration: some of those interviewed for this work were part of a present-day war resister support movement with which I have been involved, albeit peripherally.[5] Does this connection cast doubt on my objectivity as a researcher of this story? Or does it make me an ideal person to do the research? Like Bernard Cohn, who interrogated his role as an anthropologist able to "pass" as a historian, I sometimes wondered if I was a war resister "passing" as a historian, or the other way around.[6] Similarly, the question of the past as colonized territory came up in my interpretation of the actions of figures, both living and dead, from this history. David Lowenthal's preoccupation with the misuses of memory also shapes my approach. Lowenthal is concerned with "how memory establishes personal identity; the links between personal and communal memory; how recollections are verified; ... the function of forgetting; how time alters old and invents new memories." He notes, "[W]e brainwash ourselves into believing that we simply reveal the true past – a past which is unavoidably, however, partly of our own manufacture."[7] To this, I would add that we are partly of its manufacture and that, as Cohn would say, culture is historically constructed as much as history is culturally constructed.[8] I thus justify my presumption to interpret the actions of others in the past and to thereby use bits of their stories to make a new story.

Accordingly, this is a story with which many will not agree. During the research process, when I presented portions of my work, formally and informally, people who "were there" sometimes challenged the truth of my findings. I had to remind myself that documents are not the ultimate source of truth; but neither, of course, is memory. I have tried to be as honest as possible with the evidence. I hope I have fairly acknowledged the understandings of those whose stated recollections of the story differed from my retrospective compilation and selective emphasis, whether or not

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

I came to agree with them. Here, it is useful to recall the words of David Lodge: history is the judgment "of those who were not there on those who were."[9] I hope that my attempts here are more in line with Donald Ritchie's caution to remember that "oral history is a joint product," shaped by both the researcher and those she interviews.[10] Furthermore, I value the contributions of those I interviewed, not for their ability to shed light on the facts, although they certainly did so, but for their memory of their experience of this movement.[11] The value is in their lived experience and its interaction with my own as a researcher.[12]

When American forces invaded Iraq in 2003, Canada was not a direct participant – just as Canada did not participate in the war on Vietnam. A few Americans have made their way over the border as deserters from the war on Iraq. Of course, the specific circumstances have changed. But a study of the war resisters and anti-draft activists of the late 1960s and early 1970s provides both knowledge and inspiration for those who want to make sense of the almost eight-year occupation of Iraq.[13] I believe this story will contribute significantly not only to our understanding of the past but also to our understanding of the present and the future.

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

# Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| ADC | American Deserters Committee |
| AID | Ottawa AID: Assistance with Immigration and the Draft |
| BRO | Black Refugee Organization |
| CALCAV | Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam |
| CARM | Committee to Aid Refugees from Militarism, Toronto |
| CATWO | Canadian Assistance to War Objectors |
| CCC | Canadian Council of Churches |
| CCCO | Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors |
| CFIP | Toronto Committee for a Fair Immigration Policy |
| CNVA | Committee for Nonviolent Action |
| CUS | Canadian Union of Students |
| MCAWR | Montreal Council to Aid War Resisters |
| NSCAAWO | Nova Scotia Committee to Aid American War Objectors |
| RCAD | Regina Committee of American Deserters |
| RCMP | Royal Canadian Mounted Police |
| RITA | Resistance Inside the Army |
| RWB | Red White & Black |
| SAC | University of Toronto Students' Administrative Council |
| SDS | Students for a Democratic Society |
| SNCC | Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee |
| SUPA | Student Union for Peace Action |
| TADC | Toronto American Deserters Committee |
| TADP | Toronto Anti-Draft Programme |
| UAE | Union of American Exiles |
| VAEA | Vancouver American Exiles Association |

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

| | |
|---|---|
| VCAAWO | Vancouver Committee to Aid American War Objectors |
| VOW | Voice of Women |
| VVAC | Vancouver Vietnam Action Committee |
| WILPF | Women's International League for Peace and Freedom |
| WRL | War Resisters League |
| WSP | Women Strike for Peace |

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

# Chronology

| | |
|---|---|
| 1959 | Vietnam War begins |
| 1966 | Earliest articles regarding war resisters appear in mainstream newspapers in Canada and the United States |
| 1966 | Hans Sinn compiles fact sheet for war resisters, Montreal |
| 1966 | Toronto Anti-Draft Programme (TADP) begins as Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) Anti-Draft Program |
| 1966 | Nova Scotia Committee to Aid American War Objectors founded, Halifax |
| 1966 | Montreal Council to Aid War Resisters founded |
| 1966 | Vancouver Committee to Aid American War Objectors (VCAAWO) founded |
| 1966 | VCAAWO publishes "Immigration to Canada and Its Relation to the Draft" |
| 1967 | Points system introduced by Government of Canada, Ottawa |
| ca. 1967 | Ottawa Assistance with Immigration and the Draft founded |
| 1967 | University of Toronto Students' Administrative Council gives money to Toronto Anti-Draft Programme |
| 1967 | SUPA publishes *Escape from Freedom, or, I Didn't Raise My Boy to Be a Canadian* |
| 1967 | Students for a Democratic Society (US) issues a statement in qualified support of emigration to Canada |

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

| | |
|---|---|
| 1967 | VCAAWO brief "A Note on Fugitives from Justice" released |
| 1967 | VCAAWO brief "A Note on the Handling of Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada" released |
| 1968 | TADP publishes *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* |
| July 1968 | Operational Memo (Ottawa) secretly issued to exclude deserters from Canada |
| 1968 | TADP publishes *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada,* 2nd edition |
| 1968 | War resister Howie Petrick addresses Vietnam Mobilization Committee Conference, Toronto |
| 1968 | Canadian Union of Students considers becoming a contact point for war resisters |
| ca. 1969 | TADP publishes *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada,* 3rd edition |
| ca. 1969 | War resister Melody Killian addresses Canadian Union of Students congress |
| 1969 | TADP publishes *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada,* 4th edition |
| 1969 | VCAAWO brief "A Further Note on the Handling of Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada" released |
| 1969 | Tom Faulkner, pro-draft dodger candidate for University of Toronto Students' Administrative Council, re-elected |
| 22 May 1969 | Minister of Manpower and Immigration Allan MacEachen announces open border to deserters and issues revised operational memorandum to immigration officers |
| Dec. 1969–early 1970 | Canadian Council of Churches Ministry to Draft-Age Immigrants established |
| January 1970 | Voice of Women issues public statement in support of war resisters |
| May-June 1970 | Pan-Canadian Conference of US War Resisters held in Montreal |

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

| | |
|---|---|
| 1970 | TADP publishes *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada,* 5th edition |
| 1970 | Black Refugee Organization founded, Toronto |
| 1970 | Red White & Black founded, Toronto |
| 1971 | TADP publishes *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada,* 6th edition |
| July-August 1972 | Administrative Measures Program (Government of Canada) allows relaxed criteria for the consideration of appeals |
| 3 November 1972 | Section 34 of the Immigration Regulations repealed (Government of Canada); landing at the border or from within Canada no longer allowed |
| June 1973 | Bill C-197 debated and adopted, eliminating universal right to appeal and announcing Adjustment of Status Program (Government of Canada) |
| 15 August-15 October 1973 | Adjustment of Status Program (Government of Canada) implemented |

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

# Introduction

## War Resisters in Context

*Je viens de recevoir*
*Mes papiers militaires*
*Pour partir à la guerre*
*Avant mercredi soir.*

*Monsieur le président*
*Je ne veux pas la faire,*
*Je ne suis pas sur terre*
*Pour tuer de pauvres gens.*

*– Boris Vian, "Le Déserteur," 1954*[1]

Wars are divisive. They divide countries from one another, and they also divide populations and families. As the Vietnam War took hold of the American consciousness, opposition to the war became more and more widespread. At first, the opposition was mainly expressed by youth. Later, people from a variety of ages and political, economic, and social backgrounds voiced opposition.[2] The question of military service increasingly became a focus of debate and acrimony.[3] The debate continued throughout the duration of the conflict and into the years following its end in 1975. The 1976 US election was partly about the issue of amnesty for Americans of draft age who had emigrated.[4]

The war also had a considerable impact on people living in Canada. Many Canadians still remember the protest movements against the Vietnam

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

War. The image of Canada as a harbour for Americans of conscience, "draft dodgers," to a lesser extent "deserters," and their families and friends has become an important Canadian legend and part of Canadian identity.[5]

The exact number of American war resisters to immigrate to Canada between 1965 and 1973 was a matter of some debate, and remains so.[6] The consensus appears to be that forty to fifty thousand young men came to Canada to escape the draft during this period. Women also came, and many of them saw themselves as part of the same group. Estimates of the number of American war resisters in Canada suggest that this group represented a fairly large percentage of the American men who took various actions to beat the draft. To compare, a quarter million young Americans are estimated to have avoided the draft by omitting to register on their eighteenth birthday.[7] The numbers of war resisters who came to Canada were also small compared to the number of Canadians who participated in the wider opposition to war in Vietnam. But the size of this movement remains significant and helps explain the prevalent idea of Canada as a haven for draft dodgers.

In general, the draft dodgers phenomenon is one of the events to which Canadians often point, uncritically, to emphasize the differences between Canadians and Americans. But this idea of Canada as a peaceful nation is an oversimplification. The myth is that Canada, a more peaceable country than the United States, allowed American draft dodgers and deserters to find refuge from militarism across our border, which, while true, overlooks how that refuge was achieved – through the efforts of a social movement.[8]

This myth, which began to take hold in the sixties, was not always as persistent as it became. The history of war resisters is as old as the history of modern wars. According to a British study conducted after the First World War, "50,000 Englishmen pledged never to take part in another war"; sixteen thousand men refused to participate between 1916 and 1918; and 1,300 went to jail, declining alternative service provisions for conscientious objectors.[9] Furthermore, public fascination with the phenomenon of war resisters is almost as old as the phenomenon itself.

The myth represents an important part of the larger image of Canada as a peaceful nation, which, in turn, is often attributed to the government of the day, the Liberal administration of Pierre Trudeau. Trudeau's supposed sympathy for war resisters is also legendary, and the tenacity of the myth

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

of Canada as a haven for war resisters remains linked to the former prime minister. Trudeau is often quoted as saying, "Those who make the conscientious judgment that they must not participate in this war ... have my complete sympathy, and indeed our political approach has been to give them access to Canada. Canada should be a refuge from militarism." This quotation appears in two of the important works on war resisters in Canada: Renée Kasinsky's 1976 work, *Refugees from Militarism: Draft-Age Americans in Canada,* and John Hagan's 2001 book, *Northern Passage: American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada*.[10] The left alternative press also used the quotation in support of the campaign to allow American war resisters from the Iraq conflict to stay in Canada.[11] Archivist and Vietnam-era war resister Joseph Jones has traced the origins of this quotation to erroneous newspaper reports and concluded that the quotation is actually an amalgam of two statements by Trudeau, one in 1970 and one in 1971. Jones argues that Trudeau's statements about war resisters were limited to these two disparate declarations made to religious groups in the context of what Trudeau may have perceived as theological discussion. He goes on to point out that Trudeau also made at least two statements in 1969 that suggest that he believed deserters should be treated differently from draft dodgers.[12] The notion that the Trudeau government and, indeed, Trudeau himself unequivocally supported the US war resisters of the Vietnam era is, therefore, overstated.

It is true that, in a series of speeches in early 1969, Prime Minister Trudeau and Minister of Manpower and Immigration Allan MacEachen instructed immigration officials that military service was not a matter for interrogation at the border or in immigration offices when considering applications to move to Canada.[13] But the Trudeau quotes came after the 1969 announcement concerning the border. The events leading to that decision were more complicated than the myth leads us to believe. The experience of war resisters and their supporters was far from uniform as they interacted with government officials, police, and one another, both before the announcement, while the majority of American war resisters coming to Canada were draft dodgers, and after, when the balance shifted towards deserters. The Canadian anti-draft movement's interaction with government officials and police varied from openly antagonistic to fully cooperative. The interactions between activists and resisters were equally complex.

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

There was a broad and vibrant movement to support American war resisters who came to Canada either to avoid the draft or to avoid the war in Vietnam. The support for these immigrants, however, was neither monolithic nor unanimous. Many of the contentious issues in the war resisters' movement and in the broader antiwar movement reflected domestic debates about relations between the United States and Canada, which were also being played out at the level of the federal government. For example, cabinet discussions regarding the treatment of deserters at the Canadian border considered the relative wisdom and potential political impact of applying American law within Canada. The war resisters and their supporters contributed to the debates about nationalism and Canada's relationship to the United States that pervaded this period. Accordingly, in one sense, this story is a part of the history of international relations from the bottom up.

Americans arrived in a Canada that was in many ways similar to the United States they had left. In Canada, as in the United States, the movements for civil rights and against the war in Vietnam mingled with burgeoning feminist movements, and with those for Black Power, Red Power, and gay rights. Many of these social movements were influenced by activity in the United States. They were also developing at the same time as important ideas, such as Trudeau's "Just Society" and Quebec separatism, were being debated. Questions about Canadian sovereignty and Canada's place in the world were also circulating. Of this mix, the Canadian anti-draft movement was both a part and a separate ingredient. The American movement against the draft as it existed in the late 1960s had roots in the civil rights movement and cold war pacifism, conscientious objection movements of the First World War, and the "peace churches."[14] The Canadian movement had seemingly congruent origins but also incorporated the immigrants themselves into the work.

By considering merely one of the more obvious contextual issues, cross-border relations, the complexity of this movement is immediately apparent. Cross-border relations are often seen as a reflection of diplomatic history.[15] But perhaps the question to be answered is: how do Americans and Canadians talk to each other? What factors need to be considered in asking such a question – and how does one go about researching them? The literatures on nationalism, immigration history, bureaucracy, policing, and the Gramscian theories of hegemony and consciousness underlie my

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

approach to writing the story of Canadian support for Vietnam-era American war resisters.

This work has several objectives. By presenting an account that is as complete as possible of the development of the anti-draft movement in Canada, this book accounts for the transnational nature of the story. It replaces the common assumption that Canadian social movements merely imitate or are part of American ones with a picture of homegrown autonomous social movements that had mature and complex relationships with sister movements in the United States.[16] The ideas, ideals, and mutual perceptions of anti-draft activists and war resisters interacted in interesting and often unexpected ways. Describing this interaction sheds new light on the tensions that existed between Canadians and Americans of the time. These tensions can neither be reduced to Canadian nationalism nor to anti-Americanism – and neither should one be conflated with the other.

The campaign to open the border to deserters in May of 1969, which shows how the haven Canada became was the result of concerted and conscious pressure by the movement, is a central narrative of this story. The decision to open the border came about, in large part, because of a campaign by the anti-draft movement that mobilized public pressure and the mainstream media in a hegemonic skirmish for the dominant perception of war resisters in Canada. The ideas consciously promoted in this campaign remain resonant in debates about Canada's global identity. A competing force in this skirmish, the coercive activity of the government, took the form of police and RCMP surveillance of the war resisters and their supporters. Although this surveillance reflected a segment of Canadian public opinion and the opinions of some government actors, it also exposed some of the divisions among both the government and the public, which illustrates the contingent nature of hegemony. In the end, a particular confluence of events – namely, a simultaneous increase in unemployment and a rapid increase in immigration – combined to make strange bedfellows of civil society groups, such as the anti-draft movement, and government agencies, such as immigration offices, who worked together to achieve temporarily shared ends.

While the experiences and events of war resisters are taken up by scholars across various disciplines, the literatures of the twentieth-century historiography of war resisters, United States–Canada relations, and the Vietnam War are particularly important in this work. I also draw from

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

the broader literature on pacifism and American history as well as immigration history because of the prominence of nationalism in the 1960s in Canada. Because this work weaves together social, cultural, and political histories, the state and relations between state and society are also important factors. In effect, the relationships between ideas, movements, and politics; nationalism in Canada; the nature of American immigrants; and the interactions of state and civil society, bureaucracy, and policing all form a part of the picture.[17]

The movement to support American war resisters in Canada was a social movement with multifaceted and layered relationships to the state and its institutions. What is a social movement? Movements, which often include both pressure groups and individuals,[18] can be understood as "collectivities acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional or organizational channels for the purpose of challenging or ending extant authority, whether it is institutionally or culturally based, in the group, organization, society, culture, or world order of which they are a part."[19] Such was the Canadian anti-draft movement. It played a role in, and was influenced by, hegemonic processes buffeting around ideas such as the changing role of immigration, the legacy of old movements and the rise of new ones, and nationalism and national identity. The interaction of actors from government officials to police, from anti-draft groups to individual activists and war resisters, calls for framing that can account for this complexity without reducing it to the realm of either material experience or cultural practice.

As political scientist Robert Cox points out, "[T]heory is always for someone and for some purpose."[20] A history of the Canadian anti-draft movement should analyze the policing and surveillance of its proponents, the effects of individuals on movements, the movement's effects on politics and on ideas, and the interaction of individuals and groups across borders to gain an understanding of the entire picture of international relations both horizontally and, more importantly, vertically. A view of how the state and society interact, intersect, and overlap both physically and culturally is necessary for understanding. The result is a history supported by theory. Taking an interdisciplinary approach to a historical topic yields better results because it encourages a deep analysis. In this way, social historical approaches benefit from "bringing the state back in,"[21]

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

and, conversely, political historical approaches benefit from an understanding of emerging or widely held cultural beliefs and ideas and their effect on actions. This inclusivity, in turn, provides a comprehensive understanding of the history of the movement to support war resisters from the ground up.

I draw from Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony and Marxist approaches to consciousness and the state to conceptualize the physical and cultural interactions, intersections, and overlap between state and society. "Civil society" groups are as much shaped by those around them and by state regulations as the state is pushed and moulded by civil society. Regulatory regimes in the form of, and enforced by, government institutions are powerful forces, but when lived experiences cannot be forced into predetermined moulds the result is often regulatory and legislative change. Ideas about how society should work, promoted by government actors, produce expectations in that society that those ideas will be implemented, which in turn pressures the government to accommodate these ideas (for example, the "Just Society," "Canada the good") in a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy. A rich analysis of these forces and their interaction yields a rich history with much to offer both historians of the social movements of the 1960s and theorists of subsequent movements against war and to protect conscientious objectors. To historians, this history is an example of the new political history – an illustration of how an approach using several perspectives can result both in a history to which ordinary people can relate and a history that takes account of the role of government actors without privileging their role in events. To those active in social movements, this book offers lessons about the successes and failures of movements past, in which a better understanding of similar issues arising in contemporary struggles may be grounded.

## War Resisters in Context: International Relations, Immigration, and Bureaucracy

*draft resister*
*watching the ducks*
*fly south*

– *Chris Faiers, "draft resister"*[22]

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

Historians have mostly considered the topic of war resisters as a bit of an afterthought.[23] Even more recent works such as Robert Bothwell's *Alliance and Illusion, The Big Chill,* and *Canada and the United States: The Politics of Partnership* treat the phenomenon as incidental to international relations at the state level between Canada and the United States.[24] This perspective neither tells the whole story of the resisters nor attends to the possibility that the resisters and their supporters may have had some impact on those relations or on larger cultural shifts. For Bothwell and others, the war resisters are, at most, symptoms of public sentiments on both sides of the border.[25] Even Victor Levant, whose book *Quiet Complicity* is one of only a handful of books critical of Canadian involvement in the Vietnam War, examines the war resisters phenomenon and the government's attitude towards them as merely an illustration of that complicity.[26]

It is tempting to treat war resisters as a curiosity, which may explain the strong tendency for books on the war resister story to take a journalistic approach through compiling a group of twenty or thirty interviews. False polarities between voluntary expatriates and political exiles, the politically motivated and those who were not, and so on, are common.[27] Deeper examinations of the role played by Canadians in the movement, and the importance of the connections between the Canadian and American anti-draft movements, have been rare. In fact, Canadians are seldom even a part of the picture painted in this literature, whether the author is Canadian or American.

There are important exceptions. Law professor and sociologist John Hagan's *Northern Passage: American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada,* which is in large part devoted to the political history of changing immigration regulations, the sociology of the American exile ghetto in Toronto in the 1960s and early 1970s, and the socio-psychological impacts of war resistance on the future activities of war resisters, also examines the role of the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme in welcoming American immigrants and finding them housing and other services.[28] Hagan's treatment of the anti-draft movement is general and overwhelmingly positive. Historian David Churchill's study of state motivations for changes in immigration regulations regarding draft dodgers and deserters also focuses on the war resisters.[29] Churchill's work addresses the complexity of the discussion at the level of the Department of Immigration, while Hagan tends to place power more centrally in the hands of Cabinet ministers.

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

Churchill's and Hagan's works are important starting points for this research. However, while both leave a place for anti-draft movement pressure on officials, and both afford a place for the influence of ideas on events, neither author centres his attention on the movement's impact on government and policy. The otherwise considerable silence on the topic of draft dodgers by most authors is curious considering the extent to which the draft dodgers' era in Canadian history has taken on a mythical aspect.

On the topic of draft dodgers in Canada, then, there is, first and foremost, a lack of any broad historical work on the Canadian groups and individuals who worked to support and encourage American war resisters, deserters, and draft dodgers in their quest to come to Canada and settle here.[30] There is also a paucity of research on the interplay between Canadian political culture, Canadian anti-draft activists, Canadian government officials and state apparatuses, and American war resisters.

As draft dodgers and deserters were also immigrants, the field of immigration history is an obvious point of reference. But in most historical work, cross-border relations "below" the interaction of states are rarely considered and, if considered at all, are often seen as a mere reflection of diplomatic history.[31] A bottom-up approach can emphasize the processes unfolding "on the ground," as it were, and account for the influence of movements and individuals on political processes. The bottom-up approach also opens up space within which to consider whether American immigrants ought to be studied as a group of immigrants like any other, or whether enough substantial differences exist to merit a different treatment. The central questions here are: How is the immigrant seen, perceived, and defined in Canadian political culture? Does racialization – the categorization and differentiation of people on the basis of race – play a role? If so, how does the American immigrant – whose nation of origin, the United States, arguably has a very similar dominant idea of national identity to that of Canada – fit in?

In most interpretations, the points system introduced by the Canadian government in 1967 was a refinement of policy moves that had been taken by politicians in the early 1960s towards a goal of eliminating racism from selection criteria. The points system allocated points for certain characteristics of potential immigrants, such as training and education. Potential immigrants had to be allocated a minimum number of points to be granted permission to immigrate. The system replaced an earlier regime that

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

emphasized quotas of immigrants from particular countries.[32] Theorists who question both the motive and impact of immigration reform debate the idea that the new points system addressed concerns of racism. As Anna Triandafyllidou writes, "Othering the immigrant is functional ... to achieving or enhancing national cohesion ... The immigrant poses a challenge to the in-group's unity and authenticity, which it threatens to 'contaminate.'"[33] The racialization of immigrants is linked to a cultural notion – contested, but dominant – of Canadian identity as white.

In Canada, cultural perceptions of immigrants as people of colour with different languages, cultural practices, and behaviours continued to dominate long after 1967. A "'national' life and culture ... commonsensically acknowledged as 'English'" and white becomes hegemonic enough to be shared even by progressive Canadians or the Left.[34] The result was a system whereby "all white people ... become invisible and hold a dual membership in Canada, while others remain immigrants generations later."[35] As sociologist Rose Baaba Folson also points out in her study of immigration in Canada, "White immigrants are often constructed as citizens, while non-white citizens are constructed as immigrants."[36]

For Americans, Himani Bannerji observes that, historically, "decisions about who should come into Canada to do what work, definitions of skill and accreditation, licensing and certification, have been influenced by 'race' and ethnicity."[37] This observation is important for its recognition of the political economy of immigration in the 1960s and early 1970s. The vast majority of American war resisters were white. Their country of origin has a similar paradigm of "whiteness"; those immigrants who had been racialized as non-white in the United States were also racialized as non-white in Canada, and not because they were American.[38] Immigrants of colour continued to be racialized in Canada, sometimes despite expectations that race would not be as central to their lives as it was in the United States. However, the majority of war resisters fit well into the dominant norm; only an audible accent, in some cases, marked them as different.

While American immigrants could most closely "pass" in the context of dominant, white, anglophone Canada, they still experienced the "othering" process, although not as racial others. They shared some experiences with immigrants in general in that they were sometimes suspected of stealing jobs from Canadians, importing radicalism, and misbehaving. But, unlike

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

many other immigrant groups, the most important factor for Americans' experience as immigrants was their socioeconomic background.

Therefore, the analytical emphasis here is on those aspects of policy that more directly affected them – class bias in immigration policy, for instance. But most discrimination against Americans was associated primarily with their country's foreign policy and not with their individual character. The character-based discrimination that did exist was more about their military status and less about their American-ness.[39] In the anti-draft movement, the actors were generally not government officials, but Americans and Canadians interacting "on the ground" in ways affected by both nationalism and internationalism. While American immigrants were, by definition and in the eyes of government, immigrants like any others inasmuch as they crossed the border in order to live in Canada, in practice, their experiences were quite different. They were not racialized, and although they were targeted, they were not targeted for characteristics normally ascribed to more visibly different immigrant groups.

Because Canadians and Americans share some history, as well as a dominant language and many cultural norms, social movements in the two countries have often had similar trajectories. Questions about both migration and Canadian national identity tend to intersect with analysis of borders and nations, and many theorists have considered the cross-border and transnational relations between unions, social movements, and individuals in Canadian history.[40] The Canadian anti-draft movement is one such movement, strongly influenced by, and sharing a history with, the American pacifist movement and the involvement of the "peace churches."[41] These transnational linkages intersected with questions of national identity and nationalism in Canada.

International relations at the level of governments and elites are also influenced by transnational tendencies. Indeed, these ideas have been elaborated by international relations theorists such as Cox, who emphasizes the role of social movements in exerting pressure on relations between governments.[42] Similarly, in her *States and Social Revolutions,* Theda Skocpol focuses upon the "Janus-faced" nature of the state – its inherent connection to international networks of states and its dependence on social legitimacy – and incorporates the notion of states as organizations into her analysis.[43] These formulations, tempered with respect for the impact

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

of ideas on events, have fruitful uses in a history of international relations from the bottom up because they can account for the role of institutions in historical events without reducing them to monoliths outside the agency of human beings.

Telling a story based on an analysis that takes into consideration the government-society axis must consider the specific roles of government and institutions, social movements and groups, as well as intellectuals, and how they all interacted and influenced each other. This book sees the state as non-monolithic and sees government as a contingent set of outcomes of negotiations between groups of various size and influence. I employ ideas from the theory of social movements, especially that which recognize movements themselves as actors.[44] As Dominique Marshall explains, the new political history "includes all relations of power within a society ... These relations contribute to the creation (and perpetuation) of the large categories of social relations, studied in the new history, among classes, genres, generations, regions, nations, and ethnicities."[45]

Skocpol's defence of what she and others call "historical institutionalism" effectively sets out an integrated approach to any study of society – historical or otherwise – that can account for all of the nuances and factors inherent in any particular event:

> Institutions for me are sets of relationships that persist, although in an inherently conflictual and tension filled way. Institutions may be formal organizations or informal networks. They have shared meetings and relatively stable bundles of resources attached to them. I take an organizationalist approach to institutions, viewing them as actual patterns of communication and activity, rather than seeing them primarily as values, norms, ideas, or official rules. I am primarily interested in studying political processes and outcomes, and I see these as brought about, usually without intentional foresight and control, by actors whose goals and capacities and conflicts with one another are grounded in institutions ... It is not enough just to explore how people talk or think. We must also find patterns in what they do. I do not think that institutions are simply or primarily systems of meaning or normative frameworks. Group identities for me are grounded in organizational linkages, access to resources, and some sense of "success" over time in political undertakings.[46]

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

Skocpol sees individuals, groups, and government as historical actors. This perception is valuable because it offers an array of explanatory mechanisms for describing historical events. The choice of either state or society is refracted into many different potential agents of change.

Ideas also influence events. In this book, Gramsci's ideas are used to incorporate the role of intellectuals into the state-society relationship, without letting go of the importance of "grounded" group actors. In Gramsci's theory of hegemony, ideas, as part of relatively cohesive sets of ideas or ideologies that inhabit the political landscape, exist in relations to each other and to events that are historically established and recognized as part of a philosophically coherent whole.[47] In Gramsci's conception of cultural and state formation, the buildup of accepted and often dominant practices provides a backdrop of ideas, politics, and relations between people that must be involved in any strategy to make fundamental changes in that culture.[48] Further, Gramsci suggests that intellectuals aligned with either the historic bloc most clearly dominating the state, or with emerging groups and ideas, are important agents of ideological formation. "Historic blocs" – groups of people with similar ideas and objective interests, positioned to act in such a way as to have a concrete effect on the common sense of the day – can sometimes bring together unlikely allies.[49] This hegemonic process is constantly changing, and the outcome is neither guaranteed nor permanent, partly because old ideas commingle with emergent ones.[50] As Ian McKay asserts, hegemony is "not a once-and-for-all achievement of total domination."[51]

In his *Prison Notebooks,* in the section called "The Modern Prince," Gramsci discusses the often complex interface in modern democracies between the executive and legislative branches of government, that is, parliamentary bodies and the institutions of rule. For Gramsci, intellectuals are a specifically "professional category" that could be associated with classes ("fundamental social groups"). The specific functions of intellectuals, for Gramsci, were the creation of social hegemony and political government. These functions accrued to intellectuals who played the role of "deputies" to the "dominant group," or ruling class. Gramsci points out that organizing social hegemony requires an extensive division of labour, which accounts for the huge expansion of intellectuals as a social group in early 1930s Europe. According to Gramsci, "mass" training standardized

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

individuals both psychologically and in terms of individual qualification; thus, competition between potential functionaries was induced.[52] Gramsci further suggested that the division of labour brought about the formation of a "caste" of bureaucrats, a group to which specific power accrued.[53] Gramsci's interpretation offers a way to discuss the interaction between individuals and structures without collapsing into conspiracy theory or rigid structuralism. It also points to the importance of interest groups in society and has implications for both the formation and the enforcement of laws and public policy.[54]

The historical institutionalism of Skocpol and others, and Gramscian ideas, are complemented by Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy. For Weber, bureaucracies are characterized by rules, regulations, and specialization that together promote objectivity, personified in expertise. Thus, the bureaucratic mechanism exists independently of personnel.[55] This Weberian formulation is the basis for the idea of bureaucracy as actor, as opposed to government, group, or individual. But it must be tempered with Gramsci's observations about intellectuals and hegemony to be a comprehensive approach.

By attending to the interface between government institutions and individuals and the techniques of administration, approaches such as that taken by Bruce Curtis in his Foucauldian *The Politics of Population* account for the ways in which these different historical actors – bureaucracies, institutions, groups, and individuals – interact. If government is, as Curtis argues, a "circular process," whose "subjects ... are not passive" and in which "official classifications and categorizations may be opposed or subverted as well as embraced," then not only do administrative forms such as censuses and other measurements affect what they measure, encouraging people to fit the categories, but those categories are also themselves shaped by interactions with the objects of measurement.[56] Analyzing government and the mutual influence, "in both an upwards and a downwards direction," of multiple actors, helps to explain the ability of individual Canadians and small groups to effect policy change.[57]

Steve Hewitt and others make central a contention that institutional change reflects something in society. They maintain that to judge the justice system and greater society only by its written laws ignores change, the human element in legal institutions, and the particulars of a situation. Law

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

and order is more than just its institutions; it reflects a set of values. The behaviour of police and the policing of behaviour in the story of Canadian support for American war resisters show how broader society perceived the question, and how at least some branches of government sought to control it. As Allan Greer has argued, police are a "visible human embodiment" of the "state."[58] The war resisters and their supporters were the focus of both overt and covert attention by police. Police are relatively minor actors in this study, but to omit them would gloss over important aspects of the history.[59] Police institution "behaviour," such as surveillance, is not merely a result of a combination of a paranoid mindset and an individual desire to conform, as Irving Janis and disciples argue.[60] Instead, police behaviour says something about society, because individual police are themselves part of society.[61]

Bureaucrats are often seen as being allergic to change, seeking only to perpetuate the status quo. However, bearing in mind that bureaucracies are made up of individuals, and that there is a flow of influence between bureaucrats and bureaucracy as well as between bureaucracy and society, will help to avoid the pitfalls of stereotypical treatment of state and government activity as the result merely of a technocratic strategy. The influence of populations, or sections of populations, on state departments and officials and their behaviour and decisions, and vice versa, is an important part of the story of support for war resisters in Canada.[62] The actions of police and Department of Immigration officials and bureaucrats reflected the battle for hegemony in the realm of attitudes towards war resisters. The eventual involvement of anti-draft groups in promoting the government's programs was a characteristic example of the zone of interpenetration between the state (government and its institutions) and society, and their mutual reinforcement.

The Canadian government, like other governments, was, in the sixties, enduring a broader hegemonic crisis linked to widespread and global critiques of imperialism, colonialism, and capitalism.[63] In Canada, this critique in part took the form of tensions around the concept of Canadian identity. The critiques were also fuelled by an antiwar movement that was generally similar to that of the United States, and, later, by movements against racism, sexism, and various forms of discrimination. At the same time, Canadian social movements differed from other North American

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

movements by the development of two distinct strands of resistance to colonialism: a distinct movement for Quebec independence, fuelled by Quebec nationalism; and Canadian indigenous resistance movements.

Further, specificities of Canadian history and the country's relatively small population meant that there were other differences in how these movements manifested. Also, while the Left and social movements in Canada shared with their American counterparts a relationship with ancestral movements – sometimes referred to as an "Old Left," a term also taken up in this work, with a few caveats – that relationship was complicated by the influence of organizations such as the New Democratic Party (NDP) and other proponents of what may be termed the mainstream Canadian Left.

That said, hegemonic struggle does not only take place at the level of the state and is not always determined by its needs. It may not take a form that centralizes one or several large questions affecting entire classes or governments, but rather take the form of multiple skirmishes in the hegemonic struggle. Hegemonic struggle here does not mean anything so reduced as a relatively unadorned struggle for power, through electoral politics or by force; rather, hegemonic struggle refers to that constant effort between social forces with varying interests in the unfolding of events, to secure support from others and, eventually, to win a kind of dominance in the cultural domain (that of ideas), which can have an impact in the economic. Thus, the concentration is on a very specific skirmish in the broader hegemonic struggle over Vietnam, postwar capitalism, and Canada's role in the world.

Skocpol's historical institutionalist approach, applied to both movements and groups including government, and combined with this Gramscian analysis of history, provides the theoretical framework for this study. In the war resisters' story, public perceptions of the resisters and their supporters changed along with the anti-draft movement's relationship to government institutions; and government attitudes shifted in a dialectical reflection of public opinions.

The first sections of this book present ideas that have influenced its approach and direction. The story of war resisters is also a story of the interaction between government and civil society groups, which, in Gramscian terms, was a hegemonic struggle for domination of both the public discourse and the concrete actions taken by various actors related

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

to this discourse. It is also about the capacity of different institutional actors, both in and outside of government, to form independent opinions and act upon them. I outline the basic shape of the Canadian anti-draft movement, focusing on the network of anti-draft groups that existed in Canada from 1965 until the late 1970s and taking into consideration the interaction between war resisters and Canadians both inside and outside the main movement, including their respective perceptions of motivation and effectiveness.

The central section of the book deals with the treatment and perception of deserters and addresses the role played, or not played, by anti-Americanism. Anti-Americanism does not mean views held against the presence or behaviour of American individuals but views held against American policy. This distinction was slippery at the time, and, although a separate phenomenon, it was also linked to emerging Canadian nationalism in complicated ways. I give an account of the events during the months leading up to the May 1969 official decision to open the border to deserters and the campaign surrounding it. The campaign reflected debates about Canadian nationalism, which had an important impact on its effectiveness and provoked a sometimes acerbic dialogue between activists about politics, the anti-draft movement, and what could validly be called "real" political work. Taken together, these chapters constitute an analysis of a battle for hegemony in the perception and treatment of war resisters in general and deserters in particular.

The final chapter considers more generally the relationship between the anti-draft movement and government institutions as the movement matured. On one hand, anti-draft groups were under constant surveillance, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) pressured the Department of Immigration to find reasons to deport young American immigrants. On the other hand, the lobbying activities in early 1969 were an example of a more regular, although adversarial, relationship with government. These elements illustrate the blurred line between government actors and social movements in the realm of social policy and practice.

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press

© UBC Press 2013

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright, www.accesscopyright.ca.

21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13     5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on FSC-certified ancient-forest-free paper (100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

---

**Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication**

Squires, Jessica, author
Building sanctuary : the movement to support Vietnam war resisters in Canada, 1965-73 / Jessica Squires.

Includes bibliographical references and index.
Issued in print and electronic formats.
ISBN 978-0-7748-2524-5 (bound). – ISBN 978-0-7748-2526-9 (pdf).
ISBN 978-0-7748-2527-6 (epub)

1. Vietnam War, 1961-1975 – Draft resisters – United States. 2. Vietnam War, 1961-1975 – Draft resisters – Canada. 3. Vietnam War, 1961-1975 – Draft resisters – Government policy – Canada. 4. Vietnam War, 1961-1975 – Protest movements – Canada. 5. Peace movements – Canada – History – 20th century. 6. Canada – Emigration and immigration – Government policy – History – 20th century. 7. Canada – Politics and government – 1963-1984. I. Title.

FC628.D73S68 2013     971.064'4     C2013-904231-8
C2013-904232-6

---

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press
The University of British Columbia
2029 West Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2
**www.ubcpress.ca**

Sample Material © 2013 UBC Press