

**Crossing Borders: The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme and the Canadian
Anti-Vietnam War Movement**

by

Matthew McKenzie Bryant Roth

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
in fulfilment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
History

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2008

© Matthew Roth 2008

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

This study examines how the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme (TADP) assisted American war resisters who came to Canada in response to the Vietnam War. It illustrates how the TADP responded to political decisions in Canada and in the United States and adapted its strategies to meet the changing needs of war resisters who fled to Canada. The main sources of material used for this research were the TADP's archival records, newspaper accounts and secondary literature.

This study traces the organization's origins in the Canadian New Left before looking at how TADP released the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*; a document that advised war resisters on how to successfully prepare for immigration. It will also explore how TADP provided immigration counselling, employment, housing services and emotional support to American war resisters. Some of the organization's principal actors and its relationship with other Canadian aid organizations are also examined. As the number of draft resisters coming to Canada decreased during the war, the number of military resisters entering the country increased. This shift led to a change in the type of counselling the TADP provided, a reorientation that is also discussed here. As well, the unexpected numbers of African-Americans and women resisters who crossed the border presented a unique set of challenges to the TADP. Finally, this thesis examines the TADP's attempts to aid American war resisters in Sweden, spread the word about the Canadian government's liberalized immigration regulations in 1973, and address the issue of amnesty for resisters in America.

Acknowledgements

I'm forever grateful to the following people for their help with this thesis and for many other reasons: Roger and Sherryl Roth, Susan and Darrol Bryant, Dr. Bruce Muirhead, Dr. Marlene Epp and Donna Lang.

And of course Kerry too.

I would especially like to thank my MA supervisor Dr. Andrew Hunt. May all graduate students be fortunate enough to have a supervisor as helpful and encouraging as he has been to me.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
1) Inside the TADP Office	5
2) The Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada.....	18
3) Helping with the Border, Employment and Housing.....	34
4) Draft Resisters and Military Resisters.....	43
5) Different Forms of Counselling	60
6) The Attention Turns Toward Sweden	74
7) The “60-day” Period and the Issue of Amnesty.....	80
8) Letters to TADP and Emotional Support	94
Conclusion.....	112
Bibliography	115

Introduction

Southeast Asia was not the only battleground in the Vietnam War. It was also fought in the homes, campuses and streets of America as well. Not since the Civil War had an American conflict so divided the nation. Unlike the Civil War, however, sides were not drawn based on one's geographical location, but over the question of whether or not the United States should be involved in the conflict at all. On one side were those who saw Vietnam as the latest Cold War battleground and feared the "domino effect" of Communism spreading all over Southeast Asia if the North Vietnamese were not contained. On the other side, which grew as the War progressed, stood those who questioned a domestic policy that seemed to lead only to a never-ending loss of American and Vietnamese lives.

While most Americans had an opinion on the War, the decision to support or not support the war effort had far greater consequences for America's young men. The Selective Service System's draft laws guaranteed that men who had registered and were eligible for conscription could not sit on the sidelines of the debate. For those who were eligible to serve in the American military and saw the conflict in Vietnam as a valid cause, the choice was straightforward: enlist and serve. Of course there were also those who championed the cause, and for various reasons either enlisted or were drafted and then obtained one of the numerous deferments or exemptions available, or served in non-combatant positions; and then there were those who began their time in the military full of patriotic fervor, but later drew a different conclusion.

Those who did not agree with the War for any number of reasons faced a bigger dilemma. Obtaining a deferment or exemption was one option that many took pursued. A deferment or exemption could be granted based on many factors including, but not limited to, medical fitness, hardship, Conscientious Objection, and at different times throughout the war, student and marital status.

Yet there were countless others who were drafted and did not qualify for a deferment or exemption or who did qualify, but did not believe in using a technicality in their efforts to resist the war. For these men, the alternatives available did not provide any simple solutions. Compounding the difficult choice was that many who had sought Conscientious Objector status had their claims denied, as the decision was often left to the whim of local draft boards. One option among those that remained was to resist the war by refusing to serve in the military and instead serve a prison sentence. Those who chose this option were members of pacifist religions or those who wished to follow the long-standing American tradition of civil disobedience that ran from Thoreau to Martin Luther King Jr. The decision to resist the war by going to jail was not entered into lightly, as the penalty for draft violations had a maximum five-year sentence. Another option was to resist the war effort by living “underground” in the United States. Being on the run from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, however, was also not a solution that many anticipated with excitement. Some in the anti-war movement felt that the best way to oppose the war was to serve in the armed forces and attempted to change the system from within; however,

most of these quickly found out that there was little opportunity to organize once they were inducted.

One final option was to leave the country.

As with the other options available to those who resisted the draft and war, the decision to leave the United States for another nation was rarely an easy one. Leaving one's friends and family behind for a foreign land was a daunting prospect for many. Nevertheless, many Americans opted to do just this and headed north of the border to Canada. Between 1965 and 1974, approximately 50,000 young Americans came to Canada in response to the Vietnam War.¹ Approximately half of them were women. For many that chose this form of resistance, the transition was made easier by aid organizations in Canada. The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme estimated that "in 1969 alone they dealt with 20,000 young U.S. men interested in coming to Canada."²

The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme (TADP) gained a reputation as one of the most important organizations providing aid and support to war resisters in Canada. Its history, unjustifiably neglected for years, reveals the pivotal role it played in this nation's war resistance movement. Despite the invaluable aid it furnished to countless resisters, the process of immigrating to Canada remained, at best, daunting for the young men who made the journey north from the United States due to their opposition to the Vietnam War. Still, as this thesis will show,

¹ John Hagan, *Northern Passage: American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001): 241. The exact number of resisters is highly contentious. See Joseph Jones, *Contending Statistics: The Numbers for U.S. Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* (Vancouver: Quarter Sheaf, 2005).

² Michael Keating. "The War Evaders in Canada: Many Will Stay, but Many Want to Go Back," *The Globe and Mail*, September 16, 1974. Page 3. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

the TADP evolved over time, adapting its strategies and altering its services to meet the changing needs of American war resisters in Canada.

1) Inside the TADP Office

The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme did not spontaneously arise to meet the needs of resisters, as its origins were in the Canadian New Left student movement.³ It arose out of the Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA), an organization that was founded in 1964.⁴ SUPA had formed out of the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CUCND), in an attempt to turn away from a single-cause organization to one that focused on multiple societal issues such as civil rights and community organizing.⁵ Although SUPA primarily focused on Canadian concerns, its members were greatly influenced by events south of the border. The American New Left organization Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), with its adherence to participatory democracy, heavily influenced SUPA.⁶ Certain chapters of the two organizations cosponsored gatherings, and SUPA “distributed SDS literature through its offices and at its events.”⁷ The ties between SUPA and SDS were also strengthened by the interaction between members from both organizations. Many individuals involved in SUPA had participated in the civil rights movement in the American South, working on voter registration drives with students who

³ The main source of materials used in this paper was the day-to-day files of the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme. The collection is mainly comprised of documents originating from the middle to later part of the organization’s existence (circa 1970-1975) and does not include many files from the earlier years (circa 1967-1969). The files are located in the Pocock (Jack) Memorial Collection in the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library at the University of Toronto (MS COLL 331). Newspaper articles and secondary materials were also used.

⁴ Renée Kasinsky, *Refugees from Militarism: Draft-Age Americans in Canada* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1976): 96.

⁵ Douglas Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1996): 220-221.

⁶ D. Churchill, “When Home Became Away: American Expatriates and New Social Movements in Toronto, 1965-1977” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2001): 61-63.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 65.

would later join SDS.⁸ When SUPA launched an anti-poverty campaign in Kingston, Ontario, based on the SDS affiliated Economic Research Action Projects, former SDS president and prominent American New Left figure Tom Hayden visited Ontario and offered advice on community organizing.⁹

Although SUPA enlarged its mandate and engaged in other forms of activism, it did not abandon the CUCND's commitment to peace. The escalation of the Vietnam War was a primary concern of SUPA.¹⁰ Upon formation, the "first official initiative of SUPA" was a petition calling on the Canadian government to lobby the American government for an "immediate unilateral cease fire."¹¹ In 1966, SUPA began to assist war resisters from the United States. SUPA offered counselling to resisters and helped them find temporary housing, two important services that would be carried on through TADP.¹² Another important initiative of SUPA was the publication of a twelve-page pamphlet entitled *Escape from Freedom or 'I didn't raise my boy to be a Canadian,'* which supplied information on Canadian immigration policy and was sent to antiwar groups in the United States.¹³ After being inundated with requests for

⁸ Cyril Levitt, *Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the Sixties: A Study of Student Movements in Canada, the United States, and West Germany* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1984): 209. Levitt also notes that "one leading SDS figure spent a considerable amount of time working in the SUPA office in Toronto, and at least two SUPA activists spent time with the SDS in the United States (Pg. 64). Along with noting other connections between the two organizations, Churchill (Pg. 64) also points out that a SUPA volunteer named Diane Burrows was "one of the leading organizers of the Selma protest."

⁹ Churchill, 63 and Kasinsky, 96.

¹⁰ Levitt, 49 and Churchill, 68.

¹¹ Churchill, 68.

¹² Myrna Kostash, *Long Way From Home: The Story of the Sixties Generation in Canada* (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, 1980): 60.

¹³ Kasinsky, 97 and Joseph Jones, "The House of Anansi's Singular Bestseller," *Canadian Notes & Queries* 61 (2002): 19-22. Anyone looking for more information on the topic of war resisters in Canada should also see Jones' website, as it is an invaluable resource – it led the author of this

information about immigration to Canada, SUPA hired a resister to answer correspondence full time.¹⁴

The decision by SUPA to aid resisters did not sit well with SDS. At a summer convention in 1967, SDS “developed a position opposing emigration to Canada as a form of draft resistance.”¹⁵ One member of SUPA in a 1967 Washington Post article reflected the negative view of immigrating to Canada that SDS propagated: “We [SUPA] don’t entice people to come up here. It isn’t easy for them. And we’re not baby sitters.”¹⁶ As prominent SDSers voiced concern that their base of support might leave for Canada, they “put enormous pressure on SUPA to disassociate itself from the counselling of draft dodgers” and SUPA “eventually bowed out of these responsibilities.”¹⁷ Infighting and the rise of other New Left organizations that drew membership away from SUPA contributed to its demise in 1967.¹⁸ Before SUPA folded, however, members who were still interested in aiding draft resisters renamed SUPA’s Anti-Draft Committee the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme.¹⁹

After the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme (TADP) split from SUPA, it moved into an office of its own at 2279 Young Street in the fall of 1967.²⁰

paper to some of the secondary literature used throughout this document.

<http://www.library.ubc.ca/jones/amcan.html>

¹⁴ Ibid., 96-97. It is unclear who was first hired for this job; Kasinsky states that it was an American resister named Richard Paterak, Williams gives the credit to a Danny Draitch and Churchill (Pg. 158) implies that along with Paterak, “Daniel Draiche and Heather Dean” were the first SUPA members to provide assistance. Roger Neville Williams, *The New Exiles: American War Resisters in Canada* (New York: Liveright Publishers Corporation, 1971): 61.

¹⁵ Jones, 19.

¹⁶ John Maffre, “Draft Dodgers Conduct Own Anti-U.S. Underground War From Canadian Sanctuary,” *The Washington Post*, January 22, 1967, Page E1, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁷ Kasinsky, 98.

¹⁸ Owram, 231.

¹⁹ Jones, 19.

²⁰ Ibid.

Another move came later when the organization moved to 11 ½ Spadina Avenue. Descriptions of these two offices provide some insight into TADP.²¹ In one memoir, a newly arrived resister compared the TADP office to a high-school newspaper office.²² He also noted that “there were some people plunked on second-hand chairs, and a map of the United States with pin markers stuck up on a second-hand wall” and “each pin on the map represented someone who had come to Canada”²³ John Hagan described TADP’s Spadina Avenue office as “a cross between a social club and a committee room, or a small insurance or real estate office, except for its sunny yellow door with a peace dove in the center.”²⁴ A Chicago Tribune reporter covering TADP in an article on resisters in Canada described the heavily covered walls of TADP’s office including a poster of a destitute man “huddled against a brick wall...wrapped only in a blanket” with the words “escape from drafts” inscribed and a peace symbol “made entirely from draft cards, some slightly charred at the edges.” The reporter also commented on how the names on the cards had been blacked out for security reasons.²⁵ Another reporter commented on the “huge Canadian flag” that hung on the wall.²⁶ Yet another observer could have been describing a counter-cultural hippie haven when he described the TADP’s office:

Little piles of brochures and leaflets are stacked in corners or piled on window sills, and someone has carefully leaned a guitar against the safest

²¹ The two offices are being described together because various accounts of the offices do not always indicate which one is being referred to.

²² Allen Morgan, *Dropping out in 3/4 Time* (New York: Seabury Press, 1972): 107.

²³ *Ibid.*, 107-108.

²⁴ Hagan, 76.

²⁵ Glenn McCurdy, “The American Draft Resisters in Canada,” *Chicago Tribune*, March 10, 1968, Page F26. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²⁶ Barry Craig, “5,000 Manuals Published Here for U.S. Draft-Dodgers” *The Globe and Mail*, February 12, 1968. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

wall. Bob Dylan or Dr. Spock look down from a huge poster, surrounded by anti-war expressions, cartoons, sketches, and pieces of poetry written by flower children on sheets of tablet paper. Hanging from the ceiling is a mobile fowl inscribed, 'Chicken Little was right!'.... The hallway to the lavatory is covered with movement posters and signs....As you turn the knob, a small label suggests that you are about to enter the 'Richard M. Nixon Memorial Toilet.'²⁷

Most observers agreed the TADP office was a bustling place where resisters swapped stories and passed on advice about everything from job prospects to rooms available for rent to bus and subway information.²⁸ The impression is that the office itself was not only a place to receive counselling, but also an important center for resisters to congregate, share information and meet other resisters.²⁹

Staffers formed the backbone of the Anti-Draft office. Examining the individuals who comprised TADP is vital in understanding how the resistance movement in Canada operated. This is not always an easy task, however, since many people assisted the organization for a relatively short period of time. As an undated document released by TADP commented, "since the Programme's inception both the staff and the clientele have undergone many changes. Staff has varied depending on both need and resources. From an original staff of two persons it grew to six during what was yet our busiest period."³⁰ In Rene Kasinsky's *Refugees from Militarism*, the author explained how staffing of aid

²⁷ Kenneth Fred Emerick, *War Resisters Canada: The World of the American Military-Political Refugees* (Knox: Knox, Pennsylvania Free Press, 1972): 233.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ For more on this point see Churchill, 176-182.

³⁰ TADP archives, Box 13, Folder 7. The following article mentions that TADP also had a "nine-man governing board that meets about once a month." The role of this board, whom it was comprised of, and how long it lasted is not entirely clear. Lansing R. Shepard, "Draft Evaders: Jail or Self-Exile?" *Christian Science Monitor*, December 19, 1968. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

organizations in Canada usually worked and offered one possible explanation as to why there was frequent turnover of staff:

A counselor who had been on the staff for over a year was considered a veteran. A full-time counselor working day in and day out usually could not tolerate longer than six to ten months before [he or she] became emotionally “burned out” from the extreme demands of the work. After a rest period, a few dedicated souls would come back to continue their work, especially if there was no one immediately available to take over. Usually before a counselor left [he or she] would spend a month or two ‘breaking in’ a replacement, working with [him or her] until [he or she] learned the counseling procedure, office routine and the myriad of details to be handled.³¹

Kasinsky’s observation was certainly applicable to TADP. Over TADP’s history, many individuals entered and left the organization. There were also countless volunteers who helped on special occasions. Although all of these individuals cannot be discussed in detail, a few biographical sketches provide insights into the composition of the staff. Many different individuals appear as spokespeople for the organization in newspaper articles: Danny Zimmerman from Brooklyn, Mark Satin from Minnesota, Bernard Jaffe from New York, Dick Burroughs from Texas, John Levy from New York City and Dick Brown from Detroit are but a few staffers who frequently appear; all of them were American draft resisters.

Mark Satin was a central figure during the transitional phase between SUPA and TADP, as he co-founded TADP. Satin was raised in Minnesota and spent the majority of his high-school years in Texas; by the time he arrived in Toronto in 1967 at the young age of 19, he already had a long history of

³¹ Kasinsky, 82.

activism.³² At age 18, Satin dropped out of school to work for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and journeyed to Mississippi as a civil rights worker. Later he was president of his college's SDS chapter at Harpur College in Binghamton, New York, where 19 percent of the student population joined the chapter, giving it the distinction of having "the highest percentage of student enrolment at any SDS chapter ever."³³ As the war in Vietnam escalated, Satin became more and more disillusioned with American society: "The war...made a lot of things clear to me. There were so many hypocrisies about it, and you got to see that your government was not the greatest and most honest in the world like you were brought up to believe."³⁴ In another interview, Satin expanded on his disillusionment with the American government: "They talk of freedom for the South Vietnamese, but they know perfectly well that without the natural resources not only of Vietnam, but of all Asia, U.S. industry would be crippled."³⁵ Satin had protested against the war as early as 1965 and participated in a "sit-in" during which a group of anti-war activists attempted to block the driveway of the White House.³⁶

After Satin decided to drop out of Harpur College, he received an induction notice. Satin's opposition to the war left him with few alternatives, most of which he found unacceptable. "As a CO I would have been serving the

³² Kasinsky, 98 and Williams, 62.

³³ Kasinsky, 98 and Mark Satin, *Radical Middle: The Politics We Need Now* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2004): 28.

³⁴ Dan Wakefield, *Supernation at Peace and War: Being Certain Observations, Depositions, Testimonies, and Graffiti Gathered on a One-Man Fact-and-Fantasy-Finding Tour of the Most Powerful Nation in the World* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown & Company, 1968): 11.

³⁵ John Burns, "Deaf to the Draft: Called in U.S., but Asleep in Toronto" *The Globe and Mail*, October 11, 1967. Section A, Page 2. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

war machine in a non-combatant way – the only thing I wouldn't be doing was pulling the trigger," he said. "Jail was out because the U.S. makes no distinction between political prisoners and murderers, drug addicts and rapists. As far as my friends would know, I would be in jail as a criminal."³⁷ After receiving a copy of SUPA's *Escape from Freedom*, Satin decided to immigrate to Canada, yet he admitted he had little knowledge of the country and thought it had "log cabins and igloos in the middle of town."³⁸ After arriving in Canada, Satin felt that he had made the right decision. "I feel as though a great weight has been lifted from my shoulders. It's colder here, but you feel warm because you know you're not trying to kill people," he said.³⁹

After his arrival in Toronto in 1967, Satin was recruited by a SUPA member named Heather Dean and before long he was offered the job of directing the SUPA Anti-Draft Committee, which he "threw himself obsessively into...working seven days a week, from nine each morning often to midnight."⁴⁰ During his time at SUPA and in the early days of TADP, Satin expanded the scope of assistance provided by establishing a network of individuals to assist resisters once they arrived in Canada.⁴¹ Satin's tenure did not last long, however, as he frequently clashed with other members of SUPA/TADP over a number of

³⁶ Author Unknown, "19 Arrested Trying Viet Sit-In at White House," *The Washington Post*, April 21, 1965. Page A3. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

³⁷ Williams, 63.

³⁸ Wakefield, 11 and Harry Rosenthal, "Canada Increasingly Draft Dodgers' Haven," *Los Angeles Times*, June 2, 1968. Page H19. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

³⁹ Jules Witcover, *The Year the Dream Died: Revisiting 1968 in America* (New York: Warner Books, 1997): 6.

⁴⁰ Pierre Berton, *1967: The Last Good Year* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, 1997): 198.

⁴¹ Kasinsky, 98-99.

issues and was “fired/purged” in late spring 1968.⁴² Before his departure, however, Satin had made a great contribution to the resistance movement with a document he wrote titled *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*.

Detroit native Dick Brown was another key figure in TADP. After leaving the University of Michigan due to an illness, Brown lost his student deferment and was eligible for the draft.⁴³ In *Northern Passage: American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* by John Hagan, Brown recollects that his growing concern about the war was the result of personal contact with a cousin who served in Vietnam. While overseas, Brown’s cousin wrote home a letter that advised him that “if there’s anything you can do to stay out of this war, do it.” When his cousin returned home after serving in Vietnam, Brown talked with him and another veteran about their combat experiences. Brown could see that the war had changed his cousin, and the experience was not something he wanted to share. “I realized from the stories that he was telling me there was stuff I wasn’t hearing, but [from] what I did hear I realized – no way do I want to be a part of this – absolutely no way,” he recalled. Hagan notes that Brown’s story “conveys a common theme in the thinking of many draft resisters”; “that this was an ugly war, of doubtful purpose, to be avoided if at all possible.”⁴⁴ When Brown

⁴² Jones, 19. According to Jones, some of the issues included “community versus assimilation for American immigrants, the nature of correspondence with clients, office space, media relations, extent of counseling and support, production of the *Manual*, and governance.” Jones also points out that “after TADP moved to separate premises, associates of what had been the SUPA Anti-Draft Committee continued to be involved in meetings of late 1967 and early 1968” and “SDS opposition to American emigration generated early concern about the *Manual*.” After Satin left TADP, he ran a hostel for resisters in Vancouver and later helped to popularize the term “New Age” in a book he wrote called *New Age Politics: Healing Self and Society*. See Satin, 28 and 125 and Hagan, 76.

⁴³ Hagan, 22.

⁴⁴ Hagan, 22.

received his induction notice, he was faced with, in his words, “a very grim writing on the wall....Canada, the army or jail.” For Brown, choosing between those options was easy, and in 1969, he went to TADP for advice on how to immigrate.⁴⁵ After working for a few newspapers in Ontario, he ended up back at TADP and was one of the leading figures in the organization in the early 1970s.⁴⁶ Although most resisters could not return to the United States without fear of legal trouble, Brown was not one of them. After being in Canada for a few years, he discovered that all of his draft files had been destroyed when someone blew up his draft board office in Detroit. He decided to stay in Canada anyway.⁴⁷

Not all of the individuals involved in TADP were eligible for the draft. Max Allen, who was involved with TADP in the organization’s early years, had been active in the anti-war movement in the United States and was one of the founders of a group that was the forerunner of the New York Resistance. After reading a newspaper article about TADP, Allen drove to Toronto to visit the organization. Allen, however, was in no threat of being drafted – he had already served in the U.S. Army and received an honourable discharge. Instead, he wanted to see if counselling young Americans that Canada was an alternative to the military was a suitable option, as he was having trouble recommending prison as a course of action. After visiting Toronto, Allen chose to stay and work for TADP. According to Williams, Allen “felt he could contribute more through

⁴⁵ Michael Keating, “U.S. Draft Dodgers Settle into the Canadian Mosaic.” *The Globe and Mail*, September 11, 1974, Third Section, Page 33.

⁴⁶ Much of the correspondence in the TADP archive is written by Dick Brown

⁴⁷ Keating, 33.

the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme than through the antidraft groups in New York, since TADP at least could offer a realistic alternative to the draft whereas the American organizations could not.”⁴⁸

The descriptions given so far give one the impression that TADP was a male dominated organization, but this could not be further from the truth. Many women played vital roles throughout TADP’s history. One such woman was Naomi Wall, who grew up in Washington D.C. and later came to Canada in 1963 with her husband, who had acquired a teaching position in the Psychology Department at the University of Toronto.⁴⁹ Wall would become instrumental in helping resisters find housing and employment offers and by 1971 was the senior staff member at TADP.⁵⁰ Explaining her involvement in TADP, Wall noted that she had “always wanted to do something that is relevant to the peace movement....[and] considering that I’m in Canada and the movement is in the United States, the most relevant thing happening here is the draft program.”⁵¹

Another important member of TADP was Katie McGovern, who left Illinois for Canada in 1970. John Hagan’s profile of McGovern notes that she originally came to Toronto to “help move a girlfriend whose boyfriend was escaping the draft.” McGovern had been involved in the antiwar and farm labour

⁴⁸ Allen’s story is recounted from Williams, 64.

⁴⁹ Hagan, 100.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 101 and Williams, 69.

⁵¹ Author Unknown, “The Can’t Come Home Again,” *The Hartford Courant*, June 3, 1968. Page 17. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. Incidentally, Wall later married Karl Armstrong. Armstrong gained notoriety during the 1970s after participating in the bombing of the University of Wisconsin Army Math Research Center. The anti-war activists had accidentally killed a fellow activist who, unbeknownst to the others, was in the building during the “predawn hours of the morning.” After the bombing, Armstrong fled with his brother to Canada to hide out. It was during this time he met Wall, who had “initially assumed they were draft dodgers.” After being extradited to the United States and sent to prison, Wall married Armstrong “in part to improve his chances for parole.” See Hagan, 144-146.

movements in the United States and continued her activism upon arrival in Canada.⁵² After becoming involved with farm labour causes in Ontario, she later “moved down the hall” to the TADP office in a building that was shared by both tenants.⁵³ McGovern’s dedication to the anti-war cause was strong; by 1974 she was the only one remaining at TADP and continued the organization’s services, albeit in a limited manner, from her own apartment.⁵⁴ Women such as Heather Dean, Sylvia Tucker, Carol Oliver and Mona Stevens were also involved in TADP.

The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme would not have functioned very long without the dedication of the staff and volunteers who gave countless hours of their time to help others. TADP also depended on the help of others as well – especially for financial assistance. Operating TADP involved many costs: phone bills, office space, staffing, postage, and transporting resisters to the border were some of the major expenses. Donations from private citizens, church and university groups, and the proceeds from the sale of the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* were vital to keeping the organization afloat. Like many other organizations, TADP was constantly in need of additional funds. For much of the organization’s existence, the main source of funds came from the National Council of Churches in the United States and from the Canadian Council of Churches in Canada. The backing of the churches was a lifeline to the

⁵² Hagan, 109-110.

⁵³ Michael Keating. “The War Evaders in Canada: Many Will Stay, but Many Want to Go Back,” *The Globe and Mail*, September 16, 1974. Page 3. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

resistance movement in Canada as they backed not only TADP, but also many of the other major aid organizations in Canada.

2) The Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada

In order to understand how resisters ended up at TADP's office, it is necessary to look at the numerous publications on immigration that were produced in Canada during the era. One of the earliest documents was a four-page pamphlet entitled *Immigration to Canada and Its Relation to the Draft* that was published by the Vancouver Committee to Aid War Objectors. In preparing the document, the committee studied the Canadian Immigration Act and extradition treaties between the United States and Canada.⁵⁵ According to Kasinsky, the pamphlet included basic information about the different types of official status that someone could have in Canada and suggested that landed immigrant status was the most desirable, as it led to citizenship. It also highlighted the point that one's draft status was irrelevant in the immigration process.⁵⁶

As mentioned earlier, SUPA also published an informative twelve-page document entitled *Escape from Freedom or 'I didn't raise my boy to be a Canadian.'* Like the Vancouver committee's pamphlet, the SUPA publication provided basic information on Canadian immigration laws. Although brief, the document included important material that focused on who could come to Canada and who was prohibited, the different types of status available, application procedures and possible causes that would result in either extradition or deportation. A final section looked at "Life in Canada" and suggested that most Americans find Canada "more relaxed – looser, easier, [and] more friendly

⁵⁵ Kasinsky, 93.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

than the U.S.” The section on Canada also stated that there was less discrimination, greater civil liberties, and noted that “middle class Canadians live in well-heated homes, not igloos.”⁵⁷

The main author of the SUPA booklet was a draft resister from Massachusetts named Richard Paterak.⁵⁸ After graduating from Marquette University in 1965, Paterak joined the governmental anti-poverty program VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) as, in his words, “a starry eyed liberal do-gooder.” Like many young Americans of the time, his optimism soon turned to disillusionment as a result of the escalating war. For Paterak, however, the war was only a symptom of a larger ill. “The war was the first major crack I saw in the System, but that crack allowed me to see in deeper and see that the war wasn’t the problem but a manifestation of it,” he noted. “The problem was the System.” Feeling that it did not make sense to “sit passively” and wait for his induction, Paterak decided that the only way he could “maintain [his] integrity and [his] radical self” was to leave the United States for Canada.⁵⁹

As mentioned earlier, one of SUPA’s booklets made it into the hands of Mark Satin. After *Escape from Freedom* led to his arrival in Canada and subsequent work with SUPA, Satin was moved to write an in-depth document on

⁵⁷ Student Union for Peace Action, *Escape from Freedom or ‘I Didn’t Raise my Boy to be a Canadian,’* (Toronto: SUPA).

⁵⁸ John M. Lee, “Canadians Advise Foes of U.S. Draft” *New York Times*, January 29, 1967, Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁵⁹ Kasinsky, 97. It is worth noting that SUPA’s pamphlet caused a brief stir in Canada’s House of Commons when John Diefenbaker, who was Opposition Leader at the time, asked Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson if a \$4,000 grant given to SUPA by the privy council had been used to finance the booklet and wondered if the cabinet had known it would be used for “this unusual purpose.” Pearson responded by saying that he not seen the document, but would look into the matter. See “Probe Canadian Student Fund,” *Chicago Tribune*, February 21, 1967. Page 14. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

immigration to Canada called the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*.⁶⁰ The main difference between the *Manual* and earlier documents was its scope. Whereas the Vancouver pamphlet was four pages and the SUPA booklet was twelve, the *Manual* was eighty-seven pages in length.⁶¹

The *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* began with a brief preface entitled “words from Canadians” in which five individuals presented some brief thoughts on Canadian society. The first was written by a lawyer and began by stating that “even though circumstance and not choice has made Canada your haven, we are happy to welcome you.” The “we” in this instance are those who, like the lawyer, were associated with TADP. The author warned resisters that not all Canadians would be as welcoming: “Our society is no less conservative, no less enthusiastic about containing Communism than yours.” Next was an entry by an employment counsellor with the Department of Manpower and Immigration, who the editor notes was writing as a private citizen. He advised readers that although the Canadian government was not perfect, it might be the “most functioning democracy in the world.” He also highlighted some of the differences between Canada’s provinces, suggested that discrimination was more subdued than in the United States and made it known that most Canadian companies would hire resisters.⁶²

⁶⁰ Hagan, 75. In Douglas Fetherling’s memoir of the Sixties, he contends that the *Manual* was “a packaged sort of book, rather than one that had been written or even edited (in the sense that an anthology would be).” Kasinsky (Pg. 94) also notes that much of the research done by the Committee in Vancouver was “incorporated into the *Manual*.” Nevertheless, Satin was the one who “compiled” the *Manual* and assuredly wrote some sections. See Douglas Fetherling, *Travels by Night: A Memoir of the Sixties* (Toronto: McArthur & Company, 1994): 138.

⁶¹ The *Manual* referred to in the following pages is Mark Satin, ed. *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* 2nd ed. (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1968).

⁶² *Ibid.*, 1-3.

This was followed by the comments of Dr. William Mann, a Sociology Professor from York University. His editorial focused on the differences in attitude between Americans and Canadians and began by stating that Canada was like a “slightly less mature version of certain parts of the United States.” Although Canadians, especially those under 40, were greatly influenced by the United States, they were also different in “style” and “expectations.” Their style, Mann noted, was “more inclined to conformity, to some lingering attachments of puritanism, to obeying the law and to cautious investigation of new ideas” and their expectations were moderate, restrained and less confident. Mann’s entry concluded by stating that the on-going struggle between the enjoyment of the “good things that American capital and enterprise bring” and greater Canadian autonomy put the identity of Canadians “up for grabs.”⁶³

The next part, written by Heather Dean, an activist affiliated with both SUPA and TADP, disputed the claims put forth by the preceding section. After a brief quip about Dr. Mann – (“every colony has its kept professors who train the natives to think of themselves as docile”), Dean argued that the American dominance of the Canadian economy and culture was not by “default”, but through the “use and abuse of unequal power.” Canadians, Dean contended, weren’t afraid of losing “the good things that American capital and enterprise bring us...they’re afraid of the Marines.”⁶⁴ Writing about Mann’s and Dean’s differing viewpoints, David Churchill has noted that the preface painted two pictures of what resisters could expect in Canada: “Mann’s words attempted to

⁶³ Ibid., 2-3.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 3.

reassure Americans that Canada was a familiar world, one which was very much like the U.S. In contrast Dean placed potential immigrants on notice that Canada was a very different place and that there were crucial questions of power and sovereignty to be recognized.”⁶⁵

A Reverend from the United Church of Canada wrote the final piece of the preface. Unlike the other entries, it was directed at Canadians more than American resisters. After he compared the resisters with United Empire Loyalists, he urged all Canadians to help out with housing, financial assistance, employment, and friendship and to “reach out in the same spirit” as the *Manual* did. He encouraged others, especially “people of the church,” to sympathize with the plight of the resisters.⁶⁶

The introduction of the *Manual* stated that it was a “handbook for draft resisters who have chosen to immigrate to Canada” and suggested that if it was “read... carefully, from cover to cover...you will know how.”⁶⁷ It also noted that the “pamphlet does not take sides” and attempted to offer a balanced view by providing the pros and cons of immigrating to Canada.⁶⁸ Immigrating, the introduction noted, was “not an easy way out,” as it would mean leaving behind parents and friends without the opportunity of ever returning to the United States. On the upside, Americans who did choose to leave the United States for Canada would find “little discrimination by Canadians against draft resisters” and a “surprising amount of sympathy.” The introduction also reminded

⁶⁵ Churchill, 191.

⁶⁶ Mark Satin, ed. *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* 2nd ed. (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1968): 4.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 5.

potential resisters that Canada was not the “end of the world”: “You do not leave civilization behind when you cross the border. (In fact, many Canadians would claim that you enter it.)” Weighing the options of immigrating to Canada is ultimately left up to the individual, and the author of the introduction suggests that is the hardest part: “The toughest problem a draft resister faces is not how to immigrate but whether he really wants to. And only you can answer that. For yourself. That’s what Nuremberg was all about.”⁶⁹

The rest of the *Manual* is made up of two parts; one focused on the immigration process and the other on life in Canada. The first section on immigration outlined the various ways to apply for visitor, student and landed immigrant status.⁷⁰ There are detailed chapters on how to apply from the United States, at the border, by mail, at a consulate, or through a relative. Any question a prospective resister could have had about the immigration process was answered in this first section, whether it was about who was prohibited from entry, applying for citizenship or even whether a dog, cat or a variety of other pets could be brought across the border.⁷¹ To ensure that the information was accurate and up-to-date, the first section of the *Manual* was reviewed by “two lawyers, a secret supporter at the Canadian Department of Immigration, and counsellors at seven U.S. anti-draft groups.”⁷²

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 5-6.

⁷⁰ Landed immigrant status entitled an individual to virtually all the rights of citizenship except the right to vote and obtain a passport. See Mark Satin, ed. *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* 2nd ed. (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1968): 7.

⁷¹ Mark Satin, ed. *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* 2nd ed. (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1968): 40.

⁷² Jones, 19.

Arguably the most valuable piece of advice on immigration was how the “points system” worked. The system, which rated prospective immigrants on their level of education, occupation, age, languages spoken and other categories, was introduced by the Immigration Department only months before the *Manual* was printed. The system was meant to make immigration more equitable, as it rated everyone equally on a scale of one hundred “points.” An applicant that was given at least fifty points was deemed suitable for immigration. One author has argued that the new regulation was beneficial to resisters, as it made the immigration process more impartial by removing “personal prejudice from the system.” He also pointed out, however, that it “made the system complicated to the degree that very few resisters could get in if they hadn’t at least read the *TADP Manual*.”⁷³

One of the most interesting aspects of the first section, along with the impressive breadth of information provided on immigration, was how it was presented. The language is clear, succinct, and plain; missing is the New Left rhetoric common in much activist literature of the time period. The writing style in the first section of the *Manual* is more reminiscent of an actual Department of Immigration brochure. One observer remarked that even the design of the *Manual*, with a plain beige cover that has the title and a red maple leaf in the right hand corner, looked like a “Government of Canada publication.”⁷⁴ Lest the readers of the document forget that it was not an official government document, some of the comments would have revealed to a potential resister that the

⁷³ Williams, 74.

authors of the booklet were well aware of the intended audience. Some of the advice offered would certainly have not found its way into a government publication. One step of “applying at the border” for example, recommends that individuals “bathe, shave, and get a haircut. You must appear neat. Applying for status is a suit-and-tie affair, even in 100-degree weather.”⁷⁵ Another recommendation warned individuals that any connection they may have to a resister aid organization is “generally not an asset in the eyes of an immigration officer.”⁷⁶

The second part of the *Manual* was meant to familiarize individuals with Canada. There were sections written by different authors on topics including Canadian politics, culture, geography, living conditions and universities. Once again, the scope of information is impressive; while the SUPA document included two pages on life in Canada, the *Manual* contained over thirty. The information in the latter half of the *Manual* was informative but also much more opinionated than the first. In particular were two overarching themes that ran through the Canadian section. One was an unequivocal Canadian Nationalism/Anti-Americanism standpoint. Many of the authors focused their narratives on Canada’s relationship with the United States. The section on Canadian history, for example, noted that “it has sometimes seemed that the only thing holding Canadians together was a common dislike of the United States.”⁷⁷ Canadian politics were also predominantly viewed in relation to America, such

⁷⁴ Fetherling, 138. The first four editions of the *Manual* had this cover. The fifth edition had a map of Canada and the sixth had a woman and two children.

⁷⁵ Mark Satin, ed. *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* 2nd ed. (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1968): 23.

as the descriptions of political interest groups and parties. It was written, for example, that there were no “Canadian capitalists” as “all business-oriented politicians are of necessity servants of the Americans.”⁷⁸ The Social Credit parties in Alberta and British Columbia were said to “be in a race with the right-wing Liberal administration of Saskatchewan to see who can sell the country to the U.S. the fastest.”⁷⁹ Even part of the discussion of English and French relations was framed around America: “English Canadians argue that individually, English and French Canada cannot resist the encroachments of the United States. The Quebecois retort that they haven’t noticed any ‘Anglos’ resisting terribly hard lately, and that, far from helping them resist the U.S., the English are dragging them down the drain.”⁸⁰

The other main theme that ran through the chapters on Canada was that the country was an inviting place to live. Canada was presented as both socially tolerant and culturally and technologically advanced. Any resisters who came to Canada would be joining in the tradition of a long line of American dissenters, which included loyalists and African-Americans. The resisters, it was written, would be welcomed too and receive a generally sympathetic reception from Canadian citizens, the press, churches, and even the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, which “seems to like young Americans.”⁸¹ The employment and housing scenes were also presented in a favourable light.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 24.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 53.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 57.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 56.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 54.

⁸¹ Ibid., 80.

The author of the section on culture highlighted Canada's achievements: Marshall McLuhan, the electron microscope, Banting and Best's discovery of insulin, ice hockey and the Calgary Stampede – all of which indicated that Canada was “no barren wilderness to live in.”⁸² Lest any American thought he or she would be entering a cultural backwater, the *Manual* included a brief description of every university and college in Canada along with its enrolment numbers, library size and tuition fee. The section on living conditions and costs, a chapter described as “really for mothers” of prospective resisters, pointed out that based on “percentages of households owning certain goods,” more Canadians had telephones, refrigerators, washing machines, central heating, televisions and cars than Americans did.⁸³ Unappealing details about Canada such as the cold winter weather were downplayed. Instead of highlighting the freezing temperatures, a chart was included that had monthly temperature means, rain and snowfall amounts and freezing dates. Commenting on why the *Manual* presented Canada's weather statically, Mark Satin stated that “if we described the weather here they wouldn't believe it.”⁸⁴ Perhaps they would not believe it, but one must wonder if they also would not have been as likely to journey north had the *Manual* not presented Canada so favourably.

According to Mark Satin, the *Manual* was written during his time with SUPA despite the organization's wishes: “The ADC [SUPA Anti-Draft Committee] didn't even want me to write [the *Manual*] – I wrote it at night, in

⁸² Ibid., 60.

⁸³ Ibid., 65.

⁸⁴ Barry Craig, “5,000 Manuals Published Here for U.S. Draft-Dodgers” *The Globe and Mail*, February 12, 1968. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

the SUPA office, three or four nights a week after counselling guys and gals 8-10 hours a day – pounded it out in several drafts over several months.”⁸⁵ When Satin left SUPA and co-founded TADP, he was not the only one who made the transition between the two organizations. Some of the other individuals associated with SUPA also became involved with TADP, and they continued to discourage immigration to Canada as a form of draft resistance.⁸⁶ Their reluctance was readily apparent, noted Satin, as “the first act of the reconstituted committee was to reduce the next press run of the *Manual* from 30,000 to 20,000 copies, even though 12,000 copies were on back order.”⁸⁷

Satin stated that his reason for writing the *Manual* was in response to the growing amount of correspondence that requested information.⁸⁸ It was not, as he reiterated in the press at the time of its publication, meant to entice resisters to immigrate to Canada. Satin was adamant that none of TADP’s literature “encourage people to immigrate” or “advertise immigration.”⁸⁹ The only thing Satin was encouraging, he remarked, was “not to take the government’s word as final judgement, that it’s your choice of whether to go into the Army - not the government’s.”⁹⁰ The *Manual*, Satin once stated, was meant to “remind” potential resisters that they had a choice, and if they did “decide to leave, how they can do it.”⁹¹

⁸⁵ Jones, 19.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 20.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Author Unknown, “They Can’t Come Home Again,” *The Hartford Courant*, June 3, 1968. Page 17. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. Also see Jones, 20 and Williams, 67.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Barry Craig, “5,000 Manuals Published Here for U.S. Draft-Dodgers” *The Globe and Mail*, February 12, 1968. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Regardless of its intent, however, the *Manual's* impact on the migration northwards was immense. From 1968 to 1971, six different editions of the *Manual* were published.⁹² Approximately 65,000 copies of the *Manual* were sold or given away during this time period.⁹³ The *Manual* was also widely covered in the press, which increased awareness of Canada as a viable option.⁹⁴ Even if the articles about immigrating to Canada were negative, as they often were, they had the reverse effect of publicizing aid organizations resisters could seek out.⁹⁵ Countless resisters have mentioned the role that the *Manual* played in their decision to leave the United States for Canada. In John Hagan's study of resisters, it is noted that more than a third of his sample had read the *Manual* while still in America. Almost another quarter obtained a copy upon arrival in Canada.⁹⁶ Kenneth Emerick's study also found that at least a third of the draft resisters he interviewed had access to the *Manual*. Joseph Jones has pointed out that the number of copies pressed "offers an uncanny numerical correspondence to the target audience who actually came to Canada."⁹⁷

The information provided in the *Manual* on the immigration process and life in Canada was exhaustive and left few questions unanswered. This was

⁹² The House of Anansi Press, an important independent Canadian literary institution, published most editions of the *Manual* jointly with TADP. The press was founded by noted Canadian authors Dave Godfrey and Dennis Lee who incidentally "had connections with SUPA, and Lee had some early involvement in draft counselling." See Jones, 19 and Fetherling, 137.

⁹³ Kasinsky, 86. Kasinsky states that this many were sold. However, it is apparent that TADP also gave "a large percentage away." How many of the 65,000 were actually sold and how many were given away is not entirely clear. See TADP archives, "Manual For Draft Age Immigrants to Canada," Box 13, Folder 9.

⁹⁴ Jones, 20.

⁹⁵ Williams, 24. Hagan (Pg. 127) recounts the story of a couple that went to Canada in 1967 and visited the TADP office after their arrival in Toronto. While still in the United States, they had found the TADP address printed in an article about Mark Satin that appeared in the *Ladies Home Journal*.

⁹⁶ Hagan, 77-78, and Emerick, 101.

important, as it countered the inaccurate information and “outright lies” that were being dispersed through the American media at the time about immigration to Canada.⁹⁸ As the *Manual* also stated, “public officials, amateur draft counsellors, lawyers who do not specialize in draft work, and, unfortunately, the ‘underground’ press are notorious sources of misinformation.”⁹⁹ The misleading information given by public officials was the subject of a 1967 newspaper article in which Mark Satin criticized Canadian immigration officers who were stationed in America for giving draft resisters false information about Canadian law in order to “discourage” emigration. An example was the “holder of a Master of Arts degree [who] was told at the Chicago consulate not to emigrate because he had no work experience.”¹⁰⁰ In another article, Satin stated that he was sure that for every American citizen that left the country, there was another who wanted to but did not have the accurate information or know-how.¹⁰¹ Thus, the *Manual* was undoubtedly welcomed by many, as it offered correct immigration information.

Yet the *Manual* went beyond providing “facts,” and as David Churchill has written, “was a way in which aid groups, expatriates and Canadian activists prefigured Toronto as cultural and political space.” Churchill contends that “an image of Toronto emerged, one that was inclusive, politically progressive, anti-

⁹⁷ Jones, 20.

⁹⁸ Williams, 66. Williams notes that one of the “outright lies” in the American press was that the FBI was visiting resisters in Canada and “offering to drop all charges if [they would] return home to the U.S. for immediate induction.” This, according to Williams, never happened.

⁹⁹ Mark Satin, ed. *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* 2nd ed. (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1968): 6.

¹⁰⁰ Author Unknown, “Draft-Dodgers Mised, Toronto Helper Says” *The Globe and Mail*, December 11, 1967. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

imperialist and counter-cultural.”¹⁰² In other words, Canada and Canadian society were presented as considerably more attractive alternatives to the other choices a young man of draft age who opposed the war was faced with, and to the domestic and foreign problems America was experiencing. As one author put it, “if a resister had any doubts about going to Canada before he read the book, he seldom had any after finishing it.”¹⁰³

The document was also extremely important for other aid organizations both within Canada and the United States; Emerick points to the fact that groups in America often had “insufficient and out-of-date information on immigration to Canada.”¹⁰⁴ It also comforted some families of resisters, as it offered a “complete description of the situation each person will face” when he arrived in Canada.¹⁰⁵ In at least one instance, the *Manual* was also considered a valuable source for immigration officials as the father of a potential resister found out; upon visiting a Canadian immigration office and asking about a “possible extradition of his son for a draft offence if the family immigrated to Canada... an immigration official...brought out a copy of the *Manual*.”¹⁰⁶

It will never be known for certain where all of the 65,000 *Manuals* ended up, but a record of the bulk sale orders for 1970-71 kept by TADP provides some insight into where they were sent during this time period.¹⁰⁷ The record of sales

¹⁰¹ Barry Craig, “5,000 Manuals Published Here for U.S. Draft-Dodgers” *The Globe and Mail*, February 12, 1968. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁰² Churchill, 191.

¹⁰³ Williams, 67.

¹⁰⁴ Emerick, 101.

¹⁰⁵ TADP archives, “Manual For Draft Age Immigrants to Canada,” Box 13, Folder 9.

¹⁰⁶ Jones, 21. Jones recounts this event from Wilson Rockwell’s *We Hold These Truths...* (Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1976).

¹⁰⁷ TADP archives, Bulk Order Record, Box 2.

listed roughly 250 orders for approximately 10,000 manuals.¹⁰⁸ Most of the orders recorded were from organizations, while a few listed individual names. The most common type of organization that requested manuals, with approximately 95 orders placed, were other counselling services, resistance groups and peace centers, the majority of which were located in the United States. The second greatest number of requests, around 45, came from different branches of the Quaker affiliated American Friends Service Committee. The rest of the requests came from other anti-war organizations, private individuals and universities (including campus ministries, bookstores and libraries). Most of the orders, therefore, were from organizations that presumably intended to distribute the *Manual* to individuals they were counselling or to keep for reference. Generally, each request was for ten to twenty-five copies; some orders were as high as 500 – the Midwest Committee for Draft Counselling in Chicago placed multiple orders for this amount.

The sales record also provides insight into where the manuals were sent. From the orders placed, it is apparent that the document was distributed far and wide, as it was sent all over Canada and the United States. The entries indicate that in 1970-71, the *Manual* was sent to 27 American states and four Canadian provinces. All of the manuals sent within Canada to British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario were sent to other anti-war aid organizations. The top five states that appear in the inventory for orders placed were from New York (51), California (22), Ohio (19), Illinois (17), and Pennsylvania (10). That so many of

¹⁰⁸ All of the following numbers are approximate because of the illegibility of some of the entries in the book.

the orders received were from these five states should come as no real surprise, since they all had large populations and communities within them that were hotbeds of anti-war activity during the era. Some of the other states where requests came from are more surprising; included in the sales records are entries from Tennessee, North Dakota and Hawaii – not the first places that come to mind when thinking of anti-war activism.

3) Helping with the Border, Employment and Housing

Although the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* prepared many resisters for the border crossing and provided vital information about Canada, it did not do a lot to help with their immediate needs once they arrived. Physically leaving the United States was only the first step in immigrating to Canada. For those who did not have relatives or contacts north of the border, immigrating could be challenging as they searched for employment and housing, among other things. The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme eased the transition for many.

In addition to helping resisters find jobs and housing, TADP also assisted individuals to become landed immigrants. Many young Americans who entered Canada initially did so as visitors. Having “visitor status” meant that an individual was allowed to stay in Canada for six months, but was not allowed to work legally until he became a landed immigrant.¹⁰⁹ Many resisters therefore, went to TADP looking for help on how to become “landed” in Canada. Often times this meant the terrifying prospect of re-entering the United States and then turning around to apply at the Canadian border, a “frightening ordeal” for many.¹¹⁰ Meeting with a counsellor at the TADP office prepared one for this event. One resister recalled that during his first visit to TADP, he was giving an explanation of how the “point system” worked.¹¹¹ This was a common practice, and for those who had not read the explanation of the system in the *Manual*, it

¹⁰⁹ TADP archives, “Background,” Box 13, Folder 8, Page 8.

¹¹⁰ Williams, 75.

was invaluable information. During the initial meeting, after making sure the basics like food and shelter were taken care of, a counsellor would also inquire into what documents the resister had and what he needed with him for the border crossing.¹¹²

After the initial visit, there were follow-up appointments in which counsellors prepared resisters for their interviews with immigration officials, discussed any legal problems that might prohibit them from entry, and occasionally, consulted with the TADP lawyer for last-minute advice.¹¹³

Applying for status at the border was the preferred method, as the decision was immediate and if unsuccessful, the application could often be withdrawn, which meant that the resister could re-apply at another border crossing. An opportunity to earn more “points” also presented itself at the border, as a job offer was worth up to ten points. Applying within Canada meant that the decision was not known for months, a refusal could not be withdrawn, and no points were given for a job offer.¹¹⁴

After everything was in order, and TADP was “certain that the applicant [would] immigrate successfully,” he was provided with transportation to a Canadian border town (usually by train to Windsor). Once he arrived, he was billeted with a sympathetic supporter until a ride could be arranged to take him

¹¹¹ Morgan, 111. He recalled that the system was “sort of like the game of careers where you get stars and hearts and money for certain things, only with the immigration game you get five points for speaking English [and] five for speaking French.”

¹¹² Hagan, 79 and TADP archives, “Background,” Box 13, Folder 8, Page 12.

¹¹³ Hagan, 101. TADP had two lawyers who “provide free legal advice and represent...clients in court and at immigration hearings” and “handle...appeals to the immigration department when that department is attempting to deport one of [TADP’s] clients.” See TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 9, Page 2.

¹¹⁴ Kasinsky, 87.

across the border and back.¹¹⁵ One resister recollected how TADP had the border crossing down to a fine art: “They knew what time of the day and they would arrange it so that not a whole bunch of people would go there at once. They would have a guy go on the morning shift and a guy go on the afternoon shift...They knew who was there and they knew who was sympathetic and who wasn’t.”¹¹⁶ Knowing which border officials were sympathetic was vital, as they were responsible for assessing the personal suitability of applicants, which was worth fifteen points of the total one hundred possible and often enough to be the decisive factor.¹¹⁷

The reaction of border officials to resisters ranged from outright scorn to welcoming approval. One resister recounted the story of how he informed an immigration officer that he was against the war in Vietnam. This knowledge sparked a tirade that included the officer listing where he had served for 10 years in the Canadian Navy and concluded “I hate the son-of-a-bitch who refuses to serve his country.”¹¹⁸ On the other end of the spectrum was the experience of Max Allen, who worked with TADP:

I was interviewed by a very pleasant border guard who asked about my family background. This was a wonderful, happy, red-headed Irishman. So I told him my grandfather was the Mayor of Cork - which was true - and as soon as I said that, he did something with the rest of the papers, put his signature on the bottom and handed it to me. I didn't have a job offer and he asked me what I was going to do. I said I'd continue to work in draft counselling. He thought that was a fine idea.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 9, Page 2.

¹¹⁶ Hagan, 79. According to Kasinsky (Pg. 91), the Vancouver Committee even “lent out suits and ties” for resisters to wear when crossing the border.

¹¹⁷ Kasinsky, 114.

¹¹⁸ Kasinsky, 114.

Border officials were advised by the Immigration Department to discriminate against war resisters. Yet even at times when it was made clear that an individual's draft or military status should not be factored into a border official's assessment, this rule was not always followed.¹²⁰ To counter the subjectivity of the border officials, TADP devised ways to improve the chances that a resister would be granted landed immigrant status. One of these was to "match up" resisters to re-enter Canada together: "A well-dressed, well spoken resister would be paired with another whose accent and appearance might be more likely to cause problems."¹²¹

Another TADP tactic was to provide an individual with money in order for him to appear as if he would be financially self-supporting in Canada, which would earn him more "points." The resister would be given the "float" money, use it for the border crossing, and then give it back to TADP for someone else to use. Naomi Wall recalled that the amount of money entrusted to an individual could be as much as \$1,000 and that only one person ever took the money and ran.¹²² TADP also helped resisters improve their chances at the border was to make sure that an individual had a written job offer which could earn as many as ten "points" out of the fifty needed for successful immigration. The best letters

¹¹⁹ Sharon Airhart, "The Ties That Bind", *The Globe and Mail*, June 30, 1990. Section D, Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹²⁰ Kasinsky, 114.

¹²¹ Hagan, 79. Kasinsky, (Pg. 91) notes that in Vancouver there was "a group of ministers and law students who regularly accompanied refugees to the border.... In the event of an irregularity of procedure, a witness was important."

¹²² Hagan, 102.

were ones that highlighted the applicant's skills and offered prospective employment in areas where there were shortages.¹²³

Having a job offer to show immigration officials was essential in obtaining landed immigrant status. Of course employment also helped resisters make the transition to life in Canada easier. This importance was reflected in TADP's counsellor who specialized in helping resisters find job offers and employment. At first volunteering out of her own house, Naomi Wall was eventually hired by TADP full-time to continue her employment services.¹²⁴ TADP files suggest that a lot of time was devoted to finding employment for resisters who came for counselling. Employment information such as contact information and pay rates was kept on cue cards for reference.¹²⁵ The types of jobs listed on the cards were diverse, including everything from engineering to graphic art to janitorial work. Many offers available were for casual labour, "odd jobs" and other low-income positions. One card noted that both men and women were welcome for work on an assembly line that paid \$2.10 an hour. One position called for "selling paintings door to door" that paid nightly while another offered \$2 - 2.50 an hour for "testing" in a psychology lab. The employment reference cards also listed which companies would knowingly employ resisters. One company, it was written, "really need computer programmers [and] will [a] hire draft dodger." Other companies offered to hire resisters under certain conditions; one employer was "willing to hire Americans

¹²³ TADP archives, "Background" Box 13, Folder 8, Page 10.

¹²⁴ Williams, 69.

¹²⁵ The cards can be found in the TADP archives in Box 24, Folders 8-13.

if a job exists” while two others were looking for resisters who were “nice, clean-cut young men” and had a “neat appearance.”

Individuals also offered to assist with employment, such as the artist who was looking for someone to help in the studio and another person who offered to assist those who wanted to get a taxi license. There was also part-time work available from a pastor who, it was noted on the card, was a “groovy guy.” Another simply listed an individual who would “write letters.” Since immigration officials had no way of knowing if a letter offering a job was for an actual position, a fictional “job offer” was as beneficial as a real one for immigration purposes.¹²⁶ A note on one of the reference cards indicated that TADP had also figured out the appropriate number of “offers” that individual employers should distribute without raising the suspicion of immigration officials: “Current Job offers should be kept track of. A safe assumption is 1 offer per company every 1 ½ or 2 [months] is cool.”

Of course, a bogus offer for employment was helpful only for getting additional points at the border; it did not amount to much once an individual was trying to support himself as he settled in Canada. While TADP was instrumental in finding employment for some resisters, the organization could do only so much. Finding a job was a constant struggle for many individuals, especially for resisters without college education, who arrived in increasing numbers as the war progressed. Even those who had higher education had trouble, however. One resister commented on his predicament of being both under and over qualified for many of the jobs TADP had located: “With a Masters degree in history I’ve

got no special skills...On the other hand, when I tell these guys [TADP] about my education, many of them feel I'm too educated for the jobs they have open."¹²⁷

Another essential service provided by TADP was temporary housing. As the decision to leave the United States for Canada was often made hastily, many resisters arrived without knowing where they would stay. An attempt was made by TADP to find housing for every resister who came to their office in Toronto as long as they had no way of providing accommodation for themselves, which was the case the majority of the time.¹²⁸ Sympathetic Toronto residents provided most of the short-term lodging, which occasionally lasted for weeks.¹²⁹ Finding such accommodation was not always an easy task, however, as a TADP housing "sign-up sheet" indicated. The sheet asked individuals to provide their name, address and telephone number for accommodation and promised that they would "always call...before we send anyone." Twelve people provided contact information, but at least three of them had some reservations. One wrote that evening and meals would be fine, but that they had "no room!" Another stated that they were not sure, but that TADP should call them. Someone else wrote that they would house people for one to two months on their floor, but only in an emergency.¹³⁰ Yet TADP was able to find at least two hundred volunteers to help

¹²⁶ Churchill, 192.

¹²⁷ John Cooney and Dana Spitzer, "Hell, No, We Won't Go!" in *The American Military*, ed. Martin Oppenheimer (United States: Transaction Inc., 1971): 126.

¹²⁸ TADP archives, "Toronto Anti-Draft Programme," Box, 13 Folder 7, Page 7.

¹²⁹ Edward Cowan, "Draft Dodgers Find Life in Canada is Not Easy," *New York Times*, April 10, 1968. Page 49. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹³⁰ TADP archives, "Housing" Box 24, Folder 14.

accommodate and feed young Americans.¹³¹ A book that TADP used to keep track of where they sent individuals for lodging also indicates how extensive their network was and how many individuals they helped. The book has approximately one thousand entries of the names of resisters and their hosts; the entry for June 1969, for example, lists 95 instances where TADP was able to find people accommodation.¹³²

Along with finding individuals who would provide short-term shelter, TADP also ran a hostel where resisters could stay. One resister recollected that the hostel was crammed and had transient inhabitants:

There were four guys in the front room. There were a couple of bunks in the second room, there must have been four or five guys there. Upstairs there were three bedrooms, they were smaller. The younger single guys stayed downstairs and the married couples stayed upstairs. I think there was another room way up in the attic. So that would be four couples and maybe eight or ten single guys. Then we cleaned out the basement and there were another three or four single guys there. There was always a good quantity of people and it changed all the time.¹³³

According to a newspaper article, however, it appears that at least occasionally people did not randomly come and go, as the reporter noted that “27 occupants have decided to stay there permanently and it has been turned into a boarding house.”¹³⁴

Other accommodations were provided when TADP’s housing resources were stretched to the limit. A church in Toronto allowed TADP the use of its

¹³¹ Barry Craig, “5,000 manuals published here for U.S. draft-dodgers,” *The Globe and Mail*, February 12, 1968. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹³² TADP archives, “Housing Record” (blue book), Box 1. The book has approximately 103 pages with roughly ten entries per page.

¹³³ Hagan, 78-79.

¹³⁴ Barry Craig, “5,000 manuals published here for U.S. draft-dodgers,” *The Globe and Mail*, February 12, 1968. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers

basement for a hostel.¹³⁵ When nothing could be found for new arrivals, they would occasionally spend the night in the TADP office on the couch or floor before finding lodging the next day.¹³⁶ TADP staff also welcomed resisters into their homes, as was the case with Naomi Wall: “We started housing young men and the women who came with them, sometimes the dogs and babies, and from that point on we usually had one or two draft dodgers living with us.”¹³⁷ The organization even had housing contacts outside of Toronto; when one resister thought he would rather try to apply from within Canada than at a border crossing, he was advised to go to Ottawa and was referred to someone who he could stay with while he was there.¹³⁸

¹³⁵ Williams, 67.

¹³⁶ Churchill, 159.

¹³⁷ Hagan, 101.

¹³⁸ Eddie Fitzgerald, “My Life in Exile,” *The Washington Post*, March 30, 1975. Section C, Page 4. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

4) Draft Resisters and Military Resisters

It is important to remember that TADP was not the only organization in Canada dealing with American war resisters; by 1970, there were thirty-two groups in operation across Canada.¹³⁹ Initially, most of these aid organizations in Canada were apolitical and focused on helping resisters with immigration counselling and settlement.¹⁴⁰ Typically, organizations created by Canadians would soon be taken over and run by Americans.¹⁴¹ With thirty-two such organizations in existence, it is no surprise that some of the groups had different views about their role in the resistance movement. The major division between different organizations was their view of what resisters should do once they got to Canada. Some, such as TADP, believed that resisters should quietly assimilate into Canadian life. Their primary objective was to help resisters become landed immigrants and settle into their new lives. Others, such as Toronto-based AMEX, believed that resisters should continue to focus on American issues and use Canada as a base from which to oppose the war.¹⁴² As time went on, resisters in AMEX increasingly viewed themselves as being temporarily in Canada “in exile.”¹⁴³ Groups who sought to involve themselves with American issues also tried to foster an exile community through social events and newsletters.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁹ Kostash, 61.

¹⁴⁰ Kasinsky, 95.

¹⁴¹ Richard Killmer, Robert Lecky and Debrah Wiley, *They Can't Go Home Again: The Story of America's Political Refugees* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1971): 27.

¹⁴² Hagan, 80-81.

¹⁴³ Churchill, 254.

¹⁴⁴ Churchill, 166-68.

Some individuals criticized TADP's approach of not wanting to "rock the boat" as too "cautions" and not "effective."¹⁴⁵ Others saw those who favoured assimilation as betraying "the political commitments they held when they resisted."¹⁴⁶ TADP, however, equated less visibility with appeasing the Canadian public and government (whose support was vital).¹⁴⁷ In order to continue receiving support from "liberal and progressive sources of funding," TADP needed to "articulate an explicitly Canadian orientation, one which showed that the group was helping Americans adjust to life in their new country and not merely aiding foreign agitators in exile."¹⁴⁸ Furthermore, encouraging people to assimilate did not mean that they should abandon future political action. Rather, those who favoured assimilation encouraged resisters to engage in Canadian issues and even continue to oppose the war – but "from a position as Canadians."¹⁴⁹ TADP's Bill Spira, in accordance with many on the New Left in Canada, felt that resisters who did not assimilate were practising "Left imperialism": "Americans are not generally known for their understanding of the national aspirations of other people and even the American radicals that come, especially the American radicals, are very insensitive about it."¹⁵⁰

It has been written that the early wave of resisters that came from 1966 – 1967 "consisted of articulate radicals who had moved to Canada out of the

¹⁴⁵ David S. Surrey, *Choice of Conscience: Vietnam Era Military and Draft Resisters in Canada* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982): 144.

¹⁴⁶ Surrey, 148.

¹⁴⁷ Hagan, 81.

¹⁴⁸ Churchill, 165.

¹⁴⁹ Churchill, 161-162.

¹⁵⁰ Kasinsky, 140. Kasinsky (Pg. 141) notes how many American resisters "took strong exception to [these] views and in fact felt that they had personally made a contribution against American imperialism by choosing exile in Canada rather than fighting in Vietnam."

university ferment and protest of the antiwar movement.”¹⁵¹ A questionnaire that was given to one hundred individuals who had been aided by TADP confirmed this point, as the results showed that over half of them were “radical activist types.”¹⁵² During his time at SUPA, however, Mark Satin stated that most of the people who came for help were not “radicals or hippies,” but “really middle class.”¹⁵³ At the very least, these contesting views indicate that the resisters who came to Canada should not be viewed as a homogenous group, as they were a “a diverse section of the American youth population as a whole” and came from varying backgrounds.

Of course, there were also many other differences among draft resisters and military resisters who came to Canada. Among draft resisters, for example, were those who had resisted with a “full-blow court fight” in the United States that had lasted years as well as those who had “absolutely no contact with the draft board.”¹⁵⁴ Among military resisters were people who had willingly enlisted in the military before rejecting it, those who were inducted against their will but hoped to avoid being sent to Vietnam, and even some who entered the military with the hopes of resisting from within the Armed forces but soon concluded their aims were futile.¹⁵⁵ The length of time a military resister served before leaving for Canada also varied greatly – some individuals left almost immediately upon induction, while some who came to Canada had already served in Vietnam before they decided to resist by refusing any future

¹⁵¹ Kasinsky, 24.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Wakefield, 10.

¹⁵⁴ TADP archives, “Background,” Box 13, Folder 8, Page 2.

participation.¹⁵⁶ As Katie McGovern from TADP noted, there was no “typical” draft or military resister.¹⁵⁷ Yet some generalizations can be made about the resisters who came to Canada. The first resisters who came to Canada were primarily those who were resisting the draft. Typically, they were middle class and college or university educated. Most of these individuals had some money when they arrived in Canada and many also had the support of their families. Military resisters, or “deserters,” were generally younger, less educated, and from working class backgrounds. They tended to have less support from their families than draft resisters and often arrived in Canada with little money.¹⁵⁸

When military resisters began arriving in Toronto, aid counsellors falsely assumed that they could not legally stay in Canada. Mark Satin recalled that military resisters were told that “they would have to return to the United States on the advice of the TADP lawyers.”¹⁵⁹ Canadian aid organizations believed that desertion from the United States military prohibited an individual from immigrating to Canada. After researching the Canadian Extradition Treaties and the Canadian Immigration Act in-depth, it was discovered that this was not the case.¹⁶⁰ Although TADP learned that military resisters were not specially

¹⁵⁵ Anthony Astrachan, “Many U.S. Exiles Prefer Canada,” *The Washington Post*, February 21, 1972. Page A21. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁵⁶ Williams, 271.

¹⁵⁷ TADP archives, “American Draft Dodgers Defended by Pacifist,” Box 17, Folder 17. The case of the two extreme right-wing Americans who showed up at TADP and indicated that they had left the United States because they did not want to get “killed for an administration full of Commies” and felt that the government should “use the bomb and get the war over with” proves McGovern’s point that resisters were not all one and the same. Yet as someone at TADP noted, the organization did not “get too many of those” types. Author Unknown, “Anti-Draft Center Thrives in Canada,” *The Hartford Courant*, April 1, 1970. Page 34. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁵⁸ TADP archives, “Buffalo Brief,” Box 13, Folder 9, Page 1-2.

¹⁵⁹ Kasinsky, 109.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

excluded from immigrating and they no longer had to live “underground,” they were still handled separately from draft resisters. In the press, TADP denied they had anything to do with military resisters. In a 1968 *Globe and Mail* article, Jack Pocock stated that TADP sent military resisters “to another organization.”¹⁶¹ TADP had decided to handle military resisters separately, away from the public eye. As “poking and prying” reporters who were “very anxious to get the story about deserters during that time....haunted the TADP office,” the organization decided that some of the resisters had to be placed “underground.”¹⁶²

In 1966, SUPA had asked Bill Spira for help dealing with military resisters who contacted the organization.¹⁶³ Spira had left his native Hungary in 1938 and immigrated to the United States before coming to Canada in the early 1950s.¹⁶⁴ Spira had left the United States during the McCarthy-era after losing his job for refusing to “identify radical friends.”¹⁶⁵ He established himself financially in Canada and ran a steel business that did “a million dollars in a year in sales.”¹⁶⁶ Spira served on the executive board of TADP and whenever a military resister arrived in Toronto, he was sent to Spira for assistance. His

¹⁶¹ Ross H. Munro, “AWOL in Canada: Deserters Hide Behind Dodgers,” *The Globe and Mail*, April 20, 1968. Page 1. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Jack and Nancy Pocock must also be mentioned in any discussion of TADP. A 1968 newspaper article refers to Jack Pocock as the “spokesman” of TADP. Jack and his wife Nancy were middle-aged Quakers who were active in the Canadian anti-war movement, not to mention a variety of other social causes. Both were on the executive board of TADP. Along with his involvement in TADP, Jack “took part in many seminars in American universities telling young American’s about the ‘Canadian Alternative’ to being drafted into the Army.” The Pococks also provided lodging for countless resisters in their home. For more on the Pococks, see TADP archives, Box 23, Folder 1., Kasinsky, 109 and Lansing R. Shepard, “Draft Evaders: Jail or Self-Exile?” *Christian Science Monitor*, December 19, 1968. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁶² Kasinsky, 109.

¹⁶³ Hagan, 79-80. Williams (Pg. 68) states that Spira began helping resisters in 1968.

¹⁶⁴ Author Unknown, “Anti-Draft Center Thrives in Canada,” *The Hartford Courant*, April 1, 1970. Page 34. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁶⁵ Hagan, 80.

involvement grew from initially providing only food and shelter to a couple military resisters to eventually housing seventeen people in his basement.¹⁶⁷ Once he became overwhelmed with resisters, Spira began a sub-program of TADP that specifically aided individuals who had left the armed forces and come to Canada.¹⁶⁸ When TADP began openly aiding military resisters, Spira became an immigration counsellor for the organization.¹⁶⁹ By 1968, Spira was satisfied that he had assisted more than six hundred military resisters: “I’m proud to say that I have played a key role in the fact that we have 5 divisions in Canada instead of in Vietnam.”¹⁷⁰

There are a few explanations as to why TADP denied that they were in any way involved in counselling military resisters during 1967-68. According to Bill Spira, the main reason was that they feared repercussions: “For quite a while we separated the two operations in Toronto because we simply worried about the public image of the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme and of donations....We anticipated that the Canadian public opinion toward deserters would be more negative toward them than toward draft resisters.”¹⁷¹ This was incorrect, however, as public opinion was not as hostile as feared. Spira noted that the assumption had been “really swayed by the American public opinion and American attitudes and not by Canadian attitudes.”¹⁷² According to Mark Satin, the reason was that TADP and other organizations had a “gentleman’s

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Kasinsky, 110.

¹⁶⁹ Williams, 68.

¹⁷⁰ Kasinsky, 110.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 110.

¹⁷² Ibid.

agreement” with the Canadian government. The aid organizations could continue counselling any resisters as long as they “did not publicize that the government ‘welcomed deserters.’”¹⁷³

After 1969, TADP no longer had to hide that they were aiding military resisters after the government openly declared that all resisters were allowed in Canada. The transition between 1966 and 1969 in the Canadian government’s policy towards resisters has been well examined in Hagan’s *Northern Passage*. Hagan examines how the policy went from an unwritten policy that was adverse to resisters to a liberalized policy that did not discriminate against them. It is worth briefly tracing this development before discussing TADP’s role in the transition. In 1966, a memo was circulated “among ministers and immigrations officers” which stated that draft resisters could not be refused immigration on their draft status, but that their status could be taken into account. Military resisters, on the other hand, were not to be admitted to Canada. This memo “articulated what had until then been an unwritten policy excluding American servicemen.”¹⁷⁴ This position was a violation of the Canadian Immigration Act that made “no mention of draft or military service.” However, by 1966 few Americans were immigrating to Canada, so the unofficial departmental policy had not yet become a significant issue.¹⁷⁵ Although the departmental officials became increasingly inclined towards a liberalized policy, there was the “fear of offending Canada’s powerful American neighbor”: “Anticipation of *potential* American opposition likely stalled the liberalization policy before it could be

¹⁷³ Ibid., 111.

¹⁷⁴ Hagan, 38.

extended to military resisters.”¹⁷⁶ Any attempt by Tom Kent, the immigration minister at the time, and other leading officials to liberalize the policy was also thwarted by the department’s own immigration officers: “As the front-line administrators of immigration policy, these officers possessed covert, discretionary power to subvert legal department policy.” As 234 of 353 immigration officers in Canada were veterans, they did not sympathize with the plight of military resisters.¹⁷⁷

After the election of Trudeau in 1968, Allan MacEachen became the new Immigration Minister. Within a month of being sworn in, MacEachen explicitly hardened the government’s policy; any hope of a liberalization in the policy towards military resisters was dashed for the time being: “a confidential memorandum was sent to all border station officials, instructing them that military resisters could be rejected on the basis of the officer’s discretion, however great an applicant’s qualifications might otherwise be.”¹⁷⁸ Although the memo and subsequent policy were meant to be confidential, the information was leaked to a newspaper columnist named Ron Haggart who began writing about how immigration officers were not as objective as they should have been towards military resisters. This was a major turning point, as the issue became debated publicly. Although the government denied it was discriminating against military resisters, a “test” by five Canadian university students suggested the opposite was true. Each student posed as the same American military resister

¹⁷⁵ Hagan, 37-38.

¹⁷⁶ Hagan, 41.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 44.

with the same copies of documents and attempted to become landed immigrants at different border crossings. Four of the five were denied entry, while the other was given an application but did not fill it out. One of the five was told bluntly that “people at the border are under instructions not to let deserters in.”¹⁷⁹ Hagan illustrates how pressure from the United Church, the press, changing public opinion in favour of resisters, as well as dissent from within the Liberal government and other cultural and political groups helped to change the Immigration Minister’s position. The most important factor, however, was the lack of opposition from Washington: “These cultural resources prevailed only after the Nixon administration revealed its own indecisiveness about the war resisters’ migration.”¹⁸⁰ In the process, the issue became less about the “suitability” of military resisters and more about Canadian sovereignty in relation to America.¹⁸¹ Nevertheless, within the year, even Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau was quoted as saying that Canada should be a “refuge from militarism.”¹⁸²

TADP played an instrumental role in shaping public opinion on the issue of military resisters and pushing the government towards a favourable policy. In 1968, after TADP became aware of the government’s secret directive to

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 45-46. Kasinsky (Pg. 119) noted how the resulting story was “widely carried by all the major newspapers” and that “most of the stories...put Canadian government practices in this incident in an indefensible position.” Williams (Pg. 110) also wrote about this event and stated that the press coverage “incense[ed] the public against these petty bureaucrats who were enforcing American laws while ignoring their own.”

¹⁸⁰ Hagan, 37. Williams (Pg. 110-11) places a Liberal M.P. named Marcel Prud’homme in the center of the story. Prud’homme “brought together twenty-five Liberal M.P.s who met with Minister MacEachen and urged him to change his policy” after Prime Minister Trudeau hinted that he would not be against “Parliament bringing pressure to bear against the immigration department.”

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 64-65.

immigration officers that military resisters should be excluded from immigrating to Canada, TADP “prepared for a ‘head-on fight with immigration.’” The organization planned to publicize the discrimination resisters faced at the border and hoped to influence public opinion.¹⁸³ One way they publicized the issue was through the press. Some of the articles written by Ron Haggart that were instrumental in bringing the issue to the public were written with the help of Bill Spira.¹⁸⁴ A “full-scale publicity campaign” was also initiated within Canada.¹⁸⁵ As the issue became a public debate in 1968-69, TADP also stopped trying to hide that the organization was directly involved in aiding military resisters: “We... [started]... a publicity campaign showing deserters to the press; in other words, ‘Meet Your Local Deserter and See That He Doesn’t Have Horns’....The press gobbled it up. A lot of human interest stories came out.”¹⁸⁶ In conjunction with other Canadian resister organizations, TADP also lobbied the Immigration Minister, Members of Parliament and Prime Minister Trudeau.¹⁸⁷ In April of 1969, it was reported that a number of notable Canadians had signed a petition that originated with TADP. The petition stated that “U.S. deserters should be accorded the same treatment as refugees who have come to Canada from European countries” and critiqued the Immigration Department for rejecting “potential immigrants who have deserted from the armed forces of a foreign power, even though by objective criteria they are desirable applicants.” Among

¹⁸² J. Greg Robertson, “Snags Develop in Changing America’s Deserters to Canadian Citizens,” *The Hartford Courant*, August 11, 1970. Page 4. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁸³ Kasinsky, 116.

¹⁸⁴ Hagan, 45.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 117.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 116.

¹⁸⁷ Williams, 111 and Kasinsky, 112.

those who added their signatures to TADP's petition were Tommy Douglas, Pierre Berton, Farley Mowat, and Gordon Sinclair.¹⁸⁸

The announcement of the government's liberalized policy in 1969 was a major victory for the Canadian anti-war movement. Naomi Wall recalled the importance of not only pressuring the government to change its views, but also having the Immigration Minister publicly declare the new policy in the House of Commons.¹⁸⁹ The change in policy also came as a surprise to some members of TADP. Bill Spira expressed his shock that the outcome had been favourable towards the resistance movement: "It was the first and only political action that I was even engaged in that was successful. After we were successful we said, by God, what did we do wrong – we've succeeded!"¹⁹⁰ To ensure that their exuberance was not built upon false hopes, TADP had a military resister attempt to become a landed immigrant at a border crossing in a "test case" the day after the Immigration Minister's announcement. The individual was successful, and even received "extra points for U.S. Army training as a helicopter repairman."¹⁹¹ The attention of aid organizations in Canada then turned to informing others about the change in policy.¹⁹²

The declaration of the Canadian government in May of 1969 that both draft *and* military resisters would be admitted to Canada without regard to their military status led to a dramatic shift in the type of resisters who came to Canada. There was an influx of military resisters. As the information of the

¹⁸⁸ Author Unknown, "Petition Asks for Equal Laws for Deserters," *The Globe and Mail*, Saturday, April 26, 1969. Page 2. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁸⁹ Hagan, 103.

¹⁹⁰ Kasinsky, 126.

“open-door” policy spread, “the number of draft-age males entering Canada as landed immigrants each month tripled between April and August of 1969.”¹⁹³ The government’s policy was not the only cause, however. The development of the anti-war GI movement was another critical factor. Through “informal coffeehouses” near military bases and the spread of anti-war underground newspapers on the bases, many individuals in the military became opposed to the war during these years.¹⁹⁴ As Bill Spira noted, the typical draft resister encountered the anti-war movement in college, whereas the average military resister usually did not encounter the movement until they were in the military. This observation and the large number of military resisters arriving at TADP’s office led Spira to quip, “I guess you might say then that the army is our biggest recruiter.”¹⁹⁵ Increasing anti-war sentiments among the general population, as demonstrated by the large-scale protests in Washington and the revelation of war atrocities in Vietnam such as the My Lai massacre, also played a part in military resisters arriving later in Canada than draft resisters.¹⁹⁶ Counselling organizations in the United States informed more and more military resisters that Canada was an option.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹¹ Williams, 113.

¹⁹² Kasinsky, 126.

¹⁹³ Hagan, 35.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ Author Unknown, “Anti-Draft Center Thrives in Canada,” *The Hartford Courant*, April 1, 1970. Page 34. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. Williams (Pg. 69-70) writes that by 1970, Bill Spira had left TADP due to poor health and the feeling in TADP that his “influence over the Programme was a little too strong.” William also notes that after he left TADP, he “directed his energies toward the campaign to liberate Canada from American economic control. This came as a surprise to those people who had thought that because of Spira’s strong dislike of exile political action against the U.S.A. he really had been employed all along by the CIA....”

¹⁹⁶ Hagan, 115 and Kasinsky, 15.

¹⁹⁷ Kasinsky, 15.

During this same period, draft resisters stopped coming in large numbers. The decrease in draft resisters was the result of a number of factors. As draft counselling in America improved, it was easier to resist the draft without leaving the country: “A simple change of address or an appeal of the draft classification [could slow] the whole drafting process down.”¹⁹⁸ Changes in draft laws also had a major impact, as medical deferments became easier to obtain and the introduction of the “lottery system” meant that many young men knew they would not be drafted.¹⁹⁹ There were also events in Canada that led to the decrease. The October Crisis in 1970, and the resulting use of the War Measures Act which suspended civil liberties, gave some potential resisters pause as they questioned how much freedom they would encounter north of the border.²⁰⁰ A downturn in the Canadian economy and subsequent high unemployment also led aid organizations such as TADP to discourage individuals from coming to Canada.²⁰¹ The change in the type of resisters coming to Canada led one resister publication to note that “Canada is presently so flooded with deserters that an ordinary draft dodger causes one to sit up and take notice. This is a sharp reversal of the situation less than a year ago when very few deserters even knew Canada was open to them.”²⁰²

The large number of military resisters who arrived in 1969 and 1970 had a great impact on the movement in Canada. Whereas middle-class draft resisters had little trouble becoming landed immigrants and obtaining jobs, this was not

¹⁹⁸ Author Unknown, “Anti-Draft Center Thrives in Canada,” *The Hartford Courant*, April 1, 1970. Page 34. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹⁹⁹ Williams, 324.

²⁰⁰ Kasinsky, 139.

the case for most military resisters. The transition to life in Canada was often much more difficult for military resisters than for draft resisters. Whereas draft resisters were usually well prepared with “information, money, [and] documents,” military resisters often left the United States in haste, sometimes directly from the military base where they were stationed, and regularly arrived in Canada with few possessions or assets.²⁰³ According to TADP’s Dick Burroughs, individuals would sometimes walk into the organization’s office “with their fatigues on sometimes, with [a few dollars]...and that’s it.”²⁰⁴ This lack of preparedness caused many problems in the immigration process. It was much more difficult to get “landed” without any capital or the required documents.²⁰⁵ Another obstacle was that many military resisters could not earn the requisite “points” since they did not have enough education or work skills.²⁰⁶ The result was that many military resisters could not legally immigrate and became a greater burden on aid organizations’ resources since they could not support themselves.²⁰⁷ Even those who did have status and could legally work had a hard time finding employment.²⁰⁸ TADP also noted that military resisters tended to be more “disoriented” upon arrival and this in turn led to more difficulties: “Because of their legal situation and the inhuman experience in Armed Forces boot camps which has driven them across the border, deserters are much more disoriented and alienated from society....Many need individual

²⁰¹ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 9, Page 3.

²⁰² Williams, 122. The original appeared in AMEX.

²⁰³ Emerick, 102.

²⁰⁴ Chuck Noland, “One Way to Exile” *Soldiers*, Volume 27, No. 3. March 1972, 15.

²⁰⁵ Kasinsky, 90.

²⁰⁶ Hagan, 101.

²⁰⁷ Churchill, 196-97.

guidance through every step of immigration and due to their disorientation fail to hold jobs for very long.”²⁰⁹ Some military resisters also arrived with “serious emotional and social problems.”²¹⁰ This undoubtedly included those who had served in Vietnam before coming to Canada and suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder.

In April 1970, Naomi Wall appeared in Toronto before a Government Committee on Youth to stress the serious problems recently arrived resisters were faced with. She explained that they were having trouble finding employment, getting landed and were not eligible for government assistance. Since many were “afraid to ask ‘establishment’ agencies...for help because it would define them as undesirable for immigration,” they had few places or people to turn to. Although some were getting assistance from non-governmental, counter-cultural organizations, others were “starving on the streets.” She noted that TADP continually had to bail out resisters who had committed petty crimes. Wall pointed out the hypocrisy of the government as they allowed resisters to enter Canada, but did nothing for them once they arrived. She also informed the committee that in the last two months, two American resisters had committed suicide.²¹¹

As Canada received more military resisters Canadian aid organizations began to question the view that the assimilation of resisters was their “primary mission.” Some counsellors began to see how the classism (and racism) inherent

²⁰⁸ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 17, Folder 11.

²⁰⁹ TADP archives, “Buffalo Brief,” Box 13, Folder 9, Page 2.

²¹⁰ TADP archives, “In the Past Three Months,” Box 17, Folder 5, Page 1.

in the Selective Service laws were being replicated in the Canadian Immigration Act.²¹² Just as poorer individuals had a harder time obtaining deferments (they did not qualify for student deferments when they were in place and they could not afford lawyers to help them out) and were thus forced into the military, Canada's "points system" conspired to keep poor, unskilled resisters "unlanded." Thus, some aid organizations were "forced to become political pressure groups" as they realized that assimilation was not readily available to everyone.²¹³ The arrival of military resisters changed some TADP members' perspectives, including Naomi Wall: "I began to see that this was a classist and racist war, not only in terms of the Vietnamese, who were southeast Asian and being bombed into oblivion, but also in terms of who the deserters were."²¹⁴

The arrival of large numbers of military resisters whose needs were greater than those of draft resisters also coincided with an important conference in Montreal in 1970 that involved anti-war activists from Canada and the United States. Tom Hayden and Carl Ogelsby, both past presidents of SDS, spoke at the gathering and encouraged resisters in Canada to frame their resistance as an American issue. They also "emphasized the need for persons to stay in the United States and work for change there."²¹⁵ Hayden's view was that the "major struggle for Americans was in the 'motherland'" and "Americans in Canada should realize that they were there for political reasons."²¹⁶ The dominate view

²¹¹ Ross H. Munro, "Some U.S. Draft-Dodgers Turning to Crime, Even Suicide, Toronto Woman Tells Committee," *The Globe and Mail*, April 24, 1970. Pg1. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²¹² Kasinsky, 78.

²¹³ Kasinsky, 6 and 105.

²¹⁴ Hagan, 101.

²¹⁵ Killmer, 31.

²¹⁶ Kasinsky, 138.

at the conference was that resisting the draft by coming to Canada was not effective enough; draft resisters should stay in the United States and help end the war there. Leaving the military, however, was seen as a political act, and so priority should be given to helping military resisters come to Canada.²¹⁷ One TADP member interpreted Oglesby and Hayden's message as giving the aid organizations an important role to play, as they could make people aware "that they are not doing anything political by simply coming up here." The conference came at a time when some people in TADP were wondering how to be more political "within the confines of TADP which was set up as an aid organization."²¹⁸ Priority counselling provided the answer.

²¹⁷ Kasinsky, 134-35.

²¹⁸ Williams, 261-262.

5) Different Forms of Counselling

Of all the services TADP provided, they considered priority counselling to be the most vital and also the least understood.²¹⁹ Part of priority counselling involved examining all the options an individual had before providing him with immigration counselling. After an individual arrived in the TADP office, a counsellor would explain all the alternatives open and inform him that Canada was not his only option.²²⁰ People who had quickly fled often arrived without receiving any counselling (or inaccurate counselling) in the United States, unaware of the poor economic situation in Canada, with little money and few of the necessary documents.²²¹ The potential immigrant was made aware of the seriousness of the decision and informed that he may eventually be cut off from families, friends and homeland.”²²² Part of the reason that TADP implemented this new form of counselling was that they had discovered that many men came to Canada feeling they had no alternative when in fact they did: “We see 18 year-olds who panic when they receive a 1-A notice and dash to Canada before they find out their lottery number will not be determined for another year. Rather than give these men immigration counselling straightaway, we try to correct their mistake made state-side so they can make a more lengthy, mature decision concerning immigration to Canada.”²²³ Thus, many individuals who could obtain some type of deferment or resist the war within in the United States were encouraged to stay in the country and explore all of their options before making

²¹⁹ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 9, Page 3.

²²⁰ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 7, Page 8.

²²¹ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 9, Page 4.

²²² Ibid., 4.

the decision to head north. This advice was especially pressed upon resisters who could still legally remain in the United States. TADP felt that those who had the option to return to the United States should do so and try to improve their situation or work and save money until forced to come to Canada.²²⁴ They were advised to try and obtain deferments, Conscientious Objector status and to appeal court decisions. This would not only buy time but also use legal means to “clog the Selective Service System.”²²⁵ TADP also stressed the importance of obtaining “competent draft counseling” in the United States; the organization estimated that “at least 75% of draft age men should be eligible for deferments or exemptions, provided that they receive good draft counseling.”²²⁶ While TADP believed that the “final decisions rest with the person” being counseled, they also thought that a “full range of choices” should be offered “with the emphasis on using as many options as possible.” No one should be forced to make an “irrevocable decision,” TADP reasoned, without “the most thorough kind of counseling.”²²⁷ They did not try to change someone’s mind about coming to Canada, but rather gave them all of the information which they might otherwise not have received so that they could make an informed decision.²²⁸

Helping individuals explore their options and avoid unnecessarily drastic measures was only one aspect of priority counselling. Priority counselling also

²²³ Ibid., 2.

²²⁴ Ibid., 5.

²²⁵ J. Greg Robertson, “Snags Develop in Changing America’s Deserters to Canadian Citizens,” *The Hartford Courant*, August 11, 1970. Page 4. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. Williams (Pg. 261) notes that in some areas, indictments for induction refusal were backlogged over two years.

²²⁶ Toronto Anti-Draft Programme, *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* 6th ed.

(Toronto: Toronto Anti-Draft Programme, 1971). The sixth and final edition of the *Manual* was quite different from the others in that it highlighted priority counselling.

²²⁷ Ibid.

involved giving counselling to those who needed it most. This was usually draft resisters who had been sent notices of induction and especially military resisters, neither of whom could not return to the United States without fear of reprisal. As well, it was usually military resisters that had fewer means available to establish themselves successfully in Canada. TADP believed their scarce resources should be given to those who needed them most and that need was determined in part by the options an individual had open to him.²²⁹

The weak Canadian economy and poor job market meant that it was becoming harder and harder for any resister to find employment, so TADP felt that those who did not have to come to Canada should not.²³⁰ According to TADP, there were three major reasons that American resisters were having difficulty finding jobs in Canada.²³¹ A recession in the United States had led to a downturn in the Canadian economy that caused a rise in unemployment as high as 14% for ages 19 to 25, an age bracket that many resisters were in.²³² TADP observed that the “corporate head offices in New York close Canadian subsidiaries long before they close their U.S. plants”: “From those wonderful people who brought you Vietnam, you get Canadian unemployment.”²³³ The second reason TADP offered was that 60%-80% of all Canadian businesses were owned by American interests and they would simply “not hire Americans of draft age.”²³⁴ The American domination of the Canadian economy was indicated

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

²²⁹ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 7, Page 5.

²³⁰ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 7, Page 3.

²³¹ TADP archives, “Buffalo Brief” October 26, 1971. Box 13, Folder 9, Page 2.

²³² *Ibid.*

²³³ TADP archives, “Sweden Supplement” August, 1972. Box 19, Folder 4, Page 1.

²³⁴ TADP archives, “Buffalo Brief” October 26, 1971. Box 13, Folder 9, Page 2.

as a cause of employment problems for resisters as early as 1967 by Mark Satin. He noted that a number of American subsidiaries in Canada were “quite blunt – they don’t want anything to do with us.”²³⁵ The final reason given by TADP for the lack of employment opportunities in Canada was “Canadian Nationalism...combined with a rising backlash against Americans,” which led to a “‘Canadian first’ policy of employment when an American applies for a job.”²³⁶ A combination of these three factors made finding employment for resisters a laborious task for TADP staff. Surely they could relate to the member of a resister aid organization in Ottawa who described his role as “finding work mostly with prejudiced employers for mostly unskilled fellows in a very depressed job market.”²³⁷

To facilitate people who wanted to return to the United States, TADP became heavily involved in draft and military counselling. Draft counselling was given to individuals who had left the United States and had problems with their draft boards. TADP helped many individuals who had draft-related problems by looking into their cases and attempting to resolve any issues. A letter produced by TADP stressed the importance of contacting the organization about selective service “file checks” in order to see if there was any possibility that draft charges could be dismissed. TADP stated that they had found many cases in which

²³⁵ John Burns, “Deaf to the Draft: Called in U.S., but Asleep in Toronto,” *The Globe and Mail*, October, 11, 1967. Section A, Page 2. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. Not all resisters found American-owned companies discriminatory, however. According to one resister, he would “go for a job interview and they’d say, ‘Oh, finally the brain drain reverses. Good. A draft dodger? Good.’ Then they’d try to figure out how to use me.” Sharon Airhart, “The Ties that Bind”, *The Globe and Mail*, June 30, 1990. Section D, Page 5.

²³⁶ TADP archives, “Buffalo Brief” October 26,1971. Box 13, Folder 9, Page 2, and TADP archives, “Sweden Supplement” August, 1972. Box 19, Folder 4, Page 1.

“indictments have been dropped for selective service violations...normally because of the problems that the boards had in following basic procedures.” It was also mentioned that in cases where there was an indictment, this did not automatically mean that the government had a solid case, as “there can be a good defence lurking about.” One of these defences, the same document noted, was that file checks and counselling had revealed that many cases had been handled illegally by the selective service, which provided grounds for dismissal.²³⁸

TADP also composed a letter outlining how to obtain a selective service number in the event an individual did not have one. The letter opened humorously, “Yes, Virginia, your selective service number is important,” but also stressed the importance of having the number, since a draft case could not be re-opened without it. The process of getting the number from one’s local draft board was explained in detail, and it was suggested how a family member or friend in the United States could obtain it. The organization also forewarned resisters of the “tricks” that the draft board might try and play in an attempt to block access to the information: “On the odd and rare time, some draft boards might say: ‘Well, yes, Form 102 is open to the public, but for only one hour a week and that hour just expired 15 minutes ago. Come back next week.’ BS. That’s illegal.”²³⁹

Another form of counselling provided by TADP was referred to as military, discharge or repatriation counselling. This involved working with a

²³⁷ Frank H. Epp, ed. *I Would Like to Dodge the Draft-Dodgers, But...* (Waterloo and Winnipeg: Conrad Press, 1970): 84.

²³⁸ TADP archives, “Letter: Dear People”, Box 17, Folder 16.

²³⁹ TADP archives, “Selective Service Number”, Box 4, Folder 11.

military resister to obtain a discharge from the Armed Forces. Similar to draft counselling, a “file check” was done on an individual’s military record to see if his case had been dropped or if there were grounds for a discharge.²⁴⁰ This process could take months “due to the complexity and vagueness of military law and its application.”²⁴¹ Over time, this became the most requested service TADP offered.²⁴² TADP even noticed that an increasing number of people traveled to their office who had no intention of immigrating to Canada because “they have heard that we can help get them discharges.”²⁴³

Along with helping draft resisters get charges dismissed and military resisters get discharges, TADP also helped to make sure that no “secret indictments” were waiting for people if they crossed the border back in to America. A newspaper article from the *Globe and Mail* indicated that there were indictments waiting in the U.S. for individuals who were unaware of them. Dick Brown outlined the predicament faced by a large number of resisters in Canada: “A man here in Canada can check his U.S. Attorney’s office through a lawyer, find there is no open indictment, then go home to find a pair of handcuffs waiting for him through a secret indictment.” Since the indictments were “sworn before a jury behind closed doors,” it was not known how many there were, but Brown estimated the number to be in the thousands. Although no one who went back to the States from Toronto had ran into this problem, it had happened to resisters on the west coast of Canada. The article noted that through legal

²⁴⁰ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 17, Folder 16.

²⁴¹ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 7, Page 11.

²⁴² TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 7, Page 11.

processes, TADP was definitely able to help resisters find out about public indictments and often discover if there were secret indictments.²⁴⁴ In another letter issued by TADP, it was noted that there were also cases where men had moved around the United States and were “liable to be under indictment in any one of the areas where they have lived.” TADP reminded resisters that if they had “dealt with more than one board [to] please make sure you are not wanted in each and every area” and provided suggestions about how to find out what an individual’s status was.²⁴⁵ Either by doing “file checks” on behalf of resisters or by providing them with the know-how to do it by themselves, TADP was able to help many resisters settle their cases. According to TADP, even the discovery of an indictment was helpful to resisters, as “once they know where they stand and what they face, they are able to deal with their situation in a realistic manner, and to therefore feel more secure.”²⁴⁶ At the very least, the discovery of an indictment prevented a resister from returning to the United States where he might face many unexpected legal difficulties.

As military resisters started arriving in Canada in greater numbers in 1969-70, they also formed new organizations that were often known as “American Deserter Committees.” These groups formed in at least five Canadian cities: Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Regina and Vancouver.²⁴⁷ Along with providing counselling and operating hostels, these committees also “viewed

²⁴³ TADP archives, “CCC Newsletter to Aid Centres,” Box 21, Folder 26, Page 3. TADP also noticed an increase in the number of draft resisters who were “coming to find out about immigration if they lose their court cases.”

²⁴⁴ Peter Whelan, “Secret Indictments Said to be Waiting for Draft Evaders,” *The Globe and Mail*, March 13, 1973. Page 33. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²⁴⁵ TADP archives, “Letter: Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 21, Folder 24.

²⁴⁶ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 25, Folder 2, Page 3.

political action and propaganda against American imperialism as an important priority.”²⁴⁸ Part of the reason they continued to focus on American issues was that, unlike the draft resisters who came to Canada, military resisters could not easily assimilate.²⁴⁹ In Toronto, TADP and the American Deserter Committee (ADC) generally had a cordial relationship.²⁵⁰ TADP sometimes referred resisters to the ADC, who operated two hostels in downtown Toronto.²⁵¹ In a sign of solidarity, the two organizations, along with another Toronto resister organization named Red White and Black, held a joint press conference in May 1970 to defend themselves against attacks from Toronto’s mayor, who had accused them of inciting violence at a protest in which ninety-three people were arrested. The protest had been in response to the American invasion of Cambodia and the killing of four students at Kent State, and it had ended at the American consulate in Toronto. The Toronto organizations maintained that although fifteen resisters had been arrested, the protest or violence had not been their initiative. A lawyer for the groups pointed out that the Vietnam Mobilization Committee was in fact a Canadian organization. The *Globe and Mail* sided with the resisters, and after meeting with the Toronto groups, the mayor announced that the “ringleaders” of the protest “unfortunately were Canadians.”²⁵²

²⁴⁷ Kasinsky, 131.

²⁴⁸ Kasinsky, 131.

²⁴⁹ Lawrence M. Baskir and William A. Strauss, *Chance and Circumstance: The Draft, The War, and The Vietnam Generation* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1978): 192.

²⁵⁰ Unlike Toronto, the ADC in Montreal often quarrelled with other organizations and within itself. See Emerick, 236.

²⁵¹ Williams, 121.

²⁵² Williams, 349-50.

It's important to remember that white males were not the only ones who came north. African-Americans and women who opposed the draft and the war also came to Canada. Blacks that left the United States for Canada had the additional difficulty, at least initially, of assimilating into a predominantly white society. One African-American commented that there was a race problem in Canada similar to the urban areas of the northern United States and added that for any black who had emigrated from Watts, Harlem or Detroit, entering Canada was like "jumping into a pitcher of buttermilk."²⁵³ An additional difficulty was that the blacks in Canada that African-American resisters did encounter were culturally different. As one black resister commented, "the West Indians felt as though they were the real blacks and that they weren't so influenced by the whites as black Canadians were. As a black American, I felt like I was in the middle, sort of a mediator between the two groups."²⁵⁴ The dislocation and discrimination felt by black American resisters was the subject of a Toronto newspaper article from 1970. In the article, a young African-American man stated that he had trouble obtaining help from TADP because of a "subtle anti-black bias." Accounts of black resisters helped by TADP, however, illustrate that the organization extended aid to everyone regardless of their race. Alan Haig-Brown's portrayals of American resisters who immigrated north includes the story of Charles Belcher, an African-American who left New Jersey for Canada. Belcher recounts how TADP found him lodging, employment, and

²⁵³ John Egerton, "Why Canada Attracts Few U.S. Negroes," *The Globe and Mail*, November 7, 1970. Page 7. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²⁵⁴ Alan Haig-Brown, *Hell No We Won't Go: Vietnam Draft Resisters in Canada* (Vancouver: Raincoast Books, 1996): 180.

helped him get landed immigrant status.²⁵⁵ John Hagan's book also includes the story of an African-American man named Rob Winslow who was assisted by TADP. Winslow was drafted into the Army and immediately had reservations about military life. The classist nature of the military was readily apparent to Winslow: "One night we're there eating and this guy says, 'You know, this is the first time I've ever had three meals a day. You know what else, this is the first time I've ever had shoes that didn't leak.' And I looked at him and I was thinking, so...that's how the army works."²⁵⁶ After talking with a friend who had served in Vietnam, Winslow also better understood what he came to regard as the racist nature of the war, as his friend informed him that "they were using black guys like canaries in a coal mine, sticking us up front just to see if the others would make it."²⁵⁷ After Winslow decided to come to Canada, he went to TADP for help. Winslow credited Naomi Wall from TADP for saving his life "on more than one occasion."²⁵⁸ Hagan also writes that in addition to his own initiative and the support of his family, the support he received from Wall and TADP "eventually resulted in his making a successful transition to a new life in Canada."²⁵⁹

If some blacks did not feel that they were adequately helped by TADP, it is probable that the cause was less to do with discrimination and more to do with ignorance. As Kasinsky pointed out, some African-Americans who came to

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 178-79.

²⁵⁶ Hagan, 106.

²⁵⁷ Sandra Gurvis, *Where Have All the Flower Children Gone?* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2006): 165.

²⁵⁸ Hagan, 108.

TADP were not told that there was a sympathetic black community “because they [TADP] did not know about it.”²⁶⁰ To make up for this lack of knowledge, a group of three black resisters, one of whom had gone to TADP for assistance upon arrival, founded their own aid group in 1970 called the Black Refugee Organization. Among other things, the Toronto-based organization billeted African-Americans with black families in Canada. Kasinsky notes how this black-oriented group “functioned as a parallel organization to TADP, yet there was co-operation between them.” Most African-American resisters that entered the TADP office were referred to the Black Refugee Organization for additional support.²⁶¹

The existence of organizations in Toronto that specifically aided black resisters helps explain why there are not more references to African-Americans aided by TADP.²⁶² Yet it must be remembered that not many blacks chose to resist the Vietnam War by leaving America. One reporter cited that the highest estimate he heard regarding the number of black resisters in all of Canada was fewer than a thousand.²⁶³ Blacks comprised just three per cent of Kasinsky’s sample; this low number, Kasinsky wrote, was representative of “the low percentage of blacks who had sought emigration as a solution to their draft or military problems.” Those who did come to Canada, Kasinsky found, tended to

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 109. The following article also includes an African-American who was helped by TADP. See John Burns, “Deaf to the Draft: Called in U.S., but Asleep in Toronto,” *The Globe and Mail*, October, 11, 1967. Section A, Page 2. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²⁶⁰ Kasinsky, 101.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² The Black Refugee Organization was not the only black-oriented aid group as Emerick (Pg. 231) comments on a West Indian agency in Toronto called Ebony Social Services that extended their social services to black resisters.

come from middle-class backgrounds and most had at least a few years of college education.²⁶⁴

Hagan has noted that the question of why more blacks did not leave the United States often emerges in accounts of the era; there is not one simple answer, however, and many possible explanations have been given. As alluded to above, one reason given was that the culture shock of moving to Canada was greater for black Americans than it was for their white counterparts. As one African-American who came to Canada stated in a 1970 interview, few blacks left the United States because they would have been leaving their “people” and entering a culture with “few blacks...most of [whom] are West Indians.”²⁶⁵ Some African-Americans that left the country were criticized by friends for doing so because it was evidently not the “black” thing to do. One African-American resister stated that some of his peers accused him of wanting to go to Canada because he “was trying to become like ‘Whitey’.”²⁶⁶

Some have suggested that African-Americans were more likely to live “underground” in American urban centers than come to Canada. An individual who worked for TADP suggested that most black resisters “probably hide in the big city ghettos...they don’t have to leave the country to find a safe refuge.”²⁶⁷ An equally valid explanation is that the knowledge that Canada was a viable option of Canada was not widespread among African-Americans. One black

²⁶³ John Egerton, “Why Canada attracts few U.S. Negroes,” *The Globe and Mail*, November 7, 1970. Page 7. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²⁶⁴ Kasinsky, 11.

²⁶⁵ John Egerton, “Why Canada attracts few U.S. Negroes,” *The Globe and Mail*, November 7, 1970. Page 7. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²⁶⁶ Kasinsky, 13.

resister who did leave the United States for Canada suggested that more African-Americans would have left had they known that other black resisters had made the transition successfully.²⁶⁸ Another black resister in Canada came to the same conclusion, noting that “black kids don’t have the same access to information” as “white middle-class college kids who’ve been through the whole Vietnam peacenik trip.”²⁶⁹ Yet the wife of an African-American resister who came to Canada did not believe that it was a lack of knowledge, but rather the perception that blacks would not be granted immigration status: “Canada was not an option, and that was a well-known fact in the black community, because they’re black and they’re not going to get in. It was just as clear as if you close the door, it closes.”²⁷⁰

Women also came to Canada in large numbers during the Vietnam era. It has already been noted that women were central to the operation of TADP. Yet the experience of women who came to Canada has been underrepresented in literature on the topic. Part of the explanation may be that some people do not see the women who left America as “resisters,” since they were not threatened by the draft. Yet, it is evident that some of the women who came felt that they were doing their part to resist the war machine. At the conference that was held in Montreal in 1970, female participants felt that “they too were political refugees; they too had to make the political decision to leave the United

²⁶⁷ Author Unknown, “Anti-Draft Center Thrives in Canada,” *The Hartford Courant*, April 1, 1970. Page 34. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

²⁶⁸ Williams, 340.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 341.

²⁷⁰ Hagan, 108-109.

States.”²⁷¹ Some of the women came to Canada with men, but others came alone, and as Naomi Wall commented, they “made their own antiwar statement by leaving the States.”²⁷² Women also visited TADP in significant numbers. From the period between March 10 to June 10, 1972, for example, TADP counselled 379 individuals. Of this number 54 were women, and about half of them had come alone.²⁷³

²⁷¹ Kasinsky, 134.

²⁷² Hagan, 29.

²⁷³ TADP archives, “Quarterly Report,” Box 25, Folder 1.

6) The Attention Turns Toward Sweden

In 1972, TADP was faced with a new challenge as American resisters who had gone to Sweden were now looking to come to Canada. Like Canada, Sweden had been a refuge for resisters, since they could not be extradited for draft related offenses.²⁷⁴ By 1972, many Americans – especially military resisters – wanted to leave Sweden and wondered if Canada would be a suitable alternative.²⁷⁵ TADP had been informed of the situation after talking with people in America and Sweden and some others who had recently been in Sweden.²⁷⁶ In response, TADP began to look into all the rules and regulations to see if it was possible for Americans in Sweden to come to Canada. TADP planned to write a supplement to the *Manual* that was specifically for Americans in Sweden. Writing to a contact in Sweden, Dick Brown mentioned that this took longer than expected because of a “situation of total confusion” about what documents an American citizen without an American passport needed to enter Canada as a visitor from Sweden. TADP was having a lawyer look into the matter and did not want to send any “hasty messed up information.”²⁷⁷ In a letter to another contact in Sweden, Dick Brown noted that coming to Canada from Sweden must be done carefully, as there were many “pitfalls in Canadian immigration procedures

²⁷⁴ James Dickerson, *North to Canada: Men and Women Against the Vietnam War* (Westport, CT and London: Praeger Publishers, 1999): 2.

²⁷⁵ Based on the literature available in the TADP archives the reason that Americans wanted to leave Sweden is not entirely clear. Some of the letters refer to the “rough situation”, how “things are getting pretty tough” and that there were “a lot of people concerned about what’s going down.” Another mentions that “they seem to have even more problems than our people up here have [in Canada].” It is possible that the Swedish government was becoming more hostile towards military resisters. According to Baskir and Strauss (Pg. 198), “Swedes began to sour upon the young Americans” between 1970-73.

²⁷⁶ TADP archives, “Letter: August 31, 1972,” Box 19, Folder 1.

²⁷⁷ TADP archives, “Letter: July 20, 1972,” Box 19, Folder 1.

which must be avoided.” He nevertheless reassured the individual that those at TADP had not “forgotten our brothers and sisters in Sweden and we hope we can help open up a new alternative.”²⁷⁸

In August 1972, the “Sweden Supplement” was released by TADP. The eight-page document provided information on immigrating to Canada from Sweden. It began with a bleak overview of the current economic situation in Canada and the “bitter reality” of unemployment. Things were even worse for immigrants as the immigration department had “instituted a number of unwritten, unofficial policies” that conspired to keep immigrants out of Canada and to “keep Canadian jobs for Canadians.” This led to a “Catch-22” situation, as most new arrivals to Canada found themselves being told by employers that they needed to be landed immigrants to work and immigration officials informing them that they needed a job to become landed. Despite the dire situation, TADP provided detailed immigration procedures for those who nevertheless wanted or needed to come to Canada.

It was pointed out that the best way to become a landed immigrant was to fly to Canada as a visitor, consult with an aid organization, and then apply at a border crossing. It was advised that residents get their documentation together in Sweden so that they did not “wind up strung out and broke in Canada.” An invitation from someone in Canada was also suggested, as it would show that the purpose of the trip was a “visit.” TADP offered to provide a fictitious letter if one could not be found by other means.

²⁷⁸ TADP archives, “Letter: August 1, 1972,” Box 19, Folder 1 and TADP archives, “Letter: August 31, 1972,” Box 19, Folder 1.

TADP also offered advice on what *not* to do. Applying for immigration at the Canadian embassy in Stockholm was not a good idea, as the application would probably be denied. Some suggestions were also offered about what not to do after arriving at a Canadian airport: “DO NOT give any indication that you intend to apply for landed immigrant status or that you’ve even heard of such a thing.” One final piece of advice was to “NOT bring this...supplement” along to the airport. After covering the countless regulations and procedures involved in immigrating to Canada, it was remarked in the supplement that by the time an individual was landed in Canada, he would have “a fine appreciation for the incredible bureaucracy which runs Canada. It’s a real trip.”

The supplement also provided other practical information in addition to the immigration rules and regulations. The suggested flight to take from Stockholm to Toronto was given (stopover in London), as well as the different costs depending on the season. The prices were given in both Canadian and Swedish currency. Potential jobs that would look good for immigration purposes were also suggested. Apparently one job skill that would “always get you landed” was experience as a farm hand – as long as the applicant applied “between planting and harvest time.” Those that had “common labor” as their primary skill were out of luck. Although TADP thought that skill was “far out,” they reminded readers that they were “not immigration” and “immigration is trying to cut off that kind of immigrant.” The supplement concluded by listing aid organizations that resisters could contact for more information in Canada,

Sweden, and America – or as it is referred to in the document - “in the belly of the beast.”²⁷⁹

One of the organizations recommended in the supplement to seek out for advice was the Stockholm American Deserters Committee (ADC). A letter written by Dick Brown mentions that the Stockholm ADC had been “marvelously helpful,” and in another letter the organization was praised for saving TADP from mistakes while writing the Sweden Supplement.²⁸⁰ TADP wanted other groups to know that although they had crossed paths with the Stockholm ADC while working on the document and had a chance to “rap out a lot of stuff,” their inclusion in the supplement was not intended to “slight other counselling groups.” Indeed, they hoped to receive feedback from other aid groups in Sweden since “all of us have to work together.” This last statement indicates not only the desire to have a harmonious working relationship with all the groups in Sweden, but also the awareness of the precarious nature of the anti-War “movement.” The reality was that there was little room for factionalism if the organizations hoped to achieve their objective of helping resisters find refuge.

Exactly how many American resisters immigrated to Canada from Sweden remains unknown. TADP did, however, receive some letters from Sweden including one letter writer who wanted information on a number of topics. The inquisitive man wanted to know about applying through Ottawa, wondered if someone at TADP could arrange a job for him, was curious about

²⁷⁹ TADP archives, “Sweden Supplement”, Box 19, Folder 4.

the present state of immigration policy, and hoped he could be told more about the “job and women situation” in Australia.²⁸¹ TADP took the time to answer all of his questions in a two-page response – except the ones about his employment and love prospects in Australia.²⁸² For the answers to those, he was directed to the Australian embassy in Sweden. Nevertheless, TADP was able to tell him that they had heard that the situation was not great for military resisters in Australia. They also gave a detailed response about the different ways to apply for landed immigrant status in Canada.

Another resister wrote a very cryptic letter to TADP in which he explained that within in a month he would be “passing through your area in hopes of a chance to search for the eagle.” The mystery continued as he wrote, “I imagine you need to know exactly, what day, time, flight, etc. Well brothers, so do I.” The letter became less confusing as the writer indicated that he wanted to visit his ill mother in the United States.²⁸³ Dick Brown’s response was much clearer. He understandably had trouble deciphering the message and stated that he was “not quite sure as to what it is you’ll be wanting or needing here in Toronto when you get here.” He did, however, offer to explain what TADP could and could not do: “If your thoughts are to split stateside underground, we can offer lots of moral support but little else – you’ll be pretty much left on your own resourcefulness to figure and get what you might need. If, on the other hand, you’re thinking of pursuing a discharge stateside, that’s a whole different

²⁸⁰ TADP archives, “Letter: July 20, 1972,” Box 19, Folder 1 and TADP archives, “Letter: August 31, 1972,” Box 19, Folder 1.

²⁸¹ TADP archives, “Letter: March 30, 1973,” Box 19, Folder 6.

²⁸² TADP archives, “Letter: April 16, 1973,” Box 19, Folder 6.

duck.” Brown explained how TADP could help the man look into his draft or military problems from Canada, but advised him that a lot could be done from Sweden and that the process could take months. If, on the other hand, the man wanted to quickly cross the border to see his mother and then leave again, about all TADP could offer was the “best of luck.”²⁸⁴ This response is interesting, for it indicates that TADP was not only attempting to help Swedes immigrate to Canada, but also offering to be an intermediary between resisters in Sweden who wanted to return to the United States. A letter around this same time period confirms that TADP was in the process of setting up the organization as a “launching pad” for military resisters in Sweden who wanted to work towards a discharge.²⁸⁵ The proximity of Canada to the United States made this process easier, as TADP could “prepare details” and “advise, aid, and help arrange...return to military control” without having to communicate with resisters across the Atlantic.²⁸⁶

²⁸³ TADP archives, “Letter: Dear Dick and Dan,” Box 19, Folder 6. Underlines appear in the original.

²⁸⁴ TADP archives, “Letter: April 9, 1973,” Box 19, Folder 6.

²⁸⁵ TADP archives, “Letter: June 5, 1973,” Box 3, Folder 10.

²⁸⁶ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 25, Folder 2.

7) The “60-day” Period and the Issue of Amnesty

TADP was able to turn its attention towards resisters in Sweden in 1972 since fewer Americans were crossing the border into Canada. As fewer resisters came north, many of the aid organizations in Canada decreased their services in 1972.²⁸⁷ TADP was also in the process of phasing out its services during this time period, when some resisters started having trouble at the border once again. TADP corresponded with the immigration department about people who were being harassed by immigration officials.²⁸⁸ Nevertheless, most of the cases appear to have been cleared up as the individuals were granted landed immigrant status.²⁸⁹ Dick Brown noted in a letter that TADP had sent through some “test cases” and the “officials...stayed within the rule book which is exactly what we wanted.”²⁹⁰ However, as Brown wrote only nine days later, “right when it looks good, it gets bad.”²⁹¹ He was referring to the fact that on November 2, 1972, the government suddenly changed the rules of immigration. It was no longer possible for any immigrant to apply for landed immigrant status at the border or within Canada. The decision was detrimental for American resisters, as the only other way left to apply was at a Canadian embassy or consulate in the United States where the wait time was generally three to six months and was almost always unsuccessful (and could lead to an individual being apprehended by the authorities).²⁹² It was also a serious issue for resisters who had not yet obtained

²⁸⁷ Kasinsky, 139.

²⁸⁸ TADP archives, “Letter: December 4, 1972,” Box 14, Folder 1.

²⁸⁹ TADP archives, “Letter: January 2, 1972,” Box 13, Folder 2.

²⁹⁰ TADP archives, “Letter: October 31, 1972,” Box 13, Folder 2.

²⁹¹ TADP archives, “Letter: November 9, 1972,” Box 13, Folder 2.

²⁹² TADP archives, “Letter: November 16, 1972,” Box 13, Folder 2 and TADP archives, “Letter: June 8, 1973,” Box 14, Folder 10. Another letter points out that technically they could also send

landed immigrant status, but were already in Canada.²⁹³ Their options were essentially to return to the United States and face a penalty, remain underground, or seek a discharge or draft acquittal.²⁹⁴ TADP's military and draft counselling services thus became even more important.

In response to the sudden "closing of the border" TADP began a nationwide lobbying campaign.²⁹⁵ In a letter that was sent to a contact in Winnipeg, TADP suggested that help should be sought from anyone: "Any group or individuals are fair game to be approached [:] churches, social agencies, lawyers, city aldermen...provincial MLAs, MPs, concerned individuals, you name it."²⁹⁶ They also provided the names of some Members of Parliament who they thought might be sympathetic. A letter sent to Montreal also suggested some names of potential sympathizers in Quebec and asked the recipient to contact an individual on the east coast because there were some Liberal MPs who might be approached and, it was written, a "Tory MP (of all damn things) in Prince Edward Island who is supposed to be very sympathetic."²⁹⁷ Only a month after the border had closed, Dick Brown wrote that TADP had "tapped every inside source in Ottawa that would listen." He also stated that the reason TADP was

an application to Ottawa from the United States, but noted that the success rate was even lower than applying at an embassy. TADP archives, "Letter: December, 8, 1972," Box 13, Folder 2, Page 1.

²⁹³ TADP archives, "Brief for Bloor Street," Box 13, Folder 9, Page 2.

²⁹⁴ TADP archives, "Toronto Anti-Draft Programme," Box 25, Folder 2, Page 3.

²⁹⁵ The letters that follow are not addressed to anyone in particular, but from the content it can be inferred that they were sent to contacts in other organizations.

²⁹⁶ TADP archives, "Letter: November 17, 1972," Box 13, Folder 1.

²⁹⁷ TADP archives, "Letter: November 17, 1972," Box 13, Folder 2.

coordinating the campaign was that they had “apparently...gotten more information on what’s happening in Ottawa than anyone else.”²⁹⁸

In a December 1972 meeting, that included sympathetic individuals and others involved in the Toronto resistance movement, TADP formed the strategy they would use in their campaign. First, they would pressure the government to re-open the border for American war resisters and second, they would present the case that the border should be opened for all military refugees including those from Portugal, France, Holland and Vietnam.²⁹⁹ In a letter encouraging an individual to write the Minister of Immigration and “plead for a loophole,” Brown suggested that the appeal should be based on “humanitarian rather than political grounds.” The reason that Brown suggested this tactic was that he felt that the “Canadian government has never listened to our political raps, but their response to humanitarian grounds is much better.” He also encouraged the recipient of the letter to “put a word in” for South Vietnamese who had left the military and had come to Canada since they were also “really getting screwed” by the government’s immigration policy.³⁰⁰

The response to a letter that was sent from a resister in Sweden during the spring of 1973 illustrates how hopeless the situation had become in Canada. The man had inquired about immigrating to Canada and was told that there were only two ways to apply at this point, and neither was encouraging. One was to apply through the embassy in Sweden and try to earn enough “points,” but Dick Brown

²⁹⁸ TADP archives, “Letter: December 8, 1972,” Box 13, Folder 2, Page 1. TADP was in regular contact with an NDP MP from Toronto for example.

²⁹⁹ TADP archives, “Letter: December 28, 1972,” Box 13, Folder 2. Members of AMEX were at this meeting. See, TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 13, Folder 2.

explained why it was virtually impossible that his application would be successful. The alternative was to mail the application directly to Ottawa, but Brown pointed out, this method was even less likely to succeed unless the man had divine powers: “[One] method would be to mail your application straight into the Immigration Department in Ottawa and pray; problem is unless you happen to be Jesus Christ your prayers won’t be answered.” Brown reassured the man that TADP had “been looking like you wouldn’t believe for a loophole,” but had not found one so far. Brown was very blunt in his assessment of the current situation and did not give the man any false hopes. He nevertheless hoped that the information would be more helpful than the Canadian officials had recently been: “That’s as direct information as we have for your questions. Hope it’s of some help, the government certainly hasn’t been here.” What is also interesting about this letter is that Brown mentions that he was also sending along a copy of the Sweden Supplement, but that it was already out of date. Considering that it had been published only nine months earlier, one can get a sense of how fast immigration laws could change and were changing.³⁰¹ Although the situation would not improve for American resisters who still wanted to come to Canada, it did get better for those who were in Canada but not yet landed immigrants.

During the summer of 1973, the Department of Manpower and Immigration introduced legislation to help immigrants who were in Canada become landed. The government was looking for a way to clear up the backlog of cases before the Immigration Appeal Board and to deal with all of the illegal

³⁰⁰ TADP archives, “Letter: December 8, 1972,” Box 13, Folder 2.

³⁰¹ TADP archives, “Letter: April 16, 1973,” Box

immigrants presently in Canada. The bill offered any immigrant in Canada who had been in the country since November 30, 1972, a period of sixty days to come forward and apply for landed immigrant status under relaxed requirements, with “full rights of appeal” if unsuccessful. The Immigration Minister made it clear that even if someone had been living in the country illegally, he could come forward without a penalty. He also stressed that this would be the last opportunity to “gain permanent residence while in the country,” and any illegal immigrant who did not register in the sixty day time period could be “deported without appeal.”³⁰² TADP estimated that there were 10-20,000 American war resisters not yet landed in Canada and 150-200,000 immigrants in total who were in this position.³⁰³

The sixty day period of grace offered Canadian aid organizations a chance to help resisters who were not “landed” in Canada, yet it also presented a great challenge – how could they reach all of the potential candidates in a short time period and also convince them that it was an opportunity and not a government “trap”? Nine aid groups in Canada joined together through the Canadian Coalition of War Resisters and attempted to solve the problem by launching the “National Immigration Program.”³⁰⁴

The program hoped to achieve two goals; first, it planned to “inform all war resisters ” of the government initiative, and second, to advise resisters to contact one of the aid centers to “receive accurate information and assistance on

³⁰² TADP archives, “Office of the Minister Manpower and Immigration, June 18, 1972 and August 14, 1973,” Box 14, Folder 18.

³⁰³ TADP archives, “Letter: Dear Friends,” Box 14, Folder 4. In Hagan (Pg. 171) Dick Brown put the number of resisters at 5-10,000.

how to apply.”³⁰⁵ The coalition included TADP and aid groups in Montreal, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Regina, Ottawa, Halifax, Calgary and Edmonton.³⁰⁶ The organizations in the latter five cities had been inactive since the borders had closed, and had then restarted in response to the 60-day period of grace.³⁰⁷ The coalition had a budget of \$110,000 that was raised the National Council of Churches U.S.A. and used to cover the costs of a lawyer, regional staffing and media costs, as well as other expenses.³⁰⁸

The coalition launched a major publicity campaign to “get the word out” during the 60-day period that ran between August 15 and October 15, 1973. The group rented a bus to carry the message across Canada for two months, and it stopped in many remote areas of the country in an attempt to reach as many people as possible. The bus was multicoloured and had “Last chance for landed immigrant status” painted on its side.³⁰⁹ A number of radio spots and one television commercial were also produced by the Canadian Council of Churches, featuring popular folk singers. Jesse Winchester and Joan Baez each did one of the radio spots, as did Ian Tyson who also did the television commercial.

³⁰⁴ TADP archives, “Immigration Aid for Resisters,” Box 14, Folder 27.

³⁰⁵ TADP archives, “News Release,” Box 14, Folder 12.

³⁰⁶ The coalition did not include AMEX. They felt their exclusion was the “latest incident...[in a] long tradition whereby the NCC [National Council of Churches] would fund only the apolitical aid centers at the expense of the political exile groups addressing the political roots of the problem.” See Hagan, 152.

³⁰⁷ TADP archives, “Canadian Coalition of War Resisters,” Box 14, Folder 13 and TADP archives, “Sixty Days of Grace,” Box 14, Folder 16.

³⁰⁸ Hagan, 152 and TADP archives, “U.S. Draft Age Immigrants in Canada,” Box 14, Folder 13.

³⁰⁹ TADP archives, “Bus Carries Immigration Message,” Box 14, Folder 27. The immigration department also launched an extensive publicity campaign that was their largest ever for a single program. TADP archives, “News Release” Box 14, Folder 12. Kasinsky (Pg. 203) also states that part of the government’s 1.4 million advertising budget was given to some of the Canadian aid organizations.

Winchester himself was a war resister who had come to Canada.³¹⁰ Each aid organization was essentially responsible for getting the recordings on air in its respective region. TADP made sure that the spots were heard throughout stations in Ontario. Between September 17 and 21, eight ads were played each day on Toronto radio station CHUM-FM, which led one TADP member to quip, “if that doesn’t bring out the FM listenership, then they ain’t coming out.”³¹¹

TADP also sent a representative around Southern Ontario to spread the news. Information was spread through “the universities, various social services, coffee houses and aide organizations” by “newspapers...radio stations coverage, posters, leaflets and information exchanges with local store keepers.”³¹² A spokesperson for the immigration department also reported that TADP had been phoning them “with details of anonymous cases” to get a “kind of pro-clearance before the individual came in to report officially.”³¹³

One final way that TADP responded was to produce a “fact sheet” to help resisters understand the issue.³¹⁴ Throughout the document, TADP stressed the ease of obtaining landed immigrant status through the government’s program. For those that met the criteria, it was “absurdly simple,” as the government was “virtually giving away landed immigrant status.” The “points

³¹⁰ TADP archives, “Letter: August 9, 1972,” Box 14, Folder 23. The Joan Baez spot was never used because it did not “fall within Canadian content definition.” Joan Baez was a surprising choice as she had previously chastised resisters during a performance in Toronto and told them that they should not be in Canada, but in an America jail. See, Williams, 67 and TADP archives, “Letter: August 27, 1973,” Box 14, Folder 23.

³¹¹ TADP archives, “Notice to All Counsellors,” Folder 14, Page 13.

³¹² TADP archives, “Report on Finding People,” Box 14, Folder 3. The document does not say who TADP sent out to do this.

³¹³ Norman Hartley, “Ethnic ‘Mediators’ Recruited to Encourage more Illegal Immigrants to Seek Landed Status,” *The Globe and Mail*, September 22, 1973. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

³¹⁴ TADP archives, “Sixty Days of Grace,” Box 14, Folder 16.

system” was being set aside, and “in its place is a subjective criteria which is noticeably far more relaxed.” The government, it was written, would overlook information that someone had entered Canada unlawfully, worked illegally, had remained in Canada with a false passport or had stayed in Canada after being issued a deportation order. Basically, all an individual had to do was get a job offer and prove that he had been in Canada continually since November 30, 1972.

Although TADP stressed that it was an easy process, they also emphasized that it could “get tricky.” There were many rules and regulations that were not immediately clear. Not everyone was eligible, such as those who fell into a “prohibited class.” Along with being admissible, an applicant also had to be “likely to establish” themselves. The “fact sheet” helped resisters understand what all of this meant. “To make sure all goes well,” it was written, “you must know the traps and pitfalls along the way and how to avoid them.” TADP suggested that the information in the document would help resisters “walk safely in immigration’s minefield.” For example, the ways one could “prove” that he had been in Canada since the previous November 30 were explained. Rent receipts, bank statements or a driver’s license issued before that date would all suffice. The easiest way, however, was to have a sworn affidavit. To make it easier, TADP had the “necessary blank form” with the “correct legal wording” available in its office. They could even refer someone to a law office to have it sworn. The document also clarified how people could demonstrate that they would “establish themselves” and would not be a “burden” in Canada. It was

written that they could show that they had been employed, were financially stable, had furthered their education, or had relatives in Canada – but this did not include “some distant 15th cousin or something.” They could also show that they were operating a successful business. It was noted that they did not have to be “running a multi-national corporation” as “so-called ‘hip capitalism’ would count.” In the unforeseen event that the government turned down an applicant, it was advised that they visit TADP, who would refer them to a lawyer. TADP also offered some tips to ensure the process ran smoothly. It was recommended that everyone should see a TADP counsellor to double-check that they had the proper documents before they applied for landed status. It was advised that the best time to apply was when the government office was busy, as “the officer simply won’t have time to hassle anyone.” It was also suggested that resisters alter their appearance:

Wear the straightest, middle-class, Sunday-going-to-meeting clothes you own or can beg or borrow. There is simply no point in waving a red flag in the face of a bull by looking like a typical drug-crazed hippie (which is what will go through the immigration officer’s mind.) Immigration is a notoriously intolerant bureaucracy when it comes to dealing with alternate lifestyles and clothing. Play their game. For once the rules are...simple, and besides, it’s the only game in town.

They also stressed that this would almost certainly be the last time the government offered an opportunity such as this. Thus, it was made clear that every resister in Canada who was not landed had better do “the few things which you must do at the right time or you are screwed.” In case they forget the alternative, TADP reminded them that if they missed the deadline, they would be

“subject to deportation without appeal” and that meant a “free ride to the waiting arms of the loving FBI for U.S. war resisters.”³¹⁵

It should be noted that TADP did not limit itself to helping American resisters during the 60-day time period, as they provided assistance to any illegal immigrant that sought out their help.³¹⁶ During the first month of the program, they had approximately 37 inquiries a day – seventeen in person and twenty on the phone. Of these, about eighty percent were Americans. The rest came from diverse backgrounds. For example, the front desk records indicate that between September 3 and September 7, TADP had inquiries from people from India, Uruguay, Nigeria, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Italy, Hungary, Iran, Bangladesh, and France as well as other countries.³¹⁷ Only about 3,000 resisters became landed during the 60-day period in Canada, despite the efforts of TADP and other aid groups. This was fewer than they had anticipated. Many organizations felt that sixty days had not been a long enough time period to make everyone aware of the program.³¹⁸

Before the liberalized 60-day period was over, it was already becoming clear to TADP that Canada would no longer be welcoming any more resisters. According to TADP, the “golden age of easy immigration to Canada” was “now a page in history.” The only way to apply for landed immigrant status was from within the United States, which was not a viable option for draft and military

³¹⁵ Ibid.

³¹⁶ TADP archives, “Letter: Dear Friends,” Box 14, Folder 4

³¹⁷ TADP archives, “Front Desk Inquiry Records,” Box 2, Folders 1 and 2.

³¹⁸ Kasinsky, 203-04 and 295.

resisters.³¹⁹ Between 1973-1975, TADP began to wind down operations. They nevertheless still had a lot of work to do helping draft resisters re-open their cases and military resisters work towards discharges. Although people occasionally still crossed the border seeking refuge, they did so much less frequently. Preceding this time period and especially during this time period, TADP became more occupied with the issue of amnesty. It is outside the scope of this paper to trace the development of this issue, but it should be briefly discussed since it became a major concern of the anti-war movement both within Canada and the United States. It was also a turning point in TADP's relationship with other anti-war organizations in Canada.

During 1971 and 1972, American politicians increasingly discussed the question of amnesty for draft resisters and began offering their versions of what form it should take. Senator Robert Taft Jr., an Ohio Republican, proposed a bill that offered amnesty to draft resisters on the condition that they perform three years of alternative service.³²⁰ Meantime, Senator George McGovern, the anti-war Democratic presidential nominee from South Dakota, outlined his version of an amnesty that would grant an unconditional amnesty for draft resisters and a case-by-case review of each military resister.³²¹ In response to these and other pronouncements by American politicians, TADP issued a press release that announced that resisters would soon be making their voices heard on the issue. The release stated there had been "no clear-cut unified statement from Canada by

³¹⁹ TADP archives, "Immigration Fact Sheet, August, 1973," Box 13, Folder 3.

³²⁰ Jay Walz, "Exiles in Canada Wary of Amnesty Bill," *New York Times*, January 11, 1972. Page 14. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

the war resisters...being discussed...[and] we are now going to speak out on our own behalf.”³²² A few weeks later, on January 17, 1972, a statement was released that had the support of members from both TADP and AMEX.³²³

Their position paper denounced all talk of amnesty.³²⁴ The representatives of the resister organization felt that the any discussion of amnesty was irrelevant, as it distracted attention from the on-going war: “The Nixon administration appears to be making every effort to orchestrate public opinion into the belief that the war is ending. The emerging of the so-called ‘amnesty’ issue in the United States only reinforces this miscarriage of the truth. We refuse to be a part of Nixon’s lies. The war is not only continuing but is being escalated to points even Lyndon Johnson could not or dared not attempt.” They also encouraged “well-meaning political leaders” on the Left not to be “sucked in by a political football.” They continued by outlining the reasons why they were opposed to the type of amnesty currently being discussed in the United States. One reason was that they did not feel that they were the ones who were at fault: “‘Amnesty’ implies forgiveness, but for what are we to be forgiven? We refused to commit the crime.” They also rejected any form of “alternative service,” as they did not see why they were the ones who should be punished: “Since we refused to commit the crime, why must we be punished? Are not the criminals those who perpetrated the crime called the Indo-Chinese War?” Finally, they disagreed with treating draft resisters and military resisters separately: “Using

³²¹ Michael Moore, “Radical U.S. Exiles Would ‘Destroy’ Army with Total Amnesty,” *The Globe and Mail*, April 3, 1972. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

³²² TADP archives, “For Immediate Release,” Box 13, Folder 1.

³²³ Hagan, 143.

that kind of logic, the conclusion would have to be drawn that saying ‘No’ to the Indo-Chinese War before being drafted is acceptable, but after taking one step forward, saying ‘No’ is criminal. We do not need that kind of existential absurdity either.” They reinforced this last point by pointing out that military resisters came from poorer backgrounds and were the first to get drafted and sent to Vietnam, so they deserved “a full restoration of civil liberties” more than anyone. The paper concluded by arguing that the kind of acceptable amnesty was unconditional and universal.

The issue of amnesty remained an important issue for aid organizations in Canada. Organizations such as AMEX, who viewed themselves as “exiles” in Canada, made it their number one issue in the years that followed. It was also a major concern for TADP. Many statements would follow this initial one, but it set the tone for the future. Other American political initiatives, such as President Ford’s clemency offer that required alternative service and a pledge of allegiance, were also rejected by the Canadian aid organizations.³²⁵ The issue for TADP and many of the aid organizations was not so much resisters’ desire to go back to the United States permanently, but about having the opportunity to visit, and trying to get the American public and politicians to understand that people should have the “right to resist unjust, immoral wars.”³²⁶

Amnesty was also an issue that aid organizations in Canada could agree upon. There had been little communication between the Canadian aid

³²⁴ TADP archives, “Restoration of Civil Liberties,” Box 17, Folder 27.

³²⁵ Loren Lind, “Draft Dodgers Reject Ford’s Amnesty,” *The Globe and Mail*, September 23, 1974. Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

³²⁶ TADP archives, “Letter, December 5, 1974,” Box 17, Folder 16. Italics in original.

organizations before 1970, with a few exceptions. When some of the groups were forming, they had shared information regarding immigration regulations.³²⁷ The closing of the borders to military resisters also led various aid organizations to meet in 1968 and 1969 to decide how to respond.³²⁸ Yet there had also been many disagreements about what role the organizations should play, as some, such as TADP, focused on humanitarian issues and assimilation while others focused on political issues. However, the issue of amnesty increasingly unified the aid organizations. Disagreements remained, especially over issues of funding, but it prompted a flurry of meetings between organizations, which worked closely on the matter and began issuing joint statements. The initial statement made in January 1972 was “as much about amnesty” as it was about “collective unity.” Many would have probably agreed with the one resister who wrote that the statement was “a recognition that the only people who represent war resisters in Canada to the USA honestly are ourselves.”³²⁹

³²⁷ Kasinsky, 102.

³²⁸ Ibid., and Killmer 23.

³²⁹ TADP archives, “Anonymous Document,” Box 17, Folder 8.

8) Letters to TADP and Emotional Support

Only a small portion of people who received counselling ever visited TADP's office. Many more individuals wrote to TADP with questions and concerns. Hagan noted that in his sample of resisters, about a third had corresponded with TADP before arriving in Canada.³³⁰ TADP received approximately one hundred letters a week from every state in America. Most of them came from young American citizens who had been declared fit for military service or were expecting to be drafted shortly.³³¹ The letters TADP received in the organization's later years sheds some light onto the types of issues resisters were dealing with and in some cases, how TADP responded.³³² While there were common themes in the letters, there was also a lot of variety, as they covered a wide range of topics. Kasinsky, for example, noted that many Canadian aid groups "often received letters requesting information on homesteading and communal farms."³³³ More common in the letters sent to TADP in the organization's later years were inquiries about an individual's legal status in the United States or Canada.

One resister wrote to TADP to ask about travelling to the United States. He had been born in Canada and had moved to the United States when he was fourteen. At the age of seventeen, he had joined Reserves in hopes of avoiding the draft. After he "learned what it was all about," he tried to obtain

³³⁰ Hagan, 77.

³³¹ Glenn McCurdy, "The American Draft Resisters in Canada," *Chicago Tribune*, March 10, 1968, Page F26. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

³³² Almost all of the letters contained in the TADP archives are from the organization's later years.

³³³ Kasinsky, 153.

Conscientious Objector status, but was denied. After his claim was turned down, he returned to Canada. He now wanted to know his legal status and to know if he could visit America without being detained.³³⁴ Another individual, who had been born in Italy, sent a letter to TADP requesting help. The man revealed he had moved from Italy to Canada and obtained citizenship before moving to the United States with his family. After receiving a scholarship to attend college, he was told by his draft board that he first must serve in the Armed Forces and was subsequently drafted and inducted. Once in the military, he “refused to sign papers going overseas” and “was told that he would be bodily and forcibly put on a plane. He split for Canada that night.”³³⁵ Writing to TADP, the resister wondered if there was “any way [he could] get liberated from this problem,” as he wanted to return to the United States to be with his family.³³⁶ These two resisters’ cases are interesting, for they show that not every resister who came to TADP for help was born in America.

Most resisters who wrote to TADP were American, however, such as the following individual. He was a resister who had lived in Canada for the past eight years and established a new life in Canada. He had married a Canadian, had a child, ran his own business and had acquired Canadian citizenship “as soon as it became possible.” Although he had “no desire to move back” to the United States, he wanted to know if he was eligible to travel between the two countries “without fear of reprisal.” Thankful for the organization’s existence, he enclosed a “token in... appreciation for the fine work you are doing and have

³³⁴ TADP archives, “Letter: June 3, 1975,” Box 1, Folder 19.

³³⁵ TADP archives, “Letter: July 20, 1973,” Box 1, Folder 8.

done for persons with similar problems.”³³⁷ A similar message, written just five days later, came from another resister who included a letter that his draft board had recently mailed to him. Since his draft notice had illegally been sent to him in Canada while he was “classified as a deferred student,” all charges against him had been dismissed. Like the resisters who sent the previous letters, he too wanted to know if he could travel to the United States without any problems and also enclosed a money order as a sign of his appreciation.³³⁸

Wanting to know if visiting the United States was an option was evidently on the minds of a lot of resisters early in 1975, as at least two other letters were sent to TADP inquiring about the same topic. One was sent by the wife of a man who had left the army and came to Canada. Although her husband was “very content with his life in Canada,” she wanted to get her husband’s military record cleared up so that they could visit family in the United States.³³⁹ Another resister who corresponded with TADP in 1975 also wanted to travel to the United States. Interestingly, the resister had just found out that his selective service files had been destroyed, unbeknownst to him, in 1972. He had taken out Canadian citizenship, wanted to know his status, and made it clear that he desired to re-enter the States only for a short visit. This man also included a cheque, which he hoped would “benefit the cause.” The number of letters sent by people who wanted to know if they could return to the United States indicates that many resisters did not want to completely cut ties with their homeland.

³³⁶ TADP archives, “Letter: October 2, 1975,” Box 1, Folder 8.

³³⁷ TADP archives, “Letter: April 2, 1975,” Box 1, Folder 9.

³³⁸ TADP archives, “Letter: April 7, 1975,” Box 17, Folder 10.

³³⁹ TADP archives, “Letter: January 8, 1975,” Box 1, Folder 15.

Although many of them indicated they were happy with their new country, the desire to be able to travel between the two countries, often for the purpose of visiting family and friends, remained strong.

The last letter writer indicated that TADP had helped him immigrate to Canada seven years earlier, illustrating that TADP played an important role in some resister's lives on multiple occasions over an extended period of time. This was confirmed by another resister who revealed in a letter that he too, had been helped by TADP in the past: "Congratulations for continuation the work of TADP, which has been meaningful for several years. The Programme's guidance six years ago was valuable in my life and it's good to see you carrying on, with dedication. There've obviously been some big victories...and more to come."³⁴⁰ This resister also enclosed a cheque with his letter. That the last four letters included a donation to TADP signifies the gratefulness that many resisters felt towards the organization.

Other letters from 1975 indicate that TADP was still getting inquiries from individuals who wanted information about immigrating to Canada. One letter was sent from Italy from a resister who had left the United States in 1968 and had lived in three different countries. He and his wife were now considering a move to Canada and wondered how to apply for immigration.³⁴¹ Another resister wrote TADP from England and explained that he was a resister who had left the United States and "never settled anywhere" and said that his passport was due to expire. He had decided that if "worse comes to worse," he would fly

³⁴⁰ TADP archives, "Letter: April 16, 1975," Box 1, Folder 19.

³⁴¹ TADP archives, "Letter: December, 29, 1975," Box 1, Folder 12.

to Canada and wondered if he would be allowed to reside and work in Canada.³⁴²

Fortunately, some insight into how TADP responded to this last query can be gathered, as a copy of the reply letter remained in the organization's files. TADP informed the resister that Canada would "probably be your best bet," but reminded the individual that "visitors can only remain here for three months at the most, cannot work and are grilled at the airport to insure that the visitor will not remain here and 'take jobs from Canadians'." The individual was advised to immigrate legally before his passport expired, told about the "points system," and was informed that a job offer was critical. Although the organization no longer had the "facilities to look for jobs," the resister was told that TADP would "see what we can come up with." The other option, informed TADP, was to marry a Canadian (or landed immigrant) which automatically would grant an individual landed status. No money could change hands, TADP pointed out, and added that the marriage "cannot not be one of convenience," but also noted "how can anyone tell these days?" TADP enclosed additional information on immigration with the letter (presumably a copy of the *Manual*) and concluded by encouraging the resister to get to the "Canadian embassy as soon as possible. The line up from England is loooooong and the whole process is slow anyway."³⁴³

The response from TADP not only shows the extent of knowledge the organization had about immigration regulations in Canada (and even the current situation in England), but also suggests the importance they gave to every

³⁴² TADP archives, "Letter: 1975 from England," Box 1, Folder 19.

³⁴³ TADP archives, "Letter: July 25, 1975," Box 1, Folder 19. The misspelling appears in the original document.

inquiry they received. Many of the letters that TADP sent to individuals were detailed and at least a page long.

The time and dedication that TADP put into each case they dealt with was also apparent in their dealing with another resister in need of assistance. A woman contacted the organization “concerning a matter of ‘cleaning up’ [her] husband’s military record.”³⁴⁴ Once again, the desire to straighten out the resister’s status was so that the couple could visit the United States, not, the woman made very clear, to return, as they were “intent on becoming Canadian citizens.” The notes written on the letter by someone at TADP indicates that a lot of inquiries were done on the husband’s case. Evidently, TADP did a FBI check on the individual (whose mother, it turned out, had been harassed by the FBI), and also inquired into his military record.³⁴⁵ The search yielded positive results for the couple, as TADP found out that the man had been reclassified and was not going to be prosecuted, and therefore could travel freely across the border.

Not all of the letters were inquiries about an individual’s status in the United States, however. Other letters TADP received were from individuals wanting to know their status in Canada. A resister writing from British Columbia who had not heard from the Immigration Department wrote to TADP because they were “beginning to get nervous” about their “immigration situation” and wanted to “find out if anything earthshaking might have happened.” Unlike a lot of the others, this person did not include a donation with his letter; instead he apologized to TADP for not yet repaying the twenty dollars he owed the

³⁴⁴ TADP archives, “Letter: January 2, 1974,” Box 1, Folder 13.

organization. They hoped to send “at least half in a couple of weeks,” but they were “poverty-stricken” for the time being.³⁴⁶ Another resister with a penchant for profanity wrote TADP because he and his friend had “been hearing some bullshit about immigration changes.” The resister was unsure if what he had heard was accurate and wanted clarification, since he and his friend “don’t trust those fuckers at immigration.” Regaining his composure, he politely concludes the letter by writing, “so if you could please tell us all you know about any changes I would surely appreciate it.”³⁴⁷ Arguably the most important thing that these last two letters reveal is the sense of trust that people writing to TADP placed in the organization. These two resisters did not write the Immigration Department to inquire about their status or the information they heard; they wrote to those whom they believed would tell them the truth: the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme.

This sense of trust was evident in other letters in which resisters who had returned to the United States still turned to TADP for assistance. One example is the letter mailed from a resister who had left Canada and was currently residing in Miami. He noted that his return was “bitter-sweet,” as he missed “the mellower, small-country atmosphere in Canada.”³⁴⁸ Even though he had re-entered the United States, he asked TADP about their view of his legal situation. A resister from New Jersey who had returned to military custody wrote a letter informing TADP that he did not have to “spend anytime in the brig” and that

³⁴⁵ Reading through the literature on the topic indicates that many resisters’ parents in the United States were harassed by the FBI as to the whereabouts of their child.

³⁴⁶ TADP archives, “Letter: October 20,” Box 1, Folder 10. This undated letter was possibly written during the sixty-day grace period in 1973.

“most of the people were pretty nice.”³⁴⁹ Not everyone was friendly, however, as there was a Sargent who thought he could have the resister sent to jail and some doctors who tried to keep the individual in the military: “They said my records of health were so bad it might be better for my health if they could keep me in.” He had been given an Undesirable Discharge and wanted to know if TADP could help him upgrade his military status.³⁵⁰ That these resisters still turned to TADP for help even though they were back in the United States where there were countless other aid groups indicates that they trusted the Toronto organization. It also shows that they had a level of confidence in the organization’s ability to help, which was the result of having been successfully aided by TADP in the past.

Other letters received from people who had returned to the United States were not from those looking for additional aid, but from individuals providing TADP with an update of their situation. One man who had presumably left Canada and returned to military custody wrote to let TADP know “what’s going down in Philadelphia” at the Naval Base.³⁵¹ A couple who had returned to California wrote that they were preparing to take legal action against the Navy and the man was planning to turn himself into the “base hospital” once they got their case together. The couple were optimistic and felt as if “luck might be on [their] side for once,” as the man had a “congressman and a shrink” on his side. They were writing TADP to say thank-you and noted that they would look into

³⁴⁷ TADP archives, “Letter: September 9,” Box 1, Folder 13.

³⁴⁸ TADP archives, “Letter: November 23, 1974,” Box 1, Folder 13.

³⁴⁹ TADP archives, “Letter from New Jersey,” Box 1, Folder 12.

³⁵⁰ Ibid.

how they could send some American beer up north.³⁵² A letter from a resister in Pennsylvania informed TADP of his military status. Much of the letter focused on medical and other discharges and how to obtain them. He discussed military procedures – “If you don’t have a doctor’s recommendation for discharge or a history of mental illness, you usually get sent to Fort Meade, rather than stay at the hospital” – and also provided an account of a guy who was getting a certain category of status because the army made “him nervous, uptight and increase his drug use.” He also updated TADP on his personal life, as he noted that he hoped to buy a car and attend college.³⁵³ Another resister who had been in military confinement wrote Dick and Dan at TADP from Colorado. He informed them that when he arrived on the base, it had been “really loose” as people were “smoking in the barracks, at all times of the day or night” and you could find “any kind of drug you can handle and some you can’t.” Things “got a little tighter,” however, when the “new brass” arrived, but at least the new Colonel was a “very intelligent dude” who didn’t “hassle” people too much. More importantly, this individual thought that people were getting discharged relatively quickly, so TADP should send resisters down soon before things changed. He ended his letter by stating that he would “be up this summer for a visit.”³⁵⁴

Letters such as these, providing firsthand accounts of dealings with draft boards and military officials, were important to counsellors at aid groups as they

³⁵¹ TADP archives, “Letter: August, 27,” Box 1, Folder 13.

³⁵² TADP archives, “Letter: January 13, 1975,” Box 1, Folder 15.

³⁵³ TADP archives, “Letter: August 24, 1972,” Box 3, Folder 22.

³⁵⁴ TADP archives, “Letter: February 21, 1973,” Box 3, Folder 22.

undoubtedly picked up tips to offer other individuals. This informal grapevine of information, which included correspondence, publications and face-to-face “rap sessions,” was central to how the anti-war movement operated. These letters once again also show the bonds that developed between individuals and the TADP staff. It appears many resisters just wanted to “keep in touch.”

A final letter illustrated the extent to which certain resisters relied on TADP. A man who had returned from Canada and was under military control in Michigan began his letter by apologizing to TADP for not writing sooner, but he had been “sentenced to four months in the stockade.”³⁵⁵ He notes he has been unsuccessful in his attempt to acquire a discharge on medical grounds: “I tried for a discharge on my eyes and also my nervous condition but it was turned down.” Apparently, his eyesight really was not strong - he was transferred to another base that needed a driver, but when he arrived they “wouldn’t let me drive because of my eyes.” He told TADP that he had decided that he would now apply at his new base for a discharge. His real reason for writing, however, was not to give TADP an update of his situation, but to ask a favour. He hoped that TADP could send all of his clothes, camera and “other stuff” to the base; he especially desired his military clothing and stated that he did not think he would have a chance to get back to Canada anytime soon. “Please send my stuff?” he asked. “I’ll send you the money you gave me to help me back into the states. I promise that. You all helped me when I needed it. That’s something a person doesn’t forget. Please write me a letter soon so I’ll know you got this. Well, I better close. Write please?” It’s unknown whether or not TADP sent this man his

belongings. What is clear from the letter, however, is the gratitude that the individual felt towards TADP. It also indicates his sense of dependence on TADP. Not only did this resister depend on TADP to send his material possessions, but the multiple pleas for a reply that close the letter also indicate that he depended on the organization for emotional support.

This emotional support was arguably the most valuable service provided by TADP. Part of the reason this type of support was so important was that many young Americans did not have parents who supported their decisions. Moving to a foreign country was not easy for anyone; without the support of family, the move became even more painful. This was not the case for everyone, of course; some resisters did have parental support. One resister who left Chicago for Toronto unquestionably had the support of his family and friends. He stated that “hardly two weeks go by” for him and his wife without a visit from a friend or relative; even his 78-year-old grandmother, he noted, has “been here five times.”³⁵⁶ The couple still ended up at TADP for immigration counselling, but it was their last contact with the resister community, as they were fortunate to have their own base of support.

Letters TADP received from family members of resisters also indicate that some were supported at home. A mother from Michigan whose son had been registered as a conscientious objector for two years and had recently been reclassified as eligible for the draft wrote TADP and inquired about employment and immigration for her son. She concluded her letter by thanking TADP “for

³⁵⁵ TADP archives, “Letter: October 16, 1972,” Box 1, Folder 16.

what you are doing.”³⁵⁷ A concerned uncle from New York whose nephew had enlisted in the military also sent a letter to TADP. The uncle had many legal and immigration questions for TADP about what his nephew could expect in the event that he did immigrate to Canada. Should his nephew be sent to a war zone, the uncle reasoned, there may come a time when “he will want to leave the Forces rather than kill someone abroad or be killed himself.”³⁵⁸ The compassion of a sibling was evident in another letter sent to TADP. The sibling wrote from Wisconsin and thanked Katie McGovern for “the help you have given and continue to give my brother” who was of “great concern” to his family as his “mental health is [not] very stable.” The sibling suggested that the individual “will be able to regain control of his life again if he can get some help” and assured McGovern that she was “certainly... instrumental in getting him started.”³⁵⁹ One final letter is from a mother who disagreed with her daughter’s decision yet was still supportive. She was trying to track her daughter down (and presumably her daughter’s boyfriend) to let her know that she may be a diabetic and wondered if someone at TADP could look through the organization’s employment section to see if her daughter had applied for a job. The mother wanted to know if the two of them were OK, as she was worried for their safety; her father was “to the breaking point...[and] heartbroken.” Although the parents felt that the pair had made the wrong decision, they were still supportive: “So they made a mistake. That’s life. We care. We love.” The mother concludes the

³⁵⁶ Carolyn Toll, “Chicago expatriates like new lifestyle,” *Chicago Tribune*, June 23, 1972. Page 1. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

³⁵⁷ Glenn McCurdy, “The American Draft Resisters in Canada,” *Chicago Tribune*, March 10, 1968, Page F26. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

letter by requesting a copy of the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*.³⁶⁰ Interestingly, this letter illustrates not only the concern that some parents felt for their children, but also how TADP was occasionally an intermediary between resisters and their families. A newspaper article from 1972 confirms this point, as the reporter mentions that the TADP office had a bulletin board full of messages from parents who were trying to reach their children.³⁶¹

Not every resister who came to Canada was fortunate enough to receive support from his family. Parents who believed military service was an obligation that needed to be fulfilled shunned their children who left the country.³⁶² Others were ashamed at their son or daughter's act and assumed that their child was one of only a few resisters who "ran away" to Canada.³⁶³ Looking at the profiles of resisters in Haig-Brown's book confirms that many parents of resisters did not share their child's antiwar views and decision to leave for Canada. One resister was faced with the choice of joining the Army or leaving home. He took the latter choice and went to Canada.³⁶⁴ Another, upon telling his father that he was going to Canada, was told that it was the "biggest mistake [he] could ever make."³⁶⁵ Some parents' attitudes were very extreme, such as the resister whose mother was such a staunch anti-Communist that she thought "Nixon was a

³⁵⁸ TADP archives, "Letter: March 31, 1975", Box 1, Folder 19.

³⁵⁹ TADP archives, "Letter: 'Dear Ms. McGovern'", Box 1, Folder 13.

³⁶⁰ TADP archives, "Letter: May 3, 1972", Box 25, Folder 3. The request for the *Manual* is interesting for it illustrates the point made earlier that families of resisters also used the document for informative purposes.

³⁶¹ Carolyn Toll, "Parents of Draft Evaders Feel Shock, Then Relief," *Chicago Tribune*, January 24, 1972, Page 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

³⁶² Killmer, 33.

³⁶³ *Ibid.*, 34.

³⁶⁴ Haig-Brown, 145.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 81.

pinko,” and was convinced that her son’s idea about going to Canada was the result of “being strapped down on a table and brainwashed by the Communists.”³⁶⁶

Considering the contrary views that some parents and their children had, it comes as little surprise that the decision to leave the United States often led to estrangement. A letter sent to one resister by his parents was used by TADP to gain support for the organization. The letter illustrates the resentment that some young Americans faced from their families after they made the decision to immigrate to Canada. The letter was from a mother to her son, and within the first few lines, she quickly established her sentiments: “What can I say to a son who has become a deserter and traitor to his country, family and friends? You know this is what you are. You really had us proud of you and now you ask to be referred to as a man. You must be kidding. A man is not a sniveling coward who has to run away from any form of authority or discipline just because it is temporarily inconvenient. You must really be a feather in the cap of all your Godless communist friends.” Apparently the mother believed that her son’s act was inspired by the Bolsheviks, as not only were his friends “Godless” commies, but she informed him of recent testimony which stated “that all the so-called peace movements in this country are communist controlled.” The mother could not conceive that her son’s act was his own decision and hoped that he had not been “praying to one of those asinine gurus.”

After the mother made it clear that the anti-war movement was nonsense and that the “draft-program” was “nothing but a sham,” she bluntly told her son

³⁶⁶ Ibid., 115.

the effect his act had had on his family: “You say you hope you didn’t hurt us too much. Well let me tell you something, it would have been more merciful if you had killed all of us before you left.” The mother then described how her son’s decision led to an Aunt becoming sick and a brother becoming seriously ill; the mother herself was “on the verge of being committed.” “No you didn’t hurt us,” she informed her son, “You killed us.”

Lest her son was still wondering at this point in the letter if he would be receiving any assistance from his parents, his mother made it abundantly clear that he would not. She informed him that she would not send him his birth certificate and would “never ask anyone for letters of recommendation for such an irresponsible act.” She did, however, offer her prayers – and a warning: if he did not return home by the end of the month, then his family would inform the authorities of his whereabouts and consider him “DEAD.” Finally, the mother pointed out that her son had really helped her learn a lesson: “Don’t ever be too happy or proud and brag about any of your children because you can get kicked right in the teeth.”³⁶⁷ The harshness of the letter is almost comical; yet it was certainly not funny to the son who received it.

The sheer volume of resisters who came to Canada makes it difficult to estimate many had the support of their family back home. Hagan’s study, however, is one indication of the level of parental support: “About half of the sample found the decision to come to Canada either difficult or extremely difficult, with deserters finding the decision most difficult. Only about one-third of the sampled resisters’ parents approved of them coming to Canada. Another

one-third neither approved nor disapproved, while fully one-third of the sample members' parents clearly disapproved.”³⁶⁸

Having a non-supportive family could cause many problems. One difficulty it presented was that unsympathetic parents were unwilling to send documents that individuals needed for immigration purposes. An individual associated with TADP stated that at least half of the resisters could not “ask their parents to mail their birth certificates because their parents have cut them off.”

³⁶⁹ Fortunately, TADP was able to help some people who were in this position. Through a connection in New York, the organization was able to obtain documents that resisters had trouble obtaining from their parents.³⁷⁰ A more poignant problem was that being cut off from family was often emotionally difficult. As Naomi Wall recollected, many young Americans simply found “living away from friends and family to be unbearable.”³⁷¹ The added stress of having a non-supportive family increased the difficulty in adjustment for many resisters. One TADP member felt that about half of the people who came to the organization initially had a difficult time in Canada, largely in part to a “complete breakdown of family relationships.”³⁷² For some, the hardship that estrangement from family led to psychological issues. One psychiatrist in Toronto found that the majority of resisters he treated for depression had

³⁶⁷ Epp, 93-94.

³⁶⁸ Hagan, 78.

³⁶⁹ Williams, 258.

³⁷⁰ TADP archives, “Background”, Box 13, Folder 8, Page 17.

³⁷¹ Churchill, 156.

³⁷² Lansing Shepard, “Some U.S. Draft Evaders Plan to Remain in Canada,” *Christian Science Monitor*, December 26, 1968. Page 3. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

“parents who disagreed with the decision and had given no moral or financial support.”³⁷³

For those who did not have family support, organizations such as TADP were essential. The emotional support they provided to their clients was one of the most vital of their services. This could include anything from “giving encouragement and advice on a...personal level” to “offering a shoulder to cry on.”³⁷⁴ As one author has written, the resister organizations both “calmed newcomers” and “provided the basis for first friendships in the new nation.”³⁷⁵ It was not unusual for a resister to arrive in Canada with nothing more than the address or telephone number of one of the counselling groups.³⁷⁶ They did not seek out “official” agencies for assistance because they wanted to, as Dick Brown noted during the 60-day pardon period, “turn to a non-government group to find out from a non-government person what is really going on.”³⁷⁷ When resisters came to Canada, they wanted to talk to someone who understood their needs, but also understood what they were resisting and why they were doing so. It made sense, therefore, to seek out others like themselves. After all, many of the counsellors at TADP had also made the same decision earlier.

What’s particularly notable about people like Dick Brown and Mark Satin, and possibly many of the others involved in the group, is that TADP played a key role in their migrations to Canada. They in turn joined the organization and helped others in the immigration process. Looking back at his

³⁷³ Baskir and Strauss, 189.

³⁷⁴ TADP archives, “Toronto Anti-Draft Programme,” Box 21, Folder 15.

³⁷⁵ Surrey, 141.

³⁷⁶ Emerick, 101.

time in TADP, Brown explained that his desire to help other resisters resulted from his own fortunate situation: “I was one of the lucky guys...I was able to do a lot of good to help people at the time because I realized when I got up here that I was doing a lot better than a lot of these guys. I figured, ‘Hey, I got off easy on this, why not help some of these guys who aren’t having it so easy.’”³⁷⁸ Hagan’s study found that, like Brown, nearly three-quarters of resisters “in some way helped to support newcomers who followed them to Canada from the United States.”³⁷⁹ This sense of obligation that most resisters felt to return the help they were given is a recurring theme in TADP’s history. Although some did not have anything more to do with TADP after they were initially aided, many offered support in a multitude of ways. This alone is worth remembering, as perhaps no one helped Vietnam War resisters in Canada as much as they helped each other.

³⁷⁷ TADP archives, “Letter: September 26, 1973,” Box 14, Folder 15.

³⁷⁸ Hagan, 217.

³⁷⁹ Hagan, 115.

Conclusion

A January 1968 article in the Saturday Evening Post about American war resisters who came to Canada quoted a man who had been the employer of one such resister. Upon hearing that the employee had gone to Canada, the man stated that he was not surprised, because the young man in question was “always trying to escape from reality.” With these few words the employer made two errors. First, he failed to understand that many of the young Americans who came to Canada were not “escaping” anything – they were resisting the war in Vietnam, as they refused to participate in it. Second, the experience of the young man who went to Canada and the thousands of others who joined him was indeed very real. Crossing the border into Canada was not the end of their “reality,” but a new reality. To be sure, some of these individuals undoubtedly continued on with their lives almost uninterrupted. The transition for others, usually those with less fortunate backgrounds, was not so easy. Figuring out how to live and work legally in Canada could be confusing. For some, the needs were greater. Trying to find a job and place to stay in a new county without any money or support from loved ones could be a difficult task. Luckily, there was an organization that these individuals could turn to – the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme.

For almost every challenge that resisters faced in their new land, the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme was able to help. Before individuals even reached Canada, *The Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* explained what to do when they got there. Once they arrived, the organization was able to

help them become landed immigrants and find employment and housing.

Whenever the Canadian government unexpectedly changed the immigration regulations, resisters could count on TADP to interpret the bureaucratic jargon and explain the new rules in language that they could understand. When those new laws favoured resisters, such as the 60-day period of grace, TADP was able to “get the word out” to those who were unaware of such changes or did not trust the government’s word. They could also count on TADP to continually lobby the government for a more liberalized immigration policy. The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme played a pivotal role that was essential to the war resister movement in Canada.

As the needs of war resisters changed, TADP was able to develop strategies to respond to those changes. When resisters in Sweden wanted to come to Canada TADP learned more about Swedish and Canadian immigration regulations. As more and more military resisters came to Canada, TADP became the expert on military law and made them the first priority, as their needs were the most pressing. When the issue of amnesty was raised, the organization added to the collective voice of the war resisters in Canada. When parents disowned their children, it provided emotional support. The mere existence of the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme is evidence that leaving the United States in opposition to the Vietnam War was not an “easy way out.” If the act of leaving the United States during the Vietnam War really was an “escape from reality,” then there would have been no need for the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme. But there was a need – and that need, caused by the hardship of leaving one’s homeland and

becoming a political refugee, was eased because of the dedication of the small group of men and women that comprised the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme.

Bibliography

Archives

Pocock (Jack) Memorial Collection in the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library at the University of Toronto (MS COLL 331).

Books

Baskir, Lawrence M. and William A. Strauss. *Chance and Circumstance: The Draft, The War, and The Vietnam Generation* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1978).

Baskir, Lawrence M. and William A. Strauss. *Reconciliation after Vietnam: A Program of Relief for Vietnam Era Draft and Military Offenders* (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977).

Berton, Pierre. *1967: The Last Good Year* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, 1997).

Dickerson, James. *North to Canada: Men and Women against the Vietnam War* (Westport, CT and London: Praeger Publishers, 1999).

Emerick, Kenneth Fred. *War Resisters Canada: The World of the American Military-Political Refuges* (Knox: Knox, Pennsylvania Free Press, 1972).

Epp, Frank H., ed. *I Would Like to Dodge the Draft-Dodgers, But...* (Waterloo and Winnipeg: Conrad Press, 1970).

Fetherling, Douglas. *Travels by Night: A Memoir of the Sixties* (Toronto: McArthur & Company, 1994).

Foley, Michael S. *Confronting the War Machine: Draft Resistance during the Vietnam War* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

Gottlieb, Sherry Gershon. *Hell No, We Won't Go! Resisting the Draft During the Vietnam War* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1991).

Gurvis, Sandra. *Where Have All the Flower Children Gone?* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2006).

Hagan, John. *Northern Passage: American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001).

- Haig-Brown, Alan. *Hell No We Won't Go: Vietnam Draft Resisters in Canada* (Vancouver: Raincoast Books, 1996).
- Hayden, Tom. *Reunion: A Memoir* (New York: Random House, 1988).
- Jones, Joseph. *Contending Statistics: The Numbers for U.S. Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* (Vancouver: Quarter Sheaf, 2005).
- Kasinsky, Renée. *Refugees from Militarism: Draft-Age Americans in Canada* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1976).
- Killmer, Richard. Robert Lecky and Debrah Wiley, *They Can't Go Home Again: The Story of America's Political Refugees* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1971).
- Kostash, Myrna. *Long Way From Home: The Story of the Sixties Generation in Canada* (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, 1980).
- Kusch, Frank. *All American Boys: Draft Dodgers in Canada from the Vietnam War* (Westport, CT and London: Praeger Publishers, 2001).
- Levitt, Cyril. *Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the Sixties: A Study of Student Movements in Canada, the United States, and West Germany* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1984).
- MacPherson, Myra. *Long Time Passing: Vietnam and the Haunted Generation* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984).
- Morgan, Allen. *Dropping out in 3/4 Time* (New York: Seabury Press, 1972).
- Oppenheimer, Martin, ed. *The American Military* (United States: Transaction Inc., 1971).
- Owram, Douglas. *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1996).
- Polner, Murray. *When Can I Come Home? A Debate on Amnesty for Exiles, Antiwar Prisoners, and Others* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972).
- Prasad, Devi. *They Love It but Leave It: American Deserters* (London: Farmer & Sons Ltd., 1971).
- Satin, Mark. *Radical Middle: The Politics We Need Now* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2004).

- Satin, Mark., ed. *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* 2nd ed. (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1968).
- Sharpe, David. *Rochdale: The Runaway College* (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1987).
- Surrey, David S. *Choice of Conscience: Vietnam Era Military and Draft Resisters in Canada* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982).
- Taylor, Charles. *Snow Job: Canada, the United States and Vietnam [1954-1973]* (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 1974).
- Todd, Jack. *A Taste of Metal: A Deserter's Story* (Toronto: Harper Flamingo Canada, 2001).
- Tollefson, James W. *The Strength Not to Fight: An Oral History of Conscientious Objectors of the Vietnam War* (Boston, Toronto, London: Little, Brown and Company, 1993).
- Wakefield, Dan. *Supernation at Peace and War: Being Certain Observations, Depositions, Testimonies, and Graffiti Gathered on a One-Man Fact-and-Fantasy-Finding Tour of the Most Powerful Nation in the World* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown & Company, 1968).
- Williams, Roger Neville. *The New Exiles: American War Resisters in Canada* (New York: Liveright Publishers Corporation, 1971).
- Witcover, Jules. *The Year the Dream Died: Revisiting 1968 in America* (New York: Warner Books, 1997).
- York, Thomas. *And Sleep in the Woods: The Story of One Man's Spiritual Quest* (Toronto: Doubleday, 1978).

Journal Articles

- Jones, Joseph. "The House of Anansi's Singular Bestseller," *Canadian Notes & Queries* 61 (2002), 19-22.
- Hagan, John. "Cause and Country: The Politics of Ambivalence and the American Vietnam War Resistance in Canada," *Social Problems*, Vol. 48, No. 2 (2001), 168-184.

Hagan, John. "Narrowing the Gap by Widening the Conflict: Power Politics, Symbols of Sovereignty, and the American Vietnam War Resisters' Migration to Canada," *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (2000), 607-650.

PhD Dissertation

Churchill, David. "When Home Became Away: American Expatriates and New Social Movements in Toronto, 1965-1977" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2001).