

Defining a Community in Exile: Vietnam War Resister Communication and Identity in *AMEX*, 1968–1973

JAY YOUNG*

AMEX, the largest and longest-running American Vietnam War resister magazine published in Canada, served as an essential communication channel for war resisters. It provided practical information and helped build a sense of community both for individuals who produced the publication and for its readers. However, fractures of difference challenged the magazine's aspiration to represent war resisters, as the common experience of leaving the United States to avoid the Vietnam War was automatically not enough to unify all who left. During the first five years of its publication, the pages of AMEX reveal a fragile community engaged in the challenging process of debating its collective identity through print.

AMEX, la plus importante et la plus longuement publiée des revues canadiennes d'opposition à la guerre du Vietnam, était un outil de communication essentiel pour les opposants à la guerre. Il renfermait de l'information pratique et aidait tant ses producteurs que ses lecteurs à se forger un sentiment d'appartenance. Mais des scissions ont mis en péril l'aspiration de la revue de représenter les opposants à la guerre puisque l'expérience commune de quitter les États-Unis pour éviter la guerre du Vietnam ne suffisait pas d'office pour unifier toute la gauche. Durant les cinq premières années de sa publication, les pages d'AMEX révèlent une fragile communauté engagée dans le difficile processus de débattre de son identité collective à travers la presse.

IN DECEMBER 1968, journalist Harry Bruce reported on *AMEX*, a publication produced for and by American Vietnam War resisters based in Toronto. In a positive exposé on the city's growing number of draft

* Jay Young is a doctoral student in the Department of History at York University. This article originated as an MA research paper funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. The author thanks his supervisor Marcel Martel and Marlene Shore for their guidance during its early stages. The article also benefited from the insights of Bettina Bradbury and two anonymous reviewers, whose comments substantially improved the work. Finally, the author is grateful to Stan Pietlock for sharing his memories of *AMEX*.

dodgers,¹ he described the newsletter as “cheap, cheerful, biased, messy, crude, amateurish, and mimeographed.” Bruce predicted the publication might “be of great historical interest” in the future: “The National Archives will want them, and scholars will study them just as they once studied the correspondence of United Empire Loyalists to learn the inspirations behind an earlier northbound exodus.”² *AMEX* ran from September 1968 to November 1977, publishing articles and opinions concerning Americans who dodged the draft, deserted the military, and resisted the war by emigration, a majority of whom came to Canada. The longest-running such journal, *AMEX* quickly expanded from a small, Toronto-focused newsletter to a comprehensive, bimonthly magazine averaging 30 to 40 pages per issue with a global audience.³ Its ninth issue, published in January 1969, had a mailing list of 632 names and a circulation of 1,000 copies; by 1975, it announced a circulation of over 4,000 in North America alone.⁴ The magazine reported on and analysed developments related to American war resisters in Canada and the anti-Vietnam-War movement across the globe.

AMEX's expansion in circulation echoed the exodus of young Americans who left the United States in opposition to the war. While little over 1,000 resisters came to Canada in 1964 and 1965, more than triple that number journeyed north in 1967. This number mushroomed during the next five years: at least 5,000 men crossed the border annually from 1968 to 1973. The exact number of resisters who migrated to Canada, however, is politically contentious and ultimately uncountable. For example, these statistics include neither individuals who went

1 In this paper, I most commonly use “resister” to describe individuals who left the United States in opposition to or in avoidance of American military involvement in Vietnam. “Draft dodger” and “military deserter” are used in situations in which the distinction is relevant. I have no objection to using these terms because many resisters who dodged the draft or deserted the military see in these terms the possibilities of empowerment. Moreover, dodgers and deserters often used these terms for self-reference at the time, including in the magazine *AMEX*. My use of “resister” does not imply that individuals who opposed the Vietnam War by non-migratory means were unessential to the anti-Vietnam War movement.

2 Harry Bruce, “The Cheerful and Strange Ways that Draft Dodgers Look at Us,” *Toronto Star*, December 14, 1968, p. 8.

3 Although the title of the publication changed four times, this paper refers to the magazine as *AMEX*, except when citing its early incarnation, *The UAE Newsletter*. Resisters produced a number of short-lived newsletters and magazines such as the Vancouver American Deserters Committee's *Yankee Refugee*, the Montreal American Deserter Committee's *Rebel: Published in Exile* (later *ANTITHESIS*), the Union of American Exiles in Britain's *The American Exile in Britain*, and Paris resisters' *Second Front Review* and *Act*. These publications failed to reach the longevity enjoyed by *AMEX*. *AMEX* informed readers of these organs. See “Magazine Hang-up: Anyone Can Have a Magazine, a Newspaper, or at Least a Newsletter,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 4 (June 1970), p. 22.

4 [Stan Pietlock], “Editor's Notebook,” *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 10 (January 26, 1969), p. 7; Renée G. Kasinsky, *Refugees from Militarism: Draft-Age Americans in Canada* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1976), p. 103.

“underground” in Canada nor the thousands of American women who emigrated and became a central force within resister communities in Canada. Although war resisters overwhelmingly chose Canada because of geographical, linguistic, and cultural factors, thousands also migrated to other countries such as Sweden, Great Britain, and France.⁵

During its first five years of publication, from its inception in 1968 until its shift in coverage towards advocating amnesty by late 1973, *AMEX* served as an essential communication channel for war resisters. The magazine not only provided practical information but also facilitated a process of community-building for individuals who produced and read the publication. Editor Stan Pietlock and the magazine’s other producers sought to create a high-quality publication, inspired by the inclusive ethos of participatory journalism, as a means to understand issues important to the growing number of resisters in Canada. Yet fractures of difference — such as ideological and gender divisions present in *AMEX* circles and the wider resister milieu — challenged the magazine’s aspiration to represent the experiences of war resisters both to themselves and to wider society. Resisters may have shared the common experience of leaving the United States to avoid service in Vietnam, but the tensions surrounding *AMEX* illustrate that the act of anti-war migration alone was not enough to unify all who escaped the United States. Ultimately, the pages of *AMEX* from 1968 to 1973 demonstrate a fragile community engaged in the challenging process of debating its collective identity through print.

The themes discussed in *AMEX* correspond to the emphasis historians now place on the internationalism of the New Left: “the common aspirations of radicals in different settings and the synchronic quality of New Left activism.”⁶ A global yet heterogeneous movement opposed colonization, technocracy, and other forms of oppression that crossed national boundaries. The Vietnam War was the most despised of all oppressions because of its bloodshed and symbolic potential: it seemed the world’s most powerful democracy, the United States, had violently restricted the right of self-determination for the historically colonized Vietnamese people. At the same time, the war produced a particular situation in Canada that emphasized this country’s intimate connections to the United States. Although Canada did not officially participate militarily

5 John Hagan, *Northern Passage: American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), p. 3. For a discussion on the ultimately uncountable and political nature of these numbers, see Joseph Jones, *Contending Statistics: The Numbers for US Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* (Vancouver: Quarter Sheaf, 2005).

6 Jeremy Varon, *Bringing the War Home: The Weather Underground, the Red Army Faction, and Revolutionary Violence in the Sixties and Seventies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), p. 6. Varon is one of a growing cadre of scholars who believe a “[f]ocus on national experiences and narrow comparisons also inhibit an understanding of how the dynamic *interplay* of global and national contexts served simultaneously to unite and separate individual New Left movements” (p. 6).

in the conflict because of its seat on the International Control Commission, Canada supplied intelligence to the United States, and its factories produced chemicals, clothing, and other materiel used by American forces.⁷ To the Canadian New Left, these connections increasingly epitomized Canada's subservient relationship to the United States and indicated the need for an independent political agenda. American Vietnam War resisters maintained an ambiguous relationship with the Canadian New Left. Whereas organizations like the Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) established some of the earliest anti-draft groups in Canada, the posture of American resisters, who often looked back across the border as the place of real importance, indicated a unique form of American imperialism to Canadians who were increasingly developing independent, leftist perspectives.⁸

Within these international and national contexts, a study of American Vietnam War resisters in Canada is germane: crossing the border to avoid military service could itself become a transnational measure of dissent, an act that often – but not always – led to a stronger political consciousness. Despite demands from sympathetic Canadians, Ottawa refused to accept American resisters as political refugees. During the late 1960s, the federal government pronounced it held no bias against American resisters; under the newly created point system, they would be treated like all other prospective migrants. In early 1969, however, revelations emerged that the Ministry of Immigration had instructed its border officials to use discretion to deny military deserters entrance into Canada. In May 1969, Minister of Immigration Allan MacEachen, facing pressure from opposition MPs, the press, and ordinary Canadians, announced a reversal of the covert discriminatory policy towards deserters, following hints that Washington would not strongly object. Nonetheless, this change in policy did not lead to legal acceptance of all American resisters wishing to come to Canada. While those with a post-secondary education and marketable employment skills easily accumulated the points needed to gain landed immigrant status, others without such advantages – often deserters – were denied landed status.⁹ For those who entered the

7 Myrna Kostash, *Long Way from Home: The Story of the Sixties Generation in Canada* (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, 1980), pp. 41–43. See also Victor Levant, *Quiet Complicity: Canadian Involvement in the Vietnam War* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1986).

8 Kostash, *Long Way from Home*, pp. 57–68; Doug Owsram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), pp. 170–171, 218–221; Bryan D. Palmer, *Canada's 1960s: The Ironies of Identity in a Rebellious Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), pp. 269–291.

9 Joseph Jones, *Happenstance and Misquotation: Canadian Immigration Policy, 1966-1974, the Arrival of U.S. Vietnam War Resisters, and the Views of Pierre Trudeau* (Vancouver: Quarter Sheaf, 2008), pp. 13–15.

country, the border still mattered, as draft dodgers and military deserters faced prosecution if they returned to the United States.

Dimitry Anastakis, in an anthology on the 1960s in Canada, observes that historians have expanded their analysis of the relationship between Canada and the Vietnam War by “examining different perspectives and using different optics.”¹⁰ Indeed, a number of sophisticated academic studies on American Vietnam War resisters in Canada have recently emerged, focusing on such diverse threads as the advocacy work of Canadian anti-draft groups within the struggle to bring American war resisters north, the role of church groups within Canadian anti-war protest, the influence of American expatriates on alternative social spaces in Canadian urban centres, and the ways in which gender shaped the experience of war resisters who migrated to Canada.¹¹ The present study furthers this growing body of knowledge by investigating *AMEX*’s integral role as a forum of communication within the resister milieu and the complex debates that emerged during its first five years of publication, before its focus shifted towards the struggle for amnesty in the United States.¹² To

10 Dimitry Anastakis, “Introduction” in Dimitry Anastakis (ed.) *The Sixties: Passion, Politics, and Style* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2008), p. 8.

11 Early accounts of American Vietnam War resisters include Richard L. Killmer, Robert S. Lecky, and Debrah S. Wiley, *They Can’t Go Home Again: The Story of America’s Political Refugees* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1971); Roger Neville Williams, *The New Exiles: American War Resisters in Canada* (New York: Liveright Publishers, 1971); Jim Christy, ed., *The New Refugees: American Voices in Canada* (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Limited, 1972). Early sociological studies of resisters include Kenneth Fred Emerick, *War Resisters Canada: The World of American Military-Political Refugees* (Knox, PA: Pennsylvania Free Press, 1972); Kasinsky, *Refugees from Militarism*; David S. Surrey, *Choice of Conscience: Vietnam Era Military and Draft Resisters in Canada* (New York: Praeger, 1982). Recent journalistic accounts include Alan Haig-Brown, *Hell No We Won’t Go: Vietnam Draft Resisters in Canada* (Vancouver: Raincoast Books, 1996); James Dickerson, *North to Canada: Men and Women Against the Vietnam War* (Westport, CN: Praeger, 1999). Recent scholarly studies include Hagan, *Northern Passage*; David S. Churchill, “When Home Became Away: American Expatriates and New Social Movements in Toronto, 1965–1977” (PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 2001); Donald W. Maxwell, “Religion and Politics at the Border: Canadian Church Support for American Vietnam War Resisters,” *Journal of Church and State*, vol. 48, no. 4 (2006), pp. 807–829; Matthew McKenzie Bryant Roth, “Crossing Borders: The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme and the Canadian Anti-Vietnam War Movement” (MA thesis, University of Waterloo, 2008); Jessica Squires, “A Refuge from Militarism? The Canadian Movement to Support Vietnam Era American War Resisters and Government Responses, 1965–1973” (PhD dissertation, Carleton University, 2009); Lara Campbell, “‘Women United Against the War’: Gender Politics, Feminism, and Vietnam Draft Resistance in Canada” in Karen Dubinsky Catherine Krull, Susan Lord, Sean Mills, and Scott Rutherford, eds., *New World Coming: The Sixties and the Shaping of Global Consciousness* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2009), pp. 339–346; David S. Churchill, “American Expatriates and the Building of Alternative Social Space in Toronto, 1965–1977,” *Urban History Review*, vol. 48, no. 1 (Fall 2010), pp. 31–44.

12 Hagan’s analysis of *AMEX*, for example, concerns mostly the post-1973 amnesty period rather than the early years, when it strove to define itself and exuded a strong pro-Canada perspective. Hagan and Churchill, both of whom are primarily concerned with the wider resister community, focus on

uncover the aspirations and meanings of *AMEX*, this essay draws on a qualitative survey of editorials, articles, and readers' letters found within the magazine's pages. As historians such as David Paul Nord and Valerie Korinek have argued, considering the sentiments of readers in conjunction with the more traditional attention towards producers helps us better understand the communication functions of media.¹³ Starting with a discussion of *AMEX*'s transition from a local exile organization newsletter to a growing independent magazine, this essay moves to uncover the importance of the publication to its readers. Various pieces on the unique relationship between American war resisters and Canadian politics, society, and history illustrate the magazine's role as a forum to discuss collective identity. By 1973, a shift had taken place as amnesty became the dominant topic within the magazine. A reformed editorial board and a cohort of readers now looked back towards the United States as the site of war resistance, while other American émigrés who had produced and read *AMEX* felt the magazine had fulfilled its purpose as a space of solidarity.

From Organization Newsletter to Independent Magazine

As the number of American Vietnam War resisters arriving in Canada rose in the late 1960s, support groups formed to assist these immigrants. The largest concentration of resisters migrated to Toronto, a metropolis possessing attractive factors for this youthful demographic. The city offered two universities, employment opportunities, and, with time, a sizable number of individuals sharing a migrant experience. The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme (TADP) was the first anti-draft organization in the city. It originated from SUPA's anti-draft efforts and formed its own organization after SUPA's collapse in late 1967. In April 1968, the Union of American Exiles (UAE) opened its doors at the University of

the content of *AMEX* articles and editorials instead of the act of reading. Stan Pietlock has analysed the relationship between *AMEX*'s producers and readers, but he uses a quantitative method in an attempt to reach "objective" conclusions. See Stanley J. Pietlock, "Communication Between America's Vietnam-Era Refugees Preceding Gerald Ford's Repatriation Proposal: Content and Feedback in *The American Exile in Canada, 1968–1973*" (MA thesis, Annenberg School of Communication, 1984), pp. 13–16. In contrast to Pietlock's study, I employ a qualitative assessment of the magazine's contents to glean the intricacies of communication among resisters.

13 David Paul Nord argues that considering the consumers of information provides a fuller picture of the varied meanings readers construct, for meaning occurs "not in the text itself but in the reading of it." See David Paul Nord, *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and their Readers* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), p. 246. Valerie Korinek has applied this growing emphasis on readers in her study of letters to the editor of *Chatelaine*, which allowed Korinek to reveal the ways in which readers of the magazine interpreted texts with a high degree of agency: readers constructed "another layer of meaning" of the women's periodical in varied, individual ways. See Valerie J. Korinek, *Roughing it in the Suburbs: Reading Chatelaine Magazine in the Fifties and Sixties* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), pp. 8, 47.

Toronto's St. George campus in space donated by the university's student council. The TADP provided newcomers with essential legal services, employment information, and housing contacts, but, to the American émigrés who founded the UAE, an organization was needed to supplement this service with community-building fostered through social events and political engagement after young migrants had arrived. By September 1968, the UAE began to produce a two-page newsletter for members, and two months later the publication expanded into a 16-page magazine. In the beginning, the majority of the publication's content, written by UAE members, promoted the immediate aims of the group by providing minutes of the coordinating committee's meetings and other general news about the organization, along with information about employment, leisure activities, and other practical matters for living in Toronto.¹⁴

UAE member Stan Pietlock edited the publication during its first five years. Pietlock, along with Ronnie Nevin and Linda Krasnor, wives of two draft dodgers, founded the newsletter that became *AMEX*. Born into a middle-class Delaware family, Pietlock arrived in Toronto in 1967 after earning a journalism degree from Fordham University and interning at *Newsweek* magazine in New York City. He was not involved in social movements during his years in the United States, but Pietlock became politically engaged after he dodged the draft in August 1967, at the age of 24.¹⁵ While other producers and thousands of readers contributed to *AMEX*, Pietlock's dedication and journalistic skills drove the publication; indeed, his writings and reflections serve as a valuable resource in understanding the magazine's struggle to create an inclusive, high-quality journal.

Pietlock's writings exhibit a belief in the possibilities of participatory journalism, an ethos of the underground press that exploded during the 1960s and early 1970s. Influenced by the New Left's faith in participation as the remedy to alienation, participatory journalism repudiated the hierarchical division between news producers and consumers, as well as journalistic objectivity. Instead, the underground press conceived reading to be on par with writing and advocated a news framework that favoured the expression of personal opinion and experience. *AMEX* and other anti-war publications made up one segment of this cultural phenomenon. The magazine subscribed to the Liberation News Service, a New-York-based underground news wire that reported stories neglected by the

14 Churchill, "When Home Became Away," pp. 158, 166–167.

15 Biographical information on Stan Pietlock compiled from Stan Pietlock, "The Canada Trip *Can* Radicalize Liberals," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 8 (March/April 1971), pp. 5–6; *America, Love It or Leave It* (videocassette, 50 minutes), produced by Kirwan Cox and Tom Shandel, Alioli Associates Ltd, 1990; Kasinsky, *Refugees from Militarism*, p. 103; Pietlock, "Communication Between America's Vietnam-Era Refugees"; author's interview with Stan Pietlock, June 21, 2006.

mainstream press, and it allowed other “Movement” publications to reprint its articles in the spirit of free speech and solidarity.¹⁶ It also urged readers to submit pieces and had a policy of printing all letters sent to the editor.¹⁷ Similar to other underground presses of the period, *AMEX* maintained this practice to create an open and unrestricted dialogue on the magazine itself and on current issues.

At the same time, Pietlock hoped *AMEX* could become a reputable publication. As its audience grew, the staff collective realized its responsibility as an ambassador within not only resister circles but also wider society. The magazine’s collective wrote a majority of its content, but guest writers – usually *AMEX* readers – also contributed their opinions. By early 1970, however, the magazine informed its readers that published letters were edited and might be condensed. Although the collective accepted almost all submitted material, the editorial board periodically refused to publish “extreme right-wing” writings.¹⁸ Nevertheless, producers wished to avoid the image of an elite editorship in the minds of readers and wider resister circles. “Though *AMEX* at times has been accused of being a tight clique attempting to speak for all exiles around the world,” Pietlock wrote in the March-April 1973 issue, “our feeling is that anyone who is interested enough to put in a good bit of spare time . . . on producing the mag should have a voice in the direction the publication is taking. We think this is keeping the door open to anyone who wants in.”¹⁹ He and other members of the staff collective, then, grappled with the tension of being gatekeepers of communication while desiring to minimize the division between readers and producers.

Political differences within the UAE led Pietlock and fellow UAE member Charles Campbell to transform the publication into an independent magazine in mid-1969. Whereas the loss of second-class mail

16 For an overview of the dissident press in the United States, see Laurence Leamer, *The Paper Revolutionaries: The Rise of the Underground Press* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972); Lauren Kessler, *The Dissident Press: Alternative Journalism in American History* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984); Bob Ostertag, *People’s Movements, People’s Press: The Journalism of Social Justice Movements* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006). For a personal account of the Liberation News Service, see Raymond Mungo, *Famous Long Ago: My Life and Hard Times with Liberation News Service* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970). For an analysis of another milieu within the anti-Vietnam-War underground press, see James Lewes, *Protest and Survive: Underground GI Newspapers during the Vietnam War* (Westport, CN: Praeger, 2003). Ron Verzuh’s *Underground Times: Canada’s Flower-Child Revolutionaries* (Toronto: Deneau Publishers, 1989) is the only book on the English-Canadian underground press during the late 1960s and 1970s. On the relationship between different types of communications media and the rise of social movements in the 1960s and 1970s in Quebec, see Marc Raboy, *Movements and Messages: Media and Radical Politics in Quebec*, trans. David Homel (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1984).

17 “To Be Considered,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 1 (n.d.), p. 3.

18 Interview with Stan Pietlock; *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 3 (April/May 1970), pp. 7, 10.

19 Stan Pietlock, “Just Who We Are,” *AMEX*, vol. 4, no. 1 (March/April 1973), p. 2.

privileges because of its association with an organization (the UAE) provided the immediate financial impetus to form an independent publication, growing divisions between more radical UAE members and their moderate-leaning but still highly activist counterparts who published the magazine made the split inevitable. Two radical UAE members, for example, expressed how the “liberalizing element has long since possessed the [UAE] newsletter” and announced their intention to create their own communications.²⁰ The magazine then became an independent venture of Amex-Canada enterprises, a registered partnership between Pietlock and Campbell. Pietlock wrote that *AMEX*’s priority was to provide “a communication medium among American draft-dodgers and deserters in Canada, [and] information about Canada.” *AMEX* would also disseminate “information about Canada to Movement people in the States” and serve as “a forum for opinion and insight by American expatriates in Canada.”²¹ As the publication transformed into an independent magazine, its influence spread. The collective established distribution agreements with alternative book, head, and arts and crafts shops located in major Canadian cities.²² *AMEX*’s staff sent thousands of complimentary copies to American campuses and draft resistance organizations.²³ Underground presses throughout North America, which published advertisements or reviews of *AMEX*, informed many future readers about the resister publication, and North American academic and public libraries also held subscriptions.²⁴

The magazine’s producers believed a demand existed for *AMEX*. The collective prided itself on its global reach, repeatedly announcing its growing circulation across the world. Pietlock recalls a strong “need for sharing information” as the reason for the magazine’s existence. He and other members of the collective volunteered upwards to 20 hours per week on the publication, despite outside jobs and other responsibilities. Pietlock, for example, taught high school for the Toronto District Catholic School Board and involved himself with local church affairs, while others like Charles Campbell pursued university degrees. Pietlock reflects that producing the magazine fostered a positive social atmosphere: “People we came in contact with made a life if you needed one. [*AMEX*] was just a whole self-consumed thing. . . . It just grew.”²⁵ The magazine’s

20 *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 13 (March 30, 1969), p. 14.

21 [Stan Pietlock], “Anyone Can Have a Magazine,” *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 16 (n.d.), p. 3.

22 Churchill, ““When Home Became Away,”” pp. 178–179.

23 S[tan] J. P[ietlock], “Editor’s Notebook,” *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 12 (March 9, 1969), p. 12; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 10 (January 26, 1969), p. 5.

24 *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 8 (March/April 1971), p. 3; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 12 (March 9, 1969), p. 4; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 13 (March 30, 1969), p. 4.

25 Interview with Stan Pietlock; Pietlock, “Communication Between America’s Vietnam-Era Refugees,” p. 34.

producers desired inclusiveness. When *AMEX* became independent, it began to list individuals who helped with production as part of its “staff collective,” a term used to promote a sense of commonality. In the March-April 1971 issue, Pietlock announced a number of further changes within *AMEX* to rid the magazine of what he called its “bourgeois trappings.” For example, the magazine replaced its “editorial” with a “Staff Perspective” section, a space in which all staff members, not just the editor, could regularly express their views. Pietlock admitted that he still edited the magazine, but hoped the changes illustrated *AMEX*’s success in “developing a real collective effort as regards production.”²⁶

Despite attempts to create equality, the pages of *AMEX* suggest the magazine struggled with issues of race, class, and gender that divided the wider number of American war resisters living in Canada. Even though black resister Eusi Ndugu sat on the staff collective for several issues in 1970, the vast majority of its members (and probably readers) were white. This exclusion reflected the unique experience blacks faced when coming to Canada, as many African Americans decided it was more practical or desirable to resist the war by going underground within their own communities in the United States rather than migrate north.²⁷ The magazine rarely published items that dealt with the specific concerns of black resisters and other racial or ethnic minorities. Evidence indicates the middle-class position of members of the staff collective, although class is a difficult marker to determine within the magazine. For example, key figures like Charles Campbell attended university, and Pietlock had earned a degree before leaving the United States. Moreover, most members who sat on the staff collective during *AMEX*’s first five years had arrived in Canada when the majority of American émigrés were middle-class draft dodgers, preceding Ottawa’s May 1969 decision to end its covert discrimination against deserters, which led to a higher percentage of working-class resisters coming north.

Controversies over gender issues emerged during particular moments in the magazine’s first five years. Lara Campbell and Michael Foley have illustrated in the respective Canadian and American contexts that male leaders often relegated female participation in the anti-Vietnam-War movement to secondary roles involving menial tasks.²⁸ *AMEX* included a number of women on its collective and featured regular female contributors such as Maryanne Campbell and Nancy Goldberry, yet the magazine

26 Interview with Stan Pietlock; Stan Pietlock, “Notebook,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 8 (March/April 1971), p. 12.

27 Squires, “A Refuge from Militarism?,” pp. 103–105.

28 Campbell, “‘Women United Against the War,’” pp. 339–340; Michael S. Foley, *Confronting the War Machine: Draft Resistance During the Vietnam War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), pp. 180–188.

had difficulty when it came to issues of unique import to female resisters, which mirrored to a degree a similar lack of concern shown by resister support organizations. In June 1970, for example, Sandy Stevens and Mora Gregg reported in *AMEX* on the sentiments held by women who attended the May 1970 Pan-Canadian Conference of Resisters in Montreal. Female attendees felt men ignored their ideas, a situation that motivated women at the conference to form their own caucus to strengthen their collective voice.²⁹ Stephanie DuRant, a female resister instrumental in the formation of the women's caucus, attacked an element of the published article. "It is evident that *AMEX* learnt nothing from the sisters' presentation at the Conference," DuRant asserted. In the article, an image of DuRant accompanied the text with a caption identifying her as "a leader of the women's caucus." To DuRant, this categorization illustrated the magazine's male bias: "The sisters collectively rejected all male-supremist [*sic*] concepts of leadership. To say that I am a leader of the Women's Caucus of the Montréal ADC [American Deserters Committee] is to put a male ego trip on the sisters and show how little you understand how totally women are oppressed by male structures, including *AMEX*."³⁰

DuRant also repudiated *AMEX*'s tendency to disassociate females as war resisters. She pointed out that the magazine described the ADC's *ANTITHESIS* as a publication written by "deserters," a typology that denied the important role women played in the ADC organ. Moreover, a 1970 piece announcing the establishment of a Toronto female resister group to assist with issues particular to women hints at a similar problem. Whereas its headline proclaimed "Women Exiles Organize Group," the text stated the new committee was comprised of "wives of American exiles." This suggested that married females were not exiles themselves, nor were single American women who migrated to Toronto in opposition to the war. DuRant's critique of *AMEX* falls in line with other elements of the magazine that connoted sexism. One *AMEX* cover headlined, "In which city do the girls give deserters the most attention?" (although this article is not contained within the actual magazine). A piece in this issue reported that "the wife of a war resister" could "help to bring in the bacon" through conventional female occupations such as secretarial work or the more lucrative position of burlesque dancing.³¹ These cases of gender conflict and oversight of women's issues might

29 Sandy Stevens and Mora Gregg, "The Parley in Montréal: At Montreal Women United in their Struggle against Oppression in Society, the Movement, and Canadian-American Society," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 4 (June 1970), pp. 8–9.

30 *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 6 (October/November 1970), p. 2.

31 *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 6 (October/November 1970), p. 2; "Women Exiles Organize Group," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 2 (n.d.), p. 31; *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 3 (April/May 1970), front cover, p. 28.

explain why the majority of letters in *AMEX* during its first five years were from male readers.³² Although the exact gender makeup of *AMEX*'s readership is unclear, the male bias of the magazine prevented a wider and more inclusive readership.

Reading *AMEX*

American war resister support groups in Canada, such as the UAE and the larger TADP, depended on what sociologist Renée Kasinsky has described as "intimate friendship networks" that developed in these organizations to provide housing, legal, and other support services to newly arrived resisters.³³ A majority of the magazine's early readers knew one another personally from the UAE, interacting in what media theorist John Thompson calls a "traditional publicness of co-presence," a situation in which individuals meet face-to-face and share geographical space. Individuals did not have to imagine each other through the act of reading; indeed, they were already acquainted.³⁴ Nonetheless, as *AMEX*'s readership grew alongside the wider anti-war movement, correspondence indicates that the magazine fostered a community of individuals initially unaware of one another who soon imagined a bond based on the experience of war resistance, expressed through the acts of reading and writing to *AMEX*. Political theorist Benedict Anderson uses the term "imagined community" to refer to the eighteenth-century moment when individuals overlooked historic differences to construct national identities based on mythic commonalities. A key thread of his analysis centres on the common act of newspaper reading as an important process within the construction of imagined national communities. *AMEX*, in contrast to Anderson's imagined national communities, underlines the ways in which acts of communication can supplement shared experience – in this case, migration and war resistance – facilitating wider social interactions by informing such individuals of the existence of others with similar experiences. The imagined reality of these numbers, as we will see, could produce comfort at a time of tremendous personal change.³⁵

32 Pietlock, "Communication Between America's Vietnam-Era Refugees," p. 52. Pietlock's quantitative survey concludes that female exiles did not send letters unless they represented an organization or co-signed with a male writer, although non-exile women did write letters.

33 Kasinsky, *Refugees from Militarism*, p. 92.

34 John B. Thompson, *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995), p. 125.

35 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, revised ed. (New York: Verso, 1991), pp. 5–7, 24–36. On the importance of imagined reality, social interaction, and process in the construction of community, see John C. Walsh and Steven High, "Rethinking the Concept of Community," *Histoire sociale/ Social History*, vol. 32, no. 64 (November 1999), pp. 254–273.

AMEX's early issues illustrate the importance of its readers as providers of information. *AMEX* wished to receive news from its readers not only because it wanted to be a forum for communication among resisters, but also as a result of the magazine's minimal financial and logistical resources. During *AMEX*'s early years, contributions from readers fulfilled an instrumental need as the magazine gradually developed communicative connections across Canada and the globe. While *AMEX*'s staff offered employment advice in articles on supply teaching in Metro Toronto, readers also sent information on employment situations in nearby locales such as Kingston and Barrie. The magazine enabled the UAE to expand its housing list, an essential service to newly arrived resisters.³⁶ The degree to which readers provided practical information, however, did not always satisfy the magazine's producers. In early 1970, Pietlock pleaded with readers in "key locations" – particularly Edmonton, Calgary, and Saskatoon – to contribute news from locales across Canada to which resisters had migrated. Reading the magazine may have been an enjoyable and educational activity, but Pietlock reminded readers that they had an active "obligation to communicate non-classified news" to the rest of the community. Communication, after all, enabled the resister community to enhance its resources and to provide a better environment for those who left the psychological and physical comforts of home in the United States.³⁷

AMEX served as a forum not only for those who made the trek north, but also for individuals seeking more information about Canada before making the move.³⁸ Readers requested this information and found it useful in their decision to migrate to Canada or other destinations. "Please send information very soon," an 18-year-old American high-

36 "Survival Information," *The UAE Newsletter*, vol. 1, no. 2 (September 25, 1968), p. 4; "Not Bad at \$32/Day," *The UAE Newsletter*, vol. 1, no. 2 (September 25, 1968), p. 2; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 5 (November 10/ December 7, 1968), p. 3; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 10 (January 26, 1969), p. 6.

37 Stan Pietlock, "Why Not Communicate with Others," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 3 (April/May 1970), p. 7. In 1970, *AMEX* formed a short-lived communication network with Red, White and Black, a Toronto anti-draft group that sought to publish resister information across Canada in its own publication, *EXNET*. See Squires, "A Refuge from Militarism?," p. 100.

38 *The Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*, written by the TADP and published by the House of Anansi Press, was the most important source of practical information for Americans considering Canada as a means to avoid military service. The booklet debuted in 1968, with a press run of 5,000. By 1970, *The Manual* was in its fifth printing with 65,000 copies in circulation. See David S. Churchill, "An Ambiguous Welcome: Vietnam Draft Resistance, the Canadian State, and Cold War Containment," *Histoire sociale/ Social History*, vol. 37, no. 73 (May 2004), p. 6. *AMEX* reported *The Manual*'s successful publishing numbers. See "Transition of a 'How to' Book," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 5 (August/September 1970), p. 11. In terms of understanding the two-way process of communication within the resister community, *AMEX* is a more useful case study; unlike *The Manual*, *AMEX* published the thoughts of its readers. *AMEX* provides a clearer and more nuanced account of how individuals read these migration texts.

school senior pleaded in January 1969. "I was 18 Dec. 14th and as yet I have refused to register." A father from Chicago, whose son was turning 18, asked the magazine for information regarding "the best way to beat the draft and still be able to travel in the U.S." American draft resistance counsellors complimented *AMEX* on its positive function as a disseminator of information about Canadian migration, which "very nicely fills an empty spot between our Canadian Immigration literature and Canadian graduate school catalogues." A letter published in August 1970 exhibits the concrete role of *AMEX* in the decision of one individual to resist the war and immigrate to Canada: "I have a subscription to *AMEX* which is currently being mailed to . . . Chicago, Illinois. Please change this as soon as possible. My new address is . . . Toronto."³⁹

Yet *AMEX* supplied more than practical information to its readers. Its content provided a sense of comfort and belonging to young, often lonely individuals living in a new environment. In this sense, *AMEX* continued the immigrant press's tradition of fostering solidarity within migrant communities.⁴⁰ Many of *AMEX*'s Toronto readers frequented landmarks such as Grossman's Tavern, Baldwin Street, Rochdale College, and support offices that fostered a sense of community among the city's resisters;⁴¹ nevertheless, letters demonstrate the powerful psychological assistance the magazine could provide. "Happiness is reading *AMEX* when things are getting you down," one deserter wrote in 1970, after recently making the voyage to Canada. "Being kind of new to the deserter scene, it was really encouraging to find such an informative and representative magazine." Other Toronto readers agreed: "Your mag really helped my head when I first came. It still does."⁴² The therapeutic act of reading the magazine had particular importance for those with little face-to-face contact with other resisters.⁴³ Two readers expressed how "being here in

39 *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 10 (January 29 1969), p. 4; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 16 (n.d.), p. 24; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 13 (March 30, 1969), p. 4; *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 5 (August/September 1970), p. 5.

40 For a survey of various Ontario-based ethnic presses, see *Polyphony*, vol. 4 (Spring/Summer 1982).

41 War resisters in Toronto had begun to socialize in Yorkville Village by spring 1966, but, by the time *AMEX* started to publish, much of Yorkville's resister scene had moved to nearby Baldwin Street. See Stuart Henderson, *Making the Scene: Yorkville and Hip Toronto in the 1960s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), pp. 121–122.

42 Churchill, "'When Home Became Away'," p. 183; *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 4 (June 1970), p. 3; *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 5 (August/September 1970), p. 4.

43 A University of Toronto psychologist noted how war resisters' migration to Canada demanded "a rapid mobilization of various coping mechanisms in dealing with stress." "Seeking and utilizing information" represented one coping strategy resisters used to enable a smoother transition as they debated moving and eventually migrated to Canada. Once resisters were in Canada, they experienced a "sense of isolation, loneliness, and psychic pain," yet a "firm sense of belonging," fostered by the growing "network of support mechanisms," could anaesthetize these feelings. See Saul V. Levine, "Draft Dodgers: Coping with Stress, Adapting to Exile," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, vol. 42, no. 3 (April 1972), pp. 434–435.

Kingston, [Ontario,] where we have so far encountered only a few other draft-dodgers, it is comforting to have contact with you in Toronto, as well as your subscribers in other parts of Canada.”⁴⁴ Some resisters even met in person after communicating through *AMEX*. Thomas Hansen, a resister living in Norway, “never realized that there were so many draft dodgers and deserters in Canada. It’s encouraging to find out that I’m not alone.” Four years after writing this letter, Hansen, a prominent figure in the Oslo resister community, met *AMEX*’s editor, who was visiting Scandinavia. Reflecting on the importance of the magazine, Hansen believed he could not “begin to tell you what *AMEX* has meant to me during my 5 years of exile here in Norway.”⁴⁵

American émigrés were not the only individuals who encountered *AMEX*. The magazine filled its letters-to-the-editor section with endorsements by those sympathetic to resisters’ actions and goals. For example, a number of empathetic letters came from religious bodies and clergy – including Christian and Jewish faiths – who repudiated American intervention in Vietnam.⁴⁶ Letters from across the world emphasized the magnitude of the anti-war struggle and global support for resisters, including a Spanish political refugee, living in Algeria since 1939, who complimented the magazine and noted that “you have real friends . . . who stand and will stand by you in all the struggles for liberty.”⁴⁷ Not all letters empathized with the magazine or the causes of resisters. One American, requesting the magazine drop his daughter’s name from its subscription list, thought it a “shame that an organization such as yours is allowed to exist. The large mass of Americans do not believe in Communism. Why does your organization go counter to our mass ideology[?] You will not get one penny from me.” Publishing such letters may have hardened the resolve of resisters by illustrating the hawkish mentality still prominent in the United States. Nevertheless, one Canadian resident expressed even more vitriolic sentiment than his American counterpart. “[W]here . . . will you run to next if the heat hits here?” the Torontonion asked. “You chickenshit, bootlicking pacifists aren’t wanted here so, run rabbit run, and may you die of exhaustion.”⁴⁸

Some individuals had few ties to the political discourse in the magazine, but found meaning in alternative purposes. *AMEX*’s pages contained numerous letters concerning missing persons who had left the United States without informing family and friends. A Texan mother, for instance,

44 *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 10 (January 26, 1969), p. 4.

45 *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 6 (October/November 1970), p. 2; *AMEX*, vol. 5, no. 1 (October 1974), p. 3.

46 See, for example, *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 5 (November 10-23, 1968), p. 3; *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 4 (June 1970), p. 4; *AMEX*, vol. 4, no. 2 (May/June 1973), p. 5.

47 *AMEX*, vol. 4, no. 1 (March/April 1973), p. 5.

48 *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 10 (January 26, 1969), p. 4; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 16 (n.d.), p. 2.

wrote to the magazine hoping the staff might have known the location of her 19-year-old son, who was absent without leave. The desperation of this mother's letter exemplifies, in a microcosm, the familial pain brought about by the war. Once again, the magazine offered hope: not just as a forum for solidarity among fellow resisters, but also among family and friends who wished to re-establish contact with long-lost sons, brothers, and acquaintances. The producers of the magazine fostered this specific construction by publishing these letters and, periodically, including such submissions within a "missing persons" section. In this specific situation, readers, not editors, drove the publication's content.⁴⁹

Readers assisted in the processes of distribution and notification, serving not only as interpreters but also disseminators of the magazine. Pietlock understood the assistance readers could provide in this act: "You can also help the cause by sending us names of anyone you think should be receiving this publication."⁵⁰ One Canadian subscriber agreed with Pietlock's active view of readers. She felt that this responsibility was all the more imperative because of *AMEX*'s important function for resisters in Canada and the global fight against American intervention in Vietnam. At first, the reader distributed *AMEX* to organizations and American émigré friends. Only after doing so did she finally read the magazine carefully, at which time she exclaimed, "God! IT WAS GREAT."⁵¹ As the words of this individual attest, reading and publicizing *AMEX*, with its overtly political connotations of war resistance, became a political act for those opposed to the war. Producers and readers of *AMEX*, like their counterparts of the sixties' underground press, believed the production, dissemination, and consumption of the magazine could contribute to the creation of a better, more peaceful society.

AMEX's self-proclaimed role as a mouthpiece for resisters meant the issue of ideology was a subject of strong opinions for readers. Certainly not all individuals who crossed the border to escape military service were politically engaged. For others, only after a period of reflection did their migration led to activism.⁵² The tone of *AMEX*'s political content and the quality of its analysis was a sensitive issue for newly arrived resisters, since their acceptance by Canadians was fragile and integral to their migratory success. Some resisters, of course, did not agree with the need for an American émigré publication and spent little time reading the magazine. Rick Bébout, future gay rights activist, felt *AMEX* illustrated

49 *AMEX*, vol. 3, no. 4 (May/June 1972), p. 6.

50 S[tan] J. P[ietlock], "Editor's Notebook," *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 12 (March 9, 1969), p. 12.

51 *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 9 (June 30, 1971), p. 3.

52 Jessica Squires argues that studies reporting American draft-age émigrés possessed a strong ideological opposition to war and activist tendencies are based on biases associated with self-selected samples ("A Refuge from Militarism?", p. 183).

the “ghetto” nature of Toronto’s resister circles, for the magazine focused on “internal concerns that separate[d] it from the rest of the city.”⁵³ One reader, condemning a recent piece’s critical use of the word “liberal” without defining what was meant by the term, noted the publication was increasingly “becoming the voice of the entire Canadian dodger deserter community” within resister circles and wider society. Since *AMEX* symbolically represented the opinions of American war resisters, he urged its producers to realize that a heavy weight of responsibility now fell on their editorial shoulders. Another reader suggested *AMEX* avoid serving as “a political forum, movement or soapbox for . . . political speculators and the like. Concentrate on vital information about surviving in Canada, not notions of Lenin.” In contrast, others demanded the magazine take a more radical stance and inform its readers of various leftist issues. A Canadian student, himself not a resister, could not “figure out why American exiles are not the most radical people around.” He hoped that resisters did not see Canada as a “cop out,” but rather as a country to which they would serve a positive influence. A graduate student from Indiana wrote that he could “gain only indirect profit from many of the articles” on “expatriates in Toronto.” He wanted a journal of leftist opinion rather than an organ devoted simply to émigré issues.⁵⁴ No matter what stance the editorship took in terms of ideology or subject matter, the diversity of political beliefs and interests held by readers – similar to war resisters in general – meant a proportion of its readers remained unsatisfied with the magazine’s content.

Searching for an Identity in *AMEX*

The magazine’s first five years reflected the search for a collective identity within wider resister émigré circles. Avoiding service in Vietnam through migration to Canada constituted a political act for many individuals; nevertheless, the magazine’s pages brimmed with debate over whether or not resisters should assimilate into mainstream, middle-class Canadian society. Some felt that war resistance must continue after arrival in Canada and thus sought to use *AMEX* as a medium to inform each other – and greater society – of the atrocities of American imperialism and “the System.” Related to the issue of activism, the magazine had an ambiguous relationship with the Canadian mainstream press. While the magazine enjoyed attention in aboveground media, it maintained a critical edge when reporting news items published in the mainstream press on resisters, Vietnam, and the anti-war movement. *AMEX*’s producers and readers also debated their migrant identity: was leaving the United

⁵³ Rick Bébout, in Christy, ed., *The New Refugees*, p. 114.

⁵⁴ *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 6 (October/November 1970), p. 3; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 16 (n.d.), p. 2; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 10 (January 26, 1969), p. 14; *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 16 (n.d.), p. 9.

States a temporary or permanent migration? Some resisters saw themselves more as expatriates aspiring to create a new life in their adopted nation and assumed a New Canadian identity. Others saw their stay north of the border more as a temporary exile during which they could reform America from the outside. Struggles within the resister community over *AMEX*'s direction, along with external influences, continually shifted the magazine's preference for an exile or expatriate identity during particular phases of its history.

The journal's growing emphasis on Canadian identity reached its height in mid-1969 when its name changed from *The American Exile in Canada* to *AMEX: The American Expatriate in Canada*.⁵⁵ Rising English-Canadian nationalism and growing numbers of resisters earning Canadian citizenship influenced the flowering of this expatriate identity. In the May 1969 issue – the last before the magazine's name change – staff member Van Allen Gosselin argued that an expatriate identity was favourable over exile, because the latter placed Canada “in the same old colonial role.” Expatriates, according to Gosselin, realized the adaptability of one's national identity and believed the struggle for Canadian economic and cultural independence offered a way to fight American imperialism.⁵⁶ A more practical reason also corresponds to the accent on Canadian permanence. “We are primarily interested in boosting our Canadian circulation,” Pietlock wrote in early 1969, as American circulation numbers had risen at a faster rate. “We're more interested, though, to first of all define a community in exile in Canada through our mailing list and then to serve that community as a communication channel.” For Pietlock, this meant focusing not only on political content of relevance to Americans living in Canada, but also on other issues related to the growing resister community, including reports on particular happenings from specific Canadian locales.⁵⁷

A summary of the magazine's content on Canadian politics, society, and history during its first five years typifies the search for identity. Pietlock classified this period as the “getting settled,” “looking into Canada,” and “broader understanding of resistance” eras. “Getting settled” refers to

55 “UAE Proceedings,” *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 14 (April 24, 1969), p. 11.

56 Van Allen Gosselin, “Are We Exiles or Expatriates,” *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 15 (May 1969), pp. 12–13. The debate over *AMEX*'s name predated the May 1969 policy in which the Trudeau government announced it would accept both draft dodgers and military deserters; however, optimism for a more liberal policy of immigration added to the magazine's idealism toward its adopted country. *AMEX* published Gosselin's piece on exile-expatriate identity beside an article on the improved state of border crossings for dodgers and deserters and “massive support in all quarters of Canadian life” for a liberalized resister immigration policy. See “Open Door Policy Soon? Some Deserters Get Landed in Ottawa as Border Improves for Draft Dodgers,” *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 15 (May 1969), p. 14.

57 S[tan] J P[ietlock], “Editor's Notebook,” *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 12 (March 9, 1969), p. 12.

the magazine's establishment in late 1968, when resisters involved with the publication looked at their new Canadian surroundings with a surprising degree of wide-eyed fascination. A majority of the magazine's content concerned practical information regarding immediate problems faced by newly arrived resisters. Canada's quotidian cultural peculiarities astonished this nascent community, whose members, at the time, often lacked much background knowledge of their national destination. General interest pieces focused on the unique, everyday elements of English-Canadian society, including the differences between Canadian and American English. By fall 1969, Pietlock argued, the magazine entered a more in-depth "looking into Canada" period, exemplified by the inclusion of "expatriate" in *AMEX*'s title. Resisters realized they might never return to the United States and began to see Canada as the country in which they would spend the rest of their lives. The magazine dealt with issues regarding long-term residency, including a heightened attention to Canadian politics.⁵⁸ *AMEX* displayed a growing attachment towards Canada as resisters saw the possible reality of Canadian permanency, a phenomenon noted in other immigrant or ethnic presses throughout Canadian history.⁵⁹ By fall 1971, however, *AMEX* had begun to attack aspects of Canada as part of a "period of broader understanding of resistance" and entered a renewed period of interest in American affairs, which eventually led to the domination of amnesty as the subject for the magazine's content by 1973. As a result, the Canadian mainstream press, which had originally congratulated *AMEX* on its efforts, criticized the magazine's editorial stance towards Canada.⁶⁰

Sociologist David Surrey writes that American war resisters did not migrate to Canada for a better life. They had left their homeland strictly out of opposition to the Vietnam War: "They were not seeking new lives; they were rejecting old ones." Rejecting an old life, however, meant resisters were forced to seek a new one.⁶¹ This need was evident in *AMEX* during its "looking into Canada" period. Since resisters realized they would not be returning to the United States in the immediate future, if ever, they rejected America and began to see Canada as a society to which they could make a positive contribution. Draft dodger Paul Rux, for example, expressed this mentality in the magazine's early fall 1969 issue. Assessing the collective future of resisters in Canada, Rux asserted,

58 Pietlock, "Communication Between America's Vietnam-Era Refugees," p. 58.

59 Eva Stachniak, "Canadian Reflections: The Images of Canada and Poland in the Polish Ethnic Press (1908-89)," *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1 (1991), p. 48.

60 Pietlock, "Communication Between America's Vietnam-Era Refugees," pp. 56-58. Journalist David Cohen developed this temporal schema of the resister mentality based partly on sentiments in *AMEX*. Pietlock uses this framework in his study.

61 Surrey, *Choice of Conscience*, p. 138. David Churchill makes a similar criticism of Surrey's statement in "'When Home Became Away'," pp. 255-256.

“Unlike hippies, we have not dropped out of life through total despair over future hope. Rather, we have dropped in . . . ready to build a Canadian society that will be a vast improvement over the American model.” Rux placed this optimistic mentality within the context of opposition to “American imperialism in Vietnam” and support for national liberation throughout the world – including Canada. Resisters, according to Rux, “can hardly be expected to sit back forever and watch the American Moloch devour Canada around us. . . . Vietnam for the Vietnamese! Canada for the Canadians!” Rux recommended that resisters struggle for national control over Canada’s expansive natural resources and work towards an alternative model of clean, livable cities in contrast to American metropolises.⁶²

Eusi Ndugu, a black draft dodger from Mississippi, echoed Rux’s optimism in an early 1970 article. “After living in Canada for nearly 1½ months,” he wrote, “I have not encountered the oppressive form of racism . . . I encountered in the States.” While admitting that “some form of racism does exist in this country as in every other Caucasian country,” his short time in Toronto had demonstrated that “the air of freedom blows a little better” for blacks in Canada. African Americans need not worry about losing their identity in a nation with a relatively small black population; black newspapers and magazines such as *Ebony* and *Negro Digest* were readily available. The Third-World Bookstore sold African clothing and other cultural artifacts, and Toronto had a soul-food restaurant named The Underground Railroad. Toronto struck Ndugu as “very international” because of the presence of “races of people from all around the world.” He concluded with an appeal to his black counterparts still in the United States: “Canada is not heaven on earth, but it’s better than . . . [coming] home in a pine box from Vietnam.”⁶³

The optimism and idealism that resisters exhibited toward Canada during this period was not completely naive. Stan Pietlock, for example, wrote it was not Canada’s “sense of fair play” but rather the nation’s need for “trained manpower” that explained its acceptance of resisters. Canada’s immigration point system favoured immigrants who could easily assimilate into and contribute to the nation’s bustling postwar economy. In order to “dispel all of the myths” about Canada, Pietlock requested that expatriate political organizations provide information about Canadian politics. Such organizations ensured resisters did not “quickly disappear into a comfortable niche in Canadian society oblivious to Canada’s role as [a] U.S. liberal front” but, instead, become integrated into the Canadian Left.⁶⁴ Although Pietlock’s editorial provided a more

62 Paul P. Rux, “Building a Future in Canada,” *AMEX*, vol. 1, no. 16 (n.d.), p. 7.

63 Eusi Ndugu, “Black Draft Dodger Speaks out on Canada,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 2 (n.d.), p. 21.

64 S[tan] J. P[ietlock], “Editorial,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 2 (n.d.), p. 5.

accurate portrayal of Canada, it still expressed optimism about the positive effect resisters could have on their adopted society. Participation in Canadian organizations and movements was essential to this ambition. Dee Knight's early 1970 article, "Yes, It Has Politics," taught the differences between American and Canadian political systems and argued that regionalism and federal-provincial relations were the most prominent Canadian political issues. Knight aligned resisters' political affiliation to the left, devoting a large portion of the piece to the New Democratic Party (NDP), "the self-appointed protector and friend of draft dodgers and deserters in Canada."⁶⁵

The magazine's use of history demonstrates resisters' search for identity during the "looking into Canada" period. "History is written by the victors" may be the most well known of historical clichés, yet historian Peter Burke believes history is most important to groups who feel a loss from their cultural roots.⁶⁶ This theory helps to explain *AMEX*'s use of history. The magazine's contributors associated resisters with various historical groups, most prominently the Loyalists. Historians have analysed the multiple ways in which various groups have used the Loyalist tradition, which Norman Knowles depicts as "a contested and dynamic phenomenon" to which different groups have assigned radically different "selective and controversial" meanings.⁶⁷ While scholars have noted the ironic similarities between the Loyalists and American Vietnam War resisters, little work investigates whether and how resisters themselves felt an association with their American émigré predecessors.⁶⁸ A number of resisters

65 Dee Knight, "Yes, It Has Politics," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 3 (April/May 1970), pp. 14–16. Interestingly, Knight's article contained factual errors: he referred to former Quebec Premier Maurice Duplessis as "Henri Duplessis" and stated that the province's Liberal party had defeated Duplessis's Union Nationale "for the first time" in 1956.

66 Peter Burke, "History as Social Memory" in Thomas Butler, ed., *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), pp. 105–107.

67 Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867–1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), pp. 78–107; Norman Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition & the Creation of Usable Pasts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), pp. 5–6.

68 J. L. Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home? Canadians and Anti-Americanism* (Toronto: Harper Collins, 1996), pp. 182–183. John Hagan investigates how "cultural elite groups" such as the United Church framed resisters as descendants of Canada's Loyalists and more recent Hungarian and Czechoslovakian refugees. See his "Narrowing the Gap by Widening the Conflict: Power Politics, Symbols of Sovereignty, and the American War Resisters' Migration to Canada," *Law & Society Review*, vol. 34, no. 3 (2000), pp. 612, 627–629, 638–639. Canadian politicians such as External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp also used the legal-historical precedent of Canada's refusal to turn away immigrants based on their military responsibilities to another state to justify the acceptance of American Vietnam War resisters. Sharp noted how, during World War II, the United States accepted Canadian deserters before joining the conflict in late 1941: "the Americans are in a war now and we're not, so we will apply the same policy in Canada that they applied to us." See Kasinsky, *Refugees from Militarism*, p. 125.

who contributed to *AMEX* attempted to legitimate the act of Canadian immigration to themselves and to the greater Canadian populace by placing their own behaviour within a historical framework. At a time when they aspired to make a deeper contribution to Canadian society, these resisters associated themselves with the Loyalists: a historical group remembered within popular history as the founders of English Canada, commemorated for their vehement anti-Americanism, and venerated for their supposed desire to create an alternative society to the United States.

This association is most clear in *AMEX*'s early 1970 "Thank You General Brock" issue.⁶⁹ The cover featured a valiant portrayal of the Upper Canadian militia of the War of 1812 by C. W. Jefferys. The synopsis identified Sir Isaac Brock as "Canada's hero" of the war. Although the writer of the piece admitted that Brock had died in a battle "which can best be described as a skirmish," the contributor justified the general's hagiographic status within Canadian history because he was "the founder of his country." The writer described the Upper Canadian militia within the paradigm of what Carl Berger calls the "militia myth": Upper Canadians "rallied behind" Brock "in defense of their land." The heroic portrayal of an imperial general and his loyal militia within a magazine written by and for individuals who resisted their own national military seems, at first glance, overwhelmingly contradictory. However, the writer interpreted the Upper Canadian force as an army of national liberation against American manifest destiny. "When the war ended," the writer explained, "Canadians remained masters of their own land." Upper Canadians defended the independence of the new nation in which they lived and resisted American territorial expansion. Resisters such as the writer of this piece saw themselves as the descendants of this tradition; indeed, they sought to fight a modern-day struggle against American influence in defence of the national integrity of Canada.⁷⁰

Use of the Loyalist militia myth as a means to create a collective resister identity relied upon a masculine understanding of war resistance. Emphasizing the manly ideals of courage and defence as embodied through the actions of Brock's army overlooked the varied ways in which war resistance could be interpreted. The magazine's analysis of

69 *The Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* also used the Loyalists and the Underground Railroad to convince draft-age Americans to come north. For example, it juxtaposed two letters – one written by a black slave after coming to Canada in 1853, and another from an American war resister in Toronto to the TADP – to illustrate how Canada symbolized a place of freedom for both individuals. See Mark Satin, ed., *The Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* (Toronto: House of Anansi, 1968), p. iv.

70 "Synopsis," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 1 (n.d.), pp. 4–5. See also "History Rolls On," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 2 (n.d.), p. 19; Nancy Goldberry, "1759 to 1865 Move North: Loyalists and Runaway Slaves," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 7 (n.d.), pp. 30–32; "The Queen's Rangers 1777," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 7 (n.d.), p. 35.

the Loyalist experience neglected the impact of migration on Loyalist women, not surprising considering the magazine's general tendency to sideline issues of importance to female war resisters.⁷¹ Other writings in *AMEX* during this period, however, did explicitly depict the relationship between Canada and the United States in gendered terms. After reading the work of early-twentieth-century Canadian author Frederick Philip Grove, Charles Campbell noted, "Canada has been traditionally personified as a woman, Miss Canada; while the U.S. has been imagined not only as a male but as a skinny, scheming, obviously tight-sphinctered yankee trader." He observed fear within Canada that American economic imperialism threatened to leave Canada's culture "permanently barren or, worse, impregnated with the death-oriented American Dream." Rather than replicate the phallic-centred militarism of the United States, he suggested, Canada should embrace its feminine nature and fight for liberation "like the women who have grown tired of being defined negatively as men's helpmates." For Campbell, the geographic expanse of the Canadian landscape – in conjunction with the French fact – forced Canada to uphold a pragmatic respect for differences, unlike the unattained doctrine of American equality.⁷²

Contributors during this period placed resisters within other historical traditions. Paul Rux, who migrated to Canada after being denied conscientious objector status, asserted that American war resisters were religious or moral exiles, for they opposed injustice, suffering, and the shortcomings of mainstream society. Rux identified their protest within a tradition of religious conscience throughout American history. In this sense, he wrote, war resisters "are the most American of Americans." The founding migrant groups of American society, such as the Pilgrims and William Penn's Quakers, had left England because of intolerance towards religious freedom. Rux added that history records examples of migration within North America motivated by religious beliefs, namely Roger Williams' banishment from Massachusetts and the Mormon expulsion of the nineteenth century.⁷³ Resisters also aligned themselves with nineteenth-century black slaves, who used the Underground Railroad to reach freedom in Canada. Eusi Ndugu made this connection explicit. "It's probably hard to conceive that I am a run-away slave," Ndugu admitted. The resister argued that this appellation was appropriate, however, for he "ran away from an oppressive[,] racist, genocidal . . . and very imperialistic

71 Campbell, "'Women United against the War,'" pp. 343–344. On the gendered experience of female Loyalists, see Janice Potter-MacKinnon, *While the Women Only Wept: Loyalist Refugee Women* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993).

72 Charles Campbell, "Canadian Dream," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 5 (August/September 1970), pp. 34–36. This article reviewed books on Canadian identity, including a positive assessment of Kenneth McNaught's *The Pelican History of Canada* (1969).

73 Paul Rux, "The Religious Exile in North American History," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 1 (n.d.), p. 9.

country.” These negative characteristics, according to Ndugu, were “the same things my Black brothers and sisters [escaped] away from during the 19th century.” Like the Loyalist myth, the Underground Railroad served as a reference to legitimate the act of migrating north in opposition to American society.⁷⁴

The Canadian mainstream media portrayed *AMEX* in a positive light during its period of Canadian optimism. All three Toronto dailies – the *Star*, *Telegram*, and *Globe and Mail* – published articles complimenting *AMEX*'s writings on Canada. Harry Bruce's December 1968 *Star* article was the first from the mainstream press to cover the magazine. “[I]f I were 19, American and alone in this cold country that I'd suddenly adopted as my own,” Bruce announced, “I would await each issue with something close to breathlessness.” In particular, the magazine's writings on Canada intrigued the columnist: “[T]he editors urge a kind of respect for the quaintness of Canadian ways that's good-natured, self-effacing and . . . vaguely flattering.” The Toronto dailies congratulated *AMEX* for its analysis of Canada, its idiosyncratic articles on Canadian culture, and its role as an assimilator of dodgers and deserters into Canadian society.⁷⁵

Favourable coverage of *AMEX* was short-lived, however, as was the magazine's overt optimism towards Canada. The Trudeau government's enactment of the *War Measures Act* in October 1970 stimulated these changes in opinion; however, it is most accurate to view *AMEX*'s response to the October Crisis as a culmination of growing antagonism between resisters and greater Canadian society. In the spring of 1970, for example, Toronto's Mayor William Dennison lashed out at resisters following a heated downtown anti-war rally. While only 15 of the demonstration's 91 arrested participants had American origins, the mayor used resisters as scapegoats for the violence.⁷⁶ Growing criticism against resisters also came from the Canadian Left. Robin Mathews, a Carleton University professor and self-appointed leader of the movement to “Canadianize” the nation's universities from American encroachment, wrote a series of articles for the magazine in early 1970 arguing that resisters were “part of U.S. Imperialism in Canada.” *AMEX* exhibited growing attraction to Canada during this time, but Mathews did not believe a majority of resisters cared about Canadian history, politics, or culture. Most important was that these often highly educated immigrants stole jobs from Canadian nationals. He had aided young American war resisters in the past, an act

74 Eusi Ndugu, “Black Draft Dodger Speaks out on Canada,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 2 (n.d.), p. 21. Parentheses in original.

75 Bruce, “The Cheerful and Strange Ways,” p. 8; Ron Haggart, “Trade Paper for Exiles,” *Toronto Telegram*, February 5, 1969, p. 7; Martin O'Malley, “Duck! Here Comes a Flying Underground Newspaper,” *Globe Magazine*, November 7, 1970, pp. 4–5.

76 Kasinsky, *Refugees from Militarism*, p. 137.

in line with “the Canadian traditions of sanctuary.” This welcome was conditional, however, on the understanding that resisters would take a greater interest in Canadian issues.⁷⁷

Scholars note how the *War Measures Act* was a “wake-up call” that revised the resister community’s “innocent view” of Canada, since it illustrated the possibility of repression and the lack of constitutional guarantees for civil liberties in Canada.⁷⁸ The October Crisis prompted an overwhelmingly critical reaction from *AMEX*’s contributors. Pietlock, for example, noted how the *War Measures Act* “awakened a lot of people” when the federal government, restricting citizens’ civil liberties, “dropped its facade of liberalism” and “cracked down with astonishing ferocity on the whole separatist movement in Québec.” He believed the establishment press was practising self-censorship by refusing to criticize the government. Student and underground presses, on the other hand, upholding free speech and a free press, suffered oppression from government authorities and faced exclusion from printers. Pietlock now observed that Canada, too, contained its own form of domestic imperialism. The events in Quebec forced Canada to “come face-to-face with itself in a basic internal contradiction[:] . . . confederation based on domination of French Canada by English Canada.” The perception of French Canada’s place within Confederation had changed since Charles Campbell’s article. Importantly, Pietlock admitted the FLQ’s abductions of James Cross and Pierre Laporte had threatened public order, and he criticized the separatist organization’s “adventurist, elitist, aggressively violent tactics.” Yet the federal government, “so ossified in its maintenance of the status quo,” failed to seek a constructive solution to the causes of the FLQ’s desperate actions and thus enacted a measure of “repression.”⁷⁹

77 Robin Mathews, “On Draft Dodging and U.S. Imperialism in Canada,” *Canadian Dimension* (February/March 1970), pp. 10–11. Mathews penned similar comments in “The U.S. Draft Dodger in Canada is Part of U.S. Imperialism in Canada,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 4 (June 1970), pp. 25–26. The article drew criticism from resisters and sympathetic Canadians. See V. S. Brown, “Robin Mathews is a Foe of the American Exile Community and an Enemy of the Canadian Working Class” and Ron Lambert, “Answering Mr. Mathews,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 5 (August/September 1970), pp. 23–24, 8–9. On Robin Mathews and the “Canadianization” movement of left-leaning English-Canadian cultural nationalism during the late 1960s and 1970s, see Jeffrey Cormier, *The Canadianization Movement: Emergence, Survival, and Success* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004). See also Ryan Edwardson, “‘Kicking Uncle Sam out of the Peaceable Kingdom’: English-Canadian ‘New Nationalism’ and Americanization,” *Journal of Canadian Studies*, vol. 37, no. 4 (Winter 2003), pp. 131–150.

78 Granatstien, *Yankee Go Home*, p. 186; Surrey, *Choice of Conscience*, p. 117; Roger Neville Williams, “The War Measures Act and its Aftermath: Strong-Arm Rule in Canada,” *The New Republic*, January 30, 1971, p. 15.

79 Stan Pietlock, “Québec,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 6 (October/November 1970), pp. 4–6. On the complexities of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist thought in Quebec, see Sean Mills, *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2010).

The *War Measures Act* edition prompted the *Toronto Star*, supportive of the federal government during the October Crisis, to attack *AMEX*. While the *Star* advocated an open-door policy for resisters and admitted that many contributed to Canadian society, its editors criticized what they interpreted as the recent “disturbing” attitude in the magazine. *AMEX*’s response to the *War Measures Act*, they argued, did not foster assimilation into Canadian society. Specifically, the *Star* attacked Pietlock’s editorial because “[i]t denounce[d] the Canadian government for imposing the act but fail[ed] to say a word in condemnation of the FLQ and its murderous activities.” The *Star* misread Pietlock’s words: he had condemned the FLQ. Attacking the Trudeau government’s use of the *War Measures Act* and analysing the situation in Quebec from an English-Canada-as-imperialist perspective placed *AMEX* within a journalistic sphere of deviance. Canada’s largest newspaper demanded the resister magazine change direction to avoid “arousing a growing hostility and suspicion among ordinary Canadians.”⁸⁰

Yet *AMEX* continued to publish opinions that criticized Canadian politics and society, a move that embodied its leftist activism but jeopardized the magazine’s role as a public voice for resisters. Stan Pietlock, in response to the *Star*, compared the newspaper’s earlier congratulatory piece with its recent tirade. “A lot has changed since then,” he concluded. “We have . . . begun to take a much more critical new look at our new home.” Pietlock realized Canadians would have preferred that the magazine cease its adversarial Canadian coverage. He also believed a majority of exiles would rather see their fellow resisters assimilate into Canadian society, “lest Canadians pull the welcome mat.” However, young Americans who came north to avoid military service were not ordinary immigrants. Pietlock believed American émigrés, unlike newcomers from other countries, had experienced the “sour” shortcomings of living in the American materialistic society. Pietlock and other resisters who wrote for *AMEX* attacked elements of Canadian society because they believed that their negative experiences of the so-called American Dream, interpreted through a perspective critical of capitalism, militarism, and imperialism, provided lessons for Canadians. To assimilate into Canadian society without speaking out against its flaws was unjust.⁸¹ Pietlock maintained that *AMEX* condemned elements of Canadian society in an act of hope, a faith that Canadians could learn from the delusions of American materialism to create a superior society. This critical conception of Canada, however, offended not only the mainstream

80 “The Ardent Exiles: U.S. Deserters,” *Toronto Star*, December 17, 1970, p. 6. On the “sphere of dissent,” see Daniel C. Hallin, *The “Uncensored War”: The Media and Vietnam* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 116–118.

81 Stan Pietlock, “Now We . . .,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 7 (n.d.), p. 7.

press, but also individuals such as Robin Mathews and others on the Canadian Left, who felt *AMEX*'s position implied a lack of agency or knowledge on the part of Canadians.

AMEX continued its focus on Canadian society in subsequent issues. It reported on the federal government's ongoing abrogation of civil liberties and suggested ways in which Canada could achieve true national sovereignty from the United States.⁸² The magazine also reprinted an article in which Eusi Ndugu, the black resister who had praised the relative racial equality in Canada, now spoke out against the ostracism of Toronto's black community. Black resisters had not heeded Ndugu's call to join him in Canada, as few African Americans avoided military service by migrating north. His belief that blacks could retain their identity in Canada had also weakened: "[I]t's like jumping into a pitcher of buttermilk. It's all white – the music on the radio, the pictures in the papers and magazines[,] and on television. There's a race problem here, just like in the Northern cities of the U.S." Ndugu, who left *AMEX*'s staff collective in late 1970, abandoned hope that Canada could be a permanent place of residency. Instead, he wrote, "Africa is my home, and that's where I'm going."⁸³

Amnesty, Exile Identity, and a New Mission for *AMEX*

The inclusion of "expatriate" within the magazine's name and the pre-eminence of critical comment on Canadian issues did not last. By late 1970, external and internal factors influenced some resisters to (re)adopt exile identities, particularly among those who had recently arrived in Canada. The *War Measures Act* brought forth Canada's contradictions as a peaceful state. The May 1970 Pan-Canadian Conference of Resisters provided an impetus within the resister milieu to question whether reforming Canada offered the best strategy to improve global issues.⁸⁴ Military deserters now represented the majority of American resisters coming to Canada. Deserters were usually younger than draft dodgers, lacked a post-secondary education, and had working-class and minority backgrounds. Their lack of "desirable" skills meant many deserters failed to receive landed immigrant status, the first step towards Canadian citizenship. Resisters without landed immigrant status perceived their time in Canada as a temporary escape from military service and sought a future return to the United States. In November 1972, Ottawa announced the end of landed immigrant status for visitors, which

82 Dee Knight, "Canada's Movement for Independence," "Canadian Nationalism: Fighting Imperialism," and The Red Beaver [alias], "Guide to the Police-able Kingdom: Monthly Review of Canada's Post War Measures," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 8 (March/April 1971), pp. 4, 8–12, 22–23.

83 John Egerton, "Why So Few U.S. Blacks Come Here," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 7 (n.d.), pp. 13–14.

84 Roger Williams, "The Parley in Montréal," *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 4 (June 1970), p. 10.

terminated the main method by which American war resisters entered Canada. Moreover, direct American involvement in Vietnam was waning, and voluntary enlistment replaced the draft in early 1973. The United States began to strive for national reconciliation, as Congress introduced the first of a number of failed amnesty bills in late 1971.⁸⁵

An expatriate-exile division grew within the staff collective as amnesty became a prolific topic. At first, resisters despised amnesty, believing that accepting it was an admission of fault for opposing the war. Gradually, however, *AMEX* began to struggle for unconditional, universal amnesty for Americans who had resisted the war through various means: draft dodgers, military deserters, and soldiers with dishonorable discharges. Pietlock – while supportive of amnesty – did not want it to become *AMEX's* *raison d'être*. By the early 1970s, he felt the journal had fulfilled its mission and should cease publication, since the exodus of American war resisters was ending. He maintained an expatriate identity and, in 1972, became a Canadian citizen. Pietlock slowly lost editorial control to an exile faction wishing to concentrate primarily on amnesty, not on Canada and expatriatism. In September 1971, the magazine became *AMEX-Canada: Published by Americans Exiled in Canada*. Staff tensions grew until the fall of 1973, when Pietlock submitted an acerbic resignation letter to the editorial staff. “Once upon a time *AMEX* represented . . . divergent Amexile philosophies and aspirations,” the magazine’s founder and senior editor lamented. Angered by his exclusion from a recent issue’s list of staff members, he argued that amnesty was “ultimately going to be won in the U.S.,” therefore, the magazine’s concentration on the topic posed “serious implications . . . for those of us who consider ourselves more or less permanent residents of Canada.”⁸⁶ Soon after, Pietlock established *The Real Majority Up Here*, a newsletter aimed at *AMEX's* Canadian subscribers. It lasted six months.⁸⁷

Dee Knight and Jack Colhoun were the driving forces who transformed the magazine into a mouthpiece for Amex, a lobbying organization that fought for unconditional, universal amnesty. Knight and Colhoun became the émigré spokespersons for amnesty, organizing conferences and building connections with stateside interest groups.⁸⁸ Knight, a Eugene McCarthy organizer who resisted the draft by coming to Canada in 1968, had roots with the UAE and contributed to the magazine

85 Kasinsky, *Refugees from Militarism*, pp. 284–285; Grayson Dunster, “Down with Draft Dodger Chauvinism,” *AMEX*, vol. 2, no. 9 (June 30, 1971), pp. 5–6; Squires, “A Refuge from Militarism?” pp. 343–386; Pietlock, “Communication Between America’s Vietnam-Era Refugees,” pp. 35–36.

86 *AMEX*, vol. 4, no. 5 (November/December 1973), pp. 4–5.

87 Jack Colhoun, “War Resisters in Exile: The Memoirs of *AMEX-Canada*,” *AMEX* vol. 6, no. 2 (November/December 1977), p. 33.

88 Hagan, *Northern Passage*, pp. 152–153, 157.

soon after he migrated north. Colhoun, who arrived in Canada in 1970 after deserting his military training post in Wisconsin, met Pietlock and Knight in October 1971, by which time Colhoun had seriously considered the possibilities of fighting for amnesty as a method of war resistance.⁸⁹ In January 1972, *AMEX* published a special Amnesty-Repatriation issue, which included three of Colhoun's writings, one co-written by Knight. All three pieces argued resisters should accept only an unconditional, universal amnesty and foreshadowed the topic's dominance in *AMEX*.⁹⁰

An expatriate-exile divide within the readership also became more evident as the amnesty debate grew during the 1970s. By 1973, a majority of published letters focused on stateside issues, particularly amnesty, while issues dealing with Canada waned in importance. Although American letters always made up a significant percentage of readers' contributions, after 1973 they dominated published letters. Responses to a reader survey of *AMEX*'s Canadian subscribers in August 1973 also characterized the ends of the expatriate-exile spectrum. One respondent, who came to Canada "for personal reasons," was a former subscriber aligned with the community's expatriate element. He was now a Canadian citizen and planned never to return to the United States. He believed that *AMEX* "served . . . a *valuable* purpose for recent American immigrants, but once one has become *Canadian* the issues (ie: looking back at U.S.) do not seem relevant." He felt amnesty was not important to individuals who had adopted New Canadian identities. A current subscriber from Vancouver, in contrast, displayed an exile identity. He was unsure whether he would return to the United States but had no ambition to become a Canadian citizen. The reader requested *AMEX* continue the fight for amnesty and did not feel it was covering the issue excessively.⁹¹

The last question on the survey – "Would you like to write for Amex on topics of your choice?" – provides a unique insight into the magazine's goal of including the voices of its readers. Of 56 respondents, only 18 stated they were interested in contributing articles. Several of the remaining respondents felt they possessed ideological views different from those of the magazine's producers and readers, who would neither print nor appreciate their contributions. Another popular explanation for not

89 "Dee Knight" in Christy, ed, *The New Exiles*, p. 125; Jack Colhoun, "War Resisters in Exile: The Memoirs of AMEX-Canada," *AMEX*, vol. 6, no. 2 (November/December 1977), pp. 77–78. Biographical information on Jack Colhoun from *America, Love It or Leave It*.

90 Jack Colhoun and Dee Knight, "Amnesty & Repatriation . . . the Struggle for Restoration of Civil Liberties"; Jack Colhoun, "An Exile Replies to Congressman Koch" and "McGovern Proposal Discriminates Against Deserters – No Deal! (An Open Letter)," all in *AMEX* vol. 3, no. 2 (January/February 1972), pp. 13, 17, 18–19.

91 State Historical Society of Wisconsin [hereafter SHSW], *AMEX-Canada* Archives, box 1, folder 4, "Questionnaire to Exiles (1973)." Emphases and parentheses in original. Material contained in the *AMEX-Canada* Archives relates mostly to the magazine's amnesty period.

contributing was lack of time because of professional and social commitments. The most common excuse, however, was a lack of journalistic skill or writing talent. While producers of *AMEX* expressed hope that their publication avoided the elitist pitfalls of the mainstream press, in which journalists are portrayed as professionals able to overcome personal biases, not all readers viewed the magazine in this manner.⁹²

Turning *AMEX* into an exile forum on amnesty altered the purpose of the magazine and allowed it to survive at a time when expatriates were losing interest in distinct resister issues. As Knight and Colhoun became increasingly involved in various amnesty activities stateside, including participation in radio call-in shows and interviews with mainstream media outlets, the magazine struggled to maintain a regular publication schedule. In October 1976, for example, *AMEX* returned after a year-long hiatus, following what had been a busy year for the campaign.⁹³ The collective defended the magazine's absence by juxtaposing their ideas of journalism with the mainstream press. "The *New York Times* boasts that it prints all the news that's fit to print," an editorial exclaimed. "While *AMEX* has never written about our philosophy of journalism, over our eight years of existence we have developed an understanding of our role." The magazine's need "to go out and create news we write about" – specifically that which dealt with amnesty – set it apart from establishment publications.⁹⁴ The magazine itself became of secondary importance to the amnesty movement; however, Knight and Colhoun's emphasis on active participation and the value of journalism to promote positive change linked *AMEX*'s amnesty phase with its earlier years of publication, when its producers sought to create a forum in which resisters could exchange information, debate strategy, and deliberate their identities.

Conclusion

In the fall of 1973, *AMEX* celebrated five years of publication. To commemorate this accomplishment, the staff reprinted Harry Bruce's 1968 *Toronto Star* piece that had lauded the early issues of *AMEX*. Looking back on the report illustrated to one *AMEX* writer the degree to which the magazine's maturation reflected the lives of resisters. "While flattering, this article shows how much this magazine and the American exile population in Canada has changed in half a decade," the writer commented. "We're no longer 'kids,' Mr. Bruce." In fact, many Americans who had

92 SHSW, *AMEX-Canada* Archives, box 1, folder 4, "Questionnaire to Exiles (1973)."

93 The election of Jimmy Carter in November 1976 failed to result in unconditional, universal amnesty. Carter announced a full pardon for draft dodgers, but deserters and veterans with less-than-honourable discharges had to report to military control and face individual review. These developments are covered in detail in Hagan, *Northern Passage*, pp. 165–175.

94 *AMEX*, vol. 5, no. 6 (October/November 1976), p. 2.

resisted the war by coming to Canada were now in their thirties. The writer was sure to point out that the National Archives had heeded Bruce's suggestion to preserve copies of *AMEX* for future posterity.⁹⁵

During its first five years, *AMEX* played an irreplaceable role for many resisters who sought solidarity, friendship, and hope during a time of personal change and collective struggle. It provided essential information and support for individuals who dodged the draft, deserted military service, migrated to Canada in opposition to the Vietnam War, or considered such actions. Motivated by the ethos of participatory journalism, *AMEX*'s pages also offered a space to foster a sense of community and to debate symbols of collective identity for those who left the United States to avoid military conflict in Vietnam and questioned their relationship to their new country of residence. Through the very human act of communication, *AMEX* established connections between resisters and sympathizers, Canadians and Americans, producers and readers. At the same time, *AMEX* struggled to include the voices of particular groups such as women who played an essential role within resister circles, yet faced marginalization within the movement. Political ideology also created divisions within the magazine. Some readers urged the staff collective to present a more radical perspective, while others demanded the magazine limit its critical content to present to Canadians a more politically moderate depiction of American émigrés. As the circulation and audience of *AMEX* grew, the magazine's producers felt the pressure of publishing a journal that sought to define the hopes and concerns of a diverse group of Americans whose only connection was resisting the Vietnam War by migrating to Canada.

Jack Colhoun summarized his reflections on the important role *AMEX* had played in war resistance in the magazine's final issue in 1977. "In the end, these pages may have little significance beyond unfolding an interesting story. However, they may serve a much more important function for a future generation of war resisters," he wrote. "We hope the lessons of our work can be useful to future resisters [of] future U.S. wars of aggression, and help ensure that the next such war will meet even greater opposition."⁹⁶ A new generation of American war resisters have now arrived in Canada in opposition to what they conceive as an illegal and immoral war in Iraq. A website, run by the Canadian War Resisters Support Campaign, provides short biographies of young Americans who have deserted to Canada, along with statements of support from Vietnam War resisters. Urging the federal government to allow Iraq War resisters

95 "Nostalgia," *AMEX*, vol. 4, no. 4 (September/October 1973), p. 41.

96 Jack Colhoun, "War Resisters in Exile: The Memoirs of *AMEX*-Canada," *AMEX*, vol. 6, no. 2 (November/December 1977), p. 12.

admission into the country, the website notes Canada's "proud history" of accepting war resisters.⁹⁷ Moreover, the leftist dissident press is still a hotbed for discussion and debate concerning Americans who have resisted the United States' latest war.⁹⁸ Individuals continue to express their opinions on war resistance, a discourse fostered in the forum of ideas that is the dissident press.

97 War Resisters Support Campaign [website], http://www.resisters.ca/index_en.html (consulted April 7, 2011).

98 See, for example, *NOW*, June 8–14, 2006, p. 11.