

Running head: Perspectives of Vietnam War Resisters

Canada as Refuge  
Perspectives of Vietnam War Resisters  
Lori Olafson  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Paper presented at the Centre of Canadian Studies  
31<sup>st</sup> International Conference  
University of Edinburgh

### Canada as Refuge: Perspectives of Vietnam War Resisters

Using a mixed-methods design, I recently conducted a study of Vietnam war resisters currently living in southern British Columbia. In addition to completing two surveys on moral reasoning and beliefs about knowledge, 31 participants agreed to an in-depth interview. Using Rest, Bebeau, and Volker's (1986; 2000) Four Component Model of moral reasoning as an analytic framework, I was able to trace how a particular course of action (leaving the United States for Canada) was produced in the context of a particular situation. Findings demonstrated that the decision to leave the United States was a moral choice precipitated by perceptions that the Vietnam War was an illegal, undeclared war and that it was morally wrong to kill innocent people. Moving to Canada resulted in a number of short and long term consequences. As a consequence of moving to Canada, for example, war resisters were required to participate in the immigration process. This paper provides an account of the participants' perspectives about immigrating and considers whether or not they viewed Canada as a refuge from militarism.

### Theoretical Framework

Lawrence Kohlberg's work on the psychology of morality has been instrumental, providing major ideas for research in morality for decades (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999). Kohlberg's work became popular in the 1960s because "at that time many young people were challenging the moral basis of American society, finding it too repressive at home and too imperialistic abroad" (Rest, et. al, p. 3). Kohlberg actually entered the debate between Martin Luther King Jr. and George Wallace when Wallace

argued that King should be treated as any other person breaking the law: “Kohlberg proposed that development in moral judgment was sequenced into three main levels: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. Kohlberg said that King was to be distinguished from common criminals because he represented Postconventional morality, whereas George Wallace’s thinking was conventional (i.e. ‘law and order’),” (Rest, et. al, p. 4).

One of the key contributions of Kohlberg’s work was this differentiation between stages of moral judgment. At the *preconventional level*, usually observed in children between the ages of four and ten, children are responsive to cultural labels of good and bad and interpret these labels in terms of physical consequences such as punishment, reward, or exchange of favors (Kohlberg, 1981). In other words, according to Kohlberg, preconventional moral thinkers obey rules to avoid punishment or to receive rewards. The *conventional level* of moral judgment is characterized by concern with conforming, maintaining, supporting and justifying the social order. At the *postconventional level*, “there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or people holding these principles and apart from the individual’s own identification with these groups” (Kohlberg, 1981, p. 18). Within each of these levels, there are two stages of moral development. Kohlberg believed these stages represented an invariant developmental sequence where each stage “comes one at a time and always in the same order” (1981, p. 20).

#### Neo-Kohlbergian Approach

In response to some of the criticisms directed at Kohlberg’s work, Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma (1999) developed what they termed a “Neo-Kohlbergian approach”

to moral understanding. The core ideas of this cognitive-developmental approach are derived from Kohlberg and include: an emphasis on cognition (i.e. understanding how a person is making sense of the world); the construction of the basic structures of morality by the individual; moral development from simpler ideas to more complex; and a developmental shift from conventional to postconventional moral thinking (Rest, et al, 1999).

Instead of conceptualizing development as movement through stages, the neo-Kohlbergian approach views the cognitive structures of moral judgment as moral schemas. There are three structures in moral thinking development: the Personal Interest schema, the Maintaining Norms schema, and the Postconventional schema.

The Personal Interest schema “justifies a decision as morally right by appealing to the personal stake the actor has in the consequences of an action” (Rest, et al., 2000, p. 387). In the Maintaining Norms schema, morality is defined as maintaining the established social order, wherein law is connected to order in a moral sense. Four elements comprise the Postconventional schema: “primacy of moral criteria, appeal to an ideal, shareable ideals and full reciprocity” (Rest, et al., 2000, p. 388).

#### The Four Component Model

Another limitation of Kohlberg’s work, according to Rest and his colleagues is that it focused on moral judgment, which is only one component of moral psychology. Rest, Bebeau, and Volker (1986) conceptualized the Four Component Model to account for the entire domain of moral psychology. According to Rest et. al (1986) there are four psychological processes that represent the production of moral behavior in a specific

situation. Rest et al. (1986) cautioned that the four components are not a linear sequence in real time: there are complex interactions among the components.

The first component, *moral sensitivity*, involves interpreting a particular situation and being aware of different possible lines of action. “Component 1 involves identifying what we can do in a particular situation, figuring out what the consequences to all parties would be for each line of action, and identifying and trying to understand our own gut feelings on the matter” (Rest, et al., 1986, p. 7)

*Moral judgment* is the second component, and involves an individual judging which possible line of action is morally right. How people decide what is right or wrong, from a cognitive developmental perspective, depends in part on different senses of fairness. This sense of fairness is conceptualized as a stage of moral development, and stage schemes “reside in long-term memory and are invoked to help make sense of problematic social situations in arriving at a judgment of what is morally right” (Rest, et al., 1986, p. 12).

The third component is *moral motivation*: prioritizing moral values over other personal values. There are many theories that attempt to explain why some individuals choose the moral alternative. For example, Blasi (2004) maintained that concern for self identity is what motivates moral action: “Intentionally acting against one’s core values and commitments is then experienced as self-betrayal and as a loss of one’s self” (p. 343).

The fourth component, *moral character*, refers to the strength of one’s convictions to execute and implement a course of action and to overcome obstacles. “Component 4 involves figuring out the sequence of concrete actions, working around

impediments and unexpected difficulties, overcoming fatigue and frustration, resisting distractions and allurements, and keeping sight of the eventual goal” (Rest, et al., 1986, p. 15).

According to Rest et al. (1986) the four components are the major units of analysis in tracing out how a particular course of action was produced in the context of a particular situation. I used these four components as an interpretive frame to analyze the production of war resistance. War and war resistance can certainly be considered within the realm of morality.

#### War and War Resistance from a Moral Frame

There have been ongoing debates around the world about the morality of particular wars. Hurka (2005), for example, provided several examples of wars that have ignited such debates, including the Soviet Union’s invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1969, the Vietnam War, the Lebanon War (June 1982 – June 1985), and the Gulf, Kosovo, and Iraq wars. Debates about the morality of war stem from the fact that individuals have different beliefs about war. Roblyer (2005) summarized these beliefs as three basic positions on a continuum. At the extreme pacifist position, the individual does not condone any war on the basis of moral grounds. Individuals at the extreme military realist position reject any role for morality in war (“anything goes” in order to win as quickly as possible). A third position on the continuum is occupied by the Just War tradition. From this perspective, there are a series of conditions that a war must satisfy to be morally justified (Hurka, 2005). The resort to war is justified only given just cause (e.g. an armed attack on one’s state).

As Sotiron (in press) points out, draft dodging as a response to war has occurred in modern times since the French Revolution. “Refusing to submit one’s life to the dictates of the national state by whatever means – evasion, flight, exile, exemption, resistance or prison – strikes at the very heart of the nation state’s *raison d’être*. At the core of this challenge to state sovereignty, which draft dodging represents, lies the inherent conflict between individual rights and societal imperatives as exemplified by the state.” Draft dodging, then, can be seen as a legitimate response to war from either the extreme pacifist position or from the Just War tradition if the war is viewed as unjustified.

The relationship between war resistance and moral thinking has been studied previously. Although there are few studies, the results have been similar. Hay (1983), for example found that conscientious objectors had higher moral reasoning scores than a norm group. Presley (1985) found that war resisters showed a strong rejection of authority and a high level of moral reasoning. Resisters’ thinking was also characterized by a concern with moral principles and the belief that individual conscience is a better guide to conduct than the law. Linn (1986, 1996, 1998) came up with the term “selective refusal” to describe resistance that occurred when Israeli soldiers realized they could not pursue the military mission according to their moral code (e.g. encountering the civilian population). She also found that most refusers were left-wing in their political affiliation.

Although not explicitly studying moral reasoning, Kasinsky’s (1976) study provides support for the idea that moral thinking (values and beliefs) played a role in the decision to resist the Vietnam War. Kasinsky found that American draft dodgers and deserters were independent non-conformists and concluded that their “value orientations

and beliefs were more crucial than such personal and social characteristics as his geographical location, ethnicity and class” (p. 12).

### Methodology

The purpose of the larger study from which this paper is drawn was to compare moral reasoning elicited from hypothetical dilemmas to real-life dilemmas by utilizing a mixed methods approach to the research design. More specifically, the study can be characterized as a mixed-model design because both quantitative and qualitative approaches are included throughout all stages of the research process (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The collection of data included both qualitative and quantitative strategies, and these data were collected sequentially, a common approach in mixed methods research (Creswell, 2003).

Moral reasoning in hypothetical dilemmas was measured through the use of the Defining Issues Test. Information about moral reasoning in a real-life dilemma was collected through the use of in-depth interviews with participants who experienced the real-life dilemma of choosing a course of action when faced with the realities of the Vietnam War.

### *Participants*

The study included 31 male participants currently living in British Columbia, Canada. I use the term “war resisters” to broadly describe the participants as those who left the United States in opposition to the Vietnam War, regardless of their draft status. For example, some participants left the United States prior to being inducted, while others were in various stages of the induction process, such as reporting for a pre-induction physical. Seven participants were deserters, and one had received conscientious

objector status. Average age of the war resisters was 61 years. All participants were Caucasian and the majority self-reported that they were middle class (84%) and educated beyond high school (94%). The mean for the year moved to Canada was 1970.

#### *Data Sources*

Three data sources were utilized in this study: two survey instruments and an in-depth interview. In addition to a brief demographic information questionnaire, the two quantitative measures include the Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the Epistemological Beliefs Inventory (EBI). The DIT (Rest, 1979) is a widely used and objectively scored test of moral judgment in which participants are presented with a set of six stories containing a moral dilemma along with a list of statements reflecting possible considerations for deciding how to solve the moral dilemma. In one of the more widely known DIT dilemmas, the participant is asked whether or not Heinz should steal a drug needed for his wife, and one of the possible considerations provided is *whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society*. The DIT provides a score for the three developmental schemas (personal interest, maintaining norms, postconventional) outlined by Rest, et al. (2000). The DIT has been used in hundreds of studies, involving more than half a million participants. The DIT was selected for the current study in order to provide a valid and reliable measure of moral reasoning in hypothetical dilemmas.

The EBI (Schraw, Bendixen, & Dunkle, 2002) includes 28 Likert-type items designed to measure beliefs about the certainty of knowledge, simplicity of knowledge, ease of learning, innate ability, and omniscient authority. Sample items from the EBI included statements such as *people should always obey the law* and *absolute moral truth*

*does not exist*. The EBI was selected as a data source for the current study because previous research indicates that epistemological beliefs are related to moral reasoning. In their study of 154 undergraduates, Bendixen, Schraw, and Dunkle (1998) found that epistemological beliefs, as measured by the EBI, affected moral reasoning. For example, individuals who endorsed simple knowledge were less willing to consider complex solutions to moral dilemmas. Participants also completed a brief demographic information sheet.

This paper focuses, however, on the analysis and findings from the qualitative data collection. Thirty-one in-depth interviews were conducted with war resisters following the procedures for phenomenological interviewing described by Seidman (1998). All transcribed interviews were entered into a software program for qualitative data analysis (ATLAS.ti). ATLAS.ti is a software program that facilitates many of the activities involved in qualitative data analysis and interpretation, but does not automate these processes (Muhr, 2004). Within ATLAS.ti, interviews were analyzed using grounded theory procedures for open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

ATLAS.ti supports coding according to a scheme of categories (Alexa and Zuell, 2000). It offers an exploratory, yet systematic approach to qualitative analysis (Muhr, 2004). I used Rest et al.'s (1986) Four Component Model of moral behavior as a framework for analyzing the interviews. The coding scheme was derived from the Four Component Model. For example, moral sensitivity codes (Component 1) included *interpreting the situation, lines of action, and consequences*. Moral character codes (Component 4) included *draft/induction refusal, immigration process, starting a new life,*

and *obstacles*. The final coding scheme consisted of 122 codes: 29 for Component 1, 19 for Component 2, 28 for Component 3, and 46 for Component 4.

Using the four components as the major units of analysis allowed me to trace out how a particular course of action was produced in the context of a particular situation. In a previous paper, I outlined major findings related to each of the four components (Olafson, in press). This paper focuses on an in-depth analysis of the inter-relatedness of Components 2 and 4: describing the sequence of concrete actions (Component 4) related to leaving the United States (Component 2 - moral judgment). In particular, the immigration process is emphasized in order to demonstrate the variety of experiences that war resisters encountered when immigrating to Canada. To preserve anonymity, which only two participants requested, quotations are labeled by participant number, pseudonym, or actual first name.

## Results

### Moral Judgment and Moral Character

Once an individual realizes that there are a number of options related to a specific situation, he must make a moral judgment and choose which option is the best (Component 2). Obviously, the participants in the current study decided that the option of moving to Canada was “best.” This decision was not taken lightly, and usually occurred with deliberation, debate with parents and friends, and considered weighing of available options. Many of the participants could pinpoint their moment of decision: “And I just made a decision then not to go to war. You know, I was now faced with it. My student deferment was going to run out soon enough, I was going to graduate; I made a decision not to go.”

Participants saw that there was a choice to be made, and that making such a choice was part of the democratic process. The choice was clearly in the moral realm as participants spoke of struggling with trying to do the right thing. As Ross noted, "I mean the issue is really what is the right thing to do, I guess. How do you respond to the draft papers? How do you serve your country?" Serving your country involved making an informed decision: "Again, that's part of your obligation to yourself and your community. When the government says to do something, you have to think about it and say, this is morally unjust-well then, no, I'm not going to do it" (Peter).

Other justifications for doing the right thing included the belief that it was morally wrong to kill others in general, and more specifically that it was morally wrong to kill women and children. Participants viewed the Vietnam War as illegal, undeclared, and unjust. Michael said that he saw the war as an unjust war, and that "I didn't buy all the theories on the domino theory, you know, which nobody talks about anymore - the whole notion that as North Vietnam would go away the rest of the world would go." The "right" thing to do for the war resisters in the current study was to move to Canada instead of participating in the Vietnam War. As one participant summarized, "You only have one life to live, you better decide what is worth giving it for. So, from that standpoint it's a moral decision."

Moral character (Component 4) refers to the ability of the individual to execute and implement a course of action in the face of obstacles. After making a moral choice and choosing a course of action (moving to Canada), the participants were faced with the reality of putting their plans into action. For many of the participants, their first concrete

actions related to resisting the war occurred when they refused or delayed induction by overt and covert means.

Another important aspect of executing a course of action related to leaving the United States was the process of immigrating to Canada. There were various ways to immigrate to Canada, and the next section of the paper describes paths to immigration and describes individual's experiences within these pathways.

### Immigrating to Canada

Canadian policy on American war resisters shifted considerably during the course of the Vietnam War. Initially, an immigration department memo of January 1966 articulated an unwritten policy that excluded American servicemen although the existing Immigration Act did not exclude war resisters (Hagan, 2001). For many years, the "wishy-washy official Canadian attitude toward American war objectors" was reflected in policy statements (Kaskinsky, 1976, p. 65). However, by May 1969 there was a firm decision about the admissibility of American war resisters. On that date the Minister of Immigration announced Cabinet's decision that both dodgers and deserters could be admitted to Canada with regard to their military status (Hagan, 2001). This decision was widely misinterpreted as Canada "opening its borders." However, as Satin (1969) pointed out in the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*, American war resisters immigrating to Canada were not given any special status: "Canada has not 'opened its borders' to young Americans. There is no political asylum. But an American's possible military obligations are not a factor in the decision to permit him to enter and remain" (p. 5). Several immigration options were available for war resisters, and these were all outlined in detail in the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*. The majority of the

participants in the current study applied for landed immigrant status at the border or obtained visitor status. None of the participants entered with student status, another option for immigration detailed in the *Manual*, and only a handful applied for landed immigrant status from within the United States.

#### Landed Immigrant Status

Chapter Two of the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* clearly indicated that obtaining landed immigrant status was the ultimate “goal” for war resisters entering Canada. Satin (1969) noted that “Americans who want to live in Canada must apply for landed immigrant status. A landed immigrant is anyone who has been lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence” (p. 7). After the new immigration laws were passed in 1967 in order to make the immigration process more objective (Hagan, 2001), applicants applying for immigrant status needed to complete 50 out of 100 possible assessment units, or points, based on education, skills, personal qualities, and language abilities.

According to Satin (1969), “a typical draft resister would start off with at least 27 points: 12 for his high school diploma, 10 for being under 35, 5 for speaking English fluently” (p. 12). The *Manual* advised applicants to estimate their possible points:

Try to estimate how many points you would obtain. Be conservative. If you do not reach 50, or if you want to ‘play it safe’ – and we would recommend this – make sure to visit a Canadian organization helping draft resisters before you immigrate. (p. 13)

The participants in the current study were well aware of what they called the “point system” and nine of the participants were successful in their applications at the

border. No difficulties were experienced if the participant had enough points. Alan, for example, said “I had a lot points.” With sufficient points, landed immigrant status was achieved with relative ease: “I walked into the office, and it took about 45 minutes and I got landed” (Bob).

According to Kasinsky (1976), the point system, “effectively discriminated in favor of those individuals who had completed their education or who possessed ‘high-demand’ occupational skills” (p. 67). Those individuals who had not completed their education were less likely to achieve the needed number of points. This was certainly the case for three participants in the current study who were initially unsuccessful in their attempts to enter Canada because they had insufficient points. Jim arrived at the border and announced his intention to immigrate: “And, so they got some papers out and went through the whole immigration process and they said, ‘Well you don’t have enough points, you’re going to have to go.’”

Many of the participants received information about the point system through the manual or through one of the support organizations. Larry, one of the participants in the study, became a counselor for the Vancouver Committee to Aid American War Objectors once he entered Canada. He described the process by which the office counseled applicants:

And what the war objectors committee used to do is they’d tell you all the documents you needed and that you’d have to go find a job offer so you’d already have your birth certificate, school records and everything and divorce papers and it was quite complicated if you’d been married and divorced ‘cause they didn’t want any kind of liability going on so you had to have proof of all kinds of, all the

uh, you know the, that you weren't, you weren't gonna be hassled by, by uh child support.

Another participant, Michael, described how he was counseled to apply at the border at night. He was told:

The people who have the good jobs during the day are Anglophones and the people having bad jobs after midnight are Francophones and Francophones are against the draft and they're much more supportive of what you're doing. That's what you should do. So I had three things, I had my letter of offer and I had a chest X-ray that had been taken the week before. And the immigration officer kissed me on both cheeks and gave me landed immigrant status in 20 minutes.

#### Visitor Status

Almost any American could enter Canada as a visitor for six months, advised the *Manual*: however, "if the visitor's car is loaded with household effects, the officer is bound to suspect his intentions" (Satin, 1969, p. 9). Entering as a visitor was an especially attractive option if the applicant did not have enough points. One of the participants said, "We came in, we lied and said we were visitors because the Canadians who helped war resisters said it was hard 'cause we didn't have education or money so our points were inadequate." However, entering as a visitor was not reserved for those with insufficient points. Obtaining visitor status was described as a good beginning to the immigration process. Joe remembered, "As recommended, I made a visit first to talk to people in Canada about immigrating. They said, 'Come as a visitor first,' so I did that."

Five participants successfully entered Canada as visitors, and prepared documents and materials needed to apply for landed immigrant status, such as obtaining a letter of a

job offer. A job offer (“*Arranged Employment*”) counted as 10 points towards the 50 points needed. Once prepared, participants would leave Canada and then re-enter in order to apply for landed immigrant status. Larry, the counselor for the Vancouver Committee, advised applicants to “go out one border and come through another border pretending as if they were emanating from the states.” Entering the United States, however, was unsettling for some of the participants depending on their draft status. Rick explained, “Some angst was involved. It was a little nerve racking going back to the States, and then coming over again, but as I said, on that particular day I was not yet a fugitive, technically.”

#### Applying by Mail from Within the United States

The *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada* advised against applying from within the United States: “Americans who are not highly qualified or who have immediate draft problems should not attempt to apply by mail” (Satin, 1969, p. 27). Only three participants in the study applied by mail from within the United States, including Hardy:

So I applied for immigrant status and it took a few months, but I was accepted by mail. I’m a person who is kinda organized. I planned ahead, was accepted, so then I went to Canada and crossing the border it was just certain formalities to get papers stamped and stuff.

The participants that applied by mail were all successful in their attempts to become landed immigrants.

#### Support and Obstacles

Participants arrived at the Canadian border in various states of preparedness and having received different levels of support. Some received assistance from religious organizations (Quakers, Mennonites, Unitarians) or organizations in Canada (i.e. the Vancouver Committee to Aid American War Objectors, the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme), while others received no assistance at all. Some forms of support were rather less formal, such as the underground railroad.

Four participants described receiving assistance from what they called the “underground railroad.” This underground railroad was the subject of a recent documentary entitled *Safe Haven: The Underground Railroad During the Vietnam War* (Sider and Maxcy, 2002). One of the subjects of this documentary, a Quaker woman named Dorothy Stowe, recounted how she assisted in the underground railroad by transporting war resisters to a Unitarian minister in downtown Vancouver who would then find them places to stay (Sider and Maxcy, 2002). The underground railroad was further described as loosely organized with a sense of conspiring together to help. Patrick was one of the participants who received assistance from the underground railroad:

So I had this letter, I got money from the Quakers, I had money in my pocket to show them, and I had this woman who had come across the border in this van that Life magazine had done. It was like another sort of sign that maybe this was okay. It was really quite cloak and daggerish because to get the money I had to go to a certain house at a certain time, go up to the second floor, go to the bedroom, knock three times, ask for Vic, and then he would come to the building and give me an envelope. I would take the envelope and go to another corner and a car

would come by this bus stop and park 15 feet from the bus stop. I was to wait 10 minutes, it was going to be a red car and I had to go to this car and get in it.

On the other hand, not all immigrants received assistance from organizations. As Larry noted, “Hundreds of guys immigrated here not going through the committee at all. They did it on their own.” This was certainly the experience for Joe: “I had really no assistance, no support. I did it all on my own which I guess has sort of born some of my subsequent attitude because I know there were people who came and sort of had the road paved for them.” Another of the participants recalled that the only information he received was from the *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada*. Before he crossed the border, though, he described stopping to burn the book in the event that it might cause him difficulties if it were discovered in a search of his vehicle. Although many war resisters did indeed receive support and assistance from Americans and Canadians alike, it cannot be assumed that draft dodgers were guaranteed access to various forms of support on the Canadian side of the border.

Another misperception, perhaps, was that the general public in Canada welcomed war resisters with open arms. Favorable public perceptions about war resisters had increased, and by the spring of 1969 more than half of Canadians surveyed reported that they sympathized with American draft dodgers (Hagan, 2001). But sympathy may not have translated into active assistance for war resisters, and this is what was experienced by two participants, a married couple who immigrated to Canada in 1967:

And, I don't feel that there's also the Canadian who's you know very welcoming and I don't think that was very characteristic. I think most Canadians didn't have any awareness of what was going on which is understandable. But, I don't think

Canadians are as tolerant and as welcoming as they like to see themselves. The only help we really got was from other Americans.

#### Conclusion

*We were never given special treatment. (Larry)*

None of the participants expressed regrets about moving to Canada and most were grateful about the opportunities afforded them. They were not accepted into Canada as political fugitives, but were admitted under the normal procedures of the Canadian Immigration Act (Kasinsky, 1976). Participants, therefore, did not view themselves as refugees; they were able to meet immigration requirements owing to their status as white, middle-class, educated young men. And similar to the participants in Kasinsky's study, they successfully assimilated into Canadian social and economic life and contributed to their communities in countless ways. In his foreword to *Hell No We Won't Go* (Haig-Brown, 1996), Pierre Berton described how Canada benefited from these particular immigrants:

During the Vietnam War we also benefited from actors, poets, educators, writers, social workers, musicians, publishers, and urban planners. Most of all we got people who had social consciences that they refused to betray. Canada is immeasurably in their debt. (p. x)

Canada certainly benefited economically and socially from the participants in the current study. Among the participants, twelve received graduate or professional degrees after moving to Canada, and as Kasinsky (1976) found, many opted for careers in more creative or person-oriented jobs. Eleven participants in the study worked in social science occupations such as mental health worker, teacher, child-care worker, social worker, and

counselor. Creative occupations included professional musicians (2), artists (3), and writers (2). Seven participants were small business owners, and two became politicians at the local and provincial level.

The current study also found that the majority of participants continued to have “social consciences” some 40 years after moving to Canada. When asked to describe their level of current social activism, 81% reported *some to extensive* involvement. The kinds of activism reported in the interviews included advocating for homeless persons, supporting deserters from the Iraq war, and continued involvement as peace activists.

The participants in the study have undoubtedly enriched the social fabric of Canada. They successfully assimilated into Canadian society, and as a testament to their new identity as Canadians, they remained in Canada even when they were permitted to return to the United States. Did they view Canada, though, as a refuge from militarism? The next section of the paper addresses this question.

#### Canada a Refuge from Militarism

The idea of Canada as a refuge from militarism perhaps stems from an often-cited quotation by Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau. The following quote, attributed to Trudeau, appears in books, articles, and websites: "Those who make the conscientious judgment that they must not participate in this war... have my complete sympathy, and indeed our political approach has been to give them access to Canada. Canada should be a refuge from militarism" (Hagan, 2001, p. v). Hagan identified this quote as a comment made by Trudeau when he spoke to Mennonite and United Church leaders in 1970 and 1971.

However, recent research has demonstrated difficulties with verifying the source of Trudeau's comment (Jones, in press; Squires, 2007). According to Jones (in press, p. 2):

Hagan's source appears to be a sensationalized and distorted front-page headline story from the *Toronto Daily Star* of March 21, 1970: "PM sees Canada as youth haven from militarism." The opening reads: "Canada should be a refuge from militarism," Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau said here [Winnipeg] yesterday. He said he welcomed U.S. draft dodgers to Canada because many had a "religious motivation...to do with love and brotherhood."

Jones located archival material consisting of a Mennonite brief followed by a "Transcript of Mennonite Brief Presentation to the Prime Minister, Winnipeg, March 20, 1970." From the transcript of Trudeau's response to the Mennonite brief, Jones found that Trudeau indeed uttered the phrase, "We do hope that Canada will be a refuge from militarism" (p. 3). Additional research by Jones did not uncover any additional evidence of Trudeau's belief that Canada "should" be a refuge from militarism. Rather, Jones provides evidence that "demonstrates that war resisters at the time did not regard Pierre Trudeau as especially helpful or as a particular friend" (p. 7).

This would seem to be true for the participants in the current study. Only one participant mentioned Trudeau by name, saying that he was thankful for "Pierre Trudeau and Canada and Tom Douglas and the people who at the time said this country was willing to have us and there weren't very many alternatives." And only one participant described Canada as a place of refuge, saying that "I understood that Canada had given

me refuge” (Bob). Another participant said “that’s a big fallacy” when asked for his thoughts on the idea of Canada as a refuge from militarism.

Another participant in the study recalled seeing a newspaper article while he was in basic training in the United States:

So I went to the UFO against all orders and it was wonderful, the music and the long hair and disrespect for authority and all that, and there on the bulletin board was a newspaper clipping that says, ‘Canada’s prime minister sees Canada as a haven from militarism.’ And I was looking around, you know, is anybody watching me, and I read the article and it said that Canada would accept deserters and draft dodgers into the country.

Reading this article had a profound impact on his subsequent decision to desert and move to Canada. Even if Trudeau was misquoted, the resulting misinterpretation had an enormous impact. Whether or not the now-famous quote by Trudeau was actually made by him is almost immaterial, as the perception of Canada as a refuge from militarism continues to grow.

The *idea* of Canada as a refuge from militarism, then and now, seems to be firmly embedded in the collective conscience of many people, although there is very little historical fact to support the *reality* of Canada as a refuge from militarism. The experiences of the war resisters in the current study demonstrated that in reality, they were rarely considered, by themselves or the Canadian government, as “refugees.”

## References

- Alexa, M., & Zuell, C. (2000). Text analysis software: Commonalities, differences and limitations: The results of a review. *Quality and Quantity*, 34, 299 – 321.
- Bendixen, L., Schraw, G., & Dunkle, M. (1998). Epistemic beliefs and moral reasoning. *The Journal of Psychology*, 132(2), 187 – 200.
- Blasi, A. (2004). Moral functioning: Moral understanding and personality. In D. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hagan, J. (2001). *Northern passage: American Vietnam War resisters in Canada*. Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Haig-Brown, A. (1996). *Hell no we won't go: Vietnam draft resisters in Canada*. Vancouver, BC: Rainforest Books, 222 pp.
- Hay, J. (1983). A study of principled moral reasoning within a sample of conscientious objectors. *Moral educational forum*, 7, 1 – 8.
- Hurka, T. (2005). Proportionality in the morality of war. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 33(1), 34 – 66.
- Johnson, R., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14 – 26.

- Jones, J. (in press). *Happenstance and misquotation: Canadian immigration policy 1966-1974, the arrival of U.S. Vietnam War resisters, and the views of Pierre Trudeau*.
- Kasinsky, R.G. (1976). *Refugees from militarism: Draft-age Americans in Canada*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 299 p.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Linn, R. (1986). Conscientious objection in Israel during the war in Lebanon. *Armed Forces and Society*, 12(4), 489 – 511.
- Linn, R. (1996). Linn, R. (1996). When the individual soldier says “no” to war: A look at selective refusal during the intifada. *Journal of Peace Research*, 33(4), 421 – 431.
- Linn, R. (1998). Assuming a position: Women and men as moral critics in their own war zone. *Journal of Adult Development*, 5(1), 45 – 57.
- Muhr, T. (2004). *ATLAS.ti v5.0 User’s guide and reference, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Berlin: Scientific Software Development. 417 p.
- Olafson, L. (in press). No regrets: Moral reasoning and Vietnam era war resisters. *Proceedings of the Our Way Home Peace Event and Reunion*. Ottawa: NRC Press.
- Presley, S. (1985). Moral judgment and attitudes toward authority of political resisters. *Journal of research in personality*, 19, 135 – 151.
- Rest, J. (1979). *Development in judging moral issues*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Rest, J., Bebeau, M. & Volker, J. (1986). An overview of the psychology of morality. In J. Rest (Ed.), *Moral development: Advances in research and theory* (pp. 1 – 39). New York: Praeger.
- Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Thoma, S & Bebeau, M. (2000). A Neo-Kohlbergian Approach to Morality Research. *Journal of Moral Education*, 29(4), 381 – 395.
- Roblyer, D.C. (2005). Beyond precision: Morality, decision making, and collateral casualties. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 11(1), 17 – 39.
- Satin, M. (Ed.). (1969). *Manual for draft-age immigrants to Canada (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. Toronto: NTO Press.
- Schraw, G., Bendixen, L. D., & Dunkle, M. E. (2002). Development and validation of the Epistemological Belief Inventory (EBI). In B. K. Hofer & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing* (pp. 261-275). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sider, M. & Maxcy, S. (2002). *Safe Haven: The Underground Railroad During the Vietnam War*.
- Sotiron, M. (in press). Skedaddlers, shirkers and resisters: Draft dodging since the French revolution (A Work in Progress). *Proceedings of the Our Way Home Peace Event and Reunion*. Ottawa: NRC Press.

Squires, J. (2007, July). *The Canadian anti-draft movement and the State*. Paper presented at the Our Way Home Peace Event and Reunion, Castlegar, BC.