



GENERAL Hershey may rank third only to Horace Greeley and Moses as an initiator of mass migration. Not since the war of 1812 have so many citizens flocked to Canada for indefinite stays. Disillusioned with the Great Society, 17,514 people emigrated to Canada from the U.S. in 1966, an increase of 16 per cent over the previous year. Included in this number are between 2500 and 3000 young men usually referred to as "draft dodgers," and the war in Vietnam has had something to do with the departure of many of the others. Unlike the emigres of 1812, most of today's won't be coming back.

Although few really resent the appellation "draft dodger," the migrants feel that it's more applicable to those still in the States scrambling for deferments. George S. in Toronto, for instance, still has his deferment, but he "got tired of playing their game. Getting the deferment was a cinch—I failed the written tests. Being black they expected me to be dumb—why disappoint them?" George has a bachelor's degree in journalism.

Frank R. in Montreal says, "We're not draft dodgers, for the simple reason that we no longer dodge. We live and work openly, use our real names, and when we're asked we admit why we came to Canada. We are legal residents."

Of more than 160 young Americans I interviewed in Canada, few had been involved in radical politics in this country; the move was the first real political act in most of their lives. They are not setting up a "little America," and—to the disappointment of anti-war groups in the U.S.—they have no plans for banding together as revolutionaries in exile. They do not join radical or anti-war groups in Canada. Dan H. presented a common view: "We're guests here, and until we become citizens, we don't have the right. The U.S. government and businessmen do enough political interfering without our adding to it."

The young men continue to communicate with their families, the original bitterness and recriminations largely forgotten. The biggest family problem is harassment of parents by local and federal police, who use veiled threats and lies, evidently hoping to scare the parents enough to put emotional pressure on their sons to return home—and be arrested. Some parents go to visit; a few have sold the family home and business and moved to Canada to be with their sons.

One son, asked about his family, laughed. "If I hadn't done something like this, I might have been disowned. My father spent most of the war years hiding in Germany so he wouldn't be drafted by the Nazis." Another commented, "It's a family tradition. Years ago my grandfather fled Russia for the same reasons." On the other hand, one retired Air Force colonel wrote that he was abandoning his son to "stew in your own mess of self pity."

Married or single, working or still looking, only a half dozen new Canadians indicated homesickness. In spite of difficulties, they say they like it in Canada, and express no desire to return to the States. "Having visiting rights might be nice," one said, "but I wouldn't go back, even if there were no penalties." Another said, "I don't feel any stranger moving to Toronto than if I had moved to Kansas City—only freer."

A significant percentage of college dropouts will return to school in Canada. The renewed enthusiasm toward education is the more interesting, because Canadian schools have many of the same problems that students find so objectionable in America—and a few that have been overcome in the States. But for the first time, the expatriates say, they don't have to doubt their own motives for being in school, nor feel apologetic toward the I-As who couldn't afford college. They feel free to question, challenge and investigate without worrying about marks.

The young men express amazement at their reception by the Canadian people. The man on the street seems to be unconcerned or outright sympathetic; criticism is seldom heard; often the "draft dodger" is congratulated. Although job hunting presents difficulties if you are young, American and without experience, it is rare that U.S. draft status is prejudicial except in American com-

panies or their Canadian subsidiaries (of which there is no shortage). Around Yorkville, the neo-coffee house section of Toronto, young Canadians pretend to be American draft dodgers to gain status with the girls.

The Canadian government's position is an awkward one. The deputy minister of citizenship and immigration told me that "there is no basis in Canadian law for denying entry to someone solely because he may be seeking to avoid compulsory military service in his homeland." This means that an American cannot be extradited because he has refused to answer an induction notice, even after a bench warrant for his arrest has been issued.

Few doubt the existence of U.S. government pressure to slow the flow of traffic. In addition to American corporate capital investments in Canada, a large portion of the Canadian economy is dependent upon the sale of raw materials and war materials to the United States. This is no small lever.

But to yield to pressure, implied or otherwise, could only swell the ranks of Canadians resentful of U.S. interference in Canadian affairs (U.S. firms own or control more than 45 per cent of Canadian manufacturing, 50 per cent of the mining and smelting and 66 per cent of the petroleum and natural gas). Canada is an underpopulated country, and encourages immigrants from such diverse areas as Poland, Yugoslavia and Japan. And Canadian business is crying out for college graduates who speak English and/or French.

Recent immigrants report that, apparently, state police on the American side have been stopping cars driven toward the border by young people. Whatever the pretext the police use for stopping them, the men are asked for their draft cards. An American Berlin Wall?

[A STRANGE DEBATE]

CANADIAN CITIZENS may not castigate the draft objectors (a name they feel to be applicable), but there is no lack of static from their ex-countrymen. Some of it is predictable: super-patriots from General Hershey to the American Legion are quick to heap acrimony on the emigrants. The draft and military thinking have been with us long enough now so that many see the draft's opponents as unmanly, unpatriotic and communistic; in short, against the Great American Tradition.

It may not surprise the John Birch Society that Adlai Stevenson called for abolition of the draft, but so have such stalwarts as Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan. As for tradition, George Washington chewed his tri-cornered hat in frustration over the lack of recruits and the refusal of the Continental Congress to issue draft edicts. In the Civil War, \$300 could legally purchase a

draft deferment—a law which led to some nifty riots. New York and other states rejected the draft, and New York City never did get around to drafting anybody. Enrollment officers calling at the homes of draftees became lousy insurance risks. Many were shot on the doorstep; the good citizens of the time figured it was justifiable homicide.

During the short draft period in World War I, 5500 objectors were jailed and fined. The first draft act of World War II passed by a single vote. The first peacetime draft bill, presented in 1947, was defeated.

But criticism of the emigrants also comes from another quarter: the New Left anti-war groups. Those who leave for Canada are widely accused of taking the easy way out.

Benson Brown of Vancouver, B.C.—one of a group of Canadians who organized to help draft objector immigrants and who maintain Post Office Box 4231 in Vancouver for that purpose—commented, "When a man comes up here, he gives up his family, friends and familiar surroundings, with the knowledge he may never be able to return. In exchange, he faces an unpredictable future in strange surroundings, and of much longer duration than two years in service. Seasonal work and unionization make employment difficult for most, and the jobs for which they are qualified will pay less than comparable employment in the U.S. Without money there is no school." Brown snorts at the "easy way out" argument.

Will E., 25, majored in biology and was a pre-med student, but felt guilty in school. He joined the Peace Corps but was reclassified I-A just before he was to leave for India. He now supports himself and his wife as a construction laborer at \$1.50 per hour.

The rest of the argument between the protest and the migrants goes like this:

"They should stay and protest and fight the system—try to change things."

"Who are they kidding? To fight you must have a program—they don't. They're so busy protesting they don't have time to think one up."

"If 20,000 protested, it would have an effect."

"If 20,000 rejected jail as a price for staying in the United States, and came to Canada, that also would have an effect. If the protestors get enough publicity, our government might change—from Democratic to Republican. The American people are martyr-proof."

The migrants have been accused of selfishness and an individualism that precludes their being able to relate to a community larger than self. Past lack of participation, insistence that "the government should exist for the people and not the other way around," and other characteristics might prove the critics right. But if the charges are correct, many of the expatriates are acting very strangely for selfish, irresponsible people.

Many are talking of co-op farming. Richard Paterak heads up an office at 658 Spadina Street in Toronto intended to aid newcomers and to distribute information to potential immigrants from America; Jon Callender has an office reachable at Box 231, Westmount Station, in Montreal which serves the same purpose. Callender and other objectors are raising money to establish the Three Stories Art Center, which, with other community projects, will provide money, jobs and training so that objectors will not become a burden on their Canadian hosts.

Whatever else the migrants are or are called (only a few claim to be pacifists), they are individualists—mobile and free. Similar persons opened up the American West; General Hershey may provide the motivation for opening up the Canadian North.

[A DRAFT DODGER? WHO? ME?]

NO OTHER INSTITUTION outside marriage has influenced our society the way the draft has. Were it to end today, its effects would be with us for at least two generations. In addition to forcing some to “turn on and drop out,” it has perverted the purpose and the intellectual freedom of schools, and made military definitions of reality acceptable to society. Through the draft, the military has gained a subtle kind of control over the country, something it could never have achieved otherwise.

The thrust of the draft is more important than the number of men it actually sucks in each year. During the last fiscal year, 500,000 volunteered for service, 157,000 more than were drafted. Most of the volunteers signed up to avoid being drafted. Others, to avoid combat status, respond to the Army’s “Choice not Chance” recruiting program or join the ROTC while in school. Students on 247 campuses submit to wearing Army uniforms, allowing schools to become military training camps.

To provide continual updating of the war machine, those working in “occupations essential to the national security” are granted II-A deferments. General Hershey boasts that “the policy of deferring students as far as possible had much to do with influencing many of them to enter school, to pursue studies diligently and to practice the skills they acquired.” He cites the fact that the number of engineers has almost doubled in ten years, and similar figures in other fields of study, as having been accomplished “by providing students an additional inducement of prospective deferment.”

Strange words for a man that vilifies draft dodgers. Hershey also cutely suggests another way to beat the draft: “Join the Navy, the Marines, the Air Force, the Coast Guard.” You can also pull a “Pat Nugent”: spend six months on active duty and then attend weekly reserve

meetings. And of course there are your local police, the FBI and the CIA (FBI agents sometimes jokingly call each other “draft dodger,” a fact not without its touch of irony).

The draft threat prevents students from dropping out of school for a semester to relate assembly line education with the “real world,” and those who must work their way through school are snapped up as I-A the minute they are forced to drop out to earn money.

Last year, 300,000 gained deferments by subjecting themselves to the insulting questions of local draft board psychiatrists: “Have you ever felt like killing or doing violence to someone?” “What would you do if someone broke into your home and raped your pregnant wife (mother) (sister) causing the death of the baby?” The first question, incidentally, is a trap.

Other young men study and practice various psychoses and present themselves to the examiners complete with “nut papers.” Pressure is put on family doctors to write letters testifying to chronic ailments. Others unabashedly claim homosexuality (and act out the role at physical time; those that can’t bring themselves to masturbate in public are advised to wear lace panties and kiss the Army psychiatrist).

Artificially inducing high or low blood pressure, or smoking ink-impregnated cigarettes (to show lung spotting) are widespread measures. Getting on the attorney general’s list, showing up for induction while on LSD or taking a felony rap are other gambits. A few have deliberately contracted a venereal disease. The scenes at Induction Examination Centers are beginning to approach the Greatest Show on Earth.

[WHO NEEDS IT?]

CONCEDING FOR THE MOMENT that a large standing army is desirable or necessary, why not have an all-volunteer professional military?

The military says that it is impossible to find enough volunteers to keep 3.2 million men in uniform. But we don’t need 3.2 million, even aside from the fact that a smaller armed force might tempt us to substitute diplomacy for destruction.

The draft feeds and makes possible the top-heavy military bureaucracy. Two years after the 1948 Draft Act was passed, the Defense Department, inflated to five million persons, could put only 200,000 troops into the field in Korea; the reserves and the National Guard had to be called.

Lobbying, political indoctrination and propaganda programs could be cut out of the military, as could their public information services. The abolition of Selective Service, in addition to reducing the number of personnel needed, would save money: its budget has reached as high

as \$65 million. Many jobs in the military can be handled more efficiently by civilians—the Seabees have proved this point. The Defense Department admits that 75,000 men in uniform could be replaced by civilians; if they admit to that many, the figure can probably be multiplied by four or five.

We could also stop the expensive habit of allowing the military to subsidize pro-military war-is-hell-but-fun commercial movies. And a professional army would eliminate the cost of outfitting 600,000 new soldiers every year and permit the reassignment of the personnel who now train them. All of this would reduce not only the number of personnel needed, but—by many millions—the amount of money spent, so that wages could come up to the levels necessary to attract volunteers.

John R. Blanchford, chief counsel of the House Committee on the Armed Services, defends the draft on the basis that it insures a constant civilian influence on the military. But those at the top are professional. The idea of drafted individuals influencing the entrenched, highly organized military leaders to any degree makes no sense. On the contrary, the influence flows the other way.

The military isn't going to give up the draft, nor its deferment system, without a fight. There are those in the military with a professional's contempt for civilians who would prefer an all-professional corps, but cooler heads prevail. The draft supports the bureaucracy, and enables the Pentagon to perpetuate the illusion of a democratic army while in fact maintaining a professional one.

[THE GREAT NON-DEBATE]

WITH THE COMING OF SPRING, Americans have become accustomed to performing certain rites that would be noticed only in their omission. Dad gets out his fishing tackle and checks the boat trailer. Mom cleans out the closets. Swimming pools are put back into shape and storm windows replaced by screens. Police check their riot equipment as warmer weather forces ghetto residents into the streets. Students start cramming for finals. Grown men in anachronistic plus-fours beat balls around a square called a diamond.

But over the past 20 years, we have developed a new national spectator sport for spring. It is played in Congress by a relative handful of old men, while over 32 million young men anxiously, and helplessly, watch and await the outcome. The game is called Debate on the Draft, and the young men are those registered for what is called, with stunning rightness, Selective Service. The most avid spectators are the ten million between the ages of 18 and 26, joined by the 1.8 million that will turn 18 this year.

A few of the players will advocate abolition of the draft,

a few will call for a lottery system, and one or two will suggest service for *all* young people once they leave school. They won't be taken too seriously. This is not 1947, when the system was debated and defeated; by now it has been with us so long nobody seriously questions the need for its continuance.

Since it could not be implemented until 1969, the President's new lottery proposal is in fact a means to guarantee a two-year extension of the present system. Significantly, his proposal *calls* for extension of the present law, any changes to be made by executive order.

The debate will center on two studies: a twice-revised Pentagon study, and one by a panel appointed by L. Mendel Rivers' House Armed Services Committee (three of the civilians on the panel were former West Point football coach Earl Blaik; Vice Admiral Maurice Sheehy, Ret.; and Gen. Mark Clark, Ret.). Both studies call for modification of the present system, but essentially both endorse it. One argument, by the way, is that the deferment system allows the military to weed out disturbing elements before they get into the service.

The two most significant likely changes are a draft of men between the ages of 18 and 20 and of those previously rejected for lack of education (they'll be educated in the service). The first has the advantage of hitting non-voters, and the second of being able to enlarge the manpower pool without stepping on the toes of middle-class suburbia. In both cases the Army gets those least able to evaluate, and protect themselves from, militaristic indoctrination.

The Army is well aware of the advantages of in-service education. The \$50,000 cost for each 2nd Lieutenant graduating from West Point is considered a bargain. Some of the products of the Class of '66 illustrate why:

Cadet Lieutenant Philip D. Riley of Dedham, Mass., saw the Vietnam war as providing career Army officers "with a chance to keep up with the changing methods of warfare. . . . As an Army officer trained to fight, I feel we need this conflict in order to learn what we may face later" (San Francisco Chronicle, June 8, 1966).

And so most of the non-draftable debaters will content themselves with the argument over irrelevant modifications, and probably all will piously proclaim, in the best liberal tradition, their "regret that world conditions make the continuance a necessity in order to enable us to bring peace and security to the world."

For the young men of our country, the military monkey will still be on their backs. For them, the great debate will be like watching a TV instant replay: the outcome is known but everybody gets another chance to see how it's done.

And a few more of them will leave for Canada.

America The Raped

[I: WHO NEEDS A SWAMP?]

FIFTY years ago, more or less, Americans rose up in anger against the rape of their country.

The fight of a few dozen men, led by giants—Roosevelt, Pinchot, Muir, Powell—was against the uncaring lumbermen who despoiled hill and valley and left eroding soil and sick rivers in their wake; against the unthinking farmers and stockmen who replaced precious and fertile grasslands with thorn scrubs and dust bowls; against the stupid hunters who wiped out a hundred species and endangered a hundred more.

Left when the battle had ended were the national and state parks and forests, a mushy purr-word —“conservation”—and a vague conviction that except for a few renegade lumber companies and mining firms, the rapine had ended. In fact, it has hardly begun.

by Gene Marine