Speaking Up, On the Streets, and Over Here – Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam

Toby Lanyon Jones

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds
School of History

January 2021

For my father and late mother; and my boys, Rufus and Arthur

Acknowledgements

In the research and writing of this thesis I have accrued a debt of gratitude to many people across the world. First and foremost, I am enormously grateful to my family for supporting me throughout the process. It wasn't always easy to have Daddy swan off on research trips, but your support, love, and understanding have made it possible – thank you Nesta and dear boys. My wider family too – my father and Sam in particular – have provided immense support and encouragement. I will always be thankful for your humour, intelligence and love.

My dear friends, Nath, Emma, and Rachael: the support you've provided through proof reading and formatting has been immensely helpful. Your friendship, love, support and generous helpings of Scotch have kept me buoyant and sane over the years.

Thank you to all my interviewees – particularly Henry and Shelli Wortis, David Slaney, Jean Kilbourne, and Tom Culver. I have loved meeting you all, hearing your testimony, sharing conversations on culture, politics and history, and enjoying the hospitality you provided.

Many thanks to all the archivists in Britain, the USA and the Netherlands who have assisted me in my research. Thank you also to those at Leeds and the British Association of American Studies who have provided financial support.

Finally, thank you to my supervisor, Simon Hall. Your patience, understanding, dry humour, constructive criticism and brutal honesty have all been most welcome.

Abstract

This thesis explores the anti-Vietnam War activism of US citizens and serving members of the US military who lived in Britain from 1965 to 1975, and provides an analysis of the groups they formed during the period. It establishes the extent to which these British-based, US opponents of the war were connected to, and shaped by, Britain's own protest culture, as well as exploring their links with activists in North America and Europe. In doing so, it reveals the rich transfer of protest traditions between the US and Britain, and the influence Britons had on the burgeoning feminist and union movements in the US. It also reveals and bonds of friendship and collaboration formed with official representatives from both the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. The thesis further shows the concerns of the British and American authorities on the protest activities of their citizens, and the extensive use of surveillance deployed by the respective governments. Finally, it extends our understanding of the British anti-Vietnam War movement as a whole, revealing it to be longer lasting and more nuanced than current historiography allows.

While recent scholarship has begun to turn its attention to expatriate protest of Americans during the period, minimal attention has been given to Americans in Britain, and no study has analysed the important role serving members of the US military played.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

AAFM – Americans Abroad for McCarthy

ADC – American Deserters Committee

ACE – American Coalition in Europe for Peace, Freedom, Justice and Democracy

ASU – American Servicemen's Union

ARVN – Army of the Republic of Vietnam

ACLU – American Civil Liberties Union

VSC – Vietnam Solidarity Campaign

BCPV – British Council for Peace in Vietnam – later British Campaign for Peace in Vietnam

BVA – British Vietnam Association

BVC – British Vietnam Committee

RVN – Republic of Vietnam

CND – Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

CAA – Concerned Americans Abroad

CIA – Central Intelligence Agency

CWTC – Citywide Tenants Council

DRV – Democratic Republic of Vietnam

DNC – Democratic National Convention

NLF – National Liberation Front

ICDP – International Confederation of Disarmament and Peace

NCCL – National Council of Civil Liberties

PRG – Provisional Revolutionary Government

LSE – London School of Economics

IS – International Socialists

SDS – Students for a Democratic Society

SDS – Special Demonstrations Squad

IAYC – Inter-Agency Youth Committee

UAEB – Union of American Exiles in Britain

PEACE – People Emerging Against Corrupt Establishments

BPP – Black Panther Party

WRI – War Resisters International

ACAWV – Americans in Cambridge Against the War in Vietnam

NLR – New Left Review

USAF – United States Air Force

UCMJ – Uniform Code of Military Justice

OSI – Office of Special Investigations

PLP – Parliamentary Labour Party

TUC – Trade Union Conference

VVAW – Vietnam Veterans Against the War

BCAAWR – British Committee to Aid American War Refugees

CO – Commanding Officer

NPC – National Peace Council

MACV – Medical Aid Committee for Vietnam

ISC – Indochina Solidarity Conference

VMC – Vietnam Moratorium Committee

NCUUA – National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty

RITA – Resistance in the Army

SSOC – Southern Student Organizing Committee

SNCC – Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee

Introduction

It was only a matter of time before the British anti-Vietnam War movement turned violent. Having built steadily through the early 1960s, activists were beginning to lose patience with peaceful protest by 1967.[1] On 22 October 1967, as the war approached its zenith, an estimated 10,000 people descended on London for a march organised by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign (VSC). The numbers were double that of a demonstration held the previous June by the British Council for Peace in Vietnam (BCPV) and the mood was decidedly more tense.[2] The BBC evening news reported the protest to have begun 'reasonably quietly' in Trafalgar Square, before the marchers made their way toward the American embassy in Grosvenor Square to be met by a large police presence.[3] The increasingly rowdy crowd tried to break through a police cordon before being beaten back. A 'battle' then broke out and 'fierce fighting' ensued as protesters set off firecrackers, threw clods of mud at the police and broke up placards which were also thrown into the mêlée. In the midst of the fighting, a green minivan designed to look like a tank, replete with turret, canon and plywood tank tracks, manoeuvred towards the police lines. Behind the wheel was an American named Jack Warshaw, who watched as the police 'flew into a rage', then wrenched open one of the doors to haul him out. In the confusion, Warshaw fought his way free and ran into a side street, his friends close behind still carrying the banner hastily

---

[1] The scholar Sylvia Ellis states the beginning of the movement began 'as early as 1953 when a communist sympathizer, Commander Edgar Young, formed the British-Vietnam Committee (BVC) and began publishing the *Vietnam Bulletin*'. See, Ellis, Sylvia, 'Anti-Vietnam War Movement, Britain', [online]: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/9781405198073.wbierp0100?saml_referrer> [accessed 10 October 2020].

[2] The group later changed their name to the British Campaign for Peace in Vietnam.

[3] Report: 'London/Vietnam Rally', BBC TV news, 8.40pm and 10.30pm, 22 October, 1967, in microfilm role October 1967, BBC Written Archives, Reading. The demonstration was one of many held throughout the world to coincide with the American Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam organised 'March on the Pentagon' – although the VSC protest was held the following day. Other notable demonstrations were held in Paris, where 30,000 people took part, and Berlin where numbers were estimated to be about 10,000.

constructed that morning.[4] The banner read: 'STOP IT COMMITTEE Americans in Britain for U.S Withdrawal From Vietnam'.

Earlier that day, Warshaw and other members of the recently formed American Stop-it Committee had put the finishing touches to their 'tank' at their group headquarters in Rosslyn Hill, Hampstead. Warshaw's minivan, with its fabric sunroof, was ideal for the purpose. With the theatrical flair which was to become their hallmark, Stop-it members aimed to draw attention to their 'centre piece' and have it work as a focus for 'ourselves…and focus the whole procession as it moved forward'. Years later, Warshaw remembered the effect it had on both the protesters and the police; how it drew a crowd of chanting men and women as they gradually made their way to Grosvenor Square, and how it became the main target of the police 'At the height of the demonstration, at the height of the shouting, at the height of the pressure'.[5]

This was the largest and most violent demonstration against the war in Vietnam to be held in Britain up to that point, and it augured the rapid intensification of the anti-war movement. Although widely remembered as a movement of British citizens, American citizens were at the centre of this story. Many subsequent actions, both large and small, organised by British activists, would be well attended by Americans living, visiting, working and studying in the country. Throughout the war, they helped invigorate the British anti-war landscape with eye-catching, innovative forms of protest which had originally found voice on college campuses and streets of the US. They also played a pivotal role in drawing attention to Britain's complicity in the war, and, through collaboration with Britons, attempted to force a change in the law to enable military deserters to remain in the country. Through their actions the Americans in Britain helped extend the movement beyond what is currently

[4] Oral history Interview with Jack Warshaw, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Hedley, Hampshire, 18 July 2018.
[5] Oral history interview, Jack Warshaw.

documented. The British movement's foremost scholar, Sylvia Ellis, writes of the movement's 'apogee' coming on October 27, 1968 when the largest of the anti-war demonstrations took place, but neglects anti-war activities beyond this point.[6] Meanwhile, a further scholar on the subject, Nick Thomas, calls the British campaign against the war as 'all but dead' by 1969.[7] Further works which analyse Britain's anti-war movement overwhelmingly focus on the events of 1968, leaving the distinct impression that no such movement existed once the banners and placards from the 1968 demonstrations had met with the skip.[8] By providing an analysis of the Americans' interactions and cooperation with those in the British movement between 1965 and 1973, this thesis demonstrates that contrary to the conclusions of current historiography the anti-Vietnam War movement in Britain was vibrant, if small-scale, well into the early 1970s.

During the war, Sylvia Ellis tells us the British movement 'remained tangential to its domestic focus' – that is it was committed to the disassociation of the British government – and therefore its activists can be classified in Holger Nehring's terms as 'national internationalists'.[9] Although disassociation was a central aim of the British movement, through forming groups in their own right, Americans in Britain helped broaden the movements' goals beyond this domestic focus. They sought and received the assistance of a

---

[6] See Ellis, Sylvia, 'Anti-Vietnam War movement, Britain', in *The International encyclopaedia of revolution and protest: 1500 to the present*, ed. Immanuel Ness (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), pp. 218/19; see also Ellis's further work on the area: 'British Opposition to the Vietnam War, 1964 – 68', in *The Insular Dream: Obsesion and Resistance* (Vu University Press, 1995), pp. 166 – 182; and 'A Demonstration of British Good Sense?', British Student Protest During the Vietnam War', in *Student Protest – The Sixties and After*, ed. DeGroot, Gerard J. (Longman, 1998), pp. 54 - 69

[7] Thomas, Nick, 'Protests Against the Vietnam War in 1960s Britain: The Relationship between Protesters and the Press', *Contemporary British History*, 22:3, p. 350

[8] The demonstrations of Britain's 1968 are analysed in: Ali, Tariq: *Street Fighting Years: An Autobiography of the Sixties* (Verso, 2005); Caute, David: *Sixty-Eight: The Year of the Barricades* (Hamish Hamilton, 1988); Edmonds, A. O.: The Viet Nam War and the British Student Left: A Study in Political Symbolism, *Viet Nam Generation* 5, 1 – 4 (March); Fraser, R.: *1968: A Student Generation in Revolt* (Chatto and Windus, 1988); and Widgery, David: *The Left in Britain, 1956 – 1968* (Penguin, 1976)

[9] Ellis, Sylvia, 'Promoting Solidarity at Home and Abroad', p. 571.

kaleidoscopic array of British state and non-state actors in assisting American draft resisters and military deserters; they brought the global GI Movement into the heart of the capital, and in doing so spread awareness of a movement which eventually crippled the American military; and they forged connections with anti-war organisations and individuals on the continent, in Vietnam, the US and Canada. Bringing the actions of these Americans and the groups they formed to the fore extends our understanding of the British movement's transnational dimensions, while adding depth and nuance to the picture.

The thesis also explores how and why these Americans chose Britain as home during this period, their motivations to protest the actions of their government, and the response their activism generated both sides of the Atlantic. Wary of the civil unrest in the US, and fearful this would be transferred to British streets and college campuses, the British authorities had many of the Americans under surveillance throughout their time in the country. Meanwhile, the American authorities were greatly concerned that Americans would return to the US corrupted by socialist influences and return as a fifth column. This thesis reveals that these concerns were not without good foundation. Both Britons and Americans would be significantly influenced by one another, sharing ideas, beliefs, strategy and modes of protest. Although current literature accounts for an American New Left influence on British protest during the war, little mention is made of forces in the other direction. During their time in Britain, the Americans socialised with many individuals from the British Left, particularly those in the International Socialists (IS), and their later activism was marked by these relationships. The grassroots working-class based organising they encountered within the British Left instilled a commitment to working-class agency in some of the Americans, which was later implemented in the anti-war, union and feminist movements back in the US.

The British anti-Vietnam War Movement

At the 1954 Geneva Conference – organised to discuss the possibility of restoring peace in Indochina following the first Indochina war – the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union occupied the role of co-chairmen. During the conference it was decided to separate Vietnam temporarily into two zones, a northern zone to be governed by the Viet Minh – the national independence movement led by Ho Chi Minh which had recently defeated the French army – and a southern zone governed by the State of Vietnam, headed by former emperor Bao Dai. A final declaration was issued by the British chairman of the conference stating that free elections would be held by July 1956 to create a unified Vietnam, and which also called for members of the conference to 'respect the sovereignty' of Vietnam and 'refrain from any interference in their internal affairs'.[10] Not wishing to be legally bound by the document, the United States and South Vietnam refused to sign it. As the proposed date for the elections came and went with no attempt to hold them, hostilities increased between the newly formed North and South Vietnam. Meanwhile, the Americans gradually began building their forces up in the south. Starting with the deployment of military 'advisors' in the late 1950s and early 1960s, by 1965 the US government was sending marines and other branches of the military in the hope they could shore up the Republic of Vietnam (RVN) against the rising tide of communism threatening from the north, and to quell the insurgency in the south. The war, known in the West as the Vietnam War but to the Vietnamese as the 'American War' ended in 1975; the Americans taking their final ignominious exit from the roof of the US embassy in Saigon. Behind them lay a decade of destruction. Over 58,000

[10] The final declaration of the Geneva Accords, 1954 [online]: <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/1954-geneva-indochina.asp> [accessed 8 October 2020].

American lives were lost, while numbers of Vietnamese killed are believed to be between one and two million, in a war which ultimately failed to stem the rise of communism.[11]

Throughout the conflict people from around the world protested against the American-led war. Believed by many to be an affair for the Vietnamese people alone, and therefore a conflict which should be resolved without the involvement of external forces, anti-Vietnam War movements sprang up across Europe, the Antipodes and the Americas calling for the US government to withdraw its troops. Horrified by the war, but also dismayed at British governmental support – particularly considering Britain's central role at the Geneva Conference – a British anti-war movement began to emerge in the early 1960s. Although Britain never committed troops, it was deemed by many to be complicit in the conflict through the moral, political and practical support offered.[12] Well established peace groups such as the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) began demonstrating in the streets of London, but soon the activities of these groups were overtaken by single-issue peace and anti-war groups such as the BCPV and VSC. Throughout the war, the BCPV, the VSC and many smaller anti-war groups put pressure on the British government through garnering support from politicians and unions, demonstrating in the streets of British cities, and forming bonds of friendship with members of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) and the National Liberation Front (NLF).[13]

---

[11] Spector, Ronald H., 'Vietnam War – 1954-1975', *Encyclopaedia Britannica* [online] <https://www.britannica.com/event/Vietnam-War> [accessed 11 October 2020].

[12] One of the Stop-it Committee's actions was the production of a pamphlet titled '*Vietnam, United States & Britain – The Facts of Entanglement*', within which British assistance and support was detailed. Produced by scholars from the group, it is incredibly detailed, well referenced and persuasive. It is covered in more depth in the first chapter of this thesis.

[13] Information relating to the visits of Vietnamese to Britain can be found in peace publications – such as the VSC, and BCPV Bulletins – in the Chris Arthur Publications file MSS.711/C/1/63, Modern Records Centre, University of Warwick (hereafter MRC); visits from 'trade unionists', in the Lawrence Daly Papers, file MSS.302/4/3, MRC, and the J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/9/6, MRC; visits from 'intellectuals and academics' in International Confederation of Disarmament and Peace (ICDP) records, file MSS.181/16/29, MRC; and visits from 'Buddhists' in J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/2/1, MRC.

The largest demonstrations against the war took place in 1968. On 17 March, 25,000 marchers took to the streets in a VSC organised demonstration described by the BBC as the 'most violent…ever seen in [the] country'.[14] The following day's papers were filled with stories of violence and images of destruction: The *Times* reported of the embassy being 'virtually under siege for two hours', while the *Guardian* ran with the headline '300 arrested after Vietnam Protest', and mentioned 50 people who were hospitalised, including 25 policemen, one of whom had a 'serious spine injury'.[15] Seven months later, Grosvenor Square was once more the focus of the British anti-Vietnam War movement, when the VSC staged the second of their 1968 demonstrations. The 27 October demonstration was the largest to take place in the post-war period up to that date, and marked the apogee of the movement in Britain.[16] Over 100,000 took part in what was largely considered a peaceful event – although a group of about 6000 broke away from the main march and clashed violently with police in Grosvenor Square resulting in 43 arrests and 50 injuries.[17] Despite this violence, news reports in the following day's papers differed considerably from those of 18 March, and praised the police who were said to have responded with 'calm' and 'restraint'.[18] This perspective was also reflected in a National Council of Civil Liberties (NCCL) report, which praised the police and organisers alike for maintaining a vastly more ordered and peaceful event.[19]

---

[14] Report: BBC TV newsflash, 6.25pm, 17 March 1968, in microfilm role March 1968, BBC WA.
[15] Articles: '300 arrested after Vietnam Protest', *Guardian*, 18 March 1968; and '200 arrested in Vietnam war protest', *Times*, 18 March 1968.
[16] Ellis, Sylvia, 'Anti-Vietnam War movement, Britain', in Immanuel Ness (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Revolution and Protest: 1500 to the present* (Wiley Blackwell, 2009), p. 218.
[17] Thomas, Nick, 'Challenging the Myths of the 1960s: The Case of Student Protest in Britain', in *Twentieth Century History*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 2002, p. 289.
[18] Article: '6000 in Grosvenor Square fail against "calm wall"', the *Times*, 28 October, 1968. Further news reports can be found in the *Guardian* and in microfilm role October 1968 at the BBC WA.
[19] Letter and Report: NCCL to James Callaghan, Home Secretary, 27 November, 1968 in Liberty Archive, DCL/459/8, Hull History Centre (hereafter HHC).

Demonstrations would continue until the end of the war, but none garnered the support or attention of those in 1968. This is not to say by any stretch that the movement in Britain was over. For the remainder of the war, Britons engaged in all manner of activities in opposition to the conflict. In one of the most remarkable chapters of the movement, Britons such as the veteran activists Peggy Duff and Fenner Brockway forged bonds of friendship with individuals from Vietnam in the hope of securing peace in Vietnam, inviting them to Britain to take part in demonstrations and to address both unions and the House of Commons.[20] The road to the first of these visits was beset by difficulty, but the seemingly tireless efforts of Duff, Brockway and others paid off and a visa was issued to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) of the RVN, Madam Nguyen Thi Binh in 1969. Following Mme Binh's visit, dozens of further trips were made by political representatives, doctors, academics, and former political prisoners, all in the hope that their visits would contribute toward securing peace.[21]

Historiography

The 'long sixties' – as the historian Arthur Marwick famously referred to the period between 1958 and 1974 – saw mass demonstrations and student uprisings across the world: from the United States to France, Germany, Britain and Japan and Australia, activists took to the streets, manned barricades and engaged in acts of sedition against authority.[22] Many of these

[20] Article: 'Delegate of NLF talks to MPs', *Guardian*, 6 March 1969; and *The Sun*, 6 March 1969; and Article: 'CND groups open Easter protest', *Guardian*, 5 April 1969; and 'Inscrutable Mme Binh gives away nothing...', *Guardian*, 8 April 1969.

[21] Mme Binh returned to Britain in November of 1970 at the invitation of the BCPV and met once again with parliamentarians, and also members of trade unions; in BCPV WC minutes J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/2/1; and file MSS.189/V/1/2/7, MRC; Speech: Lai Van Ngoc to the quarterly conference of the BCPV, September 26th, 1971 in J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/2/1, MRC.

[22] Marwick, Arthur, 'The Cultural Revolution of the Long Sixties: Voices of Reaction, Protest, and Permeation', *The International History Review*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (December, 2005), pp. 780-806.

activists viewed themselves as historical actors in a fast moving global movement, binding them together across great distance. It is only relatively recently, however, that scholars have begun to analyse these relationships, the movements which emerged during the period, and the period itself, from a transnational perspective. If there is a single issue which united activists during the period, it is the Vietnam War. Seen by many the world over as a neo-colonialist, capitalist drive by the US to further their global hegemony, the war brought people from east and west together in condemnation and helped turn the sixties into an important historical transnational moment. Much of the protest literature on this period assesses the transnational student anti-Vietnam War movement, but there is a significant, and growing, body of work which analyses activism surrounding domestic concerns within individual nations, and the international transfer of ideas, strategy and tactics which was brought to bear upon them.

The activism which emerged in Britain, America and elsewhere during the 1960s was largely driven by the New Left. Emerging from the social and political ferment of 1956, the New Left rose across the world as a challenge to what many people, particularly the radical young, considered an outmoded, moribund, Old Left. The promise of post-war change, of a better world to be characterised by greater freedoms, prosperity and equality had rung disappointingly hollow for the up-coming generation. Meanwhile, events such as the Soviet invasion of Hungary and Khrushchev's 'secret speech' denouncing Stalin eroded the credibility of the Old Left. Reacting to this crisis, the New Left, shaped by the ideas of some of the world's leading intellectuals such as C. Wright Mills, E. P. Thompson, and Herbert Marcuse, brought a fresh energy to left politics. They moved away from the class based conflict of the past, instead focusing their attention on a wide range of social reforms such as civil, gay, and women's rights. It was the Vietnam War, however, which would come to

dominate and then define this new global movement, ultimately contributing to its demise in the late 1960s.[23]

Many leaders of the British New Left were in academia, taking part in student protest, and encouraging students to question authority and fight imperialism. With this influence shaping the student movement's rhetoric, strategy and tactics; the global crises of apartheid and the Vietnam War driving them forward; and the personal anger at the undemocratic nature of the universities, the movement soon took hold across Britain and endured for a decade. With its widespread strikes throughout 1967, its central role during the anti-Vietnam War demonstrations in the same year, and its occupation in early 1969, few universities were as emblematic of the student movement as the London School of Economics (LSE). Providing a highly personal account of student unrest at the LSE during this period are the Americans Paul Hoch and Vic Schoenbach who arrived at the LSE in the late sixties 'fresh from [their] recent radicalization at Brown and Columbia universities'.[24] Their emotive account of the occupation of the university during January 1969 offers a fascinating insight to the way activists from the American New Left viewed the movement in Britain. It also explores the strategy and tactics deployed by the students during the protests; the wide-ranging support the protesters received both nationally and internationally; and the skewed media portrayal of the protests. Written in strident, forthright tones, the authors spend little time balancing their account with others, and take significant credit for the disruptions which occurred at the LSE during 1968 and 1969. The International Socialist (IS) dominated

---

[23] Scholarly work on the New Left is voluminous. The following provide an excellent analysis of both the American and British variants: Geary, Daniel, "Becoming International Again": C. Wright Mills and the Emergence of a Global New Left, 1956 – 1962', *The Journal of American History*, (December 2008), pp. 710-736; Gitlin, Todd: *The Whole World is Watching – Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left* (University of California Press, 2003); Rudd, Mark: *My Life with SDS and the Weathermen Underground* (Harper Collins, 2009); Kenny, Michael: *The First New Left – British Intellectuals after Stalin* (Lawrence and Wishart, 1995); Matthews, Wade: *The New Left – National Identity and the Break-up of Britain* (Haymarket, 2013).

[24] Hoch, Paul and Schoenbach, Vic: *The Natives are Restless – A Report on Student Power in Action* (Sheed and Ward, 1969).

Socialist Society (Soc Soc) at the university received a 'strong, and successful, challenge by a hodge-podge group of American and German SDSers' in the Autumn of 1968.[25] Describing Soc Soc as 'demonstrat[ing] a consistent inability to organize themselves' and as having 'embarrassing gaps in political awareness', this small group of international students aimed to shake up the society and bring the 'confrontation tactics of the New Left' to Britain. The work also reveals their frustrations with the British students' 'congenital disease' of politeness, which they believed naturally tempered the revolutionary spirits of the students; and the sense that many in Britain were waiting for the 'objective conditions for revolution' instead of engaging in action.[26] Disparaging of the British student movement, they state that revolutionaries 'are developed through more and more militant *actions*, not just by adopting rhetorics or joining brand-name revolutionary sects'.[27] Although the media often sensationalised actions of the student movement – in the case of the LSE protests they elevated the 1968 actions to a 'riot' and emphasised students' drug taking and violence – the authors' work certainly advances the media's much flaunted contention that disruptions were due to 'foreign agitators'.[28]

Just at the point the British New Left began to fragment due, in part, to intense disagreements between the movement's leaders, the 'global' New Left, particularly in the United States, truly came to the fore.[29] No single individual was as influential to this new turn in American history than the prominent radical sociologist C. Wright Mills, who, in his renowned "Letter to the New Left", called upon the new generation of intellectuals to be agents of social change. Inspired by Mills's letter and other writings, the civil rights

[25] Hoch, Paul and Schoenbach, Vic: *The Natives are Restless,* p. ix.
[26] Hoch, Paul and Schoenbach, Vic: *The Natives are Restless,* p. 31 and 205.
[27] Hoch, Paul and Schoenbach, Vic: *The Natives are Restless,* p. 205.
[28] Hoch, Paul and Schoenbach, Vic: *The Natives are Restless,* p. 103.
[29] Two works which provide an analysis of the movement's collapse are the previously referenced Kenny, Michael: *The First New Left – British Intellectuals after Stalin*; and Matthews, Wade: *The New Left – National Identity and the Break-up of Britain*.

movement, and the youthful ideals of John F. Kennedy, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) wrote the Port Huron Statement, the group's political manifesto which laid out their vision for a better future. With his great influence over the burgeoning American student movement and the widely held interpretation of being a 'peculiarly American' thinker, Mills is primarily considered as influential on the American New Left. However, in his illuminating study on Mills, the historian Daniel Geary reclaims the sociologist as a thinker for the global New Left, and presents him as a man whose influence 'extended to radicals throughout the world'.[30] He also highlights the many global influences on Mills, and in doing so reveals that international connections were crucial in the formation of the American New Left.

Adding to the historiography, the historian Andrea Mammone established a similar transfer of ideas existed between the right-wing movements in Italy and France. Mammone reveals a significant commonality of ideals between activists in both countries, and demonstrates 'patterns of cross-fertilisation [and] ideological transfer' between them.[31] In doing so, she adds to the historiography of Europe which historically has been treated as 'little more than the collation of clearly delineated national histories', and challenges the notion of extreme right as a 'specific national product'.[32] As shown in Mammone's article, much of the transfer of ideas during this unprecedented decade of protest came from direct contact of individuals and groups crossing borders to share thoughts and ideas.[33] The scholar

---

[30] Geary, Daniel, "Becoming International Again", p. 711
[31] Mammone, Andrea, 'The Transnational Reaction to 1968: Neo-Fascist Fronts and Political Cultures in France and Italy', *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 17, Issue 2 (May 2008), p. 213.
[32] Mammone, Andrea, 'The Transnational Reaction to 1968, p. 214.
[33] This was not exclusively the case – with the rise in television ownership, and with it the dissemination of news broadcasts across borders, the world was becoming more interconnected, and therefore protesters across the world could draw on others' experiences. The spread of ideas via news is covered by Thelan, David in 'The Nation and Beyond', *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 86 (December, 1999), p. 956; Macdonald, Simon, 'Transnational history: a review of past and present scholarship', p. 6 [online]:< https://www.ucl.ac.uk/centre-transnational-history/sites/centre-transnational-history/files/simon_macdonald_tns_review.pdf> [accessed 20 October 2020]; and Mausbach, Wilfried, 'America's Vietnam in Germany – Germany in America's Vietnam: On the

Richard Ivan Jobs reinforces this view by analysing the increasing volume of people, largely students and the young, who travelled throughout Europe. During the decade defining year of 1968, young people from across the continent came to see themselves not as members of individual nations but, according to Ivan Jobs, a 'continent-wide, transnational social group'.[34] Travelling between protest sites, these young Europeans, through the shared experience of travel, political culture and youth culture, came to challenge national demarcations of power and create an alternative community based on these informal interchanges. This 'alternative community' could be found on the streets of London, Paris, Berlin, and Amsterdam. Anywhere there was societal unrest during 1968, the young of Europe would congregate and protest with the aim of 'invigorate[ing] each other's local movements through transnational mobility'.[35] Germans played a particularly prominent role in large British anti-Vietnam War demonstrations in Grosvenor Square on 17 March, while large numbers of British and German youths took part in the May demonstrations in Paris.[36] Ivan Jobs stresses that these interpersonal connections were also transatlantic, with many European and American activists travelling in both directions throughout the 1960s.[37] The travel of students throughout Europe and across the Atlantic created an environment within

---

relocation of spaces and appropriation of history', in *Changing the World*, *Changing Onseself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the US in the 1960s and 1970s*, eds. Belinda Davis, Wilfred Mausbach, Martin Klimke, and Carla MacDougall (Berghahn Books, 2010), p. 54; while an example of protesters directly copying what they saw on television is provided by Klimke, Martin in: 'A Growing Problem for US Foreign Policy: The West German Student Movement and the Western Alliance', in *Changing the World, Changing Onseself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the US in the 1960s and 1970s*, eds. Belinda Davis, Wilfred Mausbach, Martin Klimke, and Carla MacDougall (Berghahn Books, 2010), p. 106.

[34] Ivan Jobs, Richard, 'Youth Movements: Travel, Protest, and Europe in 1968', *American Historical Review*, Vol. 114, No. 2 (February 2009), p. 376.

[35] Ivan Jobs, Richard, 'Youth Movements: Travel, Protest, and Europe in 1968', p. 384.

[36] Interestingly, Ivan Jobs reveals how by emphasising the numbers of these foreign students participating in demonstrations, the governments of Britain and France aimed to delegitimise the movement altogether, with a British government report ascribing 'considerable responsibility' to American 'missionaries of student protest': Ivan Jobs, Richard, 'Youth Movements: Travel, Protest, and Europe in 1968', p. 391.

[37] Ivan Jobs, Richard, 'Youth Movements: Travel, Protest, and Europe in 1968', p. 380.

which the young people of the world were joined in camaraderie and spurred each other on through mutual emulation.[38] The historian Martin Klimke informs us this did not go unnoticed by the US government, which viewed the development with some alarm. In his work on the transnational exchange between protest groups and the US, Klimke explains the country invested increasingly in the Inter-Agency Youth Committee (IAYC) in order to develop a deeper understanding of the US among a foreign country's educated young leaders. The driver of this investment was a worry that, in the words of US ambassador to Germany, George McGee, international students had 'toppled prime ministers, changed governments, ruined universities, and in some cases harmed the economy of the country'.[39] The US also dedicated further time and resources to monitoring of the West German student movement, and considered a range of measures such as an Allied ban on demonstration, dismissal of civil officials, and the closure of universities. Despite the intensity of American governmental efforts, there was a steady rise in contact between students and American GIs based in West Germany, protesting by American civilians in Berlin, and, most worryingly for the US authorities, a growing network of desertion support which helped Americans escape to France and Sweden.

Where, though, does Britain fit in this transnational study of the sixties? The historian Anthony Edmonds made an early foray into the British movement with an essay which shows how the British student Left used the Vietnam War as a 'powerful and useful symbol [to]

---

[38] The world in which the youth of the day travelled was also marked by the counterculture of the era. Consequently, this work draws on a wider body of literature which assesses the broader British 'sixties experience'. Disparate topics such as communal living, the anti-psychiatry movement, and gender and youth culture are explored. See: Davis, John & Warring, Anette, 'Living Utopia: Communal Living in Denmark and Britain', *Cultural and Social History*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 513-530; Crossley, Nick, 'R.D Laing and the British Anti-Psychiatry Movement: A Socio-Historical Analysis', *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 47, No. 7 (1998), pp. 877-889; August, Andrew, 'Gender and 1960s Youth Culture: The Rolling Stones and the New Woman', *Contemporary British History*, 23:1, (2009), pp. 79-100; Hughes, Celia, 'Young Socialist Men in 1960s Britain: Subjectivity and Sociability', *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 73, (February, 2012), pp. 170-192.

[39] Klimke, Martin, 'A Growing Problem for US Foreign Policy: The West German Student Movement and the Western Alliance', p. 112.

excoriate Labour for betraying its (and their) ideals'; and within which he writes of the British movement being 'small' and 'comprised largely of young people'.[40] There are a number of further works which provide a brief analysis of the British anti-Vietnam War movement, such as *Street Fighting Years* by VSC co-founder Tariq Ali, which documents his involvement with the group, and Gerard DeGroot's *The 60s Unplugged: A Kaleidoscopic History of a Disorderly Decade*. Others make reference to it such as activist David Widgery's *The Left in Britain, 1956 – 68*, within which the British movement is referred to as a 'puny specimen'.[41] Foremost among scholars who have focussed their attention on this area, however, is the historian Sylvia Ellis. In a landmark 1995 essay, Ellis examined the extent and nature of British opposition to the war and questions whether British opinion had any discernable effect on the Johnson administration's policy in Southeast Asia. Ellis also briefly outlined the founding of the BCPV and the more radical VSC, and the 'lack of unity' between the groups.[42] Ellis extends her research into the area with an essay which looks at how the Vietnam War 'politicised' students during the sixties and 'helped fan the flames of student revolt', and reaches the conclusion that it was internal university issues rather than the war which mobilised the students to protest.[43] In a further article, Ellis provides an illuminating analysis of the goals and tactics of those engaged in activism during the period, and reveals the British movement's transnational dimensions.[44] Focussing on the rhetoric and

---

[40] Edmonds, A. O, 'The Viet Nam War and the British Student Left: A Study in Political Symbolism', *Viet Nam Generation* 5, 1 – 4 (March, 1994).
[41] Ali, Tariq: *Street Fighting Years: An Autobiography of the Sixties* (Verso, 2005); DeGroot, Gerard: The 60s *Unplugged: A Kaleidoscopic History of a Disorderly Decade* (Macmillan, 2008), pp. 359-363; Widgery, David (ed.): *The Left in Britain, 1956 – 68* (Penguin Books, 1977), p. 305. Further works which cover the demonstrations in 1968 are: Caute, David: *Sixty-Eight: The Year of the Barricades* (Hamish Hamilton, 1988); and Fraser, Ronald: *1968: A Student Generation in Revolt* (Chatto and Windus, 1988).
[42] Ellis, Sylvia, 'British Opposition to the Vietnam War, 1964 – 68', in *The Insular Dream: Obsession and Resistance* (Vu University Press, 1995), pp. 166-182.
[43] Ellis, Sylvia, 'A Demonstration of British Good Sense? British Student Protest During the Vietnam War', in *Student Protest – The Sixties and After*, ed. DeGroot, Gerard J. (Longman, 1998), pp. 54-69
[44] Ellis, Sylvia, 'Promoting Solidarity at Home and Abroad: the goals and tactics of the anti-Vietnam War Movement in Britain', *European Review of History*, 21:4, (2014), pp. 557-576.

actions of groups across the spectrum, from the VSC to the broad-left BCPV and the labour movement, Ellis reveals how anti-war opposition opened a national debate on the war; she explores the transnational links of the movement; and, similarly to Anthony Edmunds, highlights the domestic focus of the campaign. Using Nye and Koehane's definition of transnationalism as 'involving non-governmental activity' which includes 'interactions across state boundaries' involving three or more countries, Ellis states that the anti-Vietnam War movement was certainly transnational in nature, and that the British activists were clearly a part of this 'global community of non-state actors'.[45] A further work which assesses the student element of the British movement is a journal article by Nick Thomas which both mirrors conclusions drawn by Ellis, while adding to the body of knowledge with a 'challenge' to various 'myths' which persist about student protest during the period. Primacy is paid to the notion that the sixties were a 'golden age' of student protest. Contrary to this, Thomas argues that the vast majority of students were, in fact, politically apathetic.[46] Thomas adds to the historiography with a further journal article which explores the 'symbiotic' relationship between protesters and the press, and within which he analyses a number of the early protests as well as focussing on the large demonstrations of 1968. He states, however, that by 1969 the British movement was 'all but dead'.[47]

Finally, the scholar Joshua Cochran provided an analysis of expatriate protest in his 2014 PhD thesis *Beyond the Water's Edge: US Expatriates and the Vietnam Antiwar Movement*. Cochran details the activities of Americans in Canada, Britain, France and Germany, and analyses the emergence of various anti-war groups, arguing their dissent was 'motivated by a desire to broaden US civil society' in order to account for the reality of its

[45] Ellis, Sylvia, 'Promoting Solidarity at Home and Abroad', p. 567.
[46] Thomas, Nick, 'Challenging Myths of the 1960s: The Case of Student Protest in Britain', p. 280
[47] Thomas, Nick, 'Protests Against the Vietnam War in 1960s Britain: The Relationship Between Protesters and the Press', *Contemporary British History*, 22:3, p. 350.

transatlantic empire.[48] His sections on the Stop-it Committee, Group 68 and the UAEB analyses the ways group members would express their patriotism through their activism; he assesses the American authorities' response to their activism; and he details some of the group's key achievements.

What emerges from these studies is an anti-Vietnam War movement in Britain which was both transnational in nature and drew heavily on a rich protest tradition. It is clear, however, that there is room for a further study which both compliments these previous works by providing further nuance, while also introducing new actors to the picture – namely the American military personnel who were based in Britain during the 1960s and early 1970s. Through extensive oral history interviews and archival research in Britain, the Netherlands, and the United States, my thesis adds significantly to the current literature by analysing the British side of the desertion network, and establishes links between both British and American activists working within the UK and those operating on the continent.

Methodology

This thesis draws on a wealth of archival material found in Britain, the US and the Netherlands, in addition to online archives, extensive oral history interviews, private papers, newspaper articles and the underground press to produce an ethnographic account of American protest in Britain. I decided to break the thesis into four chapters, each of which focusses on one of the four American anti-war groups in Britain during the period: The Stop-it Committee (Stop-it), Group 68 (G68), the Union of American Exiles in Britain (UAEB), and People Emerging Against Corrupt Establishments (PEACE). These chapters are further divided into five thematic sections which focus on key actions, events, group dynamics or

[48] Cochran, Joshua D., PhD thesis, *'Beyond the Water's Edge: US Expatriates and the Vietnam War Movement'*, University of Iowa, August 2014, p. ix

structural difficulties. This approach enabled me to follow a largely chronological retelling and analysis of American protest in Britain, beginning with the Americans' first group to emerge. These chapters are followed by an epilogue which explores the 'after lives' of a number of key individuals, and the influence their British experience had on their later activism.

Archival research at the National Archives in Kew, the Tamiment Library in New York City and the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam allowed me to reconstruct the formation, structure and actions of two key American groups: the Stop-it Committee and Group 68. In analysing the records, which included newsletters, periodicals, correspondence, meeting minutes, memos and fliers, I was able to ascertain the motivations of the two American groups, their bonds with the British movement and the transnational links they maintained. Crucially, this early research also highlighted the central movement figures, leading me to their papers in Austin, Texas; Amherst, Massachusetts; and Churchill College, Cambridge. Through these archival visits, I was able to reconstruct the bonds between the various American individuals and groups in Britain, and uncover further documentation on the UAEB and PEACE – two groups with limited archival material.

The GI Press Collection, 1964-1977 accessible online through the Wisconsin Historical Society, proved invaluable in further contextualising the experience of Americans in Britain. The database contains about 900 periodicals created by or for US military personnel during the Vietnam War, and reveals a vast transnational network of cooperation and protest. American underground papers produced in Britain such as *Stripes and Stars*, *Chicksands D.I.T.S*, and the eponymous *P.E.A.C.E,* helped reveal the scale and development of the GI Movement in Britain. Meanwhile, online newspaper archives as well as the BBC Written Archives helped provide an understanding of the reception and impact of the American groups in Britain.

To compensate for archival limitations, and to further enrich my source base, I conducted interviews with 23 activists in both Britain and the US. My first interviewees were identified through a list of Stop-it members featured within a Special Branch file uncovered in the National Archives. Through their names, and in some cases their occupations, I was able to identify them online and contact them by email to arrange interviews. Further participants were identified through these interviews and continued research into the central figures of the American groups in the secondary literature. The interviews were conducted between June 2016 and November 2018, with the majority taking place in the homes of the participants – although some were conducted by phone. They were recorded on a digital dicta-phone then transcribed. Prior to the commencement of the interview, the subjects were provided with an information sheet which outlined my study; I then reinforced this with a verbal introduction highlighting the purpose and aims of my research. Semi-structured and lasting between one and three hours, the interviews began with short demographic and fact based questions regarding the person's background and involvement in the various anti-war groups. Open ended questions followed, in addition to those which more deeply probed the most relevant aspects of their experiences to my research. Being semi-structured, the participants were, to some extent, able to shape the direction and content of the interview. In analysing the data collected, I categorised the interviews into the groups the participants were members of, then further categorised them into themes such as social context, gender, actions, involvement with the British anti-Vietnam War movement, later protest activity, and surveillance.

Oral history is limited both by its inherent subjective nature – and therefore suffers from prejudices, preconceptions and expectations – and the failure of memory. To mitigate against this, accounts were corroborated with further interviews and cross referenced with both primary and secondary source material. Despite their limitations, the interviews proved

highly valuable in interpreting the nature, structure and beliefs of the anti-war groups; in contextualising my findings; and in gaining an in-depth insight to the views of American activists. Conducting most of the interviews in person also enabled me to view the private archives of the participants. The diary entries, photos, personal correspondence, unpublished memoires, and FBI files proved enormously helpful in helping me to understand the psychology of individuals, and assisted with the narrative flow of the thesis.

Chapter Overview

The thesis opens with a chapter on the first of the American anti-Vietnam War groups, the Stop-it Committee. Although formed in 1966 at the London School of Economics (LSE), Stop-it's foundations lay in the political and social ferment of student New Left America. The chapter begins by exploring the backgrounds of key individuals, their ties with SDS, civil rights, and their broader American anti-war experience. The bonds these American students formed with British students and anti-war groups will be analysed, and in doing so it reveals the influences which activists from both sides of the Atlantic brought to bear on one another. Although Stop-it's life was brief, it's impact was considerable. Between its formation and demise in late 1968, members engaged in a series of memorable, headline grabbing actions, which belied its modest size. Beset by the challenges which affected many New Left groups of the time – notably its loose, informal structure – and the transitory nature, the group disbanded at the height of the conflict in southeast Asia. The chapter explores how and why this occurred, while also revealing the enduring legacy the group left in its wake.

Several key individuals from Stop-it's leadership went on to form the UAEB, an anti-war organisation which fought for the rights of resisters and deserters up to and beyond the end of the war in 1975. The second chapter provides an assessment of this group's founding

and core aims – chief among which was an attempt to have the *Visiting Forces Act, 1952* amended in order to enable military deserters to remain in Britain. The battle was hard fought, and would end with the House of Lords rejecting the proposal, yet through its campaigning the group established itself at the heart of the anti-war movement in Britain. It forged close relationships with many anti-war politicians, celebrities, church and union leaders, and academics, and received significant publicity. The UAEB's reach also stretched beyond British shores. Bonds were formed with European activists engaged with assisting deserters from military bases in Germany, helping their safe passage to Sweden and elsewhere unencumbered by strict extradition laws. The chapter explores how the UAEB cultivated the relationships through trips to the continent, and ultimately became a 'station' on the so called 'underground railway' of deserters. Through four case studies of resisters and deserters who sought the UAEB's assistance, the chapter provides an analysis of the concrete ways in which it helped Americans in need. Central to the assistance provided, was a counselling service – believed to be the only one of its kind in Europe. Although SUPPORT, as it was known, was a separate entity to the UAEB, their relationship was close. The chapter provides an analysis of how SUPPORT's role adapted to changes in draft laws, and explores its advocacy of amnesty for resisters and deserters. The issue of unconditional amnesty was also taken up by the UAEB, which campaigned for years in the hope the US government would effectively pardon the many thousands of Americans who resisted, evaded and deserted.

The third chapter focusses on Group 68, a further American anti-war group which drew together professional expatriate individuals in opposition to the war. Established in 1968, but with roots in a campaigning group of Americans in support of Eugene McCarthy's election bid, G68 soon catapulted itself to the forefront of American anti-war activity in Britain. With many members drawn from a coterie of older individuals blacklisted during the

McCarthy era, the sociology of this group was markedly different from the student based Stop-it and the UAEB groups. The chapter shows how G68 attempted to establish as broad a constituency of support against the war as possible through modes of protest associated with the Old Left rather than the new. In its operative years, G68 would influence and participate in some of the defining anti-war activities of the era. It would also broaden its protest interests to include a wide range of interconnected areas, such as a campaign to impeach President Nixon, a call to release political prisoners in South Vietnam, and, like the UAEB and SUPPORT, a demand for universal amnesty for American war resisters. This chapter details the motivations and actions behind this widening of interests, while also revealing how and why the group finally disbanded.

Central to the American anti-war landscape in Britain during the late sixties and early 1970s was the military anti-war group PEACE. Considered by historian David Cortright to be 'one of the most successful organisations of the GI movement', it is remarkable so little scholarly attention has been paid to it.[49] The final chapter provides a comprehensive account of the group's life from its inception in the summer of 1970 to its eventual demise in 1972. It reveals how a unique collaboration between students at British universities, celebrities and servicemen came together to protest, petition and sow dissent among the ranks. The chapter also explores in depth the activities of Captain Tom Culver – a USAF Judge Advocate General who worked as legal counsel to PEACE. A key figure in Britain's GI movement, Culver's court-martial following a GI protest in 1971 led to many GIs, politicians, students and notables rallying around his case both sides of the Atlantic. What became something of a cause célèbre highlighted the movement and helped, briefly, to swell the ranks of PEACE. What the chapter shows, however, is that rather than joining the group because they were

[49] Cortright, David: *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance during the Vietnam War* (Haymarket Books, 2005) p. 127.

explicitly against the war, GIs were drawn to protest in the hope they would be discharged honourably from the military.

Many of the Americans activists who lived in Britain during the war would return to America significantly shaped by their experiences in the country. The thesis draws to a close with an epilogue which reveals how these individuals influenced the direction of the anti-war, union and feminist movements once they returned to the

Chapter 1

The Stop-it Committee

ON OCTOBER 16, 1967, a group of young Americans gathered in front of the American embassy in London's Grosvenor Square, draft cards in hand. Behind them a larger crowd, also American, thronged the west side of the small park, anti-Vietnam War placards held aloft. Above them all, Theodore Roszak's vast anodized aluminium American eagle, so symbolic of America's immense power, hubris, or vulgarity depending on who was asked, stared aggressively down. Having tried and failed to hand the cards to an embassy official a moment before, one member of the group, in a final act of defiance, stuck them to the embassy door. Here the cards remained for an hour before a member of staff collected them up and tossed them into the embassy's lost property section.[1]

This singular act of protest, which carried with it a maximum penalty of a five-year prison sentence, a $10,000 fine, or permanent exile from the United States, was the culmination of a lengthy debate the previous week between the participants, and the latest action by their group, the Stop-it Committee. Consisting largely of post-graduate American students from the LSE, Stop-it had been operating since the spring and had already cemented itself at the heart of anti-Vietnam War activism in Britain.

Arriving on the British anti-war scene at a point when it – and indeed the war itself – was reaching its apogee, Stop-it helped shake-up a movement many members considered entrenched in the Old Left by transposing ideas, theory and tactics found in the American New Left. The group also played a leading role in many of the decade defining

[1] Oral history Interview with Robert Brenner, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Los Angeles, 10 April 2017; Oral History Interview with Danny Coleman, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, New York City, 5 April 2017; Article, 'Americans Hand in their Cards,' *The Times*, 17 October 1967.

countercultural events and demonstrations, and caused enough concern on both sides of the Atlantic for respective governments to begin spying on the group's members. One of a number of American anti-war groups formed in Britain during the period, Stop-it existed for a mere 18-months; however, it left an enduring legacy on American protest in Britain for the remainder of the war and profoundly affected its members who would return to the US shaped by their British experience and continue their activism.

Utilising recent oral history interviews with Stop-it members, archive sources from both the US and Britain, alongside newspaper and journal reports, this chapter chronicles the group's foundation, development, and actions between the spring of 1967 to the group's demise in November 1968. In doing so, it reveals the rich transfer of protest traditions between Britain and America and the strong bonds Stop-it formed with local groups, politicians, and celebrities in the hope their anti-war message was carried far and clear. What also emerges is a group struggling with a sense of legitimacy, direction and purpose, complicated further by conflicting gender roles, perennial financial instability, and a paranoia of being under surveillance. The chapter will conclude by exploring how and why the group eventually split in the late autumn of 1968.

The Stop-it Committee is mentioned in a number of other studies, including Celia Hughes excellent monograph on young lives on the Left in Britain, and H. L. Malchow's equally compelling work on American and British special cultural relations during the 1960s and 1970s.[2] Both works, however, devote very little time to the group, merely mentioning it as an American group which operated in Britain in the mid-1960s, while also passing brief comment on its key achievements and personalities. It is mentioned in more depth in Cochran's thesis, but little attention is paid to the relationship between the American and

[2] Hughes, Celia: *Young Lives on the Left – Sixties Activism and the Liberation of the Self* (Manchester University Press, March 2015); Malchow, H.L. *Special Relations: The Americanization of Britain?* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011)

British activists, and the surveillance by British authorities. This chapter builds significantly on these works, providing a deeper and more nuanced understanding of Stop-it's nature, actions, and development.

Outside Agitators

Many of the Stop-it members who gathered outside the American embassy that autumn day in '67, had arrived in Britain the previous year. The America they left behind was a country in crisis. The war in Vietnam was escalating rapidly, student protest was breaking out across campuses the length and breadth of the country, and a more confrontational civil rights movement was growing around the Black Panther Party (BPP). Like most of those who would come to join Stop-it, the embassy group had been deeply involved in America's tumult. Separately, they had formed chapters of the student activist group SDS, they had attended anti-war demonstrations, and had played roles in the civil rights movement. They were inspired and shaped by the philosophers Herbert Marcuse, Theodore Adorno, and C. Wright Mills – particularly the latter's 'Letter to the New Left' which proclaimed students could be 'real live agencies of social change'.[3] They were drawn to the social theorists' critique of modern life and the notion that structures such as technology, capitalism, and bureaucracy, represented progress for humanity; and instead promoted the sort of participatory democracy which became a hallmark of the SDS. It was with this foundation of activism and New Left thinking that the core group and founders of Stop-it arrived in Britain to pursue their studies at the LSE.

[3] C. Wright Mills, 'Letter to the New Left,' *New Left Review*, no. 5 (Sept. – Oct. 1960), p 22. Although originally published in the *New Left Review*, Mills 'letter' was published in the leading American New Left journal *Studies on the Left* in 1961, and reprinted in pamphlet form by SDS – Geary, Daniel "Becoming international Again": C. Wright Mills and the Emergence of a Global New Left, 1956-1962,' *The Journal of American History* (Dec. 2008), p. 710.

Often cited as the first major evidence of a growing student radicalism in Britain, the protests at the LSE which took place in November 1965 then punctuated the remainder of the decade, also served as the fertile ground out of which the Stop-it Committee grew. Beginning with student concerns over lack of democracy, funding, over crowding and international events such as apartheid in South Africa, the unrest reached a critical point on 31 January 31 1967, when American student and president of the Graduate Students' Association, Marshall Bloom, and another student, South African student David Adelstein, attempted to hold a forum to discuss the controversial appointment of Dr Walter Adams as Director of the LSE.[4] Adams, who had previously held the post of Principal of the College of Rhodesia, was seen by many on the left at the university as someone who had failed to to do enough to oppose apartheid, and therefore someone wholly unsuitable to lead an institution with a famous liberal and dissenting tradition. As Bloom and others congregated at the theatre to hold their forum only to find the entrance blocked, a scuffle developed and a school porter had a heart attack and died.[5] Although no one was singled out for blame in the porter's death, the administration took aim at Bloom for orchestrating the disorder which preceded it and suspended him along with Adelstein for the remainder of the academic year.[6] The reaction from the student body was explosive. Further boycotts of lectures were arranged and a sit-in organised demanding the suspensions be rescinded. In total the school was occupied for eight days and nights.[7] No longer was this about the appointment of Adams, but in the view of future Stop-it founder, Danny Schechter, an 'infringement of their [the students] right to speak, their subservient position in the School, and the lack of communications with School

[4] Ellis, Sylvia, 'British Student Protest during the Vietnam War', in DeGroot, Gerard J. (ed): *Student Protest – The Sixties and After* (Longman, 1998), p. 59.
[5] Oral History interview with Danny Coleman, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Brooklyn, New York City, 5 April 2017; Ellis, Sylvia, 'British Student Protest during the Vietnam War', p. 58.
[6] Schechter, Danny: *News Dissector* (Akashic Books, June 2001), p. 53.
[7] Ellis, Sylvia, 'British Student Protest during the Vietnam War', p. 60.

authorities'.[8] On Friday, 17 March 1967, three thousand students from Leeds, Manchester, Cambridge and a scattering of other universities, marched through the streets of London in support of the students at the LSE.[9]

Recalling the LSE protests, Stop-it member David Holmstrom said that from the genesis of the protests to the subsequent sit-in and demonstration, American students were 'in the thick of the action'; so much so, the university authorities claimed the strike was organised by 'outside agitators…American radicals…Berkeley radicals'.[10] Although Danny Schechter considered these to be 'wild charges' which only 'exacerbat[ed] the conflict', many other Americans who took part consider their influence as considerable.[11] Stop-it founder member David Slaney who was studying as a postgraduate student under Ralph Miliband, remembers there being at least a dozen members of SDS who were 'very directly involved with the movement back [in the US]' who brought to the LSE many of the ideas formed back home.[12] Speaking of the events, Slaney said: 'a lot of us tried to figure out how to reinvigorate what we saw as a moribund or Old Left English scene; so in a lot of different ways we tried to bring these new ideas in,' admitting that this was done 'somewhat arrogantly'.[13] Fellow LSE student Danny Coleman, who had been president of an SDS chapter at Hunter College, remembered entering a largely International Socialist (IS) milieu which revolved around notable British activists such as Joan Smith, Steve Jeffries, and Laurie

---

[8] Schechter, Danny: *News Dissector*, p. 53.
[9] Oral History interview with Danny Coleman, 5 April 2017; Schechter, Danny: *News Dissector*, p. 52.
[10] David Slaney, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Boston, Mass., 28 July 2016. Further works which assess the protests at LSE during the period are: Blackstone, Tessa and Gales, Kathlenn: *Students in Conflict: LSE in 1967* (London, 1970); and Hoch, Paul: *LSE: The Natives are Restless* (Sheed & Ward, Oct., 1969).
[11] Schechter, Danny: *News Dissector*, p. 55.
[12] David Slaney, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Boston, Mass., 29 July 2016.
[13] David Slaney, interview by author, 29 July 2016. Other interviewees such as Henry and Sheli Wortis also view their attitudes of the time to be 'arrogant', and feel retrospectively that their views were ill placed, particularly considering Britain's long activist tradition and the strong connections between the British activists and the working class: Sheli Wortis, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Boston, Mass., 29 July 2016.

Flynn, and was concerned largely with 'writing papers' on leftist issues rather than 'going out and organising'.[14] Frustrated with what they felt was a tired, ill equipped and outdated mode of approach to activism, and invigorated by the suspension of Bloom and Adelstein, the Americans began to form their own group which would transplant forms of activism common to the New Left in the US, such as agitprop and Angry Arts, to the British scene.

Central to the foundation of the Stop-it Committee was Harry Pincus, an Amherst graduate who was also studying as a post-graduate at the LSE. Being a figure of importance not only in Stop-it, but also in the subsequent American anti-war groups in Britain, Group 68 and the Union of American Exiles in Britain (UAEB), his path to activism is worth exploring in greater depth.

On graduating from Amherst in 1964, Pincus travelled to Britain aboard the Council of Student Travel chartered, MS Aurelia, to pursue postgraduate sociology at Oxford University. Also aboard the Aurelia was Wellesley graduate student and future member of Stop-it, Jean Kilbourne, travelling to London to work as a secretary at the BBC.[15] The pair immediately struck up a friendship which would continue until Pincus' tragic death from suicide eight years later.[16] Between their arrival in Britain and the formation of the Stop-it Committee in the spring of 1967, Pincus and Kilbourne exchanged dozens of letters which provide a fascinating insight to Pincus' progression from high achieving student to full-time activist. His letters are full of early adulthood existential angst, but also reveal an enormous

[14] Danny Coleman, interview by author, 5 April 2017.
[15] Kilbourne did so having won a position on a joint Wellesley College/Cambridge University exchange program, run in partnership with British and American institutions such as the BBC.
[16] It is not known why Pincus ended his life, but Kilbourne and others have speculated that he was an undiagnosed schizophrenic. In the months leading to his suicide, Pincus' behaviour became increasingly erratic, and he spoke of near breakdown's in his correspondence. Throughout this time he maintained a fierce opposition to the war in Vietnam and was still dedicated to the cause of assisting those Americans who had avoided the draft and were living abroad (unable to return home due to the threat of arrest and imprisonment). On his death, his parents were inundated with good wishes from many of those who had known him during his time in London.

tenderness, sensitivity, and quest for meaning and purpose in the world which would ultimately find voice in his opposition to the war in Vietnam.

Struggling to apply himself at Oxford in April '66 while studying for his exams, Pincus wrote that: 'Always in the past I used to leave it till the last moment and then come through. But now 'twill be different. I just stare at the pages, then look up and wonder what it's all about, then usually stop. Managing to stave off a panic'.[17] And in a letter the following month he continues in the same vein, stating:

> It's ridiculous to be in academe when the academic questions have so little meaning, and when the why is so big that just to do the work is a constant struggle and defeat. But Vietnam and the glorious reality which I still can't figure out which I am more drawn to or despise.[18]

However, the letter continues the following day with greater optimism:

> All of a sudden a bit of bright, and at any rate the spirit has gone up about 16 notches. Oxford may be beginning to take hold intellectually. Isaiah Berlin is giving a series of lectures, to which I went for the second time today. The most amazing lectures I've ever heard. He knows the meaning of relevance, and manages, to show how the same thing is both the author's work and its relevance to one's life. About Marx today and the moral action that one takes by acting or not.[19]

It is evident through Pincus' correspondence that 'moral action' was foremost in his mind during these spring months of 1966; his letters abound with references to Vietnam, and an insistence that Kilbourne take an interest in politics and an active stand against the war. She remembers that during this period Pincus did much to educate her about the war and was

[17] Letter: Harry Pincus to Jean Kilbourne, 26 April 1966. Kilbourne's private archive.
[18] Letter: Harry Pincus to Jean Kilbourne, 11 May 1966. Kilbourne's private archive.
[19] Letter: Harry Pincus to Jean Kilbourne, 11 May 1966. Kilbourne's private archive.

successful at persuading her to take both note and action.[20]

In June, Pincus wrote a further letter to Kilbourne in which he spoke of longing for 'something serious, in May Sarton's good words to give my heart to,' and that he had 'written to the LSE accepting a place in sociology'.[21] It was at the LSE Pincus would find the 'something serious' he was looking for. In a letter dated May 20 1967, Pincus wrote:

> my life in last 2 months has been taken up with a whole bunch – the LSE hubbub and then an open university, and now a 'Stop It Committee – Amer. in Brit for US Withdrawal from Vietnam…I have become political political etc. stuff – a vehicle and expression, engrossing but very inadequate, frustrating and necessary. Today's headline spoke of our 'defensive' invasion of the demilitarized zone; and I think Johnson is destined to lead us all to third world war, and what will happen. Christ I can't stop it my head spins round and round.[22]

Pincus' transformation from dedicated student to full-time activist has roots in a number of areas; no doubt inspirational academics at Oxford such as Isiah Berlin helped him clarify and make sense of the world, but it was activity outside cloistered university life which would shape him more fully. In his recent PhD thesis, Cochran identifies the Tavistock Institute as a place where the young student had his 'political awakening', while working alongside the clinic's director John Sutherland, as well as founder Eric Trist and psychologist Harry Guntrip.[23] It is rather more likely, however, that Pincus derived most influence from former Tavistock employee and future radical 'anti-psychiatrist' R. D. Laing, who on leaving Tavistock in 1964 founded the Philadelphia Association and set up a therapeutic community at Kingsley Hall. Here, Laing experimented with the idea of breaking down the doctor/patient relationship and aimed to further involve the patient in the decision making process. It was

---

[20] Jean Kilbourne, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Boston, MA, 13 January 2018.
[21] Letter: Harry Pincus to Jean Kilbourne, 4 June 1966. Kilbourne's private archive.
[22] Letter: Harry Pincus to Jean Kilbourne, 20 May 1967. Kilbourne's private archive.
[23] Cochran, Joshua D., PhD thesis, *'Beyond the Water's Edge: US Expatriates and the Vietnam War Movement'*, p. 83.

also the place which would become synonymous with the anti-psychiatry movement.[24] Pincus would frequently visit Laing at Kingsley Hall where, along with Kilbourne and others, he shared dinner with those receiving treatment, discussed issues such as the Vietnam War, experimented with LSD, and formed a lasting friendship with the American writer Clancy Sigal.[25] A polarising figure, Laing was enormously influential on many in the New Left, including a number of other Stop-it members and American expats, who read and discussed his book the *Divided Self* – his study into madness in which he aimed to make madness and going mad comprehensible – and, as we will see, watched him speak at the Dialectics of Liberation conference in 1967.

Drawing from the American student population at the LSE, Pincus and the aforementioned Danny Schechter – an aspiring journalist, ardent anti-Vietnam War activist, and SDS member – built the foundations of the group primarily around the objective of helping draft resisters and military deserters, but also as an organisation which would challenge America's involvement in the war and Britain's complicity in it. Some early members of the group were 'red diaper' babies, others were from liberal backgrounds, there were those who called themselves Trotskyist while others were drawn to Maoism; all, however, were bitterly opposed to America's violent war in Vietnam and were determined to

[24] The anti-psychiatry movement can be loosely described as one of criticism against the current modes of thought and practice deployed within psychiatry. Key critics who dominated the movement such as Laing, challenged established psychiatry and questioned its purpose and its 'conception of mental illness and the very distinction between madness and sanity', and argued that techniques of psychiatry such as psycho-analysis and psychotherapy – considered the humane end of psychiatry – may in fact be 'subtle control mechanisms'. What they proposed were radically different notions of treatment which included, in some cases, administering the then legal psychedelic drug, LSD. More on the movement can be found here: Crossley, Nick, 'R.D Laing and the British Anti-Psychiatry Movement: A Socio-Historical Analysis', *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 47, No. 7 (1998), pp. 877-889.

[25] Jean Kilbourne, interview by author, Boston, MA, 13 January 2018; and folder, 'Clancy Sigal - FBI file and correspondence, 1948-1981', Clancy Sigal Papers, Harry Ransom Center, Austin, TX.

do whatever they could to convey their feelings to a broad audience.[26] It was open to all Americans from all philosophies – or as group member David Slaney said, disdainful of the rigorous quizzing he had received when trying to join British left groups, 'you didn't have to have a view on the Moscow trials to be a part'.[27]

Once formed, Stop-it quickly set about increasing its numbers by appealing to the wider American community within Britain by publishing newspaper adverts, handbills and posting letters to fellow Americans in Britain.[28] One such letter bristles with the frustration and anger felt by the newly formed group at the 'insidiousness of purpose, and the sheer hypocrisy, of the American government' in their 'bogus anti-communist crusade'.[29] And in language which echoed the beliefs of Frantz Fanon and C Wright Mills, the authors spoke of Vietnam being a 'racist war' driven by 'a white ruling elite' in order to shore up America's financial empire. In response to this, the group stated that they as 'Americans in Britain, have initiated an organisation whose purpose is to effectively translate our indignation over this whole criminal affair into concrete action, and to conduct an education programme designed to make clear…the real meaning of the Vietnam War'.[30] The 'concrete action' the group spoke of began immediately.

Concrete Action

During its months of operation, the Stop-it Committee was involved in a

[26] Of the twelve interviews conducted with former members, seven come from either socialist or communist party backgrounds; however, Harry Pincus who came from a wealthy Jewish family in Manhattan was largely seen by others in the group as a liberal.
[27] David Slaney, interview by author, 29 July 2016.
[28] Various recruiting documents are held at the War Resisters International Archives (hereafter WRI) at the International Institute of Social History (hereafter IISH). These include letters and a leaflet with a cut off section which asks the respondent to include length of stay in Britain, and to circle a sub-committee they are interested in joining. Igor Webb, interviewed by author in the summer of 2016, was recruited through this leaflet.
[29] Letter: Stop-it to 'fellow Americans', May, 1967, in file XVI, Box 303, WRI, IISH.
[30] Letter: Stop-it to 'fellow Americans', May, 1967.

tremendously diverse range of activity, organised under sub-committees holding responsibilities for 'coordination', 'direct action' and 'information and education'.[31] The earliest large-scale action took place in June of 1967 during the BCPV's 'Vietnam Week' when Stop-it organised 'Angry Arts Week', a week of music events, poetry readings, and left-wing film at Camden's Roundhouse.[32] Planned as a 'demonstration of the artistic community against American intervention in Vietnam', the event emulated the Angry Arts Week which had taken place in New York the previous February, representing a further example of Americans importing ideas and modes of protest to British shores. There were speeches and readings by Harold Pinter and George Melly, an appearance by the well known anti-war actor Paul Schofield, and a 'confrontation panel' which saw the radical firebrand Tariq Ali, the writer Kingsley Amis and journalist and broadcaster Peregrine Worsthorne debate one another.[33] Side events including 'guerilla theatre' and agitprop events which took place outside the venue served to draw attention to the anti-war message and spread awareness of the group. One memorable event arranged by the Stop-it member Richard Hammerschlag saw a small contingent of protesters march their way to Grosvenor Square so three of their group could hand in their draft cards. Leading the procession was Danny Schechter, holding aloft a four-foot pole with a recently butchered pig's head stuck on the top in order to draw attention. This vivid and peculiar spectacle garnered the intended publicity and with it the attention of future members including Stop-it steering committee member Meredith Tax, who, although finding it all 'a little odd', tracked down the group and began working in their Hampstead office mimeographing protest leaflets.[34]

---

[31] Letter: Stop-it to 'fellow Americans', May, 1967.
[32] Thomas, Nick, 'Protests Against the Vietnam War in 1960s Britain: The Relationship between Protesters and the Press', *Contemporary British History*, 22:3, p. 339; Malchow, H.L. *Special Relations: The Americanization of Britain?,* p.153.
[33] Various articles: *The Times*, June 26 – July 1, 1967.
[34] Henry Wortis, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Boston, Mass., 29 July 2016; Meredith Tax, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Manhattan, New York City, 5 April 2017. Tax and

Although expensive, the Roundhouse event was successful in that it gained press attention helping to spread awareness of the group and its anti-war message to a broad, largely British, audience.[35] However, it was Americans from whom the group drew its constituency, and it was Americans the group wanted to target with their message as much, if not more so, than the British. In a clear indication of this, the group set about creating 'a guide for Americans in 1967' which was sold at American Express and other locations around London which American tourists were likely to visit. Sold for two shillings, the pamphlet's first page provided information advising tourists on places to visit, eat, and shop; this was followed by a further 19 pages of graphic photos from the destruction in Vietnam, statistics on casualties, and quotes from leading anti-war activists and politicians. And in an attempt to sow guilt and a sense of shame among the visiting Americans, the pamphlet stated that while America 'flagrantly violated' the Geneva Agreement of 1954, both Britain and France were 'committed' to it, and 'morally against intervention…and the horrible consequences resulting from our use of toxic chemicals, napalm, bombs and soldiers'. The document ends by encouraging Americans who bought it to join with the Stop-it Committee in their efforts to 'bring the war to an immediate end'.[36]

The remainder of the year saw the group involved in a variety of guerilla theatre

---

other Stop-it members would later attend the decade defining Dialectics of Liberation conference held at the Roundhouse in the weeks following Angry Arts. The event, which drew together figures such as Stokley Charmichael, Herbert Marcuse, and R.D Laing with the purpose of 'demystifying human violence in all its forms', also featured Stop-it member Allan Krebs who lectured about the Free University of New York he had set up in 1965. Krebs would later set up the anti-university of London which was largely based on the FUNY model, and offered free lectures on topics including pharmacology and guerilla warfare. For more on the conference see: Cooper, David (ed.): *The Dialectics of Liberation* (Verso May, 2015). The scholar Jakob Jakobsen is currently researching the anti-university of London, and his findings are being documented [online]: <http://antihistory.org> [accessed 20 April 2017].

[35] Various articles from The Times, 26 June to 1 July; also Malchow, H.L. *Special Relations: The Americanization of Britain?,* p. 152-153.

[36] Pamphlet: '*London: A Guide for Americans in 1967*', Private archive of Meredith Tax; Meredith Tax, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Manhattan, New York City, 5 April 2017; David Holmstrom, interview by author, 28 July 2016.

performances, political actions, and demonstrations, further designed to keep the Americans' opposition to the war in the public eye. Throughout this early period, the group allied itself closely with The Resistance movement in America, publishing adverts in international media under the slogan 'We Won't Go', and writing letters to publications expressing their support for the wider movement back in the US.[37] On 18 August, the Stop-it Committee took to the streets and marched to Grosvenor Square where they handed a letter to a representative at the embassy expressing 'outrage and shock at yet another major escalation of the war in Vietnam', and stated that their country had ceased to be an inspiration to oppressed people by becoming 'in the words of Martin Luther King "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today"'.[38] While in a further example of guerrilla theatre, the group revealed their focus to be as much about confronting British complicity in the war as it was about excoriating the Johnson administration. With Schechter leading the way once more, a group of twenty Stop-it members gathered in Fleet Street during an afternoon's lunch break, dressed in red, white and blue Uncle Sam hats, doctors' uniforms and military fatigues. The group hummed the Marine Corps hymn as the 'soldiers' darted in and out of the lunchtime crowds proceeding to 'draft Englishmen into the war in Vietnam' by handing out flyers made to look like draft cards, while other 'plants' were dragged to the 'induction centre and off to Vietnam'.[39] Later in the year Stop-it continued with their protests against British complicity by hiring a chauffeur driven Jaguar, in which members of Stop-it – including Jean Kilbourne dressed as Miss America and Harry Pincus as a bowler hatted British businessman – drove to Downing Street where they emerged holding an eight-by-eight-foot draft card informing Harold Wilson he'd been classified as 1-A 'until his policy changes'.[40] Remembering the

[37] Committee circular detailing the progress of Stop-it: file XVI, Box 303, WRI, IISH. The Resistance and their links with the Stop-it Committee will be explored in more depth below.
[38] Article: 'Americans protest at embassy', *The Guardian*, 19 August 1967.
[39] Schechter, Danny: *News Dissector*, p. 57; Jean Kilbourne, interview by author, Boston, MA, 13 January 2018.
[40] Schechter, Danny: *News Dissector*, p. 57; Henry Wortis, interview by author, Boston, Mass., 29

event with fondness, Kilbourne spoke of how the group set out to generate as much press attention as possible.[41] This they did, although newspapers such as the *Sun*, perhaps unsurprisingly, chose to focus on the beautiful mini-skirted Kilbourne rather than the group's message.[42]

By the winter Stop-it had grown to between 200 and 400 members across the UK, with a core of between 20 to 30 'fully active' members who would congregate most weeks for meetings at the Rosslyn Hill apartment of Harry Pincus.[43] As the group advanced into the New Year, disagreements over their aims came to the fore and Stop-it began to split into separate camps. Founding members Harry Pincus and Joel Gladstone left to pursue other anti-war projects, while the remainder relocated their office to Fleet Street and continued under the Stop-it Committee name. Although this is explored in depth below, two publications the group produced at this time neatly reflect the differing positions of Stop-it's core leadership and are therefore worth discussing here. With Pincus committed to the draft resister issue, a leaflet titled '*England and Draft Age Americans*' was produced and served as a supplement to a mimeographed guide called '*Residing in Europe and its Relation to the Draft*'. The leaflet contained detailed immigration information – such as the likelihood of being admitted and what to expect at the border – for those seeking to avoid conscription and settle in Britain.[44] It also included contact information for their group and other legal organisations they could contact for help, and was circulated widely in the US.[45] A rather

---

July 2016; Jean Kilbourne, interview by author, Boston, MA, 13 January 2018.
[41] Jean Kilbourne, interview by author, Boston, MA, 13 January 2018.
[42] Articles: *The Times*, Friday December 5 1967; and *The Sun*, Friday December 5 1967; Jean Kilbourne, interview by author, Boston, MA, 13 January 2018.
[43] The precise number of members is difficult to ascertain, but all interviewees cite the core group as being between 25 to 30 members, while a section of an unfinished memoir by Meredith Tax puts the mailing number at 400: '*unpublished Meredith Tax memoir*', Private archive of Meredith Tax
[44] Pamphlet: '*England and Draft Age Americans*,' and pamphlet '*Residing in Europe and its Relation to the Draft*,' December, 1967, private archive of Meredith Tax.
[45] Stop-it Committee leaflet: Heninz Norden Papers (Hereafter HNP), Box Tam 122, File 'The Stop-it Committee', Tamiment Library, NYU.

more ambitious undertaking, however, was the so called 'March Project', a series of events which took place in the titular month. At the heart of the project was the creation of a booklet entitled '*Vietnam, the United States, and Britain*', which set out to expose Britain's complicity in the war, and erode the 'notion that Vietnam [did] not concern Britain'.[46] Within the leaves of the 25-page booklet, the authors offer a comprehensive, thoroughly well researched analysis of the British government and British business connections to Vietnam and the war stretching back to 1945. Correlations were drawn between Britain's non-military aid to South Vietnam and the escalation of the war, revealing a marked increase of 510 per cent in aid between 1964 and 1967. British military assistance was documented, showing that within the same timeframe 240 US troops and 1035 South Vietnamese troops had been trained by the British at their Jungle Warfare Training School in Jahore, Malaysia; while British facilities in Hong Kong and Singapore were being used by the American military for rest and recreation. Meanwhile, links were established between 39 British companies and the US Department of Defense.[47] One of the principal researchers of the document, David Slaney, revealed in an interview that the inspiration for the booklet had come directly from recent events at the universities of Columbia and Harvard when students took over administrative buildings and 'liberated the files', suggesting it was 'a small way in which the American New Left influenced things [in Britain]'.[48] Having gained access to the files, students copied information then used it in a 'published document called *Who Rules Harvard* which made all these connections between the board of directors and corporations and the military industrial complex…we tried to do the same thing…what were the connections

[46] Booklet: '*Vietnam, United States & Britain – The Facts of Entanglement*', private archive of David Slaney.
[47] Booklet: '*Vietnam, United States & Britain – The Facts of Entanglement*', private archive of David Slaney
[48] David Slaney, interview by author, 29 July 2016.

between England and Vietnam?'[49] Members of Stop-it then handed the booklet out at the LSE but also 'wherever we spoke' and it was used primarily 'to explain to [British] people why they should oppose the war – this wasn't something the US was doing [alone] it was something they were complicit in'.[50]

The group continued their actions into the autumn of 1968, taking part in British demonstrations, holding study groups, sending speakers to universities, clubs and teach-ins, and leafleting outside American companies based in London. It was heavily in debt, however, and although strong bonds of peace, friendship and collaboration had been formed with British groups, there was little anyone could do to help shore up the struggling Stop-it Committee which finally disbanded in November 1968. Their final action as a group would be to march under their own banner at the large British anti-war demonstration in October, 1968.

Bonds of Peace

Many of Stop-it's members arrived in Britain in the mid-sixties with no prior experience of the country, few connections beyond the universities they attended, and little understanding of the culture, politics and broader way of life. It is therefore remarkable that during the group's period of activity an intricate network of bonds was forged with groups, individuals and institutions across Britain and back home in the US. Conscious of the publicity draw of celebrities, and mindful of the influential power of politicians, Stop-it began cultivating relationships with well known British personalities from an early stage. In doing so they hoped to increase their number, place pressure on the British government to

[49] Slaney is slightly mistaken here - a document entitled 'Who Rules Columbia' was published in January of 1968 by North American Congress on Latin America, which provides links between the University's board of directors and the Military Industrial Complex. This was then used by Harvard students as a model for a similar document the following year.
[50] David Slaney, interview by author, 29 July 2016.

end complicity, and encourage the British public to offer support to Americans who were resisting the draft. Central to generating contacts was Harry Pincus. Intelligent, charismatic and charming, Pincus was naturally gifted at creating friendships and developing trust. He was also highly driven, tenacious, and, crucially, dedicated to both the anti-Vietnam War and the resister cause.

During Stop-it's early months, Pincus befriended a number of influential Britons, including Margaret Gardiner – the left wing activist and daughter of Egyptologist Sir Alan Gardiner – and the veteran peace campaigner, Peggy Duff. With the assistance of Gardiner and Duff, Pincus and Stop-it began collecting signatures of well-known Britons who would appear in a *Times* advert supporting American draft resisters. Writing to a friend about the collecting of signatures, Jean Kilbourne spoke of waiting outside the stage door of a London theatre for Sir Alec Guinness, who after an hour or so welcomed her into his dressing room where he 'spoke of his sympathy for the cause and was warm and wonderful, and didn't sign'. 'Ah well,' continued Kilbourne, 'Peter Ustinov and Stephen Spender and ten other notables did'.[51] The other 'notables' included the authors John Le Carré and Nancy Mitford, and the society figures Marjory Allen of Hurtwood and Dorothea Head. Their names featured at the bottom of the advert which stated that although Britain was not fighting in Vietnam, since the British government supported US policy British citizens could not 'evade [their] share of the guilt for this shameful war'. It also encouraged Britons to 'voice [their] admiration for the courage of these Americans and assure them that we will give them all the political support and practical assistance in our power'.[52] Support could be given in the first instance by completing a tear off and post section of the advert, where the respondent could either 'endorse the statement' or enclose a donation for legal assistance, accommodation or

[51] Letter: Kilbourne to Doane Perry, 6 January 1968, in private collection of Jean Kilbourne.
[52] Advert: 'Britons and American Draft Resisters', *The Times*, 5 December 1967.

employment of resisters. In the days after the advert appeared, a number of letters appeared in the *Times* voicing both support and caution from the British public, while a letter from Gardiner spoke of 'a good response' to its appearance.[53]

In addition to developing relationships with British individuals, Stop-it also formed and maintained bonds with groups such as the BCPV and the long established group War Resisters International (WRI). On July 2, 1967 Stop-it marched through London alongside the BCPV organisers, where they were joined by 75 American passing tourists and 'greeted with cheers and applause along the route'.[54] Encouraged by the support they received, a later circular emphasised that the group must make themselves visible as 'we do mean something to the British public!'.[55] Meanwhile, a steady contact was maintained with WRI through the prolific correspondence of Pincus, Linda Gordon and Henry Wortis. The general secretary of WRI, Devi Prasad, remained in contact with Harry Pincus throughout the American's time in London, meeting with him regularly and helping him with his efforts to provide support for draft resisters, while also allowing Pincus to use the WRI's office in London's Caledonia Road as a mailing address.[56] Although the relationships with the BCPV and WRI were mutually beneficial and cordial, it was with the VSC that Stop-it forged the closest of bonds. Remembering the relationship, Meredith Tax spoke of how she and most other Stop-it members were drawn to the British group because of its 'younger, more creative, and more militant' crowd, rather than the peace seeking BCPV who they saw as 'rather old and tired'.[57] Although the VSC was considered a British group, with veteran anti-war activist Bertrand Russell as president, a number of Americans held prominent positions, including Ralph Schoenman as chairman, and David Horowitz as National Council member. Horowitz, who

---

[53] Letter: Margaret Gardiner to *The Times*, *The Times*, 8 December 1967.
[54] Stop-it circular dated August, 1967, file XVI, Box 303, WRI, IISH.
[55] Stop-it circular dated August, 1967, file XVI, Box 303, WRI, IISH.
[56] Various letters and correspondence between both *Stop-it* and the UAEB and WRI 1967 – 1973, files XVI and XV, Box 303, WRI, IISH.
[57] '*unpublished Meredith Tax memoir*', Private archive of Meredith Tax.

had been a postgraduate student at the LSE and previously worked for the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, joined the Stop-it Committee shortly after it was set up in May 1967. A number of Stop-it members have spoken of how influential they found the Marxist academic, reading his work and being introduced by him to other famous Marxists such as Ralph Miliband, and he provided a crucial link between Stop-it and the VSC.[58] Whenever there was a large VSC event, Stop-it members would participate. The year before the final demonstration in 1968, a large contingent from Stop-it had attended the VSC demonstration on Sunday 22 October, which was held in solidarity with the march on Washington DC. Again, during the day's events Stop-it members made a conscious effort to be 'very visible' as Americans.[59] Far from confining their VSC relationship to demonstrations, however, the Americans frequently joined forces with the VSC in smaller actions such as the leafleting against Dow Chemicals at the Building Trades Fair held at the London Olympia, and would write for the VSC's regular publication, *Bulletin*.[60] So close was the relationship with the British group that once Stop-it ceased to operate in November, 1968, three contributors to the *Bulletin* would later help form local VSC ad-hoc committees in London.

There was also a concerted effort both to join forces with other Americans based outside London, and to maintain bonds with the anti-war movement back in the US. With large numbers of American scholars based at Oxford and Cambridge, bonds were formed between Stop-it and the universities' respective contingents of Americans. A Cambridge

---

[58] Horowitz would later return to the US and become co-editor of the radical New Left magazine, *Ramparts*, and form a close relationship with founder of the Black Panther Party, Huey P. Newton. In a remarkable shift of loyalties, Horowitz renounced the Left in the 1980s and became one of its fiercest critics, haranguing it for its 'hypocrisies', and doing so with the 'familiarity of an insider'. Interview with Danny Coleman, 5 April 2017. For more on Horowitz work and shift in loyalties, see Glazov, Jamie, 'The Life and Work of David Horowitz', *National Review*, Nov. 10, 2015.

[59] Stop-it circular dated October, 1967, file XVI, Box 303, WRI, IISH.

[60] Leaflet Dow Makes Napalm', issued by the VSC and *Stop-it Committee*, file XVI, Box 303, WRI, IISH; and Kilbourne interview 13 January 2018; and Vietnam Solidarity Campaign Bulletin 19 November, 1968, author's own collection; and *Stop-it* circular dated November, 1967, file XVI, Box 303, WRI, IISH.

University Stop-it Committee was formed, and members from the London group, including Bob Brenner and Doris Meibach, organised a 'busload of people' to be transported to Cambridge to attend a speech being delivered by the US ambassador to Britain; the intention of which was to 'express their appreciation for the part ambassador David Bruce plays in dishonoring our country'.[61] Group members infiltrated several of their number into the audience who forced the issue of Vietnam into the public by sharply questioning Bruce, while the remainder made it clear that Bruce did 'not speak for all the US in his support for the war' from outside the building.

Although close ties were maintained between the Cambridge group and the Stop-it Committee, it was decided in November 1967 that Americans at the university would form their own group, Americans in Cambridge Against the War in Vietnam (ACAWV).[62] Early in the New Year the group set about their first action: the collection of signatures from American residents in Cambridge who were opposed to the war. In total, 217 names were gathered and appeared on an advert taken out in the university's *Varsity* magazine under the heading 'We the undersigned Americans in Cambridge oppose our government's policy of escalation in Vietnam and support a policy of extraction of our forces from that country'.[63] In adopting a position of withdrawal in Vietnam, former ACAWV leader Jack Stauder stated that they 'reflected the broad anti-war movement…in the United States which tried to unite as many people as possible' and that they did not want to alienate anyone by supporting the NLF or being 'either united or interested in left-wing causes in general'.[64] This represented a marked difference in position from many within Stop-it and their close British ally the VSC, perhaps revealing the decision by ACAWV to form their own group.

---

[61] Stop-it circular dated November, 1967, file XVI, Box 303, WRI, IISH.
[62] Oral History interview with Jack Stauder, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, New Bedford, Mass., April 8, 2017; and Stauder's FBI file dated 11 December 1967 in Stauder's private collection.
[63] Advert, *Varsity*, February 1968, in Stauder's private collection.
[64] Jack Stauder interview by author, 8 April 2017.

Despite these ideological differences, Stauder became a regular go-between for ACAWV and Stop-it, earning the tongue-in-cheek moniker 'Chairman Jack'. As 'de-facto leader', Stauder would organise meetings with members of Stop-it and, in collaboration with the London group's Danny Schechter, arranged a speaking tour of British universities for American SDS member Norman Fruchter. A Rutgers graduate, Fruchter had previously worked in Britain on the *New Left Review* (*NLR*) as an assistant to the publication's founding editor, Stuart Hall.[65] Here the young aspiring journalist and filmmaker received 'a grounding in post-Marxist theory' during what he termed a 'very intense period for left theory in London'.[66] On his return to the US in 1962, the fledgling SDS capitalised on his experience at the *NLR* and asked him to join the publication *Studies on the Left* as an editor in their New York City office. Forging strong personal bonds with SDS members during the next few years, Fruchter then returned to Britain between 1966 and 1968 where he 'operated as a channel' between draft resister organisations in Europe and SDS's National Secretary, Steve Halliwell.[67] Using Britain as a base, Fruchter travelled to France and Sweden making contact with deserter and resistance groups and fed information back to Halliwell on who the resisters were, how they came to be where they were, and how the groups operated. Travelling back and forth between the continent, Britain and the US during this period, Fruchter became highly versed on the European anti-war landscape and provided a crucial link between the SDS and the wider international movement. When in the late spring of 1967 the DRV and NLF convened an anti-war conference in Bratislava, Tom Hayden and David

[65] The British New Left differed considerably from its American counterpart. In Britain it was characterised by the socialist humanism of those associated with the journal, *New Reasoner*, and the independent socialism of a younger crowd attached to the *Universities and Left Review*. The journals would join forces in the newly established *New Left Review* in 1960. For more on the British New Left see: Kenny, Michael: *The First New Left – British Intellectuals After Stalin* (Lawrence and Wishart, 1995); and Matthews, Wade: *The New Left – National Identity and the Break-up of Britain* (Haymarket, 2013).
[66] Norm Fruchter, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Portland, Maine, 30 June 2016.
[67] Norm Fruchter, interview by author, 30 June 2016.

Dellinger asked Fruchter to attend.[68] During the conference – also attended by members of the civil rights movement, the student movement and academics from Harvard and Yale – the Vietnamese invited Fruchter and seven other Americans to return with them to North Vietnam to view the destruction being wrought on their homeland. The small group accepted the invite and spent a month touring bomb sites, visiting hospitals and factories, and meeting with citizens of the DRV in order for the Vietnamese 'to show [that the aerial bombing] wouldn't defeat them' – something Fruchter became 'quickly convinced of'.[69] On returning to Britain, Fruchter embarked on the Stop-it organised speaking tour of universities, colleges and anti-war groups, speaking candidly of his experience and the 'inevitability of a North Vietnamese victory and the lack of effectiveness of US bombing'.[70] No doubt delivering precisely the lecture the North Vietnamese had hoped for.

Also present at the Bratislava conference was Stanford graduate and founder member of the US group 'The Resistance', Dennis Sweeney.[71] Returning to the US by way of London, Sweeney met with the Stop-it Committee to encourage them to support their national draft card turn-in on 16 October – organised to coincide with Stop the Draft Week.[72]

---

[68] Co-author of the SDS's founding document, the Port Huron Statement, Tom Hayden was a central figure in the American New Left, later becoming internationally renown for his anti-war and civil rights activism. He also married the American actress and anti-war movement poster girl, Jane Fonda. Similarly, David Dellinger was an influential anti-war activist, gaining notoriety beyond American shores as one of the so called 'Chicago Seven'.

[69] Norm Fruchter, interview by author, 30 June 2016.

[70] FBI file of Jack Stauder, dated 11 December 1967, in Stauder's private archive; and oral History interview with Norm Fruchter, 30 June 2016.

[71] Dennis Sweeney, along with Steve Hamilton, Lenny Heller and others, formed The Resistance in Palo Alto, California in March 1967. Their plan was three-fold: to undermine the draft's effectiveness through the nonviolent non-cooperation of those called up to serve in the military; to serve as visible moral examples; and third, to overwhelm the Selective Service System, courts and prisons so the institutions would be unable to carry out their duties. For more information on The Resistance see the website of documentary filmmaker, Judith Ehrlich, who is in the process of making 'The Boys Who Said NO!', a documentary on The Resistance [online]: <https://www.boyswhosaidno.com >[accessed 25 April 2017].

[72] The draft card turn-in was held as planned on 16 October, and resulted in 2000 draft cards being turned in at protests in 18 cities across the US. The first major event of its kind, draft resistance built dramatically over the following years becoming one of the most influential aspects of the anti-war movement. For more on draft resistance and its impact on ending the war, see: Foley, Michael:

Sweeney spoke to the group at length, describing The Resistance as 'a broad based campaign of civil disobedience and disruption' which was working to achieve 'the confrontation and partial polarization of forces within America, and the steady disruption of the normal day-by-day patterns of American life'.[73] Inspired by the radical American, and heartened at the thought they could join in solidarity with fellow Americans back home, Stop-it coordinated the draft-card turn in, described at this chapter's outset, with The Resistance.

The bonds Stop-it formed with The Resistance would continue with two further founding members, Paul O'Brian and Lenny Heller, meeting with the group later in the year. The relationship with Fruchter was also maintained, with the young journalist screening 'Troublemakers' – his film which followed a group of SDS militants and their attempt to politicise and organise the people of Newark, New Jersey – for the group.[74] The bonds Stop-it formed with figures such as these, combined with the established relationships with friends and family who would occasionally visit Britain and take part in Stop-it events, were important in maintaining legitimacy for many of the group's members. Far from home and distant from core American anti-war activity, group members such as Jean Kilbourne decided to return, maintaining this was the only way to make an impact on ending the war.[75] For those who chose to remain, however, the linkages with American groups and individuals enabled them to feel a sense of solidarity with the American movement and a belief they were taking part in the national conversation on the war.

Confronting the War Machine – Draft Resistance During the Vietnam War (University North Carolina Press, 2003).

[73] Special Branch file 'American Political Activity in London', p. 11 24 November 1967, HO file: 325/104, NA.

[74] Norm Fruchter, interview by author, 30 June 2016.

[75] Jean Kilbourne, interview by author, Boston, MA, 13 January 2018.

Under Surveillance

Although brief in life, few in members, and, like many anti-war groups the world over, desperately short on funds, the Stop-it Committee managed to generate significant attention not just from the media and public, but the security services both sides of the Atlantic. In his recent PhD thesis which utilises cables between the American embassy in London as well as CIA files, Joshua Cochran identifies the significant interest American authorities paid to the Stop-it Committee. He also reveals that the language used in CIA reports 'reflects the long-standing assumption that the longer US citizens remained overseas, the more susceptible the citizens were to "corrupting" influences' showing an evident fear that Americans would return to the US as a 'fifth column'.[76] The fear of a growing overseas network of organising anti-war Americans was also evident in British newspaper reports of the time. Following Stop-it's advert appealing for Britons to assist deserters, one such report headed 'Diplomatic flurry over Vietnam ad.' mentioned the American Ambassador to Britain, David Bruce, being asked 'to make a formal protest by Washington' over the advert's appearance; however Bruce decided 'it would be inappropriate to do so'.[77]

The lengths to which the American authorities went to in order to gather information on dissidents is also revealed in personal FBI files released through the US Freedom of Information Act. Many group members attracted the attention of the American security services, but it is clear on viewing members' files that the individuals who protested at American airbases came under particular scrutiny.[78] With the United States Air Force

---

[76] Cochran, Joshua D., PhD thesis, *'Beyond the Water's Edge',* p. 115.
[77] Newspaper report of unknown origin, December, 1967, '*Diplomatic flurry over Vietnam ad*', Home Office (HO) file: 325/104, National Archives (hereafter NA).
[78] Folder, 'Clancy Sigal - FBI file and correspondence, 1948-1981', Clancy Sigal Papers, Harry Ransom Center, Austin, TX; Folder, 'Harry G. Pincus FBI file', Box 7645, RG 65: Records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, NARA II, National Archives, College Park, MD; FBI file of Dennis Stukenbroeker, in Stukenbroeker's private archive; and FBI file of Jack Stauder, in Stauder's private archive.

(USAF) operating from a number of Royal Air Force bases situated close to Cambridge, Jack Stauder and others from the university would often picket outside the gates, hand out anti-war literature, and in later years, they actively encouraged the GIs to join the anti-war movement.[79] Their activity quickly attracted the attention of the USAF Intelligence wing, the Office of Special Investigations (OSI), whose operatives began gathering information on Stauder and the ACAWV. The American's FBI file reveals that he and the group had been brought to the attention of the OSI by an informer called SOURCE and codenamed OS1. The informer who was described as 'of known reliability' and 'knowledgeable of the hostile agitation element locally' advised the OSI that the aims of the ACAWV 'would be closely aligned' with those of CND, the Committee of One Hundred and the Stop-it Committee.[80] On the basis of this information, Major John F. Vanwicklen of the USAF initiated surveillance on the group from the RAF base at South Ruislip. The spying was carried out by Reginald M Dodrill, codenamed OS2, an operative at RAF Lakenheath. Dodrill attended the inaugural meeting of the ACAWV to which Norman Fruchter delivered his lecture, reporting that it was 'anti-American' in nature, and that he was able to identify individuals with the aid of photographs taken by SOURCE OS1. Stauder is described as a 'motivating personality behind' the Stop-it Committee, and had 'some official function in the ACAWV'.[81] During March the following year, Agent OS1 was active again, reporting to Dodrill that the February issue of the university newspaper *Varsity* contained a list of 216 American residents in Cambridge who were opposed to US foreign policy in Vietnam. SOURCE OS1 reported that ACAWV:

> may present a more militaristic agitational threat to the USAF in England than previously

[79] Jack Stauder, interview by author, 8 April 2017. Many students from Cambridge helped set up the British based anti-war GI group People Emerging Against Corrupt Establishments (P.E.A.C.E). The group is discussed in depth in chapter 4 of this thesis.
[80] FBI file of Jack Stauder, dated 11 December 1967, in Stauder's private archive.
[81] FBI file of Jack Stauder, dated 11 December 1967.

> presented by the British. SOURCE feels that the attitude of agitational groups in Cambridge is becoming more direct action orientated than in the past and this may be the result of the recent increase in participation by American students in agitational type activities.

The report continues by saying that all names listed in the *Variety* advert would be cross checked with Intelligence records.[82]

Speaking years later of his FBI record, Stauder said he was amazed the Intelligence community paid any attention: 'ACAWV was absolutely open about recruiting and about meetings. Yet they make us sound like a bunch of spies or plotters, as if we were secretive. The meetings were not incitements to violence, they were just talk'.[83] But aware that talk could quickly turn to action, the OSI took no chances, observing the group for the remainder of the time it was operational, and becoming increasingly concerned as the action they feared became ever more likely.[84]

Of course, where the American authorities had concerns over American expatriate activism, so too did the British. Shortly after Stop-it's foundation in the spring of 1967, Special Branch began spying on group members, and did so with considerable lack of subtlety. Although much of the British surveillance documentation on the group is closed to the public, a combination of anecdotal evidence and available Special Branch files reveals extensive monitoring of the group.[85]

---

[82] FBI file of Jack Stauder, dated 28 March 1968.
[83] Jack Stauder, quoted in, Tighe, Carl, '*Intelligence Report'*, Radical Wales (date unknown), in Stauder's private archive.
[84] The continued spying on Cambridge and Oxford students, as well as members of the armed forces, is explored in further depth in chapter 4.
[85] A Freedom of Information Request relating to Special Branch observation of the Stop-it Committee was submitted to the Metropolitan Police by the author in September 2017; however, the request was declined. In an email reply dated 18 October 2017, the Met stated that they could 'neither confirm nor deny whether it holds the information…requested…by virtue of the following exemptions': Section 23(5) – Information supplied by, or concerning, certain security bodies; Section 24(2) – National Security; Section 30(3) – Criminal Investigations; Section 31(3) – Law Enforcement; Section 40(5) – Personal Information. In the years immediately following the Freedom of Information Act in 2005, the Metropolitan Police and the Home Office had a relatively flexible policy on releasing Special Branch documents. Since then, and for undisclosed reasons, virtually all requests for Special Branch

In interviews with Stop-it members many spoke of being followed while others mentioned individuals turning up to meetings who seemed out of place. The journalist who wrote the above newspaper article on the 'diplomatic flurry', also wrote that a 'Special Branch car [was] parked opposite the HQ in Rosslyn Hill' for 14 days.[86] Indeed, by the time the article was written, Special Branch had built a considerable report on the 'multifarious activities' of the 'United States citizens'.[87] Where the American authorities were worried about fifth columnists, the British were concerned with the 'increasing militancy among Americans in London over an expanding field of activity'.[88] This 'expanding field' included Black Power and the spread of drugs, particularly LSD, through the rising anti-psychiatry movement, and the worry that the Americans were becoming involved in domestic British political concerns such as 'support[ing] a demonstrations against alleged police brutality'.[89] The report details the connections between Harry Pincus and the Black Power leader Stokeley Carmichael who had come to speak at the Dialectics of Liberation conference; whilst further establishing links between 'The Resistance' and the Stop-it Committee.[90] In total, 114 names of Americans appear on the document, and although the extent of information on each person varies considerably, the evident time and resources spent on compiling it serves as a clear indication of the government's fear that the turbulence of America's growing anti-war, civil rights, and countercultural movements, would cross the

---

files are declined. However, a group of British journalists and historians have recently launched an online project to collect and display Special Branch files released during the years immediately following the FOI act. Files can be viewed online:< www.specialbranchfiles.co.uk.> [accessed 5 May 2017].

[86] Newspaper report of unknown origin, December 1967, '*Diplomatic flurry over Vietnam ad',* HO file: 325/104, NA.

[87] Letter from Special Branch to the Home Office, 28 November 1967: HO file: 325/104, NA.

[88] Special Branch file 'American Political Activity in London', p. 11 November 24, 1967, HO file: 325/104, NA.

[89] Special Branch file, p. 9 24 November 1967, HO file: 325/104, NA.

[90] Special Branch file, 24 November 1967, HO file: 325/104, NA. Three members of the Resistance – the group set up in America in 1967 to oppose the draft – were documented as having spent time in the UK, and in interviews conducted by the author, *Stop-it* members revealed this as a direct influence in their handing draft cards over to the American embassy.

Atlantic.

Following the large anti-Vietnam War demonstration on 17 March 1968 the Metropolitan Police (Met) realised they were woefully ill prepared for the scale and the violence which could erupt at such events. One former Special Branch operative recalled that they 'underestimated the number of people coming, we were ill equipped at the time and couldn't bring in enough men to control it…when the violence erupted, we were amateurs'; while another believed that Special Branch were 'totally inept at both the information we gathered and the way we dealt with that information'.[91] Fearful of a revolution, the Met quickly formed a Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) to gather information on Marxist and Trotskyist groups. Using the identities of 80 dead children, undercover operators known as 'hairies' due to their appearance, infiltrated groups and fed information back to the Met. Although it is currently impossible to ascertain whether the SDS infiltrated Stop-it, many members spoke of British individuals attempting to join their group who they strongly suspected were from the security services.[92] Further to this, David Slaney and Henry and Sheli Wortis appear in Special Branch reports filed after the SDS was formed, in which they are described as 'prominent persons in the VSC' who 'possess the necessary influence and following to sway events'; Slaney is also mentioned as secretary of the Kentish Town VSC ad-hoc committee.[93] In a further report compiled in the lead up to the 'autumn offensive' of the VSC in 1968, the Stop-it Committee are mentioned under the subheading of 'Foreign elements' who were expected to attend the 27 October demonstration, and said to be

---

[91] Documentary produced by the BBC – *True Spies* episode 1: '*Subversive My Arse*', 27 October 2002.
[92] David Slaney, interview by author, 29 July 2016; Sheli Wortis, interview by author, 29 July 2016; Henry Wortis, interview by author, 29 July 2016; Jack Stauder, interview by author, 8 April 2017; Meredith Tax, interview by author, 5 April 2017.
[93] Special Branch report dated 16 October 1968 [online]: <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2494420-16th-oct-1968-weekly-report-on-preparations-for.html > [accessed 25 May 2017].

'opposed to their own government's policies, particularly the draft'.[94] While in an indication that the group was beginning to crumble, a further report describes members as being 'split on the violence issue'.[95] Violence was far from the only issue the group was divided on, however.

Stop-it Splits

From the moment the group formed, members were in disagreement over what their aims and objectives should be, and the fractures which finally caused the group to split began to emerge shortly after the group's Angry Arts Week.[96] The foremost divisive issue was whether or not they should simply focus on draft resistance or diversify to include British complicity. Although heated debates on the issue were commonplace, the group's differences only came to a head following the VSC demonstration of 27 October 1967. The surprise success of the demonstration heralded the arrival of what some believed was a true British anti-Vietnam War movement, and there was a belief from many in Stop-it that they should broaden their mandate to help build it. Adding to the contentious environment was the issue over whether or not members agreed with the VSC's rallying cry for an NLF victory. Sharply divided on their position, a 'political struggle' ensued between what Meredith Tax characterized as 'the liberals' and 'the radicals'.[97] Firmly entrenched with the radicals, Tax remembered Harry Pincus and his 'liberals friends' viewing the Vietnam War as a terrible error, a departure from US democratic traditions; therefore, they believed the correct approach was to 'seize the moral high ground, refuse to participate in the war, and do

---

[94] Special Branch report dated 3 October 1968 [online]: <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2494422-3rd-oct-1968-weekly-report-on-preparations-for.html > [accessed 25 May 2017].
[95] Special Branch report 'Vietnam Solidarity Campaign "Autumn Offensive"', 9 October 1968 [online]:< http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487404-10th-sep-1968-sb-report-on-vietnam-solidarity.html > [accessed 29 May 2017].
[96] Meredith Tax, interview by author, 5 April 2017.
[97] Meredith Tax, interview by author, 5 April 2017.

everything…to make the US government to see the error of its ways'. To achieve this they wanted to stay focused on draft resistance. The radicals, meanwhile, argued that the policy being directed in Vietnam was not an aberration but 'part of a consistent US policy of trying to run the world for its own economic benefit', and followed a string of similar US 'imperialist venture[s]'. To the radicals, the strategy derived from this analysis was one of expanding their program to 'create enough pressure in England to make the Labour government get off the fence and stop being complicit in the US war effort'.[98]

Hindering the group at this juncture was the intrinsic lack of structure common to New Left groups of the time.[99] Many of Stop-it's actions were agreed in a 'typical New Left fashion' which adhered to principals of no hierarchy or elected leadership.[100] This lack of structure, combined with factional in-fighting and overall disagreements about the direction of the group, led to the decision to elect a steering committee shortly after the group of eight members took their draft cards to the embassy.[101] Remembering the decision, Meredith Tax said: 'the problem with unaccountable leadership…particularly in groups which have no clear structure…is that often one person becomes public representative without ever having been elected, either because that person's house is the communications hub, or because he or she has enough personal resources to do organisational work full-time'.[102] In this case, the problem lay with Harry Pincus, the man who first set up the group and whose apartment the members met in. Other group members remember Pincus as 'an angry liberal', and someone the group was 'always trying to overthrow'.[103] Despite these feelings, and perhaps in

---

[98] Meredith Tax, interview by author, 5 April 2017.
[99] The issue of structure – or lack thereof – was explored in depth by Jo Freeman in her essay, '*The Tyranny of Structurelessness*', which explore the problem in the women's liberation movement [online]: < http://www.jofreeman.com/joreen/tyranny.htm > [accessed 4 June 2017].
[100] David Slaney, interview by author, 29 July 2016.
[101] '*Proposal for Structural Revision of the Stop-it Committee*,' Oct., 1967, Private archive of Meredith Tax.
[102] Meredith Tax, interview by author, 5 April 2017.
[103] Henry Wortis, interview by author, Boston, Mass., 29 July 2016 and Robert Brenner, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Los Angeles, 10 April 2017.

acknowledgment of his role in founding the group, he was voted onto the steering committee alongside eight others.[104] This was a briefly held position, however, as group's first action following the election of the committee would see Pincus leave the group he founded and the remaining members take a direction which bound them more closely with the British cause.

Pincus and fellow group member Joel Gladstone were tasked with organising the December '67 advert which appeared in the *Times* and which pledged support for American draft resisters. Pincus had, however, confused the Stop-it address at the bottom of the advert with the office address of the ICDP and therefore effectively put the group's money into the hands of the ICDP.[105] Pincus resigned from the steering committee the following week, and ultimately left the group. With Pincus gone, the group moved to a new address off Fleet Street and wrote to all British peace groups informing them of a change in their strategy. The letter, penned by Danny Schechter, revealed the majority of the group had decided to structure the support for resisters 'within the context of a broader political strategy within Great Britain,' and to 'do more than simply "wag the tail" of a distant American movement'.[106] To this end, the group moved to a position which prioritised the pressuring of the British government to withdraw its support for the war, rather than attacking the American government and encouraging support for draft resisters.

The broadening of Stop-it's mandate was welcomed by women in the group who believed the move would empower them. Although draft resistance inspired many women in Stop-it, there was a feeling that focusing purely on this area left little for them other than a supporting role. With no draft cards to hand in or burn, there was no opportunity for the group's female members to take a lead. Recalling the decision, Meredith Tax spoke of her

---

[104] 'Steering committee notes', private archive of Meredith Tax.
[105] 'unpublished Meredith Tax memoir', Private archive of Meredith Tax.
[106] Letter, 17 January 1968, signed by Danny Schechter, International Affairs Secretary, in private archive of Meredith Tax.

relief that the group would be moving away from a position which gave 'the boys a role as heroes' towards a stance where they were likely to play a secondary part.[107] The frustration Stop-it's female members felt over their single-issue mandate reflected a wider annoyance of their supporting position in the group – and, indeed, wider society at the time. Tax recalled how 'The Resistance, as in life, the boys were heroic leaders, at least in theory, and the girls were their secretaries,' Tax, adding that whenever a 'boring task came up, some guy in the group was sure to say, "get one of the girls to do it."' This attitude and the condescension with which some men spoke to women in the group, often referring to them disparagingly as the 'Stoppettes', became incredibly irritating for Tax and others. The feeling was that although they did not have draft cards, they 'were the ones who did most of the work…kept the organization's communications going, raised funds, and built its mailing list'.[108] In view of this, Jean Kilbourne remembers working for Stop-it ten hours a day, while Tax spent much of her time in the office answering the phone and mimeographing leaflets.[109] Although not a central factor in the eventual collapse of Stop-it, the annoyances many women felt within the group, combined with a growing awareness of the gender imbalances and sexism in society, pulled at the frayed edges of the group and contributed to general discord.[110]

The broadening of Stop-it's mandate and the restructuring of the group – which placed three women on the nine-member committee – enabled the group to produce their March Project in relative harmony; however, frustrations were rarely far from the surface. In considering the ongoing disagreements, it is important to recognise the nature of Stop-it as a

---

[107] Meredith Tax, interview by author, 5 April 2017.
[108] '*unpublished Meredith Tax memoir*', Private archive of Meredith Tax.
[109] Letter, Jean Kilbourne to Doane Perry, dated 6 January 1968; and Meredith Tax, interview by author, 5 April 2017.
[110] There is a growing body of literature which analyses women's move from the anti-war movement into second wave feminism; of particular note here is Say Burgin's examination of anti-war activism as a 'gendering activity': Burgin, Say, 'Understanding Anti-war Activism as a Gendering Activity: A Look at the U.S.'s Anti-Vietnam War Movement', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, Vol. 13, Issue 6 (Dec, 2012), pp 18-31.

social group as well as a political one; almost as interested in partying as it was about making political statements. Its constituency was drawn from a pool of highly educated, opinionated, young Americans, many abroad for the first time in their lives, living and working in a city where the exchange rate was favourable. They were at the beginning of their adult lives and wanted to engage with the important issues of the day but also have as much fun as possible while doing so. Most of those interviewed spoke of Stop-it as their social group during the time they were in London, while Jack Stauder remembered that 'A lot of the activities we did were purely social…of course there was a certain amount of eating and smoking of hashish…dancing and parties and pot lucks'.[111] Consequently, commitment to Stop-it's projects and actions varied considerably between members, with some taking the lead whilst others either followed or failed to take part. This combined with the transitory nature of postgraduate students, which involved 'a lot of coming and going' between the US and Britain, and long extended breaks during university recess, meant the group was 'a bit of a moving target', largely driven by a few committed members and therefore prone to collapse.[112]

The group limped into the autumn of 1968 suffering from a severe lack of funds, a reduced membership, and flagging motivation. With many of the core membership still committed to an American anti-war movement in Britain, however, debate began over how to engage new arrivals from the US in the anti-war movement. Both Henry and Sheli Wortis remembered that during the autumn of 1968, Stop-it held a meeting at the Unity Theatre in London, open to all Americans who were against the war and wanted to take a stand. During the meeting, Stop-it 'had disagreements…over what we should advise [these] incoming Americans to do with respect to activism against the war', but a decision was finally reached

[111] Jack Stauder, interview by author, April 8, 2017.
[112] David Slaney, interview by author, July 29, 2016; Linda Gordon, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, New York City, April 4, 2017.

'to encourage people to join their local Vietnam Solidarity groups'.[113] Leading by example, Henry and Sheli Wortis, along with David Slaney and others, left Stop-it and helped set up local VSC groups in north London; meanwhile, others attempted and failed to hold the fracturing group together. With fundamental disagreements over Stop-it's direction, aims and motives dominating much of its existence; an inherent lack of formal structure; and complicated internal dynamics due to gender roles and personality clashes, the group failed to maintain momentum and finally split following the VSC's demonstration in October 1968.

Conclusion

During its 18-month existence, the Stop-it Committee brought a distinctively American character to the British anti-war scene, transplanting ideas, tactics and theory which had originally found voice in the civil rights movement and across American college campuses. In doing so, Stop-it helped introduce forms and modes of protest to British shores which were new, energetic and innovative, catching people's attention and generating an interest which belied its size and financial resources. Through appearing as visible as possible at demonstrations and rallies, by indicating their satisfaction that they did mean something to the British public, and through expressing to US ambassador Bruce that he did not speak for all the US, it is clear that the young Americans wanted to fly the flag for a different America – an America defined by tolerance and humanity, rather than one engaged in what many viewed as neo-colonialism. Horrified by their country's actions in Vietnam, the group set out to show Britons the error of the American government's actions and urge them to protest their own government's support. It was an attempt which would ultimately fail, yet Stop-it inspired others to follow their example and over the following years further American groups formed and drew on the rich legacy of protest Stop-it left in its wake. This was most evident

[113] Sheli Wortis, interview by author, 29 July 2016.

with the Union of American Exiles in Britain formed by Stop-it founder, Harry Pincus, but also Group 68, an American anti-war group which consisted of an older, middle-class crowd of expat Americans who were largely employed in the arts.[114]

Influence did not just flow one way, however. Many of Stop-it's members were shaped enormously by their time in Britain, and carried back to the US organisational and tactical approaches to activism which they implemented in both the anti-war and burgeoning women's movements – most notably the strong bonds which existed between the working class and the anti-war movement. Taken aback by the close relationship between the British anti-war movement and the unions, Danny Coleman returned to the US and organized an anti-war group with the United Automobile Workers union in New York.[115] Similarly, David Slaney, Robert Brenner and Henry Wortis, also impressed by the level of cooperation between the working class and the anti-war movement, returned and formed close connections with unions in both the northeast US and California.[116] Meanwhile, Meredith Tax and Linda Gordon returned to America shaped by their experiences and founded the feminist Bread and Roses group in Boston, out of which the pioneering clerical union 9to5 was born.[117]

---

[114] A number of documents in the group founder's papers reveal this influence, including a pamphlet produced for draft eligible Americans residing in Britain which is a near verbatim copy of Stop-it's '*England and Draft Age Americans*,' called '*Britain and Draft Age Americans, 1972*': Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University, TAM 122, Box 4.
[115] Danny Coleman, interview by author, 5 April 2017.
[116] David Slaney, interview by author, 29 July 2016; Robert Brenner, interview by author, 10 April 2017.
[117] Linda Gordon, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Manhattan, New York City, 4 April 2017.

Chapter 2

The Union of American Exiles

ON 12 SEPTEMBER 1971, the Vietnam War claimed yet another young American life. Far from the verdant battlefields of Vietnam, in Spokane, Washington, Frank Aller, a former Rhodes Scholar and draft resister, shot himself in the head. He died instantly. Eight months later, Aller's close friend and fellow draft resister, Harry Pincus, hanged himself in New York City. It is not clear why either man committed suicide; what is certain, however, is they both shared the scars of refusing to fight in a war they did not believe in and, therefore, bore the burden of refusing their country's call to arms.

Both Aller and Pincus also shared a history. The pair lived in Britain during the late 1960s and were instrumental in setting up the Union of American Exiles in Britain (UAEB), an organisation of American draft resisters and 'political exiles' who were united in their opposition to the Vietnam War. Members held the belief that 'opposition must take the form of resistance to the military machine', and therefore refused to obey orders and serve in the armed forces in the US.[1] In its four operational years, the UAEB was involved in various anti-war activities, while also assisting deserters from the military in Britain and Europe, and attempting to influence the British government to change the law which demanded their arrest and deportation.

With a core membership of half a dozen Americans – some of whom had also been members of the Stop-it Committee – the UAEB was small in number. However, the group's size belied its ability to draw attention, generate publicity, and, with Pincus' renowned ability

[1] The American Exile in Britain, No 2, 16 April 1969, in the Ann Kerr Papers, DMK/187, Hull History Centre (Hereafter HHC).

to network, attract a surprising number of influential Britons who became 'friends' of the UAEB, helping it in its mission. The activities of both the American members and their British supporters, such as the actress Vanessa Redgrave and the hereditary peer Anthony Gifford who attempted to introduce a bill through parliament providing sanctuary for military deserters, will be assessed first. The chapter then moves on to provide an analysis of the UAEB's role in the underground railroad of American military deserters and draft resisters who passed through Britain. Central to the British 'station' was Clancy Sigal, the American author who Pincus befriended at Kingsley Hall, therefore this section will assess Sigal's contribution to the underground network, taking into consideration the social background of those he helped, the nature of his work, and the links he formed with other 'stationmasters' in Europe. Four case studies of resisters and military deserters who sought help from the UAEB will then be provided, before the chapter discusses the draft counselling service 'SUPPORT' – a group closely tied with the UAEB. With the war all but over by 1973, the UAEB's focus shifted to the issue of unconditional amnesty for all those living in exile. An analysis of this new direction, combined with the group's role as the first European chapter of Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) will bring the chapter to a close.

In Exile

Between the years 1964 – 1973 the American draft, organised through the Select Service System (SSS) called upon 2.2 million men to serve in Vietnam – amounting to roughly a third of all troops to be sent to Vietnam by the American government – the rest being volunteers or those currently serving within the military. Seen as inherently unfair to the poor and undereducated, the draft was deeply unpopular and prompted over 200,000 Americans to avoid conscription. Many of these draft resisters fled to countries where they were welcomed, such as Canada and Sweden, while others travelled to parts of the world

where they had links, such as Britain, and were forced to live lives of uncertainty. Far from hiding, many of these resisters embraced their opposition to the war and its draft, mounting campaigns against it and openly challenging the British and American governments.[2]

One such draft resister was Harry Pincus, who, as previously shown, spent much of his time during the mid to late sixties dividing his time between psychiatric social work in London and political resistance. Described by Clancy Sigal as 'angry and dedicated and [a person who had] a creative concern for those 'in need'', Pincus was quickly drawn to Americans in Britain who were in need of advice on evading the draft.[3] Following the collapse of the Stop-it Committee, he was determined to continue helping Americans in Britain with whom he shared an affinity. Therefore, on the afternoon of 22 February 1969, Pincus and five other Americans including Frank Aller gathered in London to form a group with the primary aim of assisting those who wished to resist the draft.

It must be mentioned at this juncture that Pincus, Aller and the other members of the UAEB considered themselves to be draft 'resisters' and would have baulked at the pejorative, catch all term 'draft dodger', an oft used term during the war. Those considered to be 'dodging' the draft either had influential contacts, power, money or were skilled enough to deceive the SSS into believing the were not fit for combat. Often, draft dodgers had no ideological opposition to the war, they simply did not want to go. Resisters, on the other hand, resisted against the immorality of the war and the inherent unfairness of the draft system, and lived with the possibility of being imprisoned for their actions.[4]

---

[2] Statistics relating to draft dodging can be found in the work of Cortright, David: *Soldiers in Revolt* (Haymarket Books, 2005), pp. 4 - 5; while information pertaining to the biased nature of the draft can be found in: Appy, Christian G.: *Working Class War* (University of North Carolina Press, 1993), pp. 28 - 38; and its 'institutional racism' in: Westheider, James E.: *Fighting on Two Fronts* (New York University Press), pp. 24-29.

[3] Harry Pincus' Obituary, May, 1972, in F. Brockway Papers FEBR/178, Churchill Archives.

[4] The distinction between 'draft dodger' and 'draft resister' is a complicated, subjective issue; some would certainly have viewed Pincus, Aller and others who fled abroad as 'dodgers' rather than 'resisters', but, due to the subversive activities of these men in Britain, this thesis refers to them as resisters. An excellent study which looks more closely at the issue is Michael S. Foley's: *Confronting*

The draft resister meeting of 22 February ended with four decisions:

1.) To form a Union of American Exiles in Britain, to forward the interests of draft resisters here;
2.) To send an open letter to the new President Nixon during his London visit three days hence;
3.) To publish (probably monthly) a newspaper which would serve as a forum for resisters and their supporters in Britain and as a way of having regular contact with draft…exiles in…other countries, and with our fellow resisters in America;
4.) To try to organize meetings to speak with draft eligible Americans at Oxford, Cambridge, and London.[5]

The first decision was achieved that very day in late February, while the second was fulfilled a few days later. The group writing as: 'Americans who have been driven into exile by...America's Vietnam policy', composed a letter to President Nixon which urged him to withdraw all American troops from the 'civil war', so that America could 'be restored to a law abiding position among the community of nations'. The letter was then taken by Pincus and handed to one of Nixon's security personnel at Claridge's in Mayfair – an attempt to hand the letter to Nixon personally was thwarted by a 'contingent of the American Club' who had got in the way as Pincus tried to 'shove the letter under his nose'.[6]

The paper took its inspiration from the many hundreds of underground newspapers in circulation at the time, and set out to inform members and supporters of upcoming events; it

---

the War Machine – Draft Resistance During the Vietnam War (University of North Carolina Press, 2003).
[5] *The American Exile in Britain*, No. 1, 5 March, 1969, in the Anne Kerr Papers, DMK/187, HHC.
[6] *The American Exile in Britain*, No. 2, 16 April, 1969, in the Anne Kerr Papers, DMK/187, HHC.

reported on events past; and contained letters of support, personal accounts, and draft counselling advice.

The fourth decision was simple to carry out. Being a Rhodes Scholar, Aller had links with many Americans at British universities, including his close friend the future 42nd President of the United States, Bill Clinton, with whom Aller shared a house. Referring to his stance on the war and his decision to write to his draft board and officially becoming a resister, Clinton described his friend as: 'one of the bravest, best men I know'.[7]

Despite this admiration for Aller and his own protesting activity, Clinton, with his eye on a future career in politics, never joined the union, and today is considered by most historians and commentators to have been a 'draft dodger'. Clinton was far from alone in his reticence to join the union, however; many of his fellow Americans at British universities, with their wealth, education and influential contacts were able to take advantage of such a highly discriminative draft system and could easily avoid being drafted – or defer their service if they were – without the help of the union.[8] Others were not so lucky. Adding to a general sense of unrest among anti-war Americans in Britain – even those at elite institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge – was the concerning news in 1969 that the American government had begun taking the passports of draft-resisters who were living in Britain as exiles. The purpose being that once a passport had been withdrawn, the resister became 'non-returnable', which under British immigration law was grounds for refusal of entry to the UK and refusal to extend permission to remain. The choice for many became: return to the US where they could face imprisonment and a fine of $10,000, or remain illegally in the UK.

---

[7] 'Most Likely to Succeed', *New York Times Magazine*, 22 November 1992.
[8] Much has been written about Clinton's protesting activity during his Oxford years and his subsequent draft evasion; the following sources detail some of it: 'The Bill Clinton We Knew at Oxford', *The Independent on Sunday*, 11 October, 1992; Letter from Bill Clinton to ROTC officer, Col. Holmes, University of Arkansas [online]: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/clinton/etc/draftletter.html> [accessed 4 May 2018].

Hearing his passport was about to be withdrawn before the end of the academic year, one young American Rhodes scholar fled the country to seek refuge in Canada before he could complete his Oxford examinations.[9] This need not necessarily have been the case, however. With many British political figures fiercely opposed to the war, resisters living in Britain could often find a sympathetic ear and much needed assistance from within Westminster. Despite Britain's continued 'moral support' for the war, there were a number of recorded instances where draft resisters contacted a friendly MP or Member of the House of Lords who wrote letters of recommendation to the Home Office, thus enabling them to stay in the UK. Two resisters interviewed for this thesis remained in Britain thanks to letters sent on their behalf by British politicians. Leo Aliferis, a member of the UAEB, received help from Lord Brockway with obtaining British travel papers.[10] Meanwhile, Dennis Stukenbroeker, who later became a member of SUPPORT, received assistance from the Labour Party MP, Paul Rose. Stukenbroeker, who had been 'drifting around Europe' during the summer of 1969, discovered he had been drafted on collecting his post from the American Express office in Athens.[11] Deciding not to return to the US, he arrived in Britain on 26 July with a three-month tourist visa which was later extended for a year. With this due for renewal in October 1970, and his passport about to expire, Stukenbroeker wrote to Rose stating that there was 'no question of an extension or getting a new passport' as he had been 'indicted by the United States for failure to report for induction,' and would therefore be 'refused under Section 51.70 of the Immigration and Nationality Act'. He continued by stating that if he returned to the US he would be 'subject to 'immediate prosecution, and because I will not put on a

[9] 'The Current Situation', July 1969, in Union of American Exiles file XI, War Resisters International Papers, IISH; and article 'Exiled in Britain because the said 'No' to Vietnam war', in the *Morning Star*, 17 July 1969.
[10] Letter: Harry Pincus to Fenner Brockway, 30 July 1969, in F. Brockway Papers, FEBR/178, Churchill Archives.
[11] Oral history Interview with Dennis Stukenbroeker, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Oxfordshire, 6 January 2018.

uniform or take up arms, suffer five years in prison and a fine of $10,000'.[12] Rose wrote to the Under-Secretary of State, Mark Carlisle, expressing his support for the young draft resister, receiving a letter back from the Home Office declaring that although they normally 'expect a foreigner to be able to maintain the validity of his passport or travel document,' they were, 'prepared to take special circumstances into account,' and therefore granted a visa extension of 12 months.[13]

Recognising the concrete help British politicians and other influential individuals could offer, the UAEB began seeking their support. Within its first year, the UAEB could count upon the patronage of the Nobel Peace Prize recipient, Lord Boyd-Orr; the president of the BCPV, Lord Brockway; the actress Vanessa Redgrave, the Liberal Party, a number of MPs, academics, and CND. Pincus' considerable charm did not work on everybody, however. Responding to his request for support, the fledgling National Front launched a blistering attack on him and the UAEB, strongly denouncing the group for its 'pro Communist' sympathies, and declared that once they were in a more powerful political position they would make 'life hot for organisations such as your own'. The author, activities organiser Martin Webster, ended the letter by suggesting that the UAEB's 'alien members and supporters leave Britain now, bag and baggage, while the going is good'.[14] It is unclear why Pincus chose to contact an organisation holding such extreme right views, and Webbster's reply surely came as little surprise. This rather peculiar, illogical, action was perhaps a sign of Pincus' increasingly erratic behaviour which many of his friends and associates commented on at the time.

---

[12] Letter: Paul B. Rose MP to Mark Carlisle (including text of letter sent by Stukenbroeker to Rose), 9 September 1970, in private archive of Dennis Stukenbroeker.
[13] Letter from Lord Windlesham to Paul Rose MP, 12 October 1970, in Dennis Stukenbroeker's private archive.
[14] Letter: Martin Webster, activities organizer, National Front to Harry Pincus, 18 June 1970, in Union of American Exiles file XI, War Resisters International Papers, International Institute of Social History (hereafter IISH).

National Front aggression aside, it was hoped by the UAEB that having prestigious and influential friends such as Brockway, they would be able to overturn current British law regarding deserters from the military. Unlike European countries such as France and Sweden, Britain did not provide a safe haven for deserters; instead, under the British *Visiting Forces Act*, deserters could be arrested and deported. There was no chance of appeal, and there was no onus on the American government to file an application for extradition. The man was simply seized – either by the British police or by the American Military Police who had absolute authority to operate in Britain – handed over to the American authorities, and returned under arrest to the US.[15] To the UAEB and its British supporters, the law seemed out of place in a country with a recent history of offering sanctuary to defectors from Eastern Europe, and a country where even a Russian ballerina could expect almost automatic asylum.[16] Additionally, the fact Britain co-chaired the Geneva Convention of 1954, which guaranteed the Vietnamese no foreign troops would be deployed to their country, contributed to a sense the law was anachronistic. Therefore, the UAEB hoped the government would 'take a friendly view to the position of Americans on their soil who…in their actions [were] supporting this convention'.[17]

With mounting concern, and on the advice of Lord Brockway, the UAEB contacted twelve members of the House of Lords in May 1969 who were believed to be sympathetic to their cause.[18] On the list was Lord Gifford, a hereditary peer and known advocate for deserter rights. Within months of contacting Lord Gifford, a 'Gifford Bill Support Committee' was set up to organise support for a bill through parliament aiming to amend the

---

[15] Section 13 of the Visiting Forces Act, 1952 [online]: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6and1Eliz2/15-16/67/contents> [accessed 5 May 2018]
[16] Article: 'Deserters or Refugees?', *The Guardian*, Thursday 15 October 1970.
[17] Memo, titled 'The Current Situation', July 1969, in Union of American Exiles file XI, War Resisters International Papers, IISH.
[18] Letter: UAEB to Lord Brockway, 21 May 1969, in F. Brockway Papers, FEBR/178, Churchill Archives.

Visiting Forces Act and provide asylum for American deserters who absconded from military units abroad.[19] Among other duties, the committee was tasked with generating support from the spheres of politics, trade unions, students and churches.[20] Posters were printed, adverts were placed in peace publications such as the BCPVs publication *Bulletin,* and leaflets were handed out to the public.[21]

On 24 November 1970, over a dozen organisations, including WRI and Christian Aid, took part in what was believed at the time to be the first organised lobby of the House of Lords, where Lord Gifford introduced his Private Members Bill.[22] The bill sought to amend the *Visiting Forces Act* so that the power to arrest was limited to cover 'only deserters and absentees without leave...if they deserted from a base situated in the United Kingdom'. Introducing his bill, Lord Gifford stressed that defectors from Communist Eastern Europe could find asylum in Britain, but American servicemen who opposed the war were refused a safe haven. He also stated that Sweden, France, Switzerland, Denmark and Finland provided sanctuary for such service personnel, while British law simply provided for their arrest and a return to the American military authorities. Speaking for the government, Lord Windlesham told the Lords that they couldn't support the bill. He argued that few American deserters came to Britain, adding: 'we do not want to do anything to encourage a greater flow.' It failed to pass, however, with votes going 95 to 54 against.[23]

The disappointment felt by members of the UAEB spurred the founding of a further group, the British Committee to Aid American War Refugees (BCAAWR) which was

---

[19] Although any amendment would naturally only help deserters from the military, rather than resisters living in the UK, in most cases the British authorities tended to ignore draft resisters so this area was seen as less of a concern to those in the UAEB.
[20] Letter: Gifford Bill Support Committee to Fenner Brockway, 1 December 1970, in F. Brockway Papers, FEBR/178, Churchill Archives.
[21] Examples of these adverts and leaflets can be found in the J. Askins Papers, files MSS.189/V/1/2/1, and MSS.189/V/2/4/1, MRC.
[22] 'Organised lobby of the House of Lords, press photo and explanation' [online]: <http://store.historicimages.com/products/ksb18449> [accessed 8 May 2018].
[23] Visiting Forces Bill [H.L], *Hansard*, Vol. 313, cc 9 – 59, 24 November 1970.

devoted solely to 'remedying the unique harshness in British NATO law, under which…American deserters may be apprehended by British police'. Little is know of the group, and it is likely it barely gained traction despite the support of a broad coalition of British groups such as the BCPV and WRI, a handful of Labour MPs, the Young Liberals, and 'several church and other groups'. Despite its failure to rise to prominence, or achieve its set aim, it serves as a further example of the efforts, both British and American, to unite against the war and assist deserters as best they could.[24]

Also attending the lobby at the Lords was Mary Haygood, the English wife of US Marine, Lee Haygood, who had been arrested by the Metropolitan Police and sent back to America to face charges of desertion the month before – one of the 12 deserters sent back to their home country since 1952 when the *Visiting Forces Act* was introduced.[25] In a last ditch attempt to save Haygood from deportation, Lord Brockway contacted the Home Office on his behalf, but his letter arrived too late to have any effect; besides, as the response from the Home Office implied, it would have been unlikely the Secretary of State could or should have intervened.[26]

During the following few years of UAEB activity, Brockway continued to support the organisation in any way he could: writing letters to the Home Office in support of the exiles; assisting in the gathering of legal documents relating to historic cases of political exiles granted asylum in Britain, for use by those furthering the cause; and attending various meetings and vigils.[27] He also maintained a correspondence with Harry Pincus whose letters spoke despairingly of the situation for exiles and his own personal struggles, including what

---

[24] Letter to 'Fellow Delegates' at the World Assembly in Paris for Peace and Independence of the Peoples of Indochina', February 1972, in file Group 68 Bulletins/Public statements/Press releases/Petitions, 1968-73, Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library.
[25] 'Peer will try to change desertion Act', *The Guardian*, Wednesday 14 October 1970.
[26] Letter: Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs, Mark Carlisle (Home Office) to Lord Brockway, 12 October, 1970, in F. Brockway Papers, FEBR/178, Churchill Archives.
[27] The continued activity of Brockway and the UAEB can be found in his correspondence and various documentation in box file FEBR/178, F. Brockway Papers, Churchill Archives.

he described in one letter as 'a complete breakdown,' a sad portent of the suicide that would follow a year later.[28]

Brockway was also instrumental in organizing the visit of Madam Nguyen Thi Binh to Britain in March, 1969. Binh was drawn into the world of student rebellion in the 1950s, and helped organise the first anti-American demonstration in Vietnam in 1950. She was then arrested for her protesting activities in 1951 and remained imprisoned by the French until the signing of the 1954 Geneva Accords. After her release from prison, she joined a number of resistance groups in Saigon and was elected to the NLFs Central Committee in 1962. From this point until 1969, she served in the NLFs diplomatic corps, travelling the world offering interviews and furthering the cause of peace.[29]

After a protracted campaign to grant her an entry visa, the deputy head of the NLF's delegation to the Paris peace talks arrived in Britain for the first of two extraordinary trips to London. The visit was the fruit born from four years campaigning by the British anti-Vietnam War movement who had petitioned, lobbied and cajoled the British government to grant visas to members of the DRV and the NLF so Britons could 'hear the views [of the Vietnamese]' and 'make up their own minds' as to whether Britain should be supporting the US.[30] During her short stay, and a further brief visit the following month, Mme Binh addressed the House of Commons, informing them of her sincere disappointment at the US intensification of the war; she spoke with a number of peace and anti-war groups; she stood at the base of Nelson's column in Trafalgar Square and delivered an anti-war speech to a crowd of thousands; and she met with draft resisting members of the UAEB. Binh met with members of the UAEB at a residential house in North London which was soon to serve as the temporary embassy

---

[28] Letter: Harry Pincus to Lord Brockway, 27 November, 1970, in F. Brockway Papers, FEBR/178, Churchill Archives.
[29] Tucker, Spencer C. (ed.): *The Encyclopaedia of the Vietnam War – A Political, Social & Military History* (Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 834-835; and Uglo, Jennifer S. (ed.): *The Northeastern Dictionary of Women's Biography* (Northeastern University Press, 1999), pp. 400-401.
[30] Free speech petition on behalf of the NLF, 1967 in J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/2/3/2, MRC.

of the PRG.[31] The meeting was set up by the UAEB who remarked that the accessibility of the NLF representative was in 'striking contrast' to that of Nixon, who they had tried to contact in London only the week before to hand him their letter against the war.[32] During their meeting, Binh told the half dozen draft resisters that she had learnt of their demonstration against the Nixon visit, and that although they were unable to meet with him 'at least, he must know there are young American people in London who want to meet him to speak with him about things that are against his own desire'. She continued by saying how 'especially highly' she valued their actions and that they would 'make the British people active and stronger and more concerned about the war in South Vietnam.' The UAEB presented her with a copy of their newspaper *The American Exile in Britain*, and received a signed print depicting a Vietnamese woman holding a DRV flag aloft with a backdrop of destroyed buildings. It had been printed in the 'liberated area of South Vietnam'.[33]

The path had been carved, and where Mme Nguyen Thi Binh had gone, others followed. During the years following her Easter trip, dozens of Vietnamese travelled to Britain and forged links with academics, politicians, trade unionists, and peace campaigners. The visits varied in style and length but they all shared the purpose of furthering peace in Indochina. In February 1970, a young Vietnamese survivor of the massacre at My Lai, Vo Thi Lien, came to London as a guest of the Communist Party of Great Britain, and attended press conferences as well as signing an affidavit which spoke in detail of her experiences during the massacre, including the murder of 19 of her relatives.[34] In November 1970, Mme

---

[31] Formed on 8 June 1969, the PRG was an underground government set up in opposition to the South Vietnamese government – the Republic of Vietnam (RVN) of Nguyen Van Thieu. It merged with the DRV on 2 July 1976 to form the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

[32] *The American Exile in Britain*, No. 2, 16 April 1969, in the Anne Kerr Papers, file DMK/187, HHC.

[33] Transcript: meeting between UAEB and Mme Binh, 7 March 1969, in *The American Exile in Britain*, No. 2, 16 April 1969, in the Anne Kerr Papers, file DMK/187, HHC.

[34] Affidavit: Vo Thi Linh, affirmed at 51/52 Chancery Lane, London, W.C 2, February 23rd, 1970, in F. Brockway Papers, file FEBR/241, Churchill Archives; and photo with caption: *The Times*, February 20th, 1970

Linh Qui, a North Vietnamese, addressed a conference of trade unions at TUC House in London, thanking the British people for what they 'had done in supporting the struggle of the people of Vietnam for peace, independence, and the right to determine their own future'. The conference unanimously passed a motion which appealed to 'all British Trade Unionists to give practical expression to their solidarity with the victims of U.S bombing by contributing to a Vietnam Solidarity Fund for medical supplies for the Vietnamese people'.[35] In September 1971, Mr. Lai Van Ngoc, a visitor from the DRV, gave a speech to the quarterly conference of the BCPV where he expressed 'warm greetings of friendship and our sincere thanks' to the BCPV for their 'valued support to the Vietnamese people in their struggle for national independence', and mentioned that this support had 'greatly encouraged our people in our just struggle'.[36] In June 1973, two released prisoners from South Vietnam, the Venerable Thich Vien Hao, a Buddhist priest, and Miss Le Tho Do, a bakery worker travelled to London at the invitation of the BCPV and MACV, and reported on their experiences to a meeting in the Grand Committee Room of the House of Commons. Le Tho Do had been arrested and held in a number of prisons in South Vietnam, including Thu Duc, a women's prison in Saigon where torture was said to be 'systematic and prolonged', but she was never charged for any crime.[37] Her story and the story of Thich Vien Hao reflected a growing humanitarian crisis in South Vietnam which would continue until the end of the war in 1975. These and other visits during the years 1969 – 73, show a continued interest in the

---

[35] Report: Conference of Trade Unionists for Peace in Vietnam; Sunday 15th November, 1970 in J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/2/1, MRC

[36] Speech: Lai Van Ngoc to the quarterly conference of the BCPV, September 26th, 1971 in J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/2/1, MRC

[37] Report: MACVs eighth annual report, January to December 1973 in J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189.V/1/7/1, MRC. The issue of political prisoners being held in South Vietnam became a focus of the BCPV, other peace and anti-war organisations, and British politicians up to the end of the war in 1975. Encouraged by the BCPV, the Labour Party arranged a delegation which visited Vietnam shortly after the peace accords were signed in January 1973, to meet with leaders and, in particular, follow up on the political prisoner issue. Their request to visit Thu Duc prison was declined. The visit of Labour MPs is beyond the scope of this thesis, but further information can be found in the J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/2/7, MRC

goal of peace by both Americans and Britons, and reveal a sustained commitment by those in the anti-war movement to further the drive for peace up to and beyond the signing of the Paris Peace Accords.[38] These were not the actions of a dying movement, but of a movement committed to the cause of peace far beyond the well-documented demonstrations of 1968, and of a movement determined to succeed despite the continued disappointments it suffered from both the Labour and Conservative governments.

There is a growing body of scholarly literature which sheds a spotlight on the hitherto ignored area of informal diplomacy from a Vietnamese perspective. In doing so it gives agency to non-state North Vietnamese within the global anti-war movement, while highlighting Ho Chi Minh's assertion that 'diplomacy practiced by mass organisations and individuals was just as important as government diplomacy'.[39] It also reveals the highly coordinated campaign of the DRV in sending 'mass organisations' abroad in the hope of 'win[ing] over peace activists by presenting Vietnamese communism as a combination of nationalism, anticolonialism, and internationalism.[40]

Although no Americans interviewed for this thesis met personally with Vietnamese nationals, a few spoke of friends who did. Igor Webb of the Stop-it Committee commented that 'the North Vietnamese, and especially the people fighting in the South were considered heroes by [Americans in Britain] – there was little attention paid to the North as a dictatorship', adding:

---

[38] Further information relating to the visits of Vietnamese to Britain can be found in peace publications – such as the VSC, and BCPV Bulletins – in the Chris Arthur Publications file MSS.711/C/1/63, MRC; visits from 'trade unionists', in the Lawrence Daly Papers, file MSS.302/4/3, MRC, and the J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/9/6, MRC; visits from 'intellectuals and academics' in ICDP records, file MSS.181/16/29, MRC; and visits from 'Buddhists' in J. Askins Papers, file MSS.189/V/1/2/1, MRC

[39] Mehta, Harish C, 'Restoring Agency to Informal Diplomats in Narratives of the Vietnam War', *History Compass*, 13/6 (2015), p. 263

[40] Nguyen, Lien-Hang, 'Revolutionary Circuits: Towards Internationalizing America in the World', Diplomatic History, Vol. 39, No. 3 (2015), p. 415

> There was ongoing contact between the North Vietnamese and segments of "the Movement", in particular between those people who identified themselves with "the resistance". It was considered a special badge of your revolutionary status if you met with, or even more, were contacted by the Vietnamese. For example, Dennis Sweeney came through London while I was there – he told me he was on his way to Paris to meet with the Vietnamese – there were three reasons to meet – first, to get stamped as a serious revolutionary person; then to learn what the Vietnamese might ask of the Movement – the Vietnamese had their party line one movement politics and what they believed were the proper tactics etc. at any given moment; and finally to learn revolutionary tactics from the Vietnamese. By 1967/8 there was a small but significant number of people in the Movement who were loosely aligned and saw themselves as preparing themselves, a cadre, for the coming "revolutionary struggle" in the US.'[41]

The reflections of Webb, and other American activists in Britain such as David Holmstrom who commented 'we would have been happy to co-ordinate [with the North Vietnamese], reveal not only an awareness of the DRV's tactics, and a sense they were being used, but a desire to learn from them. As the historian Lien-Hang Nguyen has written, the 'public relations campaign with Binh at the helm was extremely successful at promoting a global revolutionary consciousness'.[42]

Stationmaster

With the failure of Gifford's bill to pass, the hundred or so deserters living in Britain

[41] Email from Igor Webb to author, 9 July, 2021
[42] Nguyen, Lien-Hang, 'Revolutionary Circuits: Towards Internationalizing America in the World', p. 421

were left with few options; none of them appealing.[43] They could, of course, return to their units – as many did – and face the consequences of desertion such as court-martial; they could remain underground in the UK and hope to find a means of income through the UAEB or other friendly organisations and individuals; or they could attempt to continue along the underground railroad to places which welcomed – or as was more often was the case, tolerated – them. For this final option they could again turn to the UAEB.

Originally, the term 'Underground Railroad' was used to describe the network of organisations and individuals who helped facilitate safe passage for fugitive slaves into the northern free states and Canada during the early to mid-19th century, and relied heavily on sympathetic religious groups and the kindness of strangers. The second railroad which operated during the Vietnam era operated in much the same way, drawing on organisations such as the Quakers to assist them, and retaining the same terminology such as 'passengers', 'conductors' and 'stations'. Naturally, many Americans who either resisted the draft or deserted the military followed the logical route to Canada – a country which welcomed them, was relatively easy to get to, and provided a similar environment in which to live and work.[44] However, others were drawn to Europe through family connections, historical ties, or the promise of adventure. Meanwhile, draft age Americans who had been travelling in Europe for work or pleasure, such as Dennis Stukenbroeker, often chose to remain, while American GIs stationed at European military bases regularly absconded from their units. With differing laws pertaining to both draft resisters and deserters in each European country, the situation for these Americans was complicated.

---

[43] There is no record of exactly how many deserters lived in Britain during the period, but the figure of 100 deserters was often cited by the UAEB and politicians, such as Lord Brockway, who helped them. ''100 US deserters' now living in Britain', *The Guardian*, 16 October 1970.

[44] Between 20 – 30,000 Americans would eventually cross the border into Canada to avoid the draft – the largest political exodus from the United States since the revolutionary war. John Hagen, himself a draft resister who avoided the war in Canada, details the journey and life in exile in his work *Northern Passage*: Hagen, John: *Northern Passage – American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* (Harvard University Press, 2001); while the historian Jessica Squires provides a compelling analysis of the

As previously discussed, anti-war groups such as the Stop-it Committee produced leaflets offering advice to draft age Americans residing in Europe, warning that Britain was far from welcoming. WRI, with whom the UAEB shared office space, also produced a pamphlet offering advice for American deserters. Simply entitled *American Deserters*, the document detailed the likely reception of deserters in various European countries, and highlighted the dangers of arrest through the *Visiting Forces Act* in Britain; adding that deserters generally found 'Great Britain [was] not a very safe place to go for refuge'.[45]

Despite such advice, with the draw of a common language, some resisters and country and wished to travel to more welcoming countries, often found their way to the exclusive enclave of Marylebone in west London. Here they met with members of the UAEB at the British 'station' on the underground railroad, and were helped on their way by its 'stationmaster', Clancy Sigal.

Born in 1926 and raised in Chicago by his mother – and occasionally his father who was often absent working as a labor organiser – Sigal, much to his mother's chagrin, joined the Communist Party at 15. Although his parents had solid socialist credentials, his mother, Jennie, who he wrote extensively about in his biography *A Woman of Uncertain Character*, was said to be a more ardent anti-Communist than she was a passionate socialist.[46] He left

---

Canadian movement to support the war resisters: Squires, Jessica: *Building Sanctuary – The Movement to Support Vietnam War Resisters in Canada, 1965 – 73* (University of British Columbia Press, 2013).

[45] Pamphlet, *American Deserters*, in file 19.3, Clancy Sigal Papers, Harry Ransom Center (hereafter HRC), Austin, TX.

[46] Sigal, Clancy: *A Woman of Uncertain Character – The Amorous and Radical Adventures of My Mother Jennie – Who Always Wanted to Be a respectable Jewish Mom* – (Da Capo Press, 2007).

home shortly afterwards and joined the army, spending time in occupied Europe and attending the Nurenburg Trials, before then retuning to the US where he worked as a union organiser in Detroit. He eventually found a measure of fame through his writing – most notably his account of crossing America by car in 1956, *Going Away*, the year before he arrived in Britain.[47] On arriving, he soon fell in with an older crowd of expat Americans and joined their anti-war group Group 68, then worked for peace in Vietnam until the war finally ended in 1975. The group is covered in depth in the following chapter. It was through Group 68's founder, Heinz Norden, that Sigal first encountered draft resisters and soon crossed paths with Harry Pincus at Kingsley Hall.

Shortly after their first meeting, Sigal moved into the elegant Georgian apartment in Marylebone, rented by Pincus.[48] Following the collapse of the Stop-it Committee, Pincus moved into the large apartment and, through advertising his address in underground papers in Britain and Germany as a place of refuge, soon began to draw draft resisters and deserters from the military to the safe house – or 'Foco' as it became known.[49] Over the following years, a kaleidoscopic array of individuals passed through the doors of Number 56 Queen

[47] Sigal, Clancy: *Going Away – A report, A Memoir* (Caroll & Graf Publishers, 1984).
[48] Both this apartment at 56, Queen Anne St and Pincus' Hampstead address were paid for by his parents.
[49] One such advert was 'prominently featured' in a left-wing leaflet which was published in Heidelberg – the location of the US Army's European headquarters: unpublished draft of 'Stationmaster', in file 17.3, The Uses of Treason: Titled draft and articles, 1970 – 2006, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.

Anne Street. Many sought help in avoiding the war, but most were drawn by the promise of a party, casual sex and the occasional joint. Frank Aller was a regular visitor, occasionally bringing along 'another longhaired war protestor, Bill Clinton'; while the notorious former CIA operative, Philip Agee, stayed while writing for *Time Out* and other London publications.[50] It was here, in this unlikely corner of 'swinging London' that Pincus set himself up as stationmaster on the underground railroad – a self appointed position which he soon passed on to Sigal.

With his history of organising in Britain, combined with a large network of contacts and financial support from his parents, Pincus seemed an ideal person to assist resisters and deserters. His increasingly erratic nature undermined these efforts, however. Writing of his early encounters with Pincus, Sigal speaks of the young American 'richochet[ing] between frenetic outbursts of political activity and a charming, spine-chilling passivity'; and recalls the arguments over Pincus' 'right' to embark on his 'schizophrenic voyage' through the regular use of LSD.[51] Soon, the older, more experienced and less drug addled American took over the responsibilities of 'organizing the unorganized' as stationmaster.[52]

By the time he met Pincus, Sigal had already attracted the attention of the FBI. Despite being a self-described 'disgustingly law abiding citizen', as a member of the American Communist Party he had been flagged up by the security services years before.[53] Throughout his time in Britain he remained on the FBI's watch list; while his personal notes during this period are full of accounts featuring encounters with those observing him and

---

[50] Draft for an article titled 'Stationmaster', in file 17.3, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC; and Philip Agee's obituary, in *Guardian*, Wednesday 9 January 2008.
[51] Draft for an article titled 'Stationmaster', in file 17.3, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC
[52] Letter: Clancy Sigal to Ian, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.
[53] Radio transcript, 'The American Deserters – Clancy Sigal', produced by BBC Radio 4, transmission date: 10 September 1970; in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC; and folder, 'Clancy Sigal - FBI file and correspondence, 1948-1981', Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.

others entering and leaving their flat in Queen Anne St.[54] The attention from the security services did little to deter Sigal from assisting deserters with whom he identified strongly, however.[55] An analysis of Sigal's correspondence and extensive notes of the time, reveals a direct link between the London station and the Paris and Stockholm counterparts. What also emerges is a network of organisations and individuals within the UK who were willing to provide work and lodging to potential military deserters. In early 1970, Sigal set off on what he termed 'inspection tours' of his 'battle zone' – places within the UK which would provide 'AWOLs sanctuary' – before heading to Europe to establish contact with deserters and operators on the underground railway. In Paris he met with Thomas Schwaetzer - better know under the pseudonym Max Watts – a central figure on the underground railway.[56]

A veteran supporter of revolutionary causes, Watts helped deserting American soldiers to escape Germany through Amsterdam to Paris where the soldiers would not be prosecuted. During the few days he spent with Watts, Sigal learned a tremendous amount about the GI movement, the nature of those deserting, and interrogation techniques aimed at weeding out potential CIA and CID posing as deserters. From Paris, Sigal headed to Sweden where he met with 'deserters, officials and friendly types', interviewing many about their

---

[54] A prolific letter writer and note taker during the period, Clancy's papers held at the Harry Ransom Center in Austin Texas offer a fascinating insight to the goings on at Queen Anne St, adding tremendous colour and excitement to events. Being an author of fiction, however, these accounts are treated with caution by the author and as far as possible are corroborated with accounts from others, such as Stukenbroeker and Warshaw. Although official documentation – either British or American – pertaining to the covert observation of members of the UAEB is near impossible to access due government restrictions, it is clear the security services kept watch. As with the Stop-it Committee, the British were concerned that the United States was exporting its 'problems' while the Americans had their own concerns about their country's standing abroad.

[55] Sigal attributes this affinity with deserters to his own experiences of being accused of betraying the United States by leaving it to live abroad. In draft for an article titled 'Stationmaster', Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.

[56] Watts' papers can be found at: Brünn-Harris-Watts Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands. Two further works which detail the life of Max Watts are: Perrin, Dick: *GI Resister: The Story of How One American Soldier and His Family Fought the War in Vietnam* (Trafford Publishing, 2001); and Sweet, Matthew*: Operation Chaos: The Vietnam Deserters Who Fought the CIA, the Brainwashers, and Themselves* (Henry holt and Co. 2018).

experiences. The trip furnished Sigal with a multi-faceted understanding of the complex deserter landscape. He witnessed first hand the fragility of many of those deserting; the paranoia they and their 'handlers' suffered; and the harsh existence many endured living underground. Speaking of his experiences with deserters years later, Sigal commented on their 'extraordinarily difficult life', adding, 'it took enormous grit, determination, courage and self-understanding to survive'.[57] Having previously toed the line of staunch anti-war MP Frank Allaun, who believed the deserter issue in the UK should not be publicised for fear of ruffling the feathers of the Home Office, Sigal returned to England with with a desire to both 'challenge British complicity in the Indo-China war', and to begin publicising the deserter issue in the UK in the hope that pressure could be put on the government to change the law.[58] For the remainder of the year, Sigal helped to highlight the deserter issue in the UK, while also playing a role in lobbying the House of Lords to amend the *Visiting Forces Act*. The increase in publicity appears to have helped in generating interest among ordinary Britons, and encouraged many to offer assistance to military deserters. This can be seen in the responses of individuals to Sigal's request for help, and correspondence between Sigal and a woman called Denise who appears to have been working as his assistant. In one letter recalling the network he set up, Sigal wrote 'from Hull to Liverpool, all through Middle England, there arose a spontaneous network of volunteers who, sight unseen, offered their homes, money and sometimes hearts to young off-the-wall Americans on the run'. These volunteers, Sigal added, 'were uncategorizable, Quakers and CND peaceniks and leftist teachers, but also parish vicars, Womens Institute members and in a few cases even Regular Army (retired) officers repelled by the war in Vietnam'.[59]

---

[57] Interview between Alice McKay, News Service, with Clancy Sigal, 20 December 1982, in file 19.1, The Uses of Treason, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.
[58] Letter: Clancy Sigal to Heinz (Norden) and Lionel (Colloms), 4 June 1970, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.
[59] Letter: Clancy Sigal to Ian, undated, in file 16.12, The Uses of Treason: Editorial correspondence, 1994 – 2004, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.

Letters from Denise to Sigal reveal more about who these Britons were and what they were offering by way of help. There were those happy to offer a spare room for free but 'might need a contribution for food after a while'; others who asked for a 'self sufficient visitor'; a 'radical journalist on the Liverpool Echo' willing to offer 'a few nights' haven'; and a Church of England vicar in Portsmouth who wrote 'I'm OK for American deserters for as long as necessary, for free'. Many offered rooms – or more often a mattress on the floor – providing the deserter could work for their board and lodging, 'with no problems about work permits'. There were others, however, whose responses were marked with a little more trepidation, with one respondent from Cornwall writing they would be happy to take someone briefly, then pass them around friends, providing no 'lame ducks and bandwaggoners' were sent, and that whoever was passed on 'mustn't be afraid of hard physical work for poor wages'.[60]

Unlike the largely 'white…middle-class…articulate, often university-trained' draft resisters Sigal lived with at Queen Anne St, the deserters who found their way to the UAEB were often from humble backgrounds, working class and with few resources.[61] Sigal soon discovered that their motivations varied widely. Some would desert for explicit anti-war reasons, while others deserted because 'they didn't want to get their heads shot off or because their CO demanded a humiliatingly short haircut'.[62] Sigal also learnt that he could not take their explanations for absconding too literally. Speaking of his experience, Sigal said, 'A kid might have said, "Oh, I got into a fight with my sergeant", but underneath a vague discontent with the war had been germinating for a long time.'[63] Whatever the reason for deserting,

---

[60] Various letters from Denise to Clancy Sigal dated between 26 August 1970 and 30 November, 1970, in file 16.6, The Uses of Treason: correspondence with military deserters, 1969 – 1993, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.
[61] Radio transcript, 'The American Deserters – Clancy Sigal', produced by BBC Radio 4, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC; and Interview between Alice McKay, News Service, with Clancy Sigal, 20 December 1982, in file 19.1, The Uses of Treason, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.
[62] Interview with Alice McKay, in file 19.1, The Uses of Treason, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.
[63] Interview with Alice McKay, in file 19.1, The Uses of Treason, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.

drawn by the struggle of fellow Americans, Sigal would help them as best he could: provide them with food, lodging and occasionally money; pass them down the line towards Sweden; or find them an alternative means of employment in Britain.

Due to the clandestine, underground existence military deserters lived, many of the individuals successfully 'processed' by Sigal and the UAEB went undocumented. However, documents do exist on those who came to the attention of the authorities, and the following section details the background and deserter experience of four such GIs who found their way to the group.

Over Here and Underground

The plight of deserters living in Britain was brought to the fore with the arrest of Jeremy Tupper. On being told his army unit was to go to Vietnam in early 1968, Tupper, a 21-year-old newly-wed, chose to abscond from his unit in Irwin, California, rather than fight in a war he believed to be 'morally wrong'.[64] Instead, he travelled to Britain where he remained with his wife for the following six months before he was discovered and a warrant issued for his arrest. The following week, Tupper handed himself over to British police who passed him to the US authorities, who in turn returned him to the US where he was court-martialled and sent to the Fort Dix Stockade in New Jersey.[65]

The incident served to highlight the deserter issue in the UK, but it also revealed the assistance afforded to the American authorities by British police. An article in the WRI pamphlet *War Resistance* included a statement issued by the BCPV claiming that Tupper was

---

[64] Article in *News Notes of the Central Committee of Conscientious Objectors*, p. 3, 1965 – 1969, GI Press Collection – Wisconsin Historical Society; and Prasad, Devi in *War Resistance*, War Resisters International, p. 16 [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p15932coll8> [accessed 28 September 2018].

[65] Underground paper, *About Face*, p. 6, 'Political E.M.s' [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p15932coll8> [accessed 28 September 2018].

arrested 'because of pressure applied by the United States authorities'.[66] The exact nature of the pressure applied is unknown, however the arrest of Tupper emphasised to many Britain's complicity in the war, and encouraged the UAEB in their attempt to get the *Visiting Forces Act* – under which Tupper was arrested – amended.[67] Before this attempt was made, however, there were a further nine cases where the British police arrested deserting GIs and handed them over to the US defence authorities.[68] One such case was that of sp/4 Gary Mark, a GI who absconded from his unit in Germany and made his way to Britain in the summer of 1969.

On arriving in the UK, Mark found his way to the offices of the alternative information centre, BIT, in Notting Hill, searching for a place to sleep. BIT (standing for Binary Information Transfer – 'the smallest unit of information that can be fed into a computer') was an organisation set up by the well known countercultural figure John 'Hoppy' Hopkins, and was a spin off from his earlier *International Times*. The service ran between 1968 and 1974, offering advice and information to anybody wanted it.[69] Here he met BIT worker and future girlfriend, Janet Norman-Philips who put him up at the home of another worker at the organisation.[70] Helping out at the centre during the evenings and

---

[66] Prasad, Devi in *War Resistance*, War Resisters International, p. 16 [online] <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p15932coll8> [accessed 29 September 2018].

[67] An unfortunate, and unanticipated, result of attempts to get the law changed, was the American military authorities increased their efforts to arrest deserters living in Britain. In this attempt they had the cooperation of the British police. Commenting at the time, Lord Brockway said it was likely the British police would assist the Americans 'to the fullest degree'. Lord Brockway, quoted in article 'Hunt is on for ex-GI deserters', *Guardian*, 21 October 1970.

[68] From a comment made by current Home Secretary, Reginald Maudling, in response to a question from Frank Allaun MP regarding American deserters. Hansard, United States Forces (Deserters), Vol. 805, 5 November 1970 [online]:< https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1970-11-05/debates/ced7c3f2-7362-4003-85ce-e01070121426/UnitedStatesForces(Deserters)> [accessed September 28 2018].

[69] More about BIT can be found via the organisation's newsletters [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15932coll8/id/11874/rec/2> [accessed 4 October 2018].

[70] Mark's decision to seek out BIT rather than the UAEB is likely due to the latter group's low profile. BIT was a well established, well know group which had been operating for a full year before Mark

weekends, Norman-Philips remembers Mark as 'a really sweet American chap' who had left the military fed up with the discipline, the thought of being deployed to Vietnam, and a general feeling of being 'tricked into' joining up. Once in the hands of BIT, Mark was kept hidden from the authorities until January 1970.[71] During this time he 'made himself useful and popular', set up a coffee shop in the BIT offices, and assisted Norman-Philips with a BBC film about English runaways.[72] The film was made in cooperation with British police and shown on British television early on New Year's Day. It was later on the same day that Mark was picked up by police on the way home.[73]

Remembering his arrest, Norman-Philips said, 'he got stopped, he got asked for papers…and before anybody knew what had happened they'd handed him over to the American military police.' As soon as Norman-Philips and others at BIT discovered what had happened they 'started complaining very very very loudly; got lawyers involved…and started protesting'. With the help of Harvey Matusow, the famous American actor, communist, and FBI informer, who was living in London and was friends with Norman-Philips, BIT rapidly put together posters calling for Mark's release. Small-scale protests were held outside the American embassy, parliament and Downing Street; Clancy Sigal lent his support and the connections he had in parliament; and money was raised for lawyers. All to no avail. The support generated was, as Sigal put it, 'no match for Part II, section 13, paragraph 1 to 7 and

---

arrived in the UK; the UAEB meanwhile had only been operating for a few months and did not receive prominence until after the attempt to have the *Visiting Forces Act* amended.

[71] Oral history interview with Janet Norman-Philips, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 2 October 2018.

[72] Letter: Clancy Sigal to Mr Schwatzer (Max Watts), 14 January 1970, in 16.6, The Uses of Treason: correspondence with military deserters, 1969 – 1993, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC; and Oral history interview with Janet Norman-Philips.

[73] It is unclear how the police discovered Mark was a deserter living in the country, but a likely answer would be the police became aware of his background while he filmed the documentary on runaways with Norman-Philips. On being questioned by Norman-Philips at the time, the production company denied having informed the police: Oral history interview with Janet Norman-Philips.

section 14 (a) and (b) of the Visiting Forces Act'.[74]

In a letter to Max Watts, Clancy Sigal wrote that although Mark had 'a lot of lawyers [supporting] him', it was decided not to try to 'spring him on habeas corpus because we were afraid a High Court judge might not only rule against him – the lawyers felt this was certain – but in doing so make a general anti-deserter judgment'. He continued by asking Watts to inform GIs that England was not safe for them, but if they did come to stay away from Notting Hill and the underground scene as police 'HATE OBVIOUS MANIFESTATIONS OF REBELLIOUS YOUTH' (emphasis in the original).[75]

Mark was returned to his unit in Nuremburg, Germany and sentenced to '30 days by a Nuremburg court-martial', which left many of his supporters angry and frustrated, and encouraged the drive to change the law to enable deserters to remain free from arrest and prosecution in Britain. The incident also served to highlight the existence of the UAEB, and the group soon began receiving requests for help from others who had absconded from the military. One of whom was Robert Cranshaw.

Drafted to serve in the US Armed Forces in the summer of 1969, Robert Edward Cranshaw completed basic training at Fort Ord, California, before being sent to Fort Hood, Texas, where he trained in reconnaissance; on 15 January he was posted to Germany and placed in the 3rd Armoured Division stationed near Frankfurt where, on 25 February, he was informed that his brother had been killed in action in Vietnam. After 30 days leave which he spent with his mother back in the US, Cranshaw returned to his unit and informed his Commanding Officer (CO) that he would 'not serve if he was given orders to fight in Vietnam'. His orders came through on 12 May and a month to the day later he deserted from

[74] Clancy Sigal's notes, in 18.3, The Uses of Treason: Interviews with deserters, undated, Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.
[75] Letter: Clancy Sigal to Mr Schwatzer (Max Watts), 14 January 1970.

the US Army and travelled from Germany with a view to ultimately seek refuge in Britain.[76]

Having spent two months living a 'semi-'underground'' existence, and in 'constant insecurity and fear', Cranshaw contacted the UAEB in the hope they could help him seek asylum. He had decided that he did not want to 'inflict the possible pain of losing a second son on his mother', while also feeling that the American Army was engaged in subterfuge 'when it announces a policy of military "withdrawal"; but then sends fresh recruits to Vietnam'. The UAEB duly took up his case and made an application for political asylum on his behalf, with the hope of achieving 'political refugee' status for him.[77] The government was swift in its decision to refuse asylum. In a letter to Frank Allaun, who was working alongside the UAEB to help Cranshaw, Lord Windlesham, Minister of State at the Home Office said: 'As a serving member of the United States forces, Mr Cranshaw is subject to the terms of the *Visiting Forces Act, 1952* and there are no provisions in that Act which would exempt a deserter on the grounds that he was a political refugee'. Windlesham later said that Cranshaw must make 'immediate arrangements to leave the country'.[78]

Wary of the Mark incident and their previous mistakes, the UAEB treated the case of Ronald James Kaufmann rather differently. Kaufmann had enlisted in the US Air Force in 1967, believing he was doing his 'patriotic duty'; however, on witnessing the war first hand, Kaufmann's sense of patriotism and loyalty became tested daily. On his first counter-insurgency operation in Vietnam, the young American was ordered to 'shoot anything that moves' and witnessed his 'cannon-fire kill women and children'.[79] Speaking vividly about

---

[76] Robert Cranshaw's application for political asylum in the UK, in F. Brockway Papers, FEBR/178, Churchill Archives.
[77] Cranshaw's application for political asylum in the UK, in F. Brockway Papers, FEBR/178, Churchill Archives.
[78] 'GI is refused asylum', *The Guardian*, Tuesday 13 October 1970. It is unknown what happened to Cranshaw.
[79] Information pamphlet from Lord Gifford on the Visiting Forces Bill, cited under 'Two Cases of Injustice – Ronald Kaufmann', in 19.3, The Uses of Treason, assorted research materials, 1969 – 2007, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC. The order to 'shoot anything that moves' or more commonly 'kill anything that moves', was frequently delivered by commanders during the Vietnam War. The phrase,

this experience, Kaufmann said of the women and children that 'they would be thrown for 50 or 60 feet, and disintegrate into bits and pieces midst a splash of blood'. Deeply disturbed, Kaufmann returned from the subsequent four missions with his 'cannon unfired'.[80] On a later mission, he 'received a hit from a MIG 21…his back was broken, and he sustained spinal injuries; but landed safely'. After recovering from his injuries in the US, Kaufmann was returned to his unit before receiving a re-posting confirmation on 27 July 1970. On this day he applied for leave with a view to seek asylum in Sweden and headed to the UK. While in London visiting friends, however, he discovered his passport and over $2000 were missing; it was at this point he decided to contact the UAEB.

Mindful of the asylum rejections of Cranshaw and Tupper, the UAEB wrote to the Swedish government by way of the Swedish embassy in London in the hope his asylum would be granted. Included within the application was a statement from Kaufmann which spoke of his 'genuine and sincere conviction' he was doing the right thing in volunteering for the USAF, and his belief in 'Kennedy's principle: "Don't ask what your country can do for you…"'; before continuing:

> For nearly two years I used to wake up in terror, or in a cold sweat depending on which dream I had had – either of the village or of trying to fly a Super Sabre with no rudder, with the big bitch sliding all over the sky.
>
> With the news of the reposting, I was forced to come to decisions about my own position which previously I had avoided.
>
> I decided to desert.[81]

---

combined with other military parlance at the time such as 'Free Fire Zones', revealed the often indiscriminate killing which took place in Vietnam. Recent studies, such as Nick Turse's '*Kill Anything That Moves*', persuasively argue that, rather than being an exception, infamous massacres such as My Lai were pervasive and systematic. Turse, Nick: *Kill Anything That Moves* (Picador, December, 2013).

[80] Quoted in application for political and humanitarian asylum in Sweden (via the Swedish embassy in London), written by Harry Pincus, 25 August 1970, in 19.3, The Uses of Treason, assorted research materials, 1969 – 2007, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC.

[81] Statement by Ronald James Kaufmann, in application for asylum in Sweden, 25 August 1970, in 19.3, The Uses of Treason, assorted research materials, 1969 – 2007, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC

Unfortunately for Kaufmann, the Swedish government were unwilling to grant him asylum while he was residing in Britain, and a letter of rejection was received by the UAEB on 15 September 1970.[82] With dwindling options, Kaufmann was sent to Ireland by the UAEB where he remained 'technically safe but…subject to intimidation by the US authorities'.[83] Meanwhile, Pincus and the UAEB wrote to the Home Office with an urgent plea for asylum, highlighting Kaufmann's experience in Vietnam where he had been asked to 'commit war crimes'; citing the violation of the 1954 Geneva Agreement which 'guaranteed…no foreign troops or bases in Vietnam; and reminding the Home Office that Britain was the western chairman of the conference.[84] Although there is no record of the government's response, it is almost certain that the application would have been refused.

In addition to contacting the UAEB for advice, deserters also contacted the draft-counselling service SUPPORT, details of which were advertised in London's *Time Out*, as well as underground newspapers. With a focus on draft resisters rather than deserters, however, SUPPORT tended to pass deserters, such as Cranshaw, to the UAEB.

SUPPORT

Established by the Stop-it Committee in 1968, SUPPORT was initially set up to aid Americans studying in Britain, and 'rose out of the necessity for organisation and information' following the 'very large number of young and inexperienced Americans forced into the conscription mill of the Vietnam war'.[85] Announcing their new group at an event

---

[82] Application for Political Asylum in the UK, in Union of American Exiles file XI, War Resisters IISH.
[83] 'Two Cases of Injustice – Ronald Kaufmann', in 19.3, The Uses of Treason, assorted research materials, 1969 – 2007, in Clancy Sigal Papers, HRC; and application for Political Asylum in the UK, in Union of American Exiles file XI, War Resisters IISH.
[84] Application for Political Asylum in the UK, in Union of American Exiles file XI, War Resisters IISH.
[85] SUPPORT Interim Report, October 1970, in file 'Other Organizations – Support – 1972', Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.

organised by the National Peace Council (NPC), Stop-it's representative listed SUPPORT's responsibilities as finding American students' accommodation, helping them locate employment, and offering legal advice on their resident status. They also emphasised that initiating the group was a 'concrete way of helping the American movement…by clog[ing] the wheels of the induction machine.[86] The service was situated in the Peace News building at 5, Caledonian Rd, King's Cross and run by individuals well-versed in the maze-like law of the SSS and the intricacies of the British immigration system.

The group was run in its infancy largely by two young draft resisters, Lawrence Calmus and David Kennedy – both of whom had dual British/American citizenship – and Jocelyn Whitaker, a young Briton who worked as their secretary. Inspired to help GIs avoid the draft by a Vietnam veteran while she was staying in the US in 1968, Whitaker returned to Britain and was soon introduced to Kennedy and Calmus by UAEB member Leo Aliferis. During this period, Whitaker remembers travelling to the continent with both Calmus and Kennedy in a London black cab they had acquired, first to Paris then on to Brussels, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark and eventually Sweden, in order to establish contact with groups and individuals engaged in helping resisters and deserters. Many they met in Paris were Quakers – a few Americans but mainly French – who were helping absconding GIs along the underground railroad to Sweden. While there, one individual 'hatched this crazy plan to pop a deserter in the boot of the taxi…and cross the border into Belgium' in order to 'show it could be done…as the French were very ambivalent about having deserters in the country'. Conscious of remaining within the law, however, the trio from London 'declined the offer'.[87] Later in 1969 the group was joined by Carolee Gerwin (now known as Jeane Freer), a trained

[86] Statement made by the representative of the *Stop-it Committee* at the forum on 'The Right to Refuse Military Service and Orders', organized by the National Peace Council, 15 June 1968, in file XVI, the Stop-it Committee, The Union of American Exiles in Britain, 1967 – 1975, War Resisters International Papers, International Institute of Social History.
[87] Oral history interview with Jocelyn Kennedy, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 1 October 2018.

draft counsellor who had been working in California under the influential civil rights attorney, William Smith – a man who 'spearheaded the defence of draft resisters in the Vietnam War era' and would continue to assist SUPPORT throughout its active years.[88] With influential contacts such as Smith, relationships cemented with activists assisting resisters and deserters across Europe, and the core experience the draft resisting counsellors shared, the assistance SUPPORT could provide belied its modest size. The group quickly rose to prominence in the underground community and were able to boast with some justification that they were 'widely known in Britain, on the continent, and in the United States as a counselling service'.[89]

Advertising their counsel services in *Time Out* and underground newspapers, SUPPORT stated the Selective Service law 'discriminates against ghetto youth and the poor, and preys on the uninformed', adding that 'most potential soldiers could receive deferments, but only by competent draft counselling'.[90] As the group's profile rose through adverts such as this and word of mouth, their mandate broadened to include assisting Americans other than students. Operating a surgery once a week on a Thursday evening at the Peace News building, and providing an answer machine service which ran 24 hours a day seven days a week, SUPPORT received visits and calls from a remarkably diverse cross section of Americans abroad. Although the largest single group remained American students, SUPPORT began assisting conscientious objectors, draft-resisters based in Britain, deserters from both British and German military bases, children of American ex-pats who realised that

[88] Obituary, William G. Smith; Lawyer for Draft resisters, Veterans, in the los Angeles times, August 4, 1999 [online]:< http://articles.latimes.com/1999/aug/04/news/mn-62550 > [accessed 12 December 2018]; and Oral history interview with Jeane Freer, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 13 November 2018.
[89] Interim Report, October 1970, in file 'Other Organizations – Support – 1972', Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.
[90] Advertisement, *Counsel on the US Selective Service System*, in file 'Other Organizations – Support – 1972', Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.

when they turn 18 years of age they became liable for draft registration, and even Britons who were travelling to the US for work or study and were fearful of being drafted.[91] Recalling the individuals she encountered while working as a draft counsellor at SUPPORT, Gerwin said 'there were basically three groups of people…people who were facing the draft and hoping to get a deferment…deserters from the army…and a third group of people, basically nutters'.[92] The second and third categories are revealing of the murky, uncertain, unlawful, and potentially dangerous world Gerwin and others at SUPPORT worked within. Wanting to assist those who sought help from them the best they could, but conscious of staying on the right side of the law, the counsellors traversed a fine line between lawfulness and criminality. In order to help many of the deserters who came to them, however, this line was occasionally crossed.

During the operational years of SUPPORT, Gerwin estimated that she counselled 'about 1000 people face-to-face' in addition to helping many more via telephone.[93] Of these 'a few dozen…maybe a hundred' were deserters.[94] Although a few absconded from military bases in Britain, it is clear through the testimony of SUPPORT members and the diary entries of Clancy Sigal that the majority were arriving from Germany. With countries such as Sweden serving as safe havens to deserters, it may seem illogical – or at least impractical – to travel to Britain. However, much in the same way Britain proved a draw to resisters, with its common language and culture, it almost certainly drew deserters for the same reasons. Once contact was made with the group, the counsellors either passed them on to the UAEB and Clancy Sigal, or helped by finding them work and lodging – often provided by Quakers.

---

[91] Oral history interview with Jeane Freer, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 13 November 2018; Oral history Interview with Dennis Stukenbroeker, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Oxfordshire, 6 January 2018; and Interim Report, October 1970, in file 'Other Organizations – Support – 1972', Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University
[92] Freer, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 13 November 2018.
[93] Email from Jeane Freer to author, 13 November 2018.
[94] Freer, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 13 November 2018.

Occasionally, however, they would be helped along the underground railway to Sweden. Gerwin recalled that 'there were a number of conduits to get people to where they wanted to go', but in order to pass them down the line they had to have travel documents, 'and the problem with deserters was they usually didn't'.[95] In these cases Gerwin would help them obtain documents illegally then provide them with contact details of the Sweden based ex Green Beret, Gerry Condon, who was able to assist the GI further. Condon became a central figure on the underground railway, helping many individuals find sanctuary in Sweden, before returning to the US in 1975 as part of a campaign for amnesty for war resisters. He continues to be active in anti-war work, working closely with GI resisters to this day.[96] Speaking of obtaining documents for deserters, Gerwin stressed that this was 'the biggest, biggest risk' and that she was careful not to ask too many questions of those she helped – 'the less I knew the better it was for everybody'.[97] This sense of caution was echoed in the testimonies of both Stukenbroeker and Whitaker, with the latter stating SUPPORT would 'push [deserters] on as quickly as possible', while Stukenbroeker said 'we tried to help anybody who came in the door…[but] we actually held ourselves out to be quite neutral'.[98] Subsequently, deserters were often passed on to the UAEB (at least by Stukenbroeker) while SUPPORT received resister traffic in the opposite direction. This he said was 'the real dividing line' between the groups, 'Harry and co. would handle all the military types…and we handled the resisters'.[99]

The majority of help SUPPORT offered, however, was perfectly legal. As previously mentioned, most of those contacting SUPPORT were those facing the draft and seeking

---

[95] Jeane Freer, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 13 November 2018.
[96] From interview with Irish network for nonviolent action training & education (Innate) [online]: <http://www.innatenonviolence.org/readings/2011_11.shtml > [accessed 23 December 2018].
[97] Freer, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 13 November 2018.
[98] Oral history Interview with Dennis Stukenbroeker, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Oxfordshire, 6 January 2018.
[99] Stukenbroeker, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Oxfordshire, 6 January 2018.

deferments. Gerwin recalls the two most 'useful' ways in obtaining deferments was either through failing a medical or becoming a student. On receiving orders to report for pre-induction physical examinations, SUPPORT would assist draft eligible Americans in finding facilities to do so in Britain – and then Naples, Italy when the US stopped the practice in Britain – thus saving Americans the effort of returning to the US.[100] With the onus for proving disqualifying disabilities resting on the individual, SUPPORT had 'success in many cases of getting men medically disqualified for service', through prepping the candidate beforehand. Meanwhile, assistance was provided by a consulting psychiatrist who SUPPORT could refer the American to 'if they feel they are psychologically unfit for military service'.[101] In terms of helping Americans gain student deferments, Gerwin developed 'a good relationship with somebody who ran…a Tech college in London…people enrolled in the college and he helped them then they would get a student deferment'.[102] The counsellors also offered advice for conscientious objectors, but warned this was a 'long and difficult process' which could 'easily be denied if not properly applied for'.[103]

Those individuals who had, in Gerwin's words, 'a loose touch on reality', and who she was not comfortable putting up in 'someone's nice comfortable mansion flat' were passed along to Jim Haynes, a central figure in London's 'swinging sixties' who ran the Arts Lab in Covent Garden – a well known countercultural hangout. Haynes provided the individual with a place to stay at the Arts Lab, and occasionally casual paid work. Being a 'shoestring' operation which kept once weekly office hours and was run by a staff of only three or four people working pro-bono at any one time, the group was able to keep

[100] Stukenbroeker, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Oxfordshire, 6 January 2018.
[101] Interim Report, October 1970, in file 'Other Organizations – Support – 1972', Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.
[102] Freer, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 13 November 2018.
[103] Interim Report, October 1970, in file 'Other Organizations – Support – 1972', Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.

finances to a minimum.[104] Costs did mount, however, and with rent and phone bill to pay SUPPORT relied heavily on Group 68's pledge to raise £40 per quarter. In addition to the help received through Group 68, SUPPORT also obtained a grant of between £250 and £300 (£4368 to £5242 in 2020) from the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, and 'a trickle of help from other sources, including US'.[105] Despite this, members recall a near continuous struggle to raise enough money – their precarious finances can also be seen in a letter written by Stukenbroeker to the chairman of Group 68, Heinz Norden, in 1971, stating they had 'less than four pounds in the bank…in arrears in our rent payments and the phone and answering service bills are about to come in'.[106] Aware of their worth, and determined to continue operating regardless of the difficulties they faced, SUPPORT continued to help resisters until President Nixon finally ended the draft in early 1973; ultimately assisting a few thousand individuals between 1968 and 1973. Although many documents were destroyed by Stukenbroeker when SUPPORT ceased to operate, oral testimony reveals a few thousand individuals being counselled; while one financial document shows that during the course of one 18 month period they assisted '250 youth at meetings, 75 by correspondence, and many more by telephone'.[107]

Reflecting the changing needs of resisters as the war wound down, SUPPORT began receiving an increasing number of calls enquiring about the issue of amnesty. Stukenbroeker,

---

[104] Freer, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, via telephone, 13 November 2018.
[105] Stukenbroeker, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Oxfordshire, 6 January 2018. Stukenbroeker wrote to the JRCT in 1975 'politely declining' the offer of a renewed grant, commenting that SUPPORT's 'raison d'etre' was over. Letter to 'Fellow Delegates' at the World Assembly in Paris for Peace and Independence of the Peoples of Indochina', February 1972, in file Group 68 Bulletins/Public statements/Press releases/Petitions, 1968 – 73, Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library. Currency converted online: < http://inflation.iamkate.com/ > [accessed 29 December 2018].
[106] Letter, Dennis Stukenbroeker to Heinz Norden, 13 May 1971, in file 'Other Organizations – Support – 1972', Heinz Norden Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.
[107] SUPPORT: Council on the Select Service System, in J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/2/4/1, MRC. This box file also contains further information which relates to SUPPORT, such as fund raising leaflets and names of famous Britons who were sponsors, including the author John Le Carre and the actor Peter Ustinov.

who was largely running the group by himself at this late stage, would either direct these enquiries to the Los Angeles civil rights lawyer William Smith, or pass them along to the UAEB who had altered course and engaged fully in the issue of securing amnesty for draft resisters.

A Change of Direction

In its final years, the UAEB was led by Fritz Efaw, a draft resisting graduate student at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Anticipating his draft notice in May 1969, Efaw travelled to London and found work as a computer programmer at London University. Shortly after he arrived he was notified by the Oklahoma draft board that he had been drafted; failing to respond, he was indicted in January 1970.[108] Like most Americans who joined the UAEB, Efaw was morally opposed to the war and had been involved in anti-war activism in the US before he arrived in Britain. Dedicated to helping deserters and resisters during the six years he lived in London, he was central to spreading awareness of the UAEB throughout Europe and beyond. He was also instrumental in forging links with other anti-war organisations on the continent, developing a relationship with the VVAW which saw the UAEB become only the second VVAW chapter outside the US, and becoming committed to the issue of amnesty. So shaped was he by his experience living and working as a draft resister in Britain he would, as we shall see in a the epilogue, return to the US as a candidate for vice president at the 1976 Democratic National Convention, running to promote the cause of universal and unconditional amnesty.[109]

---

[108] Oral history Interview with Fritz Efaw, telephone interview by author, MP3 digital recording, New York City, 17 April 2017.

[109] 'How Fritz Efaw was nominated to be Vice President', *The Ledger*, Wednesday 11 August 1976 [online]: <http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1346&dat=19760811&id=XlZNAAAAIBAJ&sjid=vfoDAAAAIBAJ&pg=7032,2927809 > [accessed 5 September 2018].

In the spring of 1971 it became clear to the UAEB that 'the influx of American war resisters into England was over', so they decided to coordinate more closely with groups in Europe and Canada on the issue of amnesty, supporting the burgeoning GI movement, and wider anti-war work.[110] The following year and a half witnessed a flurry of activity which considerably widened its net of influence, while also significantly depleting its funds. A financial balance sheet covering the months between March 1971 and December 1972 reveals that aside from everyday expenses such as publication and stationary costs, the UAEB posted 200 letters to 'sympathetic Americans in England'; spent £154 on two return flights to Copenhagen to meet with European GIs and exiles; paid £3.93 for phone calls to Toronto and Paris; provided travel expenses for VVAW speakers; sent aid to 'a jobless deserter and wife in Paris' of £14; provided loans of £40 to exiles, including one residing in Ireland; paid the legal expenses in a deportation case of £26; and covered the £35 fare for a deserter to reach Sweden. A total of £272.93 (£4752 in 2020).[111] A significant financial undertaking for a group as small in number as the UAEB. It also shows the diverse nature of the group's activities, and the broadening of its network. Financial links can also be seen in a letter written by Efaw addressed to 'Friends', which reveals American church groups provided the UAEB with £500 in 1970.[112]

Of particular significance within the above expenses is the return flights to Copenhagen – a trip arranged at the behest of Mike Powers of the American Deserters Committee (ADC) in Sweden. Established by draft resisters in 1968, the ADC set out to 'give the deserters and draft resisters in Sweden a political voice…to encourage other GIs to desert,

---

[110] Letter, Fritz Efaw to 'Friends', 15 January 1973, in file 'Other organisations – Union of American Exiles – Britain – 1972, Tam 122, Box 4, Heinz Norden Paper, Tamiment Library; and Interview with Fritz Efaw.
[111] UAEB Expenses sheet, March, 1971 to December, 1972, in file 'Other organisations – Union of American Exiles – Britain – 1972, Tam 122, Box 4, Heinz Norden Paper, Tamiment Library. Currency converted online: < http://inflation.iamkate.com/ > [accessed 5 September 2018].
[112] Letter, Fritz Efaw to 'Friends', 15 January 1973.

to establish links to the American anti-war movement, and to represent the exiles in their dealings with Swedish authorities'.[113] The group alienated many in the Swedish exile community, though, through advocating radical politics which embraced Maoism and aligning itself with the Soviet backed International Communist Youth Conference.[114] The group is also now known to have been infiltrated by the CIA who acted as agents provocateurs, encouraging the embrace of political extremism.[115] Firm in the belief that strengthening ties with continental groups would increase their influence, the UAEB responded enthusiastically to a letter Powers sent calling to meet and 'facilitate an intensive discussion on the issues facing us…and [take] concrete steps to becoming a functioning, integral part of our movement at home'. Efaw went as a representative of the UAEB, and was joined by individuals representing groups from Germany, Denmark and Italy.[116] The result of the three day meeting in mid-October 1972 was the formation of a new Europe-wide organisation, the American Coalition in Europe for Peace, Freedom, Justice and Democracy (ACE). The following day a press release was sent out confirming the group's foundation and eleven core aims. Closer anti-war collaboration across Europe was promoted, while strengthening ties with US groups was hoped to be achieved through sending a European report every three or four months. The new group also hoped to bus GIs to Copenhagen and

---

[113] Scott, Carl-Gustaf, '"Sweden Might Be a Haven, But It's Not Heaven": American War Resisters in Sweden During the Vietnam War, *Immigrants & Minorities*, 33:3 (2015), pp. 205 – 230.
[114] Scott, Carl-Gustaf, '"Sweden Might Be a Haven, But It's Not Heaven", p. 211.
[115] The story of the American Deserters Committee in Sweden and its infiltration by the CIA is vividly told in the previous Mattew Sweet book: *Operation Chaos: The Vietnam Deserters Who Fought the CIA, the Brainwashers, and Themselves* (Henry holt and Co. 2018) https://www.nytimes.com/1976/12/26/archives/deserters-in-sweden-feel-they-were-right.html
[116] Letter, Mike Powers to 'Dear People', September 1972, file 'Other organisations – Union of American Exiles – Britain – 1972, Tam 122, Box 4, Heinz Norden Paper, Tamiment Library; and article 'Exiles, GIs, Vets Meet in Copenhagen, by Fritz Efaw, in The American Exile in Britain, Vol 2, No. 3, November/December, 1972, p. 4 [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15932coll8/id/9960/rec/4 > [accessed 29 December 2018)].

Paris for anti-war leafleting, while also 'activate American students in Europe'.[117] The group declared, 'We, the American Coalition in Europe for Peace, Freedom, Justice, and Democracy (ACE), have combined forces because of the continued American aggression against the Indochinese people and because of the repression against the American people at home and abroad'. Adding they would endorse the 7 Point Peace Plan of the PRG of South Vietnam, which demanded the US withdraw its forces, stop all criminal acts against the Vietnamese people and end all aid to the Thieu regime.[118]

Despite the effort of convening the conference, it is apparent the umbrella group failed to coordinate successfully. Writing to ACE's membership two years later in the hope of drawing the groups together to 'review the lessons of the past two years', Efaw stated that although the groups had 'continued to maintain contact with each other…[ACE] has not been particularly active'.[119] An indication of this failure to coordinate can be seen in a letter sent by Efaw to anti-war and exile groups in Europe and North America towards the end of 1972. Writing to encourage them to attend a conference on amnesty in Paris in February 1973, Efaw spoke of 'certain divisions within our ranks, especially in Sweden'. He continued by stating that the UAEB saw no 'contradiction between working for amnesty, working with GIs, and working locally with movements in solidarity with the Indochinese people. Indeed, we feel that all these areas must be given full attention'. He added that all anti-war groups in England 'stand united in their attitudes toward Indochina and amnesty, and we oppose sectarian divisions which detract from the effectiveness of a united front on these vital and

[117] Press release, ACE, October 19, 1972 [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15932coll8/id/28187/rec/1> [accessed 29 December 2018].
[118] Article 'Exiles, GIs, Vets Meet in Copenhagen, by Fritz Efaw, in The American Exile in Britain, Vol 2, No. 3, November/December, 1972, p. 5.
[119] Letter, Fritz Efaw to 15 American groups in Europe, June 18, 1974, in file 'Other organisations – Union of American Exiles – Britain – 1972, Tam 122, Box 4, Heinz Norden Paper, Tamiment Library

related issues'.[120] In discussing the weaknesses of the American anti-Vietnam war movement, the historian Simon Hall commented that 'from the very beginning [it was] bedevilled by factionalism and infighting that sapped its moral, diverted its energies, and alienated potential supporters'.[121] This was certainly true of the American anti-war groups in Britain. As we have seen, the Stop-it Committee was torn over whether to protest over a single issue, such as the draft; divided over whether to help resisters and deserters; and fought endlessly over the tactics which would best achieve their aims. They were also challenged by the context in which they were operating. As Americans in Britain, the issue of protesting against British complicity was a further hotly debated issue.

Although no meaningful collaboration materialised, the conference did enable Efaw to forge bonds with two important groups - the PRG and VVAW who had representatives in Copenhagen attending the third session of the International Commission of Inquiry into US War Crimes in Indochina.[122] Writing in the UAEB's publication , *The American Exile in Britain*, Efaw stated that the solidarity between the exiles and VVAW 'exploded one of the myths Nixon is trying to perpetrate—the myth of animosity between the Americans who fought in Vietnam and the Americans who refused to fight'. He continued, 'In fact the real animosity is between those who engineered America's involvement in the war and those on both sides who suffered in it'. This distinction was highlighted the next day when the exiles met with the deputy head of the PRG delegation to the War Crimes Commission, Mr Tai, who spoke of two Americas: 'One America belongs to the war mongers, and for the time

---

[120] Letter, Fritz Efaw to 'Comrades', December 29, 1972, in file 'Other organisations – Union of American Exiles – Britain – 1972, Tam 122, Box 4, Heinz Norden Paper, Tamiment Library.
[121] Hall, Simon: *Rethinking the American Anti-War Movement* (Routledge, 2012), p. 127.
[122] The International Commission of Inquiry into US War Crimes in Indochina (ICI) was established at the Soviet supported Fifth Stockholm Conference in March 1970. The purpose of the commission was to discuss 'discuss not only US war crimes in Indochina in the strict meaning of the word, but also US aggression, genocide, and crimes against humanity'. Quoted in CIA file [online]: <https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP80R01720R000700090029-1.pdf> [accessed 22 January 2019].

being is represented by Mr Nixon. The other America belongs to the people like you, who represent peace, democracy and justice'.[123] The relationship forged between the UAEB and PRG would continue until 1976 – the year Vietnam was reunified and Efaw returned to America to attend the Democratic National Convention.

Bonds between the UAEB and VVAW were further cemented early the following year. Travelling to Paris to attend a meeting of European peace groups organised to coincide with the Paris Peace Accords, Efaw met with Barry Romo of VVAW and asked him whether the UAEB could align themselves with the veterans group.[124] Recalling this meeting, Efaw said Romo 'liked the idea of having some exiles [as part of their group]…agreed, and we became a part of VVAW'.[125] Writing at the time, Efaw said that joining with VVAW reflected 'the growth of our group to include veterans, GIs, exiles, and other progressive women and men who share our struggles'. He also stated the group was at the 'forefront of the fight for unconditional amnesty,' as well as working with GIs and veterans in the UK, and working closely with 'British and American groups who oppose US imperialism in Indochina and elsewhere'.[126] Efaw was careful to point out however that the 'affiliation [did] not alter the kind of work that the UAEB [did],' and that they still regarded themselves primarily as 'representatives of the exile and GI communities in Britain'.[127]

---

[123] Article 'Exiles, GIs, Vets Meet in Copenhagen, by Fritz Efaw, in The American Exile in Britain, Vol 2, No. 3, November/December, 1972, p. 4.

[124] Between 1966 and 1973 Barry Romo went from being a model soldier to a model protestor. Decorated for valor in combat, Romo became disillusioned with the war and on returning to the US soon joined VVAW, becoming the first West Coast Coordinator for VVAW. He is involved in activism to this day. A recording of Romo addressing students at Antioch College in 1973 can be found online:<https://www.wyso.org/post/how-model-soldier-becomes-vietnam-protester-barry-romo-story-part-i-ii> [accessed 14 January 2019]. For more information on VVAW see: Hunt, Andrew E.: *The Turning – A History of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War* (New York University Press, 2001).

[125] Interview with Fritz Efaw, 17 April 2017.

[126] Appeal for financial aid, in Box No. 2, File Group 68 Newspaper Clippings – 1968 – 1973, HN Papers, Tamiment Library.

[127] Article in *The American Exile*, Vol. 3, No. 1, September 1974 [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15932coll8/id/9896/rec/2> [accessed 14 January 2019]. The merging of the UAEB with VVAW was widely reported in the

The UAEB had been involved with the issue of amnesty prior to their affiliation with VVAW, but it was following Efaw's meeting with Barry Romo that it became their dominant issue. Described in a Group 68 circular as 'spearheading the struggle over here for unconditional amnesty', Efaw was due to attend a conference on amnesty in Paris in February 1973.[128] Organised by *Amex- Canada*, *Up From Exile*, and *Safe Return* the conference aimed to bring together exile groups in order to work out 'broad outlines of a strategy to achieve a universal, unconditional amnesty in America'.[129] However, three days before the conference was due to take place the Paris Prefect of Police, at the instruction of the French Minister of the Interior, banned the event from taking place as it was deemed potentially 'disruptive to public order'.[130] Despite the frustrations caused by the late cancellation, and in order that representatives of exile groups could attend, the conference took place three months later in Toronto, Canada. Efaw joined exiles from across Europe and Canada at the conference which emphasised the importance of 'grass-roots organizing' to highlight the issue of amnesty.[131] During the following year the London chapter of VVAW retained strong ties with exile groups in Europe and Canada, sharing information, writing for each others publications, and hosting events such as anti-war lectures and film showings.

A year after the Toronto conference, Efaw returned to the city to attend a further meeting of exile groups on 21 September 1974, where Ford's recent proclamation offering amnesty to those who evaded the war was discussed at length. Announced five days previously, Ford stated that 'desertion in time of war is a major, serious offense…Yet,

---

underground press throughout the world - see article in Winter Soldier, Vol. 4, Issue 1, Jan. 1974, p. 15 [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15932coll8/id/36359/rec/1> [accessed 14 January 2019].

[128] Circular, Group 68, February 1973, in file 'Captain Culver – 1971', Box 2, HN Papers.

[129] Article, 'Latest Tangle in Paris', *The American Exile*, Vol. 2, No. 5 April/May 1973, p. 1.

[130] Article, 'Latest Tangle in Paris', *The American Exile*, p. 1.

[131] Article, Amnesty Campaign Begins, Winter Soldier, Vol. 3, No. 5 July 1973 [online]: <http://www.vvaw.org/veteran/article/?id=1436&hilite=Amnesty> [accessed 22 January 2019].

reconciliation calls for an act of mercy to bind the nation's wounds and to heal the scars of divisiveness'.[132] The 'conditional' amnesty was rejected by Efaw and the other representatives at the Toronto conference, and a boycott was called for. Returning to Britain, he announced to 'all Americans in the UK' that the amnesty Ford was offering was 'phony' in that it was 'neither unconditional, since it requires recipients to admit their "guilt" and serve a 2-year punitive sentence…nor universal, since it does not apply to many categories of war resisters, particularly veterans with less-than-honourable discharges'. He continued by encouraging potential recipients of amnesty to get in touch with London VVAW 'immediately', and that if the boycott was observed it would 'increase the chances of obtaining universal, unconditional amnesty in the near future'.[133] On 21 January 1977, exiles patience was rewarded when, in his first day in office, President Carter fulfilled a campaign promise in granting amnesty to hundreds of thousands of draft evading Americans.

Efaw and the London chapter of VVAW continued to work on forwarding the rights of draft resisters and deserters up to Efaw's return to the US in 1976. One example of their continued activity was the support of Air Force Sgt. Dan Pruitt who was convicted by a court-martial on eight counts of refusing to get his hair cut. Over 800 signatures were collected in support of Pruitt, and stickers reading 'Fight The Hair Reg: Support Dan!' appeared all over the airbase where he was stationed at RAF Alconbury.[134] With Efaw's return to America to take part in the Democratic National Convention, the London chapter of VVAW ceased to exist.

---

[132] Article, Conditional Amnesty for Vietnam Draft Resisters and Military Deserters, *New York Times*, September 16, 1974.
[133] Public announcement, London chapter VVAW, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – correspondence 1974, Box 2, HN Papers.
[134] 'Sgt. Fights Hair Reg', *Winter Soldier – a VVAW Publication*, Vol. 4 No. 3 (March 1974).

Conclusion

Between 1969 and 1976, the UAEB was by far the most dedicated and successful group, American or British, in aiding draft resisters and deserters from the military in Britain. With the assistance of their sister group SUPPORT, they helped many thousands of Americans in all manner of ways. In the vast majority of cases what they provided was small – offering advice on deferments, leading young men through the complicated laws of the Selective Service System, or helping with visa arrangements. But, of the thousands who sought their counsel there were some whose lives were irrevocably changed.

Although the concrete ways in which the UAEB assisted those in need was extensive, it is important to consider the wider significance of the group. They were an integral part of the anti-Vietnam War landscape in Britain during the period, forming and retaining close bonds with British and American groups, while also attempting to alter British law. The failure of the Gifford bill to pass was a blow to the UAEB, but this defeat should not mask the dedication of those who campaigned tirelessly for it. Their commitment to this cause was founded on a belief that the British government was wrong in its support of the American led war, and one which they felt, as Americans, was their moral duty to oppose.

Efaw loved his country. So too did Cranshaw, Haygood and the other members of the UAEB. In that, there was no doubt. But, as the war in Vietnam continued, it began to tug at the conscience of these men and many like them serving in the US Armed Forces. Their thoughts, compounded by the grim reality of atrocities such as My Lai where over 500 innocent men women and children were slaughtered by American soldiers, soon turned to questions. In particular, the question asked by VVAW member John Kerry during his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, began to resonate: ‘How do you

ask a man to be the last man to die for a mistake?'[135] GIs such as Cranshaw and Haygood began to rebel, and soon the GI Movement was born – a movement which threatened to tear the US military apart from the inside out.[136] Britain, as we shall see in the final chapter, bore witness to this rebellion of GIs and their call for peace in Vietnam.

Members of the group, like those in the Stop-it Committee before them, were patriots. The ideals of America were shared by many back home in the US, and although far from her shores they held a patriotic belief that they should uphold and fight for these ideals despite their distance from the debate back home.

[135] John Kerry speaking before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 22 April 1971 [online]: <www.lib.berkeley.edu/videodir/pacificaviet/kerry.pdf> [accessed 5 September 2018].

[136] The GI Movement was an anti-war movement which swept through all branches of the US armed forces during the Vietnam War. To date it is the largest, most extensive, and most successful anti-war movement to emerge from the armed forces of the US. By 1971, the situation had become so critical that one US Army colonel was reported as saying: '[The US Army] have met the enemy, and they are us.' Two first rate accounts of the GI Movement are: Cortright, David: *Soldiers in Revolt* (Haymarket Books, 2005); and the documentary *Sir! No Sir! – The Suppressed Story of the GI Movement to End the War in Vietnam* (Dir. David Zeiger, 2006) Also see: Sevy, Grace: *The American Experience in Vietnam – A Reader* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), pp. 175 – 182.

Chapter 3

Group 68

AS THE FINAL US troops serving in Vietnam shouldered their duffel bags and began boarding planes for the long, much anticipated journey home, a crowd of five hundred peace campaigners gathered opposite the American embassy in London's Grosvenor Square. The crowd, a mix of parliamentarians, Nobel Peace Prize recipients, the British public, and leaders from trade unions, peace groups, youth groups, and the church, were marking the end of another commitment: a commitment to maintain a vigil opposite the US embassy until all American servicemen left Vietnam. Beginning on 17 April 1972, the Vietnam Vigil to end the War took place every day the embassy was open, between midday and 1pm, until 28 March 1973. Believed at the time to be the longest running continuous protest anywhere in the world, this remarkable year-long demonstration was the final significant action of the American anti-Vietnam War movement in Britain.

The Vigil – as it became to be known – was the inspiration of an American woman, Mia Lord, but the lengthy demonstration would not have been possible without the support of Group 68, for which Lord worked as a secretary. Established as an expatriate organisation of Americans in opposition to the war in 1968, Group 68 operated in Britain up to and beyond the withdrawal of all Americans from Vietnam in 1975. Unlike the rather more youthful, student-based groups previously discussed, Group 68 was made up of older, professional Americans who had lived and worked in Britain since the late 1950s and early 1960s. Their approach to anti-war activism shied away from the theatrical, adventurous, and occasionally illegal methods of the younger Americans. Instead, Group 68 aimed to build momentum against the war through establishing as broad a constituency of support as possible, and reflected modes of protest associated with the Old Left rather than the New. In doing so they

developed strong and sustained relationships with individuals from British political, public and religious spheres, while working in close collaboration with local anti-Vietnam War groups such as the BCPV. Throughout their operational years they also kept up a steady presence at anti-war demonstrations and peace rallies, and maintained pressure on both British and American politicians to support an end to the conflict.

This chapter begins by exploring the background of the Americans who formed the core of the group, many of whom lived in self-imposed exile from McCarthy era America. It charts how the expatriate group of actors, artists and other professionals, grappled with life abroad and reveals how this experience shaped their actions in setting up a campaigning organisation for anti-war presidential candidates. It goes on to show how, conscious of the group's narrow focus, a handful of members chose to break away and form a separate organisation with a broader anti-war mandate. Once formed, the new Group 68 launched itself to the forefront of anti-war opposition in Britain, revealing the American expat anti-war landscape to be more than the domain of students and the young. In assessing the transition of the group over the following years, a picture emerges of Americans very much at odds with their government, but resolutely patriotic and determined to remain part of the debate raging back home. What is also shown, however, is the bitterness and disunity which periodically afflicted the group, and its sometimes complicated relationship with other expat American groups in Britain. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the group's transformation, once again, into an organisation with broader concerns. Although remaining focussed on ending the war, Concerned Americans Abroad (CAA), as the group became known, campaigned to impeach president Nixon, demanded universal amnesty for American war resisters, and called for the CIA to be abolished.

A Constituency of Conscience

As relations between East and West soured year-on-year following the Second World War and the world seemed an increasingly bipolar place, a fear of communism infiltrating the American way of life began taking hold in the United States. The so-called Red Scare metastasised through the late 1940s and 1950s, eventually infecting all levels of American society, from politics and the media to education and the arts, destabilising democracy and sowing paranoia. Escaping this climate of fear and intimidation, hundreds of individuals, particularly those from the entertainment industry who found themselves blacklisted in Hollywood, moved to Europe and elsewhere. Rebuilding their professional and private lives abroad, the 'McCarthy Refugees' as they became known, often criticised the US government and challenge its Cold War ideology through their work.[1] Dozens of individuals, drawn by a common language and culture, family connections and work opportunities, moved to Britain.

While filming his 1951 comedy *Pardon My French* in Paris, the American film director Bernard Vorhaus discovered he had been named before the House Committee investigating Communist subversion in the film industry by several 'Hollywood Ten' witnesses.[2] On refusing to return to the US and testify himself, Vorhaus was blacklisted. Shortly afterwards, he moved permanently to England with his wife Hetty who had British citizenship, later admitting that for a while he had been 'very active with the Communists in the anti-Fascist work they were doing'.[3] Around the same time, other Hollywood émigrés

---

[1] For more on blacklisted Americans who moved to Europe to continue their careers in film, see Prime, Rebecca: *Hollywood Exiles in Europe: The Blacklist and Cold War Film Culture* - new Directions in International Studies – (Rutgers University Press, January 2014); and Falk, Andrew: *Upstaging the Cold War – American Dissent and Cultural Diplomacy, 1940 – 1960* (University of Massachusetts Press, 2011).

[2] The Hollywood Ten were a group of American movie producers, directors and screenwriters who refused to answer questions before the HUAC in October 1947. An excellent account of the ten is provided by one of their number, Edward Dmytryk, in his memoir. See Dmytryk, Edward*: A Memoir of the Hollywood Ten* (Southern Illinois Press, 2003).

[3] Buhle, Paul and McGilligan Patrick: *Tender Comrades – A Backstory of the Hollywood Blacklist* (St Martin's Press, 1997).

chose to make Britain their home. While he was filming in Britain, the actor Sam Wanamaker learned that his earlier years as a communist sympathiser could be used to have him blacklisted. On discovering this, he decided to remain in England to pursue a successful career in the arts. Explaining his decision years later, Wanamaker said 'I knew that because I had worked with actors who had problems in Hollywood, I might have difficulties'.[4] Meanwhile, the famous harmonica player Larry Adler also settled in Britain following accusations of being a communist sympathiser. Called to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) in 1949 while travelling in England, Adler refused and, like Wanamaker, chose to remain.[5] Other future Group 68 members who found a reprieve from the McCarthy witch-hunts in London included the actress Betsy Blair, whose interest in Marxism led to an investigation by HUAC, the previously mentioned Clancy Sigal, and Albert Colloms, an American civil rights lawyer. Colloms was subpoenaed and appeared before a HUAC hearing at the height of McCarthyism during 1956. Called before the committee due to his links with a little-known legislative pressure group called Conference for Legislation in the National Interest, Colloms steadfastly refused to answer questions regarding his personal beliefs. On being asked whether he had ever been a member of the Communist Party, he refused to answer on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments, adding 'I don't think this committee has any authority to enter an inquiry concerning my beliefs or political affiliations'.[6]

On settling in Britain, many of these Americans united behind the campaign to re-elect president Johnson in 1964 – not out of enthusiasm for the man, but because they were

---

[4] Article, 'The McCarthy Era Kept Him Away', *St Louis Post-Dispatch*, January 23, 1985, p. 64 [online]: <https://www.newspapers.com/newspage/140931321/> [accessed 7 March 2019].
[5] Obituary, 'Larry Adler: Mouth organ virtuoso', August, 2001, BBC [online]: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/198252.stm> [accessed 7 March 2019].
[6] Albert L. Colloms HUAC testimony, in *Hearings Before the Committee on Un-American Activities*, House of Representatives, Eighty-Fourth Congress, Second Session, p. 6198 [online]: <https://archive.org/details/1956HUACCommunistPoliticalSubversion/page/n65> [accessed 7 March 2019].

'bitterly opposed to American involvement in Vietnam' and they believed 'the overriding consideration was to oppose the disastrous policies being advocated by Goldwater'.[7] In the weeks leading up to the election, Johnson's apparent anti-war position stood in marked contrast to Goldwater's hawkish stance. While headlines emphasised Johnson's pledge to 'seek no wider war' and assurance he was not 'about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away…to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves', Goldwater was drawing opprobrium for advocating the use of atomic weapons. Galvanised by a concern of Goldwater's fiery rhetoric and fearful of what his presidency would bring, the British group joined with thousands of other expatriate Americans around the world in uniting behind Johnson. Although, due to discriminatory election laws, many members of this early formation of Americans in Britain were unable to vote themselves, they engaged in money and awareness raising activities for the incumbent president. Not until the *1975 Overseas Voting Rights Act* was signed by President Ford could all expats over the age of 18 cast absentee ballots. Before this, the *1955 Federal Overseas Voting Assistance Act* 'recommended, but did not guarantee, absentee registration and voting for members of the military, federal employees who lived outside the United States, and members of civilian service organizations affiliated with the Armed Forces'.[8]

Johnson's dramatic escalation of the Vietnam War soon after re-election did little to deter the Britain based Americans in their support of future presidential candidates. For the 1968 election which took place at the height of the conflict, they came together once more, reuniting in order to plan and carry out 'effective action on the burning issues of the day

---

[7] 'Some Plain Speaking About McCarthy – By a Group of Americans in London Who Are Against Him – and Think You Should Be Too, July 10, in box 2, TAM 122, file: Group 68, Americans Abroad for McCarthy – 1968, Heinz Norden Papers (hereafter HN Papers), Tamiment Library, New York University.

[8] Coleman, Kevin J.: *The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act: Overview and Issues* (July 30, 2015) [online]:< https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RS20764.pdf H.R 3211 (94th) > [accessed 7 March 2019]; and *Overseas Citizens Voting Rights Act*.: <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/94/hr3211> [accessed 22 March 2019].

affecting our country and the world such as the Vietnam War and civil rights'.[9] Established by New Yorker, Ruth Lassoff , because she 'felt helpless…and very much cut off from the political scene at home,' Americans Abroad for McCarthy (AAFM) quickly gained support across London, 'enabl[ing] Americans abroad to add their voices to what is happening in America'.[10] The group's rapid growth saw their numbers rise to 500 within a few weeks, mirroring the groundswell of support generated stateside by McCarthy's 'constituency of conscience'.[11]

Their first action was to distribute a letter to known Americans in Britain urging them to support McCarthy and help fund a declaration of support to be published in the *New York Times*, entitled 'Americans in Britain say McCarthy Must Be Nominated and Elected!'[12] The declaration stated that McCarthy embodied the dream of the recently assassinated Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, and that he was the lone voice surviving to 'sound the call for redirection of national policy and a realistic new and moral approach to the questions that are tearing our country apart, the questions of Vietnam and Human Rights'. It continued, 'From across the sea, we join our voices to the great and historic mass movement at home that will, with your help, sweep Eugene McCarthy into the White House and return sanity and justice to our country…As Americans who happen to be away from our country, we are particularly mindful of what the coming elections mean not only at home but abroad'. It then urged Americans at home to 'dispel the shadow of doom that hangs over the world, in large

[9] 'Some Plain Speaking About McCarthy – By a Group of Americans in London Who Are Against Him – and Think You Should Be Too, July 10, in box 2, TAM 122, file: Group 68, Americans Abroad for McCarthy – 1968, HN Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.
[10] Article, 'Rootin' for McCarthy Abroad', *Evening Standard*, Monday 5 August 1968
[11] Article, 'McCarthy: a Poet's Voice Stirs the Land', *Life*, April 12, 1968; and support of 500 in *Express & News*, 2 August 1968.
[12] Declaration 'Americans in Britain Say: McCarthy Must Be Nominated and Elected!', 8 July 1968, in box 2, TAM 122, file: Group 68, Americans Abroad for McCarthy – 1968, HN Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.

part by the actions of our government' by dedicating themselves 'mind and soul to the nomination and election of Senator Eugene McCarthy!'[13]

It is clear that having lived in Britain for an extended period of time, the Americans possessed, or at least believed they possessed, a certain objectivity when it came to the United States' actions – both domestic and international – and their vantage point afforded them a unique perspective on how American foreign policy was being perceived in an international context. What they observed concerned them greatly. The fear and paranoia of communism which had forced them from America's shores and morphed into the seemingly intractable conflict in South East Asia was damaging America's global reputation. The so called 'Special Relationship' between Britain and America was under immense strain, and the British public were protesting widely against the war. Conscious of international perceptions, the Americans in Britain believed McCarthy was the only candidate capable of restoring the country's image abroad. Therefore, despite being far from the centre of the debate, effectively disenfranchised through election laws, and wilfully living abroad, the Americans urgently wanted to convey their beliefs to their countrymen and women back home.

The group's existence, if not their beliefs, became known early on in the United States when an article appeared in the *New York Times* announcing their hosting of New York Senatorial candidate, Paul O'Dwyer. In Britain to discuss 'narcotics problems' with officials at the British Home Office, the staunch supporter of McCarthy found time to join the Americans in Britain for McCarthy during a cocktail party held at the London Press Club where they launched the group.[14] At this point there were a modest '50 or so names

[13] Declaration 'Americans in Britain Say: McCarthy Must Be Nominated and Elected!', 8 July 1968, in box 2, TAM 122, file: Group 68, Americans Abroad for McCarthy – 1968, HN Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.
[14] Article, 'O'Dwyer is Given Party in London', *New York Times*, 19 July 1968.

associated with the group' who were engaged in the raising of funds for newspaper advertisements stating the signers 'want to go home to an America where Senator McCarthy is President'. One such draft advert, intended to be published on 'McCarthy Day' in mid-August, declared that, 'We speak as fellow Americans' and 'though an ocean separates us from our homes, our thoughts are with America…and we want to come home to an America which has re-discovered its traditional commitment to peace, justice, freedom and equality'.[15]

As the Democratic National Convention (DNC) approached, AAFM recruited the support of 'a hundred young Americans – most of them on post-graduate courses' to collect signatures for a petition supporting McCarthy.[16] The group visited areas frequented by American tourists and expats, such as the Kings Road, Carnaby Street, outside the American Express offices in the Haymarket, and on Oxford St. Much of the current scholarship on anti-Vietnam War activism in Britain, such as the work of Sylvia Ellis and Caroline Hoefferle, focuses on native British protesting, with little mention of American involvement – less so of the connections formed between Britons and expatriate Americans. However, the Americans were conscious of British opinion and the concerns were revealed by the Americans handing out two petitions: one for fellow citizens and one for British supporters. Speaking at the time, David Golding, chairman of the committee said 'So many British people want to have their say in this too…Londoners seem to be as interested and determined as we are'.[17] Further highlighting this British interest, a young English woman, Felicity Loxton-Peacock, recently engaged to the businessman Sir Peter Osborne, and soon to be student of philosophy at Reading, joined the Americans in raising signatures.[18] One of a number of British supporters,

---

[15] Text for Advertisement, 'An Open Letter to Delegates at the Democratic National Convention', 19 July 1968, in box 2, TAM 122, file: Group 68, Americans Abroad for McCarthy – 1968, HN Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.
[16] Article, 'McCarthy men', *Evening Standard*, Thursday 8 August 1968.
[17] Article, 'Signatures for McCarthy', *Evening Standard*, Saturday 10 August 1968.
[18] On 23 May 1971 she gave birth to George Osborne who would become MP for Tatton and Chancellor of the Exchequer from 2010 to 2016 under David Cameron.

Loxton-Peacock commented, 'I'm not all that interested in British politics…I think they are more important in America because of Vietnam'.[19]

By the middle of August, AAFM had collected 4000 signatures and raised $8000 towards the cost of the *New York Times* article.[20] They had also attracted the attention of the Senator himself who sent a telegram to Ruth Lassoff saying he was 'pleased to learn that United States citizens living abroad are involved in the American political process,' and that their support proved his candidacy was a sign 'that the desire for a change in American policies does not end at our shores'.[21] The telegram was read at a 'speak-out' held by the group in Hyde Park on Sunday 18 August. Attended by a crowd of between one to two thousand Americans and Britons, including the Labour MP for Putney, Hugh Jenkins who said he was 'proud to associate with Americans…supporting McCarthy', the rally raised further money and signatures.[22]

Rather than being used to fund the planned *New York Times* advert, the money raised was, on the direction of McCarthy headquarters in Washington, instead put towards the 'professional McCarthy operation at the DNC and for TV appearances'.[23] Meanwhile, the total 5,665 signatures were eventually sent to the DNC on 26 August, with 'sympathetic British signatories' included – British supporters of the petition included Vanessa Redgrave, Iris Murdoch, Harold Pinter and Robert Shaw.[24]

The decision both to recruit sympathetic Britons and collect British signatures of support is revealing of the group's intentions. It was important for them to convey not just

---

[19] Article, 'Signs of Sympathy', *Evening Standard*, Thursday 8 August 1968.
[20] Article, 'Sad Americans', *Express & News*, 13 September 1968.
[21] Telegram, Eugene J. McCarthy to Ruth Lassoff, Secretary for Americans for McCarthy, in file 'Group 68 – Americans Abroad for McCarthy 1968, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[22] Articles, '1000 'speak out' for McCarthy at Park' and 'London rally', in *The Times*, 19 August 1968.
[23] Letter, Ruth Lassoff to Friend, August 7, 1968 in box 2, TAM 122, file: Group 68, Americans Abroad for McCarthy – 1968, HN Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.
[24] Article, 'Support for McCarthy', *The Guardian*, 19 August 1968.

their frustrations and anger to the voting American public, but to draw voters' attention to British feelings, too. In highlighting the British support for the anti-war McCarthy, the group hoped that voters would, like them, be encouraged to restore America's moral authority overseas by backing the candidate. Despite their actions and the actions of the sizable US based support McCarthy received, the senator would fail to secure the nomination. Vice President Hubert Humphrey would go on to win the Democratic nomination, only to lose the November election to Richard Nixon and place the presidency in the hands of a man who would escalate the war into Laos and Cambodia. By this point, AAFM had already splintered into two groups – one concerned solely with the election of McCarthy, the other committed to ending the Vietnam War.

Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam

The beginnings of what became Group 68 – Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam, were far from auspicious. An early meeting held by AAFM founder Ruth Lassoff to discuss 'the possibility of a minor peace movement in London for Americans', ended with all 25 attendees leaving 'mad' after the meeting descended into chaos.[25] A letter sent by Lassoff to the steering committee bemoaned the lack of appreciation she received in hosting the meeting, while expressing her frustrations that '25 people…had 25 different ideas…different goals, different desires, different motives – and different ways of working'. Despite these frustrations which Lassoff described as 'another STOP IT situation with grown-ups' – a reference to the disintegrating Stop-it Committee – the group gradually began to form in July 1968.

[25] Letter, Ruth Lassoff to Steering Committee, 22 June 1968, in box 2, TAM 122, file: Group 68, HN Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.

From these early days, Britons such as the veteran peace campaigner Peggy Duff and political activist Margaret Gardiner, lent support. Duff, who had helped establish CND in 1957 and was currently working for the International Confederation of Disarmament and Peace (ICDP), attended most early meetings and helped forge contacts between the fledgling group and individuals of influence.[26] At this early stage, Group 68 also began to develop relationships with, and draw inspiration from, other British peace groups. At the time Group 68 formed, the BCPV was engaged in one of their most significant actions: the British People's Declaration for Peace in Vietnam. This wide ranging campaign focussed on pressuring the British government in 'withdrawing support of American intervention in Vietnam,' while also, 'co-opting other Governments to take common action to secure an end to the war'.[27] The declaration received impressive support from the peace, political and labour spheres, including 106 MPs, 20 Members of the Lords, 175 Constituency Labour Parties, 178 Co-op Parties and Guilds, 10 trade Union National Executives, and 250 peace groups. The issue of British governmental support for the American war effort was a deeply emotive issue for the British anti-Vietnam War movement, particularly as the policy was driven by the socialist prime minister, Harold Wilson. Attempting to force disassociation from the policy was, therefore, a central motive of many of the local anti-war movements. On entering the British anti-Vietnam War scene at this moment, Group 68 launched their first campaign which tied very closely with that of their British friends: a petition from 'Americans in Britain to Harold Wilson' urging him to break from American policy and encourage the United States government to 'end all bombing of Vietnam, immediately, permanently and unconditionally'.[28]

---

[26] Meeting notes, Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam, 23 June 1968, in box 2, TAM 122, file: Group 68, HN Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University.
[27] The 1968 People's Declaration for Peace in Vietnam, in J. Askins Papers, MSS. 189/V/1/2/7, MRC.
[28] Letter, Group 68 (Heinz Norden) to Dear Fellow Americans, 10 September 1968, in box 4, TAM 122, file, Group 68 – Bulletins/Public Statements/Press Releases/Petitions, 1968 – 73, HN Papers.

Although inspired by the BCPV, the decision to launch this first campaign was down to the de-facto leader of Group 68, Heinz Norden. Born in London on 8 December 1905 to German parents, Norden emigrated to the US in 1924 where he attended the University of Chicago and the New School for Social Research. Following his education, he worked variously as an editor, a writer, a translator an advertising executive, and an administrator for the New York City Housing Authority. While living in New York, he became involved with the tenants' rights movement and in 1936 helped found the Citywide Tenants Council (CWTC), the first permanent coalition of neighbourhood tenants' groups in the city. Through his work with CWCT and other grassroots movements which aimed to 'educate, agitate, and mobilize a community to understand its problems and power', Norden earned a reputation for being a 'good, efficient organizer involved in…liberal and left causes' and as a man with 'political savvy'.[29] An ideal background for a someone who wanted to form an anti-war group.

Having settled in London in 1961, Norden became involved in various anti-war activities as the US escalated the conflict in Vietnam, including joining AAFM. He and others, however, believed a new group should be formed as there were those in AAFM who were 'solely concerned with the McCarthy movement,' while others were concerned 'with the anti-Vietnam War movement'.[30] Therefore Group 68 formed as a splinter group from the original McCarthy organisation. Although this was cited early as the principal reason for forming another organisation, it is clear through later correspondence, internal memorandums and actions that Group 68 were concerned with issues beyond Vietnam. As we shall see, Norden and others were ever conscious of the 'struggle back home…civil rights, racialism,

[29] Biographical note in guide to the Heinz Norden Papers, 1934 – 1978. Tamiment Library/Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives [online]: <http://dlib.nyu.edu/findingaids/html/tamwag/tam_122/bioghist.html> [accessed 25 February 2019].
[30] 'Presidential election bulletin from Group 68', in J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/2/4/1, MRC.

the right to dissent' throughout their existence – a position which would strengthen as the war wound down in the early 1970s.[31]

Establishing a group with such broad, albeit linked, concerns, attracted a similarly broad membership. Although many who joined were from the artistic community who fled McCarthyism, others were described by Norden as 'business or professional men and women, [in addition to a] mildly "radicalized middle-class", members who hold outright radical and revolutionary views [and] young people belonging to the distinctive subculture of our time'. All, however, were described by Norden as being brought together because they were 'in varying degree, at odds with "the Establishment", and wanted to do something meaningful about [their] convictions'.[32] Being a group with such a heterogeneous character brought particular challenges. Foremost among which was an inability to reach consensus on actions which risked controversy or the possibility of arrest. With many, particularly those from the younger generation, calling for a more radical approach, divisions soon began to appear. Writing to members in early 1969, Norden expressed his concern on this issue stating that some members had:

> a good deal at stake in risking unpopular political action—non renewal of passports, social and economic reprisals, even domestic discord, that would greatly complicate their lives. We should understand this. Others couldn't care less, indeed, may actually court trouble in their commitment to help change the world, for which they deserve our respect.[33]

Although not named, it seems likely he was referring to members within their group such as Harry Pincus who was set on helping military deserters and would soon found the

---

[31] Group 68 Petition, September 1968, in file Group 68 Bulletins/Public Statements/Press Releases/Petitions 1968 – 73, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[32] Appraisal and Outlook, Group 68, January 1969, in file 19:3 The Uses of Treason: Assorted research materials, 1969 – 2007, Clancy Sigal Papers, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas.
[33] Appraisal and Outlook, Group 68, January 1969, in file 19:3, CS Papers.

UAEB. The issue of helping deserters proved particularly divisive within the group, and after 'repeated debate' the decision was finally made in September 1970 they would not 'as a matter of policy "aid and abet" them'.[34] This decision opened Group 68 up to accusations from the younger crowd of Americans of being 'old, insufficiently militant, and irrelevant', 'tame', and 'mainly concerned with salving [their] own consciences'; while the disdain of many young American activists was summed up by SUPPORT member, Dennis Stukenbroeker, who described them as the 'old farts from Hampstead'.[35] These views did little, if anything, to encourage the group in a more radical direction. Conscious that some believed their actions to be 'piddling and ineffective', Norden believed fervently that 'No action "on the side of the angels," no matter how trifling, is ever completely wasted,' however he was insistent that the group 'should strive to make our actions as meaningful and impactful as possible,' and 'not easily give way to a sense of failure'.[36] Group 68 would remain scrupulously within the boundaries of the law throughout its active years.

Although Norden and others remained steadfast in their commitment to a more moderate, legal, line of protest, the views of the younger generation did prompt them to question the efficacy of their actions. With this in mind, Group 68 sought strength through establishing constructive, mutually beneficial, relationships with other American and British groups, and preached unity between them; hoping that strength in numbers would help them achieve their aims. Working as far as possible with no formal structure to preserve 'informality and spontaneity…and avoid the risk of "institutionalization"', they worked most closely with the BCPV.[37] Individuals would occasionally join each other's meetings, while delegates from Group 68 would attend BCPV sponsored events such as the annual Trade

[34] Newsletter 'Out!', September 1970, in file Newsletter Out, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[35] Email: Fritz Efaw to Clancy Sigal, 19 July 2000, in file 16.12, CS Papers; and letter: Dennis Stukenbroeker to Clancy Sigal, Christmas 2000 in file 16.12, CS Papers; and newsletter 'Out!', in file Newsletter Out, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[36] Appraisal and Outlook, Group 68, January 1969, in file 19:3, CS Papers.
[37] Appraisal and Outlook, Group 68, January 1969, in file 19:3, CS Papers.

Union Conference (TUC) on Vietnam – receiving 'great applause' during one such meeting when identified as belonging to the American group.[38] As well as drawing inspiration and support from the British group, the Americans campaigned alongside the BCPV and marched with them during demonstrations. One significant BCPV venture that Group 68 supported was the campaign to 'Name the Date' of withdrawal. Inspired by an eight-point programme to end the war which had been delivered by the PRG at the 1970 Paris peace talks, the petition called on Nixon to name the date of withdrawal. Hundreds of signatures were raised by the British and Americans from the public, political and media spheres and the final petition was delivered by president of the BCPV, Fenner Brockway, to the Paris peace talks in 1971.[39]

Group 68 also worked alongside other British groups such as the aforementioned VSC, and the Medical Aid Committee for Vietnam (MACV), a charity set up in 1965 to raise medical supplies for Vietnamese casualties. Meanwhile, it also provided considerable financial support for the American draft resistance counselling service SUPPORT – although this was done 'unofficially…because of the possibility that we might be laying ourselves open to reprisals for contravening US law.[40] SUPPORT's monthly running costs were estimated to be £20 a month, of which Group 68 raised what they could. Despite rarely raising all that was required, the counselling organisation 'always got the phone bill paid' with Group 68's help.[41] Group 68 also formed working relationships with the UAEB and the later GI group People Emerging Against Corrupt Establishments (PEACE), which saw the American groups collaborating on leafleting campaigns and organising protests. Maintaining

[38] Report of Group 68 delegate to Trade Union Conference, December 1971, in file correspondence – 1971, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[39] Minutes: Working Committee of the BCPV, 2 June 1971, in J. Askins Papers, MSS. 189/V/1/2/1, Modern Records Centre, Warwick; and American raising of signatures in Group 68 leaflet, in file 'Group 68 Public statements etc.', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[40] Appraisal and Outlook, Group 68, January 1969, in file '19:3', CS Papers.
[41] Interview Jean Freer; Meeting notes, 11 May 1969, in file '19:3', CS Papers.

these bonds and encouraging a united front between them became increasingly difficult as the war wound on and ideological differences came evermore to the fore. The divisions within the British movement, particularly over the issue of 'solidarity' with the Vietnamese, are well documented by historians such as Sylvia Ellis and Nick Thomas. As Ellis explains, solidarity 'meant different things to different protesters precisely because of their varying aims: from the moderate demand of British diplomacy to achieve peace talks, through campaigns for British dissociation or an end to US bombing, to calls for an immediate withdrawal from Vietnam'.[42] The BCPV and 'much of the labour movement took a solidarity position with the 'Vietnamese' people and with the US anti-war movement; but for more revolutionary groups such as the VSC, the Vietnamese struggle was a war of liberation'.[43] The discord between the British groups echoed the difficulties the American groups faced across the Atlantic – as one historian noted of the American movement, it was 'less a unified army than a rich mix of political notions and visions'.[44] However, what is not acknowledged in current historiography is the sincere effort on behalf of the Americans in Britain to maintain unity between these native British groups.[45]

To coincide with the inauguration of President Nixon on 20 January 1973, Stateside American groups held a united rally against racism and the war which was mirrored across the Atlantic in London. However, the foremost British groups of the time, the Indochina Solidarity Conference (ISC) – successor organisation to the VSC – and the BCPV were at

---

[42] Ellis, Sylvia A, 'Promoting solidarity at home and abroad: the goals and tactics of the anti-Vietnam War movement in Britain', *European Review of History*, 21:4 (September, 2014), p. 565.
[43] Ellis, Sylvia A, 'Promoting solidarity at home and abroad', p. 565.
[44] Wells, Tom, 'The Anti-Vietnam War Movement in the United States', in Lowe, P. (ed) The Vietnam War – Problems in Focus (Palgrave, 1998), p. 115.
[45] For more on this area of division within the British anti-war movement see: Ellis, Sylvia, 'British Opposition to the Vietnam War, 1964 – 68', in *The Insular Dream: Obsesion and Resistance* (Vu University Press, 1995), pp. 166 – 182; and Ellis, Sylvia, 'A Demonstration of British Good Sense?', British Student Protest During the Vietnam War', in *Student Protest – The Sixties and After*, ed. DeGroot, Gerard J. (Longman, 1998), pp. 54 – 69; and Thomas, Nick, 'Challenging Myths of the 1960s: The Case of Student Protests in Britain', *Twentieth Century British History*, 2002, Vol. 13 (3), pp. 277 – 297.

loggerheads over their differing aims – most significantly the VSC's support of the NLF – and refused to coordinate their rallies into one single large demonstration. Writing to chairman of the BCPV, Alfred Lomas, Norden spoke of his 'greatest dismay' that they had decided not to enter a co-sponsorship arrangement with the ISC, adding that the decision was 'dreadfully, inexplicably, irresponsibly wrong' and implored him to reconsider.[46] Responding, Lomas assured Norden that he agreed with much of what he said and had made a 'very strong appeal' for unity to the ISC who refused and insisted on staging a separate demonstration.[47] Norden further expressed his views in an article titled 'Divided We Lose' for the London based magazine *Time Out*; within which he spoke of 'the two leading American peace groups' overcoming 'ideological differences' in order to show unity by marching together.[48] Frustrated with what he saw as an impasse, Norden and members of Group 68 decided unanimously that their group would march 'approximately in the middle of the [rival British groups]' in order to show unity.[49]

There can be little doubt that Norden's desire for group integration was, in part, shaped by the enormous success enjoyed by American marches such as the 1967 National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and the later Moratorium – despite the difficulties the American groups had to overcome on building unity. However, as a Jewish American with strong German roots, Norden had more personal reasons to fight for a unified approach. Writing to Lomas, Norden spoke of how during the 1930s he had 'tried desperately to help what little German underground there was to fight Nazism,' adding that the 'trouble was…the Socialist and Communist functions of the Underground spent much more time

---

[46] Letter: Heinz Norden to Alfred Lomas, 4 January 1972, in file 'Group 68 correspondence – 1972', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[47] Letter: Alfred Lomas to Heinz Norden, 11 January 1973, in file 'Group 68 correspondence – 1973', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[48] Article 'Divided We Lose', draft copy for *Time Out*, in file 'Group 68 Bulletins etc, 1968 – 73', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[49] Group minutes, January 1973, in file 'Captain Culver 1971', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

fighting each other than they did fighting Hitler'. He continued by claiming that 'of course the anti-Nazi nationalists fought them both,' before asking rhetorically 'Are we ever going to learn?'[50] Unfortunately, there is no further record of Norden's involvement in the underground, what is certain however is that it marked the man, shaping his later attitude, actions and direction in which he would steer Group 68.

Norden's referencing the Nazis by way of comparison was not isolated to this letter. Other correspondence and group bulletins referred to the Nazis, while Group 68 posters and leaflets frequently spoke of the war as a 'Holocaust' – a word synonymous with the attempted annihilation of the Jewish race. There is a growing body of work which explores how post-Second World War activists used the crimes of the Nazis to reflect the horror inflicted by their own governments. Holger Nehring for instance, has written of how protesters in Britain and West Germany viewed the Cold War through the prism of the cruelties and atrocities of the previous war; while the historian William Mausbach highlights how students in West Germany 'invoked Vietnam as a present representation of Auschwitz'; doing so to 'confront their parents with the past', to 'redeem themselves from the burden of guilt,' and to 'appeal to their compatriots to stop the evil this time'.[51] Although operating in a very different context, it is clear Norden and Group 68's frequent references to the Nazis and the Holocaust was done to force an association between the actions of the Nazis in World War II and the current American war policy. They wanted to hold a mirror up to the American government, while also encouraging Americans – and Britons – in London to draw a parallel between Nazi crimes and current American atrocities.

---

[50] Letter: Heinz Norden to Alfred Lomas, 4 January 1972, 'Group 68 correspondence – 1972', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

[51] Mausbach, Wilfred, in 'Auschwitz and Vietnam', in Daum, Andreas W; Gardiner, Lloyd C; Mausbach, Wilfred (eds.): *America, the Vietnam War and the World* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 296; and Nehring, Holger: *Politics of Security – British and West German Protest Movements and the Early Cold War, 1945 – 1970* (Oxford University Press, 2013).

The strength Norden and others aimed to create through unity and bonds between groups also extended to their desire to maintain contact with the American movement. Throughout its active years, Group 68 entertained – and were entertained by – many visiting Americans, either invited specifically by the group or in Britain independently. The folk singer and activist Barbara Dane was a regular guest, and would perform small concerts to raise money while also informing group members and visitors of her work supporting GI resistance and the 'GI Coffee House Movement'.[52] Noam Chomsky came and spoke to a few dozen members about recent developments in the American movement, and said he believed the best way of affecting the war policy was to 'get the Yale graduating class to refuse induction'.[53] And in January 1972, the founder of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), Tom Hayden, and activist Jane Fonda spoke to the group about the 'apathy back home,' and how it sprang from people 'becoming numbed by the widening gap between what they want and what happens'.[54] Despite little of the discussion being recorded, the meeting itself reveals the importance the high profile activists saw in the American movement in Britain. Fonda would travel on to North Vietnam later in the year where she toured the Vietnamese dyke system (which had allegedly been bombed deliberately by the Americans), make radio broadcasts, visit American POWs, and was photographed sat on an antiaircraft gun – an image which did much to damage her reputation.[55]

Although much has been written about the 'Special Relationship' between Britain and the United States, this literature tends to focus on the political and diplomatic engagement between the countries. However, the historian Howard Malchow's work *Special Relations – the Americanization of Britain?*, redefines our understanding of this relationship by focussing

[52] Bulletin, October 1970, in file 'Group 68 Bulletins etc, 1968 – 73', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[53] Diary entry, 11 May 1969, in 'file The Uses of Treason notes, 1969 – 1970s', CS Papers.
[54] Bulletin, January 1972, in file 'Captain Culver 1971', HN Papers.
[55] Article, 'Jane fonda relives her protest days on set of her new film', *Daily Telegraph*, 19 July 2011.

on the rather more demotic field of popular culture.[56] Meanwhile, editors Stephen Tuck and Robin Kelley have recently drawn together a collection of works which explore the shared experience of empire, racial inequality, and the struggles for civil rights and political reform which mark Britain and America's recent histories.[57] The close links Group 68 formed across the British political, social and religious spheres of British life, and the bonds it retained with America comfortably fits into this narrative. A special relationship developed between Group 68 and British anti-war groups which witnessed cooperation, disagreement and influence which ran in both directions. This relationship was most in evidence through their actions.

Marching in the Street

As summer turned to fall in 1968, Americans looked ahead to a presidential election many hoped would heal divisions and ease the anxiety which had recently blighted American society. Behind them lay chaos. The assassinations of Martin Luther King Jr in April and Robert F Kennedy nine weeks later had helped stoke simmering racial and civil unrest; the political and propaganda success of the Tet Offensive lay notions of American dominance in Vietnam questionable at best; and the lacerating effects of the violent DNC clashes had many wondering whether law and order had collapsed in America. The fear and pain wrought by this most tumultuous of years affected members of Group 68 deeply. Living in Britain did little to dampen their anger at the fracturing of American society, while their perspective as expatriates heightened their awareness of America's international standing. With the failure to help Eugene McCarthy secure the Democratic nomination behind them, the group set its sights on the upcoming November 1968 presidential election.

---

[56] Malchow, HL: *Special Relations – The Americanization of Britain?* (Stanford University Press, 2011).
[57] Kelley, Robin D. G, and Tuck, Stephen G. N, eds.: *The other special relationship: race, right, and riots in Britain and the United States* (Palgrave, 2015).

Writing in an 'appeal to Americans', the group spoke of the election as possibly 'the most important in our county's history,' the outcome of which would 'have a profound effect on the future of the whole world'.[58] Urging Americans to 'think hard and gather new will for action,' and emphasising how 'deeply touched' Britons and the rest of the were world by America's actions, the Americans in Britain encouraged those who had the vote both sides of the Atlantic to 'vote dissent'.[59] The position of voting dissent, which entailed voting for neither of the major candidates, had been reached due to deep feelings of distrust and malaise of the Democratic and Republican parties. Considering the group's position in October, Norden had written to Hubert Humphrey asking for clarification on a recent televised statement where the vice-president appeared to say that, if elected, he would halt the bombing. Norden dangled the possibility of helping to secure American votes from Britain, saying he had done so for Johnson four years ago but felt 'grossly betrayed', adding 'it is true that only a small number of American voters are likely to be cast from over here,' but that they could 'profoundly affect your chance in the election'.[60] In a lengthy response, perhaps influenced by the extreme narrowness of John F Kennedy's victory in 1961, Humphrey wrote that the 'initial order of business in a Humphrey-Muskie Administration would be to find a means of ending the war'.[61] He failed, however, to clarify his position on bombing, while in a further letter sent at the end of October stated, 'I have not and will not repudiate the many accomplishments of the Johnson Administration,' but that he in no sense felt 'bound by the policies of the past'.[62] Norden decided that Humphrey's belated call to end the bombing of

[58] Appeal, 1968, in file 'Group 68 – 1968, Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[59] Leaflet, 1968, in file 'Group 68 – 1968, Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[60] Letter, Heinz Norden to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, 4 October 1968, in file correspondence 1968, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[61] Letter, Hubert Humphrey to Heinz Norden, 8 October 1968, in in file 'Correspondence 1968', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[62] Letter, Hubert Humphrey to Heinz Norden, 29 October 1968, in file 'Correspondence 1968', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

North Vietnam was a 'desperate campaign maneuver (sic)', and one which appeared to be a move to distance himself from Johnson's policies.[63] The vote for him would constitute a showing of support for 'the supersalesman of Johnson's Vietnam War'. Meanwhile, a vote for Nixon, they believed, was a vote for the continuation of America's 'dangerous foreign policy'. Instead of voting for Nixon or Humphrey as the candidate for the American Independence Party, Group 68 encouraged people to vote for only state and local candidates who had 'unequivocally come out for halting the war in Vietnam'.[64]

In order to convey their message to Americans in Britain and the US, the group placed advertisements in newspapers both sides of the Atlantic. A series of adverts appeared in the *New York Times* on consecutive days beginning 'SOME AMERICANS IN LONDON', and continuing with various concerns such as '…want to stop killing American servicemen in Vietnam. End the War', and signed Group 68.[65] They also set up a 'VOTE DISSENT' stand in the new Oxford Street shopping arcade alongside similar stands set up for the Democratic and Republican candidates.[66] Manned by group members, leaflets were produced and handed out which detailed the names of state and local candidates who were deserving of support, such as Senators J. William Fulbright, George McGovern and Paul O'Dwyer who were all vocal in their opposition to the war.[67] While a further pamphlet encouraged the position of dissent, and spoke of not letting disillusion with the presidential candidates get in the way of awarding 'the courageous Members of Congress who have fought against the war,' and urged voters to 'Vote for them; send them your contributions'.[68]

---

[63] Letter, Heinz Norden to various group recipients, 21 June 1968, in file 'Correspondence 1968', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[64] Letter, Heinz Norden to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, 4 October 1968.
[65] Text for newspaper advertisements, August 5, 1968, in file 'Group 68 Bulletins etc, 1968 – 73'; and file 'Group 68 – newspaper Clippings 1968 – 1973, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[66] Meeting notes, 1968, in file 'Captain Culver 1971', HN Papers.
[67] List of antiwar candidates, 1968, in file 'Group 68 – Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[68] Leaflet, 1968, in file 'Group 68 – Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

In considering voting intentions, Group 68 also highlighted the problems which were 'tearing [their] country apart,' such as the 'fight against needless poverty, injustice and inequality, and stated that beneath the 'hue and cry for law and order lurks a drift towards a police state'.[69] Strong words but words which echoed the thoughts of many back home. In a final attempt to convey their message, group members gathered across from the US embassy in Grosvenor Square on election day. Despite the small demonstration of 20 people, they received 'extensive television coverage' including interviews with ITV shot at the square.[70]

The success of generating publicity combined with an ability to draw large numbers of Americans under their banner – as they had done during the large British anti-Vietnam war demonstration on 27 October 1968 – encouraged Group 68 to stage further street protests.[71] Over the following months and years, Group 68 would organise, support and participate in a remarkable number of demonstrations, leafleting campaigns and vigils. In order to create an added significance to these occasions, the events were often held on public holidays ingrained within the American conscience, such as Independence Day and Thanksgiving. These historic dates of remembrance and national unity provided the Americans with an ideal opportunity to draw parallels between their own country's establishment and fight for freedom and that of the Vietnamese.

Shortly after their election day protest, seven members of Group 68 gathered outside the Dorchester Hotel where the American Society were holding their annual Thanksgiving dinner. Under the 'watchful eyes of two police constables and an inspector', members handed

---

[69] Leaflet, 'The Struggle is Not Over', 1968, in file 'Group 68 – Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

[70] Group minutes, 10 November 1968, in file 'Captain Culver, 1971', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers. Nixon's eventual victory was notably paper thin – winning the popular vote by seven-tenths of one percent – and is seen by many historians and commentators as a demise of a long era of liberalism in American politics which had begun with Roosevelt's New Deal in the 1930s. What followed was a shift to a more conservative politics at home, and a widening of the war into Laos and Cambodia.

[71] Letter, Heinz Norden to Ruth Lassoff, 1 November 1968, in file 'Correspondence, 1968', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

out a leaflet asking the diners to 'remember as you sit down to your Thanksgiving dinner…American boys are still being killed in Vietnam! Vietnamese are still dying on both sides!' and advocating complete withdrawal from Vietnam.[72] The leaflet was 'on the whole' received well, including by the ambassador David Bruce, with only 'a few persons rejecting it or displaying animosity'.[73] On Memorial Day the following May, as Americans commemorated the victims of all wars in which America has participated, group members placed a wreath at the Roosevelt memorial in Grosvenor Square under the slogan 'How Many More Must We Remember?'[74] The small gathering of thirty or so members, which typified the group's principles of being a 'mild, non-violent, middle class group [who] run peaceful demos, wreath-laying ceremonies', was covered by the BBC and served as a prelude to their Independence Day demonstration seven weeks later.[75] Organised with their friends from the BCPV, the 4 July demonstration served to highlight the 193rd anniversary of America's independence and the 111 years since Vietnam last celebrated theirs. Marching once again opposite the American embassy, protesters handed out leaflets which condemned the war as 'destructive of the ideals of freedom commemorated on [Independence Day]', and highlighted the growing resistance within American society and the military.[76] In what was to become a regular staple of Group 68 protests, the names of GIs killed in the war were also read out while others marched under banners proclaiming the number of both Americans and Vietnamese killed to date.[77] While in a further nod to independence, protesters called for Britain to 'declare [its own] independence from the American war policy', and a second

[72] Leaflet, November 1968, in file 'Bulletins etc.', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[73] Group minutes, December 1968, in file 'Captain Culver, 1971', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[74] Press release, July 1969, in file 'Bulletins etc.', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[75] Diary entry, 30 May 1969, in file 'The Uses of Treason notes, 1969 – 1970s', CS Papers.
[76] Leaflet, July 1969, in file 'Bulletins etc.', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[77] Article, 'US Dead Named Outside Embassy', *Morning Star*, 5 July 1969, p.1.

group branched off to meet with MPs at the House of Commons in the hope the British government would 'take a friendly view of their position'.[78]

In addition to marking these occasions with protest, and in a move to show solidarity with the stateside movement, demonstrations were often organised to coincide with anti-war events in the US. Having established themselves as the foremost American group in Britain within a year of their founding, members of Group 68 ended 1969 with a rally in support of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee's (VMC) second stage Moratorium and March Against Death on November 15 – an event supported by many other demonstrations around the world. Led by young, politically involved individuals from the Eugene McCarthy and Robert Kennedy Democratic Presidential campaigns, the VMC aimed to 'galvanise a moderate majority position [within the American anti-war movement] by uniting student, labor, business, Congressional, and civic anti-war sentiment', while also encouraging global protest.[79] This was an approach which bonded very closely with that of Group 68. The stateside demonstrations were vast in scale, with the second Moratorium on 15 November attracting 500,000 in Washington DC alone. Group 68's supporting demonstration held in London was naturally much smaller, but the imagery, peaceful nature, solemnity, and unifying intentions were the same. British groups such as the BCPV, the ICDP, CND, and the VSC, and individuals from within the academic, political, religious and cultural spheres, including Iris Murdoch, Lord Boyd Orr, and Anne Kerr MP supported the day's events.[80] The 2000 protesters, some in black arm bands and carrying cards bearing the name, rank and hometown of an American killed in Vietnam, above the word DEAD, marched in single file

---

[78] Press release, July 1969, in file 'Bulletins etc.', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
and BCPV leaflet 'US Out Now', in file 'Group correspondence 1970', TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers; and Article, 'US Dead Named Outside Embassy'.

[79] Jurma, William E., 'Moderate Movement Leadership and the Vietnam Moratorium Committee', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68 (1982), p. 263.

[80] Bulletin, 15 November 1969, in in file 'Group 68 – Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

from Marble Arch to the American embassy.[81] Once at the embassy, each marcher called out the name of the dead serviceman and dropped the card into a coffin which, at the end of the day, was presented to an American official at the embassy – just as was arranged in Washington DC and across the US.[82] Norden had written previously to newly installed American ambassador, Walter Annenberg, expressing his and Group 68's support for the Moratorium. He also drew the ambassador's attention to the 'eloquent answer' the demonstrations provided to Secretary of State, William P. Rogers' assertion that 'dissent is subversive'.[83]

Although the Moratorium drew many hundreds of thousands of people together across the world in protest, this success was met with indifference from the White House, raising questions over the efficacy of moderate protest.[84] With the apparent failure to make an impact, many activists became radicalised and formed factions defined by aggression, bloodshed, and revolutionary thinking. To Bill Zimmerman, a former activist and organiser of the 1967 March on the Pentagon, the movement had entered a 'third stage', one shaped by 'widespread disobedience, rejection of mainstream lifestyles, violent clashes with police and militant opposition to the government'. The strategy was 'less coherent than in earlier stages,' and was set on forcing the war to an end by 'creating instability, chaos and disruption at home'.[85] Much in the same way, the revolutionary Black Panther Party grew from frustrations with the civil-rights movement, the radical left Weathermen organisation was born from the apparent failures of the anti-Vietnam War movement. Meanwhile, the move to

---

[81] Bulletin, 15 November 1969, in in file 'Group 68 – Americans in Britain Against the War in Vietnam', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[82] Bulletin, 19 October 1969, in file 'Captain Culver 1971', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers; article '2000, March in London', *Sunday Telegraph*, 17 November 1969; and article 'London Rally, *International Herald Tribune*, 17 November 1969.
[83] HN 3165
[84] Jurma, William E., 'Moderate Movement Leadership and the Vietnam Moratorium Committee' p. 266.
[85] Article: 'The Four Stages of the Antiwar Movement', by Bill Zimmerman, *New York Times*, 24 October 2017.

a more radical, violent approach to activism was also seen in Germany as the Red Army Faction emerged from the student protest movement in West Germany. Responding to this more radical climate, the VMC would disband six months after their vast 15 November protest, saying their money had run out and the 'political fad' of large demonstrations had run its course.[86]

Frustrations were also growing within the community of anti-war Americans in Britain, with many believing that demonstrations were ineffective, increasingly small scale and pointless. These concerns, largely from the more radical crowd of Americans in London, did little to deter Group 68, however. Demonstrations, pickets, vigils and leafleting continued unabated – although with ever falling numbers. In acknowledgment of dissenting voices, correspondence and group bulletins were increasingly defensive on the point of street demonstrations. Advertising its protest planned for 4 July 1970 Norden stated: 'What, another demonstration? YES!...It is essential that we keep up our unrelenting pressure—indeed, to demonstrate is the one thing we can do…It does matter. It does count'.[87] And two years later on 4 June , in a further advert 'All right then – you tell US what good does not demonstrating do? We must stand up and be counted—AGAIN &AGAIN until the slaughter stops'.[88] The group's tenacity on this issue was equalled by its insistence of conveying its anti-war message to the American embassy, officials in the US at the executive level, and the British government. Various meetings between group members and the American embassy took place between 1970 and 1972, and on at least one occasion, in April of 1970, the American embassy's press attaché, John Pettus, visited the group at Norden's home to discuss their concerns on the war and answer questions they had. The meeting served to strengthen the channels between Group 68 and the embassy, while also enabling members to

[86] Article, 'Vietnam Moritorium Committee is Disbanding', *New York Times*, 20 April 1970.
[87] Leaflet, July 1970, in file 'Group 68 correspondence 1970, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[88] Leaflet, June 1972, in file 'Bulletins etc.', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

convey their strength of feeling regarding the war, and to show they were 'by and large responsible people rather than addle-patted kooks'.[89]

Remaining steadfast in their commitment to moderate protest, while deflecting accusations of continuing merely to 'salve [their] own consciences', is revealing of members' aims. It is clear they wanted to stand up and be counted, to contribute in any way they could to convey their message to the war managers, and ultimately to bear witness to the atrocities being committed in the name of democracy and freedom.

As the air war entered a new phase of destruction in 1972, with the USAF wreaking havoc from the skies over North Vietnam, Group 68 furthered their commitment to the anti-war cause by attending the World Assembly in Paris for Peace and Independence of the Peoples of Indochina. Held over three days in February of that year, 1200 people from 83 countries met in a 'powerful display of solidarity' against the war, which aimed to 're-establish the truth…about the war in Indochina [and] restore the right of the peoples of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia to independence and self-determination'.[90] Heinz Norden and Lionel Colloms travelled as representatives of Group 68, alongside a British contingent of 50 activists, including Lord Fenner Brockway and Afred Lomas from the BCPV.[91] During the event, Norden delivered a speech to fellow delegates which detailed the American anti-war landscape in Britain, while stating that 'none of the Americans active in the movement is satisfied with the scope and effectiveness of the effort now being but forward,' adding that they would:

---

[89] Letter, 21 April 1970, Heinz Norden to John Pettus, in file 'Group 68 correspondence, 1972', TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.
[90] Leaflet, 'Hear the Truth', in file 'Newspaper Clippings 1968 -1973, TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers; and BCPV letter, 30 December 1971, in file 'Newspaper Clippings 1968 -1973, TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.
[91] List of participants at assembly, in file 'Newspaper Clippings 1968 -1973, TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.

> redouble our exertions and hope to take back from this great assembly renewed inspiration and courage and a sense of international solidarity to continue the struggle until peace is restored, and beyond.[92]

This pledge to 'redouble' their efforts took the form of a year-long demonstration known as the Vietnam Vigil – the last major action of Americans in Britain against the war in Vietnam.

The Vietnam Vigil

Although by 1972 the ground war in Vietnam was being fought almost entirely by the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN), the increase in bombing lay testament to the American government's commitment to the war. Responding to this increase of bombing, Group 68 secretary, Mia Lord, began organising what was to become one of the longest continuous protests anywhere in the world against the Vietnam War.[93]

Lord, a native New Yorker who moved to Britain in the mid-60s, was a veteran peace campaigner and worked as the private secretary to Arthur Latham, Labour MP for Paddington North and member of the BCPV.[94] Describing herself as 'completely non-partisan politically,' and as someone who was working for 'one thing only – world peace and the brotherhood of man,' she gained the support – and financial assistance – of Group 68 to launch the Vigil.[95] With this initial backing, she encouraged a further 150 groups to become involved in her drive to mount a continuous 'noon hour' Vigil which took place outside the American embassy in Grosvenor Square every day it was open. These including peace and

---

[92] Speech to delegates at the World Assembly in Paris, delivered by Heinz Norden, February 1972, in file 'Bulletins/public statements/press releases/petitions, 1968 – 73, TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.
[93] Report: Vietnam Vigil to End the War, Mia Lord, 1972, in J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/1/11/1, MRC. Further documentation within this file refers to the vigil as 'the longest running protest anywhere in the world', this would be impossible to confirm, however, hence the decision to refer to it in this thesis as 'one of the longest'.
[94] Article, 'John Windsor on the Grosvenor Square Marathon, *The Guardian*, 29 March 1973.
[95] Letter, Mia Lord to Heinz Norden, 17 February 1969, in file 'Correspondence – 1969', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

anti-war organisations, unions, youth groups, churches, the theatre, as well as individuals from universities and both houses of parliament.[96] The Vietnam Vigil Against the War began on 17 April 1972 with the following three aims:

1. To continue the VIGIL until the US war on Vietnam ends;
2. To draw more and more trade unions, professionals and population groupings to participate in the VIGIL; and
3. To extend the VIGIL to the capital cities of all the other countries throughout the world. [97]

Sponsored by the BCPV, WRI, Labour Action for Peace, and, others, the Vigil kept up its daily pressure on the embassy for over nine months until it achieved its first aim, and then continued for an additional 60 days until the US troops left Vietnam.[98] Their second aim was achieved throughout the year as further groups became involved, giving up their time to stand outside the embassy, singing anti-war songs and carrying placards. Unsurprisingly for such an ambitious aim, the Vigil would fail to extend to all the other countries in the world, however.

Scattered throughout the year of protest were so called 'specials'; these were days where a particular group, organisation or institution was represented in the square. The first week began with a full schedule of specials with one occurring on each noon hour the embassy was open. Starting the Vigil off on Monday 17 April was a group of 100 representatives from 13 trade unions, including the NUM; Tuesday saw the square filled with performers from the arts, including performers from West End shows, poets, and artists;

---

[96] Letter: Mia Lord to Ivor Montagu, 25 April, 1973, in J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/1/11/1, MRC. The Embassy was open from Monday to Friday, therefore the vigil did not take place on the weekends.
[97] Report: Vietnam Vigil to End the War, in J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/1/11/1, MRC.
[98] Summary of Vigil, Mia Lord, 14 May, 1973, in J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/1/11/1, MRC.

Wednesday was the turn of parliament when 23 MPs 'vigilled' for an hour, together with a further 30 members of the public – they also presented a petition to staff at the embassy signed in protest against the war by 69 MPs; on Thursday the 'Peace Group Noon Hour' took place with 'just about every peace group' taking part; and finally, Friday was the turn of 'youth' and 'students' to parade outside the embassy, before the week was rounded off with a 24 hour vigil on Saturday and a march from Charing Cross to Grosvenor Square.[99] The year continued with between 50 and 500 people maintaining the Vigil every day the embassy was open. Further notable specials featured the 'Medical Profession', where 100 doctors, psychiatrists, dentists and medical students marched outside the embassy; 'Fringe and Street Theatre', whose members performed a 'dramatic enactment of the heinous and vile murder of Vietnamese civilians by US soldiers; 'Journalists noon hour', when 120 turned out representing 'almost every national newspaper and weekly'; and 'Group 68', who played tapes of the Winter Soldier investigation – an investigation which took place in the US and was set up by the VVAW to challenge the morality of the war. It was based around soldiers' testimonies of atrocities and alleged war crimes committed by the US armed forces. [100] Group 68 members would regularly attend these specials, while many passers-by, both British and American, would join in, prompting Norden to remark that the Vigil was becoming 'a meeting place, begetting an extraordinary spirit of comradeship'. Although he added that they also had 'our hecklers, too, who mistakenly refer to the war as one between communism and capitalism…we point out…it is a war of national liberation against invaders'.[101]

The unity seen within Grosvenor Square was not always evident during Vigil meetings. Lord's approach to organising became increasingly autocratic, alienating stalwart

[99] Summary of Vigil, Mia Lord, 14 May, 1973, in J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/1/11/1, MRC.
[100] A full schedule of the vigil can be found in the J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/1/11/1, MRC.
[101] Report, Vietnam Vigil to End the War, in file 'Newspaper Clippings, 1968 – 1973, TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.

members of Group 68. One such member, Margaret Halsey Stern, complained to Dick Nettleton of CND that the Vigil had morphed from being 'in a rough sort of way' democratic, to the 'preserve of an egomaniac publicity-hound'.[102] While another wrote describing Lord as running a 'dictatorship', and stating that although the Vigil had 'made a significant contribution to the Vietnamese struggle,' a lot more would have been achieved if the team had been 'working under democratic procedures!'[103] Despite these occasional internal squabbles threatening to destabilise the Vigil, it continued until 28 March 1973 when a 500 strong contingent of British notables, including Nobel Peace Prize recipients and parliamentarians, marched around the square.

Taking a break from organising the Vigil, Mia Lord travelled to Vietnam as a guest of the North Vietnamese Women's Union in early 1973. Like many activists such as Jane Fonda and representatives of Britain's trade unions who visited in September 1970, Lord was accompanied around areas heavily bombed by the Americans, including shipyards, hospitals and residential areas.[104] She also met with members of the National Assembly, one of whom pleaded with Lord to 'urge the British people, and especially British MPs, not to forget Vietnam, not to relax their efforts to get the Americans out of Vietnam, to stop supplying Thieu'.[105] On leaving, Lord presented her hosts with a Vietnam Vigil poster as a sign of solidarity.

Although the Vigil enjoyed considerable success in terms of garnering support and sustaining interest, the media largely ignored the event, frustrating those such as Lord who

---

[102] Letter, Margaret Halsey Stern to Dick Nettleton, November 9, 1972 in file 'Correspondence, 1972', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[103] Letter, Ed Hearst to Heinz Norden, November 8, 1972 in file 'Correspondence, 1972', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[104] A further notable visitor to Vietnam was Peggy Duff in her role as General Secretary of CND, and later the ICDP, who between the years 1965 – 73, built strong friendships with the North Vietnamese during a number of visits.
[105] Lord, Mia 'Impressions of Vietnam – Vietnam S.O.S', in file 'Group 68 – Correspondence – 1973', TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.

had invested so heavily in it. Writing in September 1972's edition of *The American Exile in Britain*, Fritz Efaw, spoke of a 'complete blackout of the event by the establishment press', despite the widespread support.[106] However, it appeared that even when the media reported the event this did not guarantee a positive response from the organisers. In a letter from Norden to the *New Statesman* editor, the Group 68 chairman criticised him for referring to the protest as 'few in number', 'poignant' and 'pitiful'. He continued: 'Whether thousands…mass in Grosvenor Square or only dozens, we are determined to carry on the protest until the war is ended,' as this was the best way for 'ordinary people to bear witness to their conviction'.[107] A certain weariness on the side of the media is perhaps understandable in the context; the days of large scale protests were over, and other than the event's duration there was little to be considered newsworthy about it. There were, however, further isolated moments of reporting such as when clergymen, including Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Baptists and Quakers protested outside the embassy carrying placards which read 'For Christ's sake stop the killing'.[108] Or on a further occasion when a group of American students from a college in Hertfordshire joined the Vigil to 'do their thing', by chaining themselves to the embassy railings. The five girls were eventually arrested causing widespread newspaper coverage.[109]

The end of the Vigil marked the end of the significant protests organised and carried out by Americans in Britain. There were scattered demonstrations – including a return of the Vigil in October, 1973, which took place in Grosvenor Square and called for the release of 200,000 political prisoners – but with the war largely over, so too was the protesting of

[106] Article, 'Vietnam Vigil', The American Exile in Britain', p. 6, in file 'Other organizations – UAEB – 1972', TAM 122, Box 4, HN Papers.
[107] Letter, Heinz Norden to Editor of the New Statesman, 30 June 1972, in HN Papers 3265
[108] Article, *The Times*, 11 May 1972.
[109] Summary report, 'Vietnam Vigil to end the War', in file 'Newspaper Clippings 1968 -1973, TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.

Americans in Britain.[110] With America's commitment winding down, Group 68 once again regrouped under another name – one they felt neatly conveyed their feelings as patriotic expatriate Americans concerned not only with the Vietnam War but 'wider concerns about events at home and parts of the world outside Indochina'.[111]

Concerned Americans Abroad

Other than a change of name to Concerned Americans Abroad (CAA), the group's social and political make-up and mission remained much the same. They self-described as a London based organisation of 'American men and women with a deep concern about the effects of US political events and foreign policy outside the US,' who were 'politically, financially, and ideologically independent'.[112] They continued to fight for a complete withdrawal of US arms and personnel from Indochina, while a focus on Vietnam was also retained in the calling for a release of 200,000 political prisoners in Saigon jails. However, with details emerging of the CIA's controversial Phoenix Program – designed to infiltrate and defeat the NLF – with vivid accounts of torture and assassinations, CAA questioned the legitimacy of the Agency and began to campaign for its abolishment. This cause was given additional impetus through the blossoming friendship with the CIA defector Philip Agee, who made Britain his home prior to the publication of his CIA exposé, *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*. Of immediate concern to the freshly named CAA, however, was the seeking of a universal unconditional amnesty for American war resisters.

Much like the war itself, the drive to secure amnesty was a bitterly fought, divisive, and prolonged battle. Unlike the war, however, the Americans who fought it would ultimately achieve victory – despite stiff opposition from the outset. Nixon was virulently against granting

[110] Leaflet: 'Vigils! Vigils! A call for a nationwide demand for the release of 200,000 prisoners', in J. Askins Papers, MSS.189/V/1/2/1.
[111] CAA Bulletin, in file 'Newspaper Clippings 1968 – 1973', TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.
[112] CAA Bulletin, in file 'Newspaper Clippings 1968 – 1973', TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.

clemency, believing there could be 'no greater insult to the memories of those who have fought and died, to the memory of those who have served'.[113] Meanwhile, his successor, Gerald Ford, attempted to carve a middle-way, one which would stay true to his belief that those who illegally evaded the draft or deserted were in the wrong, but one that did not result in imprisonment for returnees. His answer lay in an 'earned re-entry' program which required up to two years' public service that 'shall promote the national health, safety, or interest'.[114] The clemency plan was laughed off as a joke by many amnesty advocates, while others were deeply angered by the idea of being punished for refusing to participate in a war which was widely believed to have been a mistake. The historian Donald W. Maxwell wrote that, despite the resistance of many from within political, military and social circles, 'US exiles and liberal groups found strange bedfellows among those who criticized Ford's clemency plan,' including, 'the Department of Justice and veterans' groups'.[115] It would ultimately fall to President Carter to offer the full amnesty on his first day in office; a move seen as unsurprising by Maxwell, who wrote that Carter seemed determined not to let the Vietnam War 'intrude upon his administration, as it had those of his predecessors'.[116]

In fighting for the cause of amnesty, CAA built on their well-established bonds with UAEB/VVAW, combining forces once more with Fritz Efaw's newly formed Vietnam Veterans London chapter. In a calmly worded telegram to President Ford in August, 1974, the groups referred to his 'fair minded initiative in the matter of amnesty,' but urged him to 'not

---

[113] President Nixon, quoted in Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard M. Nixon, 1973.
[114] Gerald Ford, 'Remarks to the Veterans of Foreign Wars Annual Convention, Chicago, Illinois, 19 August 1974', quoted in Maxwell, Donald W.: '"These Are the Things You Gain if You Make Our Country Your Country": US – Vietnam War Draft Resisters And Military Deserters And The Meaning Of Citizenship In North America In The 1970s', in *Peace & Change*, Vol. 40, No. 4, October 2015, p. 447.
[115] Maxwell, Donald W.: '"These Are the Things You Gain if You Make Our Country Your Country", p. 450.
[116] Maxwell, Donald W.: '"These Are the Things You Gain if You Make Our Country Your Country", p. 453.

limit [the] simple act of justice by conditions and exceptions'.[117] Had the telegram been sent a few weeks later, the tone may have been rather more frosty. Ford's full and unconditional pardon of his predecessor was met with opprobrium by amnesty supporters, while its irony was lost on no-one – least of all those campaigning hard for pardons for all resisters and deserters. The groups followed the telegram up with an ad posted in *Time Out* in October, 1974 which called on all potential recipients of amnesty to boycott Ford's amnesty re-entry programme.[118] During this period, the CAA also reached out to the recently formed National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty (NCUUA). The American group brought together over a hundred national and local groups with the purpose of mobilising the American people to work for an:

> immediate amnesty without conditions (such as alternative service) and without a case-by-case review for…all military resisters (including "deserters"), whether in exile or underground in the United States; all persons who, because of their opposition to the war and the military, have been administratively punished, convicted by civilian or military courts, or the subject of prosecution; and all veterans with less-than-honourable discharges.[119]

In a telegram to the NCUUA in early 1975, the CAA wrote to support the group's protest action in the American capital, stating 'we are solidly with in (sic) your campaign for universal and unconditional amnesty for war resisters'.[120] While in a letter to 'friends' early the following year, the group wrote that they aimed to support the NCUUA's action in

---

[117] Telegram, Group 68/Concerned Americans Abroad to President Ford, 27 August 1974, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – correspondence – 1974', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[118] Letter, Fritz Efaw to comrades, 10 September 1974, in file file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – correspondence – 1974', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[119] NCUUA Statemment of Purpose, published in the NCUUA Amnesty Update, issue no. 1, April 1974 [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15932coll8/id/25090/rec/1> [accessed 9 September 2019].
[120] Telegram, CAA to National Council for Amnesty, January 31, 1975, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – correspondence – 1975', TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

Washington DC with a return of the vigil during the stateside group's National Amnesty Week between 22 – 28 February; to be attended also by the British Vietnam Association (BVA – formerly the BCPV) and the British Peace Committee (BPC).[121] Clearly stating the group's views, the letter spoke of 'nearly one million Americans who made their opposition known and felt by actively resisting the war are still being punished,' and that these included 'more than half a million Vietnam veterans with less-than-honourable discharges' who were not included in President Ford's 'earned re-entry' programme.[122]

Throughout this latter period of the group's life, protest events would be staged as they had previously on days of remembrance and national unity. On 4 July 1976 the group once more met outside the Dorchester Hotel to press leaflets into the hands of those attending the American banquet. The leaflet encouraged members to 'give real meaning to the bicentennial of the declaration of independence,' by considering how far they were from the 'vision of our founding fathers'.[123] Under a neatly hand drawn Great Seal of the United States, CAA called for universal unconditional amnesty, independence for Puero Rico, and a 'repudiation of President Ford's recent threat to use nuclear weapons against North Korea'. However, top billing was reserved for the group's latest concern – one which along with amnesty would dominate its final year of operation: abolition of the CIA.

In December 1974, the celebrated *New York Times* journalist Seymour Hersh wrote a series of explosive stories for the newspaper which exposed a massive programme of domestic spying by the CIA. The first article published on 22 December, reported that the CIA had files on over 10,000 Americans, despite being barred by its charter to do so. The damaging exposé

---

[121] Letter, CAA to Dear Friends, in file 'Group 68 – newspaper Clippings 1968 – 1973, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[122] Letter, CAA to Dear Friends, in file 'Group 68 – newspaper Clippings 1968 – 1973, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[123] Leaflet, 'Help give real meaning to the bicentennial of the declaration of independence', Dorchester Hotel, 4 July 1976, in file 'Group 68 – newspaper Clippings 1968 – 1973, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

prompted three investigations of the Agency. The first, designed to head off congressional investigations, was the Rockefeller Commission, a presidential commission appointed by President Ford. The Senate then created the Church Committee on 27 January 1975, and the House of Representatives launched the Pike Committee the following month.[124] The catalogue of shocking revelations contained in the reports, such as assassination plots against foreign leaders and the widespread monitoring of telegraphic data and mail, ultimately led to a series of reforms including the *1978 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act*. Shortly after the Hersh stories appeared, Philip Agee published his own exposé of the CIA, *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*, which detailed his 12 years working for the Agency and the accusation that the White House authorised the CIA to use 'state terrorism' to 'thwart rising left-wing movements in Latin America'.[125] Rather more controversially, the book also contained the names of 250 CIA agents, immediately placing them and the individuals who they had recruited as informants in danger. Encouraged by Agee, the young American journalist Mark Hosenball who was working in Britain for the publication *Time Out*, also wrote articles naming further agents operating in Britain. The reasoning behind this was, as a later article for Agee's subversive magazine *Covert Action Information Bulletin*, put it, 'exposure of [the CIA's] secret operations – and secret operatives – remains the most effective way to reduce the suffering they cause'.[126] It also happened to be the most effective way to provoke the ire of the American government and prompted the British government to declare Agee *persona non grata*. At the request of then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, deportation orders were issued against both Agee and

[124] Hardy, S. Timothy, 'Intelligence Reform in the Mid-1970s', CIA Historical Review Program, July 2, 1996 [online]: <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol20no2/html/v20i2a01p_0001.htm> [accessed 20 September 2019].
[125] Agee, Philip: *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*, (Farrar Straus & Giroux, July, 1975); Obituary, Philip Agee, *The Independent*, Friday 11 January, 2008.
[126] Article, 'Where Myths Lead to Murder', by Philip Agee, *Covert Action Information Bulletin*, Premier Issue, July 1978.

Hosenball the following year.[127]

In the year leading up to his deportation, Agee occasionally lived with Clancy Sigal and the members of the UAEB at Queen Anne St, while a close relationship was also formed with CAA for whom he gave lectures – one of which attracted over 500 people.[128] The war in Vietnam may have been over by the summer of 1975, but Agee's revelations highlighted the occasionally subversive, undemocratic and aggressive nature of America's involvement overseas, prompting CAA to adopt Agee's cause as their own. In his recent work on transnational protest and Philip Agee, the historian Kaeten Mistry examines Agee's whistle-blowing campaign, and reveals his struggle was 'supported by a broad international spectrum of people, organizations and nongovernmental associations'.[129] CAA were central to the assistance provided to the former CIA operative, helping him contribute to the 'fluid transnational movements that sought to restrain the US national security state as well as its Latin American and European allies'.[130] CAA's interests aligned squarely with Agee's. It believed the CIA should be abolished because it wasted taxpayer dollars, 'acted illegally to manipulate the affairs of other countries, to back military dictatorships, and to assassinate popular leaders' and because they were 'unalterably opposed to those actions of agencies of the US government which undermine the democratic process at home and overseas'.[131] They also believed there was no possible way the CIA could reform, so abolition was the only option. To this end the group began working with Agee in drawing attention to the CIA's

---

[127] Article, 'American newsman told to quit Britain', New York Times, 17 November 1976; and article 'Britain to deport former CIA man alleged to have contact with foreign agents', *The Times*, 18 November 1976.
[128] Letter, to 'Concerned Americans,' from CAA steering committee, 11 June 1975, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – correspondence, 1975, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.
[129] Mistry, Kaeten, 'A Transnational Protest against the National Security State: Whistle-Blowing, Philip Agee, and Networks of Dissent', Journal of American History, Vol. 106, Issue 2 (September 2019), pp 362-389
[130] Mistry, Kaeten, 'A Transnational Protest against the National Security State', p. 363
[131] CAA document titled 'Who are Concerned Americans Abroad?', in file 'Newspaper Clippings 1968 -1973, TAM 122, Box 2 HN Papers.

renegade activity. In its most spectacular action, CAA launched an event titled, 'Misguided Tours to the Stately Homes of Friendly CIA Operatives', where group members, helped by Ed Berman's street theatre, performed agitprop events outside the homes of London based CIA operatives. The event which invited people to 'see how the underhand lived', drew significant press attention on both sides of the Atlantic.[132] Not wishing to miss out on the action, the UAEB mounted what Clancy Sigal referred to as 'comic opera assaults' on the front lawn of the CIA station chief's Belgravia home, by 'using a jazz band and an Uncle Sam on stilts (our lankiest member, Chip) to embarrass the clandestine agency'.[133] The action drew further attention on Clancy Sigal and the UAEB at Queen Anne St, however, prompting the police to call at the house. Notes written by Sigal for an unpublished memoir called *The Uses of Treason*, stated that Agee 'took it for granted that the CIA was trying to murder him and, on the evidence, he may have been right'. Sigal added that in dealing with Agee he had a 'feeling [he] was stepping over an invisible line,' but that this was something he would simply 'put on a growing list of things [he] wasn't going to worry about'.[134] Interestingly, it did not seem to bother the hitherto upstanding, law-abiding, and moderate members of CAA, either. In May 1975, representatives of CAA, including Norden, met with John F. Canon, First Secretary and Information Officer of the American Embassy in London, to 'discuss disquiet over reports of a large concentration of CIA officers in London'. [135] The group were primarily concerned with the CIA conducting illegal activities in the UK, and asked for

[132] Letter, to 'Concerned Americans,' from CAA steering committee, 11 June 1975, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – correspondence, 1975, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers; and Jeffreys-Jones, Rhodri: *In Spies We Trust: The Story of Western Intelligence* (Oxford University Press, August 2013) p. 164.
[133] Unfinished memoir, 'The Uses of Treason' in file 16.3 'The Uses of treason: Editorial correspondence, 1994 – 2004', CS Papers.
[134] Unfinished memoir, 'The Uses of Treason' in file 17.3 'The Uses of Treason: Titled drafts and articles – 1970 – 2006', CS Papers.
[135] Report of embassy meeting, 9 May 1975, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – CIA activities – 1975 – 1976', iTAM 122, Box 3, HN Papers.

assurances that the agency's activities were within both US and UK law – Mr Cannon gave assurances they were, but refused to divulge 'the substance of US intelligence activities'.

Interest in the activities of the CIA in Britain rose following the publication of Agee's book, prompting questions to be raised in parliament as to whether the prime minister would investigate the 'appalling affairs' of the CIA in Britain. Responding to the question posed by Dennis Skinner MP, Harold Wilson said that although his honourable friend 'may have been concerned about reports of the CIA engaging in industrial espionage [in Britain],' the reports had been 'categorically denied,' and he had 'no reason at all to think that the denial was inaccurate'.[136] The later expulsion of both Agee and Hosenball revealed that the government's priorities lay firmly with the wishes of the US – perhaps in part helped by the latest sterling crisis which the historian Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones cites as a 'further reason not to alienate the USA'.[137]

In December 1975 an event occurred which had the potential to disrupt the support provided by CAA to Agee and Hosenball. Leaving a Christmas party with his wife on 23 December in Athens, CIA station chief Richard Welch was shot dead with a Colt 45 at close range. His name, along with others, had been published by the English-language *Athens News* newspaper in a 25 November anti-CIA article.[138] To many, this killing was as a direct consequence of the CIA operative's name being published – a troubling trend which had begun with Agee. CAA saw events differently, however, and launched a campaign of support for him and Hosenball which involved the sending of a letter to the *Herald Tribune* headed 'Exposures of CIA', and which expressed support for those 'persons and publications that are

---

[136] Hansard entry, [online]< https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1975-03-18/debates/b2d787a8-288c-41ce-a1e5-b351b607ff14/PresidentFord?highlight=cia#contribution-afdd8602-dbf3-4444-9a13-360ac19c2cc3 > [accessed 18 June 2019]

[137] Jeffreys-Jones, Rhodri: *In Spies We Trust: The Story of Western Intelligence* (Oxford University Press, August 2013) p. 164.

[138] Kassimeris, George: *Europe's Last Red Terrorists: The Revolutionary Organization 17 November* (New York University Press, December, 2001) p. 73.

currently identifying CIA operatives'. The letter which was published in the 31 January edition continued, 'the charge that the exposure of Richard Welch caused him to be in the CIA's own phrase "terminated with extreme prejudice" is wide of the mark…it was the CIA itself which set Mr Welch up for the kill by sending him to Athens after he had been exposed a long-time previously as a top-level CIA operative in Cyprus'.[139] Following the publishing of this letter, CAA launched a petition which expressed support for the individuals and publications who were identifying CIA operatives. Contrary to the American authorities' assertion that the exposures were unpatriotic when done by Americans and irresponsible when done by others, CAA believed they would curtail the activities of the CIA which went 'far beyond the mere collection of information'. The petition went on to state that 'undeniably…the United States must collect information, but CIA activities have far exceeded reasonable boundaries.[140] It is unknown how many signatures were raised, or whether the petition was even handed in to the US embassy. However, its existence reveals an ongoing commitment of those within CAA to stand up to an America they believed was straying yet further from the ideals and principles set down by the founding fathers.

This commitment to have their voices heard as concerned Americans abroad continued beyond the subsequent deportations of Agee and Hosenball. In remarks made at a CAA meeting in May 1977, Norden aimed to formulate a policy for CAA which centred on denuclearisation and support, in principal, of President Carter's new energy policy. He ended his speech with a comment which typified the nature of CAA and Group 68 before it, and encapsulated their commitment to the causes they dedicated themselves to:

---

[139] Letter, Margaret Halsey and CAA to the International Herald Tribune, the *Herald Tribune*, 31 January 1976.
[140] Petition concerning the activities of the CIA, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – CIA activities – 1975 – 1976', TAM 122, Box 3, HN Papers.

> As free Americans, independent men and women, we are entitled to take whatever other steps we can agree upon, to change, modify and expand our positions. Whatever we do, let not our dedication falter! [141]

However, the new path Norden had hoped to set CAA on was cut tragically short. On 1 February 1978 while crossing a London street, Heinz Norden was killed in a traffic accident. The group he had help found died with him – a testament to how central a figure he was in the organisation.

Conclusion

They were a group born out of division and in turn they were divided from the outset. Nonetheless, Group 68/CAA sought and received the ear of politicians both sides of the Atlantic, they instigated and participated in the seminal British demonstrations of the Vietnam War, and were instrumental in the success of the Vietnam Vigil. They also endured. Where other American groups in Britain disintegrated in acrimony or fizzled out, Group 68/CAA continued beyond the removal of American troops from South East Asia. In part this was no doubt down to their age and residency status, but it was also due to their particular brand of activism. Abiding by the law and remaining steadfast in their commitment to moderate protest was central in ensuring the group's survival.

Group 68/CAA was a modest, informal group which despite its size spoke for a substantial segment of overseas Americans in Britain. Through collaboration with British peace and anti-war groups such as the BCPV and VSC, it was able to generate significant interest and press attention in its causes – causes which tended to be those on which consensus was likely to be achieved. From the early campaigning days for Eugene McCarthy,

---

[141] Remarks by Heinz Norden at CAA meeting, 8 May 1977, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad – correspondence, 1975, TAM 122, Box 2, HN Papers.

through protests and vigils organised in opposition to the Vietnam war, and on to its support of amnesty and the defence of Agee and Hosenball, the group concentrated their efforts on liberal to left issues in which its constituency was on agreement. Despite the periodic acrimony and disputes which affected the group, they were ultimately able to unite behind core issues of the day and campaign tirelessly for them. Although largely concentrating on American issues, both domestic and international, Group 68 also supported, and was instrumental in, campaigning for British causes. They were in regular touch with British politicians and worked alongside them and British peace groups for British disassociation from American war policy; while they also joined with other British and American groups in attempting to amend the *Visiting Forces Act*.

In its near ten operational years, Group 68/CAA revealed itself to be a group which was patriotically American, but not blindly so. Instead, members such as Norden embraced criticism as a way of expressing their patriotism. The America they left was a country they loved but a country seemingly on a path which diverged significantly from their own. As Americans abroad they hoped to influence American policy so they could feel proud of a country they once called home

Chapter 4

People Emerging Against Corrupt Establishments

Late on a summer's evening in 1971, two armed American soldiers and a major from RAF Lakenheath drove to a quiet residential address in Cambridge and rapped sharply on the door. Inside, Tom Culver, captain in the US Air Force, Vietnam veteran, and legal counsel to the GI movement in Britain, was enjoying what he believed to be his final few hours in England before returning to the US. Instead, he was arrested, placed in the back of the waiting car, and escorted to the USAF occupied Suffolk airbase. Here he remained for the following three days, incarcerated in the base awaiting court-martial.

Culver played a central role in the almost entirely neglected area of GI protesting in Britain during the Vietnam War. Although the historiography of Britain's role is wanting, the story of the wider GI movement has been told in depth over the years. Building steadily from the mid-1960s, the movement developed within the armed forces until by the early 1970s morale and discipline had virtually collapsed in the US Army. The 'fragging' of officers had increased dramatically, drug use was widespread among the troops, hundreds of GI newspapers critical of the war were being produced and distributed on military bases, and atrocities on the field of combat were widespread. Some believed the army to be in revolt, while Colonel Heinl writing in the June 1971 edition of the *Armed Forces Journal* was concerned enough to suggest that the US Army had 'met the enemy, and they are us'.[1] The following chapter begins by providing context to the wider GI movement – its rise from within the US army, the bonds it formed with the civilian movement, and its eventual

[1] Robert D. Heinl Jr., 'The Collapse of the Armed Forces,' *Armed Forces Journal* (June 1971), p.32.

infiltrating of all branches of the US military – and explores how the movement in Britain fits in to this. Focus then turns to the disparate group of servicemen, celebrities and American students who, identifying a need for such a movement in Britain, launched the GI group People Emerging Against Corrupt Establishments (PEACE). Attention then turns to the key events organised by the group, including a petition signed by 1000 members of the British based US military, and a gathering of USAF personnel in central London for an anti-war concert. With US military law holding a tighter rein on the first amendment rights of freedom of speech, the gathering was deemed a protest and therefore participants could be court-martialled. To be made an example of, the highest ranking member of the group, Captain Tom Culver, was duly court-martialled and returned to the US. The following section of this chapter details the motivations and the consequences of this action, and the eventual return to Britain of Culver to assist with civil liberties cases in the military. The chapter then closes by analysing the successful destruction of PEACE, and with it the GI movement in Britain, by US military authorities.

The GI movement

> Should senior commanders not be able to reverse the trend towards indiscipline [within the army], this country will, not long from now, lose its status as the world's first power and stand almost helpless against those who would humble it or destroy it.[2]

With this damning assessment, aired by the retired General Howze to a *New York Times* correspondent in September 1971, it was clear the US Army had reached crisis point. No longer were generals proudly boasting of the 'finest military the world had ever seen', as they had confidently proclaimed at the commencement of major ground operations in 1965. The army had fought bitterly for six years, lost tens of thousands of men, and was finally coming

[2] Quote from General Hamilton H. Howze, in the *New York Times*, 5 September 1971, p.1.

to terms with the gloomy observations of General Howze and Colonel Heinl. As worried officials set about getting a grip on the crisis which threatened to destroy the army, one of its main contributing factors showed signs of waning. Having grown in influence over the previous four years, laying bare the beliefs of the American soldier and revealing the nation's folly to its people in blunt, course, shocking imagery, the GI movement finally began to lose momentum.

Although the anti-Vietnam war movement is popularly portrayed as one of student radicals and civilians – as has been discussed thus far in this thesis – it was far from confined to college campuses and city streets. The GI movement emerged in 1967 when leaders within the civilian movement recognised anti-war sentiment within the military could be effective when channelled into political action. With their own money they set up coffee houses near large military bases, helping to lay the foundations of the only movement of its kind in American military history.[3] Much in the same way, American civilians based in Britain for work and study, along with British friends and supporters, founded the movement at USAF occupied RAF bases. Although they did not set up coffee houses, they were, as we will see later in this chapter, instrumental in the founding of the GI group PEACE and the distribution of the group's underground newspaper.

The American coffee houses were places independent of military influence where soldiers could congregate, listen to music, shoot pool, and freely exchange thoughts on the war and the army. They were occasionally staffed by civilian dissidents and provided an

[3] There are plentiful articles, essays and books on the GI movement. The most authoritative and best known is David Cortright's *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance during the Vietnam War* (Haymarket Books, 2005). This exhaustive, expertly researched account began life as a PhD thesis, and benefits enormously from the author's own experience as a GI movement soldier during the Vietnam War. Other key works include: Moser, Richard: *The New Winter Soldiers* (Rutgers University Press, 1996); Lewis, Penny: *Hardhats, Hippies, and Hawks: The Vietnam Antiwar Movement as Myth and Memory* (Cornell University Press, 2013); Stapp, Andy: *Up Against the Brass* (Simon and Schuster, 1970); and Appy, Christian: *Working Class War: American Combat Soldiers and Vietnam* (University of North Carolina Press, 1993); while James Lewes provides a thorough analysis of underground newspapers in *Protest and Survive – Underground GI Newspapers during the Vietnam War*, (Praeger, 2003).

important link between the civilian and military anti-war movements.[4] Within a year, the coffee house movement was attracting national media attention. *The New York Times* ran with a front page story on the first to be set up – the U.F.O, based in Columbia, S.C and situated within easy driving distance of the 23,000 soldiers stationed at Fort Jackson. The lengthy article spoke of the army's 'worry' at the proliferation of coffee houses, while also carrying an interview with one of its co-ordinators, the Chicago Seven defendant Rennie Davis, who confirmed the army's fears by suggesting the objective was to 'encourage servicemen to raise critical questions in the barracks'.[5] From humble beginnings, the number of coffee houses rose to nineteen in 1970 and as many as twenty-six in 1971.[6] Tens of thousands of GIs would pass through the doors of the coffee shops and into the fug of anti-military, anti-establishment, anti-war sentiment. They were places where coffee was brewed and indiscipline fomented. Returning soldiers would recount stories of combat and dissent within the ranks, spreading a defiance of military authority through the establishment – a principal reason the historian David Cortright believes indiscipline rose within the military.[7]

Within the safe environment of these coffee houses, underground newspapers were produced and distributed. Designed with the primary purpose of 'spead[ing] news of the GI movement', in language and style which reflected the cultural explosion of the 1960s, papers such as '*FED UP*', '*Rage*' and '*Right-on Post*' championed the 'peace, pot and personal expression of the hippie counterculture'.[8] The papers, hundreds of which were in production by the end of the war, contained stories of resistance and the military response, while also offering advice on how to become a conscientious-objector, and encouraging sedition within the ranks. Writing in the GI press, a Vietnam veteran suggested tactical approaches to

---

[4] Moser, Richard: *The New Winter Soldiers*, p.99.
[5] Article, 'Antiwar Coffeehouses Delight GIs but Not Army,' *New York Times*, 12 August 1968, p.1.
[6] Robert D. Heinl Jr., 'The Collapse of the Armed Forces,' p.32.
[7] Cortright, David: *Soldiers in Revolt* (Haymarket Books, 2005), pp. 27, 85.
[8] Moser, Richard: *The New Winter Soldiers*, p.97.

undermine the military. In an article entitled 'How to FTA' he suggested 'You can rip off supplies, break trucks…punch holes in walls, go AWOL'.[9] The military acronym used to advertise the army, FTA (Fun, Travel, Adventure) was often changed to 'Fuck The Army' by soldiers wishing to show discontent. In an article, which appeared in the October 1967 edition of *Veterans Stars and Stripes for Peace*, one Vietnam veteran revealed his anger at discovering he was fighting the people of South Vietnam 'ninety percent of the time,' instead of the communists. Having joined up to 'answer the plea of victimised people in their struggle against communist aggression,' he felt thoroughly demoralised, and implored readers to 'bring out the truth and get this thing stopped'.[10] GI movement coffee shops may not have existed in Britain – although an attempt was made by Group 68 to set one up in Cambridge in 1973 – but GIs and civilians would meet in the pubs near the bases, and it was here the first underground GI paper in Britain was created.[11] Produced monthly, *P.E.A.C.E* ran from August 1971 until September the following year, and had a readership in the thousands. Producing 3,500 copies on each print run, with each of the nine US bases in Britain receiving 500, the papers would be left around the barracks and shared between servicemen.[12] Further papers came later, such as *Alconbury Raps* and *Chicksands D.I.T.S* (Dignity In The Service) in 1971, and *Stripes and Stars* which began printing in February 1973. These papers produced in Britain, and the others printed around the world, provided what James Lewes has described as a 'unique space where GIs – without fear of retribution – could question the logic, and question the praxis, of those who ruled their lives'.[13]

---

[9] Article, 'How to FTA', in *Aboveground* (March, 1970), p.3.
[10] Article, *Veterans Stars and Stripes for Peace*, no. 2 (October, 1967), p.4.
[11] Group 68 meeting notes, March 1973, in file 'BPC 2/9', British Library of Political and Economic Science, London School of Economics (hereafter LSE).
[12] Article, 'We Need Help, Your Help', in *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 11 June 1971, p.7 Wisconsin GI Press Collection [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p15932coll8> [accessed 18 April 2020] (hereafter GI Press) .
[13] Lewes, James: *Protest and Survive – Underground GI Newspapers during the Vietnam War*, (Praeger, 2003) p.4.

The coffee houses and newspapers provided the lifeblood of the movement, but it was through dozens of groups active during the 1960s and 1970s that the movement was able to turn the GI frustration into action. Although there were many dozens of these groups, all involved in someway or other in undermining the disciplinary structure of the army and keeping the movement going, many fragmented shortly after forming. Two organisations which gained traction early on and became solid, interstate, cross country support networks, however, were the American Servicemen's Union (ASU) and the previously mentioned Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW). Both founded in 1967, these two organisations boasted thousands of members in Vietnam by the early 1970s.[14] The ASU, headed by Andy Stapp, a socialist who entered the army in 1966 with the aim of spreading dissent, proclaimed its purpose as the building of a worldwide GI union to unite all low-ranking enlisted people in a common struggle against the military. Despite not personally being involved in the rise of the British GI movement, Stapp's approach influenced the founders of PEACE heavily. In response to accusations from career military men that the editors of *P.E.A.C.E* were 'Communist backed, anarchists, undemocratic, and young punks,' the writers stated in the second edition of the paper that the allegations were all untrue, and that they 'strongly support…the American Servicemen's Union', before then listing the ASU's ten following demands, adopting them as their own:[15]

1. The right to refuse to obey illegal orders – like the order to fight in the illegal, imperial war in Southeast Asia.
2. Election of officers by vote of the men.
3. An end to sir-ing and saluting of officers.

[14] Moser, Richard: *The New Winter Soldiers*, p.58.
[15] Article, 'Our Stand Explained AGAIN', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol. 1, No. 2, September 1970, p.1 GI Press.

4. The right of black and brown skinned servicemen to determine their own lives, free from the oppression of any racist whites.
5. No troops to be used against anti-war demonstrators.
6. No troops to be used against workers on strike.
7. Rank and file control of court-martial boards.
8. The right of free political association.
9. Federal minimum wages.
10. The right of collective bargaining.[16]

Published not only by *P.E.A.C.E* but by many underground papers produced on US military bases around the world, the ten demands soon gained traction with rank-and-file troops, many of whom felt embittered, angry, and disenfranchised. Sweeping and unrealistic as they were, the demands and the enthusiasm with which they were received revealed a military in serious trouble. They also reflected the social upheavals of the era seeping into the military, challenging its core values of discipline, motivation, and obedience, and threatened to bring the institution to its knees. The British based GIs behind PEACE, alongside their supporters and sponsors, were determined to play a central role in this humbling of the US armed forces.

Although many of the actions directed by the ASU, such as strikes and 'sick-ins' where soldiers were told to call in sick *en masse*, failed or fell by the way side, the Vietnam Moratorium actions in the autumn of 1969 showed the ASU and other organisations displaying unity and political strength. On 9 November 1969, one week before the planned moratorium, a full page advert appeared in the Sunday edition of the *New York Times*. A statement which called for an end to the war and support for the planned 15 November

[16] Stapp, Andy: *Up Against the Brass* (Simon and Schuster, 1970), pp.88-9.

mobilisation in Washington D.C was signed by 1,366 active-duty servicemen, 189 of whom were currently serving in Vietnam.[17] This was something, as we will see, the later PEACE group would also draw inspiration from. The following weekend saw as many as 250,000 people attend the peace rally in the capital, led by a contingent of 200 GIs. This was only one of the many marches which took place across the US during the war years – countless demonstrations involving both GIs and civilians were a regular feature near military bases across the country, many of which caused panic amongst the army top brass.

Although the marches were significant in number, and occasionally in generating press attention and impact, it would be the events in the third week in April 1971 that truly demonstrated the servicemen's anger and resentment toward the war and the US military. Dewey Canyon III was a week-long lobbying effort, organised by the VVAW, which targeted congressional representatives, and combined speeches, candlelit vigils, and songs to highlight the servicemen's desire for an end to the war. Described as 'an incursion into the land of Congress', Dewey Canyon peaked in one of the most dramatic and influential moments of the anti-war movement. On 23 April approximately 2,000 veterans marched towards the nation's Capitol building. One by one, the veterans, dressed in faded uniforms and torn combat dress, approached a microphone, pronounced declarations of anger and peace, then hurled their combat medals onto the steps of the Capitol. Earlier in the day, VVAW member and future Senator John Kerry, read a statement to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which criticised the war, and asked the profound question: 'How do you ask a man to be the last man to die in Vietnam? How do you ask a man to be the last man to die for a mistake?'[18] The events of this momentous week resonated with many active servicemen around the world.

[17] Article, *New York Times*, 9 November 1969.
[18] Kerry, John: Vietnam Veterans Against the War statement to the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations, 23 April 1971.

The unparalleled actions by American GIs described here reflected a society in the grip of a cultural revolution, a revolution which had swept across the western hemisphere during the 1960s, blowing the ghosts of the Second World War away and giving rise to a counterculture which found expression in wearing hair long, playing music loudly, and taking drugs. In his lacerating critique of the armed forces, Colonel Heinl spoke of the 'truism' that national armies closely reflect societies from which they were raised.[19] This was certainly the case during the Vietnam era, and no matter how far the military was from the shores of the US or the battlefields of Vietnam, the counterculture permeated.

Servicemen, Students & Celebrities

Known to her critics as 'Hanoi Jane' due to her anti-Vietnam War Campaigning and her visit to North Vietnam in July 1972, the American actress Jane Fonda became the poster girl of the American peace and anti-war movement during the early 1970s. With her striking looks and position at the heart of the American film industry, Fonda was an instantly recognisable national figure, and one who decided to use her celebrity to try and bring peace to Vietnam. Fonda also played a little-known role in the GI movement within Britain.

Having been persuaded by Fonda to accompany her to the US marine base of Camp Pendleton to distribute Resistance in the Army (RITA) pamphlets, the British actress Vanessa Redgrave returned home inspired and determined to continue the work of the GI movement.[20] Much like Fonda, Redgrave was born into a family of actors – her father was the actor, director and manager Sir Michael Redgrave – and she took political activism seriously. An active member of the radical Committee of 100, and later committed member and friend of the VSC, the Stop-it Committee, the UAEB and Group 68, Redgrave was at the forefront of

[19] Heinl, Robert D., 'The Collapse of the Armed Forces', p.31.
[20] Interview with activist Max Watts [online]: <http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/marxism/2005w31/msg00075.html> [accessed 30 April 2020].

anti-Vietnam War protesting in Britain – in some cases quite literally: during the huge 27 October, 1968 protest organised by the VSC, Redgrave walked side-by-side with organiser Tariq Ali as they marched through London at the head of the protesters. With this background and significant means behind her, she was an ideal person to help spur the GI movement in Britain.

With air bases scattered throughout Britain, it was the USAF rather than the army which Redgrave targeted. On 7 June 1970, between 2000 and 3000 anti-war activists gathered behind the vast Corinthian columns of London's Lyceum Ballroom to listen as five active-duty GIs spoke of their personal experiences and of the growing GI movement in Europe. Invited by Redgrave, the GIs 'breaching innumerable Army regulations' had travelled from Germany where they were stationed with the American 7th Army, specifically to further spread the word of unrest within the military.[21] Standing before the crowd, the GIs, two of whom had fought in Vietnam, described variously their disillusionment with the military, the incompetence of officers, and their shock of seeing the war first-hand.[22] They also spoke of their involvement in the growing RITA movement, and how the army had 'radicalized us and made us political,' adding that, 'None of us were political before joining the service'.[23] A group of USAF personnel based in Britain also attending the event later met with the GIs and Vanessa Redgrave to express their support. Speaking to Redgrave, sergeant Jerry Gutowski of the Mildenhall Transportation Sq. indicated his desire to start a paper and 'discussion group'.[24] Shortly thereafter, Gutowski was contacted by students at Cambridge University who offered financial support to establish a paper. Having 'hemmed and hawed'

[21] Interview: Watts, Utah University Archives.
[22] Article, 'US army "breeds rebels"', *The Guardian*, 8 June 1970.
[23] Article, '5 Germany-Based GIs join Spock, Stars in London Antiwar Rally', *The Stripes and Stars*, 9 June 1970. In file 'GB 097 Coll Misc 07/01' LSE.
[24] Article, 'Vanessa Finances Underground GI Paper', newspaper clipping of unknown origin, 12 February 1971 found in file 16.8, The Uses of Treason: Correspondence with military deserters, 1970-1971, Clancy Sigal Papers, Harry Ransom Centre, University of Texas (hereafter HRC).

over the decision, Gutowski decided to found PEACE – a group the GI movement historian David Cortright described as 'one of the most successful organisations of the GI movement,' attracting support from 'a large percentage of the twenty-two thousand airmen stationed in [Britain].[25]

The first copies of *P.E.A.C.E* were printed and delivered to RAF Lakenheath and Mildenhall in early August, 1970. Immediately prior to setting the paper up, and concerned his actions could be illegal, Gutowski met with Culver at RAF Lakenheath who was working as a Judge Advocate for the USAF. Reassured by Culver that he could proceed 'perfectly lawfully', the GI quickly set to work on the first edition. Recalling this moment and the legal counsel he provided, Culver said 'we were doing our damndest to stay within the law, we didn't want to break the law, but we wanted to make as much noise without doing so'. From this point until his court-martial and beyond Culver would continue to provide legal counsel to PEACE.[26]

Directly under the paper's masthead, a statement in bold type served as a reminder both to GIs and to the military brass: 'This paper is your property it cannot legally be taken from you'. Written in GI vernacular, the paper's first edition spoke of how the 'lifers…harass those under them' and that 'even though you work under an inhuman system, you can prove that you, unlike the lifers, are human'. It stated its primary aim as one of improving life on base for the GIs, while offering civilian legal help, and encouraged airmen to get in touch with their 'gripes'. The founders' allegiance was to 'humanity first…our country second…the military last…but above these, is our allegiance to our individual conscience'.[27] In addition to anti-war issues, the paper also served as a mouthpiece for the rights of GIs,

[25] Cortright, David: *Soldiers in Revolt*, pp. 127-128.
[26] Culver interview, 3 January 2018.
[27] *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 1, August 1970, p.2 GI Press.

black rights and the feminist movement – areas which, as we shall see, caused a rupture within PEACE in the months to come.

It is uncertain whether Gutowski's hesitation in starting the group was due to fears the students and Redgrave would attempt to control the content; however, if it was, these fears were soon allayed. Both students and Redgrave expressed no desire to use the paper or the GIs for their own political aims. Interviewed at the time by RAF Mildenhall's official GI paper, *Traveller*, Gutowski said Redgrave 'never put any ideas in our heads. She just says "Here's the money, you run it the way you want it". She's never given us any ideas on how to do anything. I don't think she ever will'.[28] This 'hands off' approach by the paper's chief benefactor was later reinforced by Tom Culver, who commented that while Redgrave attended many of the PEACE meetings and events, she was never present when the paper was being written.[29]

Although legally speaking the USAF could do little to halt the production of the paper, Gutowski spoke of being singled out for minor harassment such as the way he wore his uniform, his haircut, and keeping an unregistered motorbike on base – which he said many had but he was given 'three days to get rid of it'.[30] In a further harassment by Air Force police, Gutowski was arrested in the early hours of the morning on 30 August 1970 on 'suspicion of distributing…*P.E.A.C.E*' – allegedly in contravention of federal law. Two days later he was released without charge. The editors believed this was a 'scare tactic, hoping it might end the paper'.[31]

---

[28] Interview between *Traveller* editor Sgt. Jim Mahoney and Sgt. Jerry Gutowski, PO3 Robert Dabney (Robert Duval), and Sgt. Gary Hoeppner, in *Traveller*, 29 January 1971, p.2-3, author's private collection.
[29] Oral History interview with Tom Culver, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Cambridge, UK, 3 January 2018.
[30] *Traveller*, 29 January 1971, p.2-3.
[31] *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 3, October 1970, p.6, GI Press.

Joining Gutowski shortly after the founding of PEACE was Robert Duval, a naval mechanic based at RAF Mildenhall. Having become politicised while watching the police beat protesters during the DNC in 1968, Duval joined the Georgia Tech chapter of the Southern Student Organizing Committee (SSOC) while studying as a Physics major. Disenchanted with his experience, he 'flunked out' of university despite knowing he would lose his 2-S Deferment, and signed up for the navy's requisite four-year enlistment. A move he said was 'tactical, rather than heartfelt' – being 'risk averse', Duval decided to take the 'safe way out,' believing 'four years in the navy was better than two in the army'.[32] Following his enlistment, Duval's gamble paid off when he was posted to RAF Mildenhall to join a small contingent of US Navy personnel servicing naval and US Mail planes. A posting far from war-torn Vietnam, and in a country he desired to visit. Although not aware of the GI movement before arriving in Britain, he was drawn to PEACE, excited by what he had read in the first edition of their paper, and soon began writing and formatting the magazine.

Essential to the success of PEACE and their paper was the dedicated support of a dozen or so American civilians based in Britain for study or work. Foremost among them was Ira Magaziner, a Rhodes scholar from Oxford University and friend of future US president Bill Clinton. Magaziner held an impressive record for student activism back home in the US. Having become 'frustrated with the perceived lack of creative thinking and dynamism in American higher education,' while president of the student government at Brown University, the young Magaziner set about fomenting change. A 400-page document dubbed the Magaziner-Maxwell Report was produced calling for the abolition of grades in favour of written evaluations, and which suggested alternative courses to replace inadequate lectures. Following an exhaustive lobbying effort by Magaziner and others, the university adopted

[32] Oral History interview with Robert Duval, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Morgantown WV, USA 9 January 2018.

many of its suggestions, and a so called 'New Curriculum' was established, which, to this day, remains the 'heart and soul' of Brown.[33] A further incident of note, and one which highlights the organising ability of Magaziner, took place during the awarding of an honorary degree to then National Security Advisor Henry Kissenger in the summer of 1969. With the war at its height, Magaziner believed the awarding of the degree was 'inappropriate' so organised a protest of students culminating in the graduating year 'almost to a person' rising and turning their backs on the politician.[34] He is remembered as the student who has arguably 'had a greater impact upon the culture, philosophy and pedagogy of Brown University than any other student'.[35]

Having encouraged Gutowski to found PEACE shortly after the Lyceum Ballroom anti-war rally, Magaziner began recruiting other American civilians to raise awareness of the GI movement and distribute the paper. Early recruit, Lee Beier, an assistant lecturer from Lancaster University on sabbatical leave, remembered he and then girlfriend Lucia Adams 'were importantly mainly…because we had a car'. Living in a 'strategically important' position in north London, Beier and Adams spent much of their time driving to bases and delivering the paper, often enlisting the support of guests visiting from the US. Meanwhile, Adams recalled regularly entertaining GIs in London with English peace activist friends, cooking them food, talking about the war, and showing films of interviews with My Lai veterans. More than anything, however, she felt more 'useful…for distributing the paper than anything else'.[36] Others without transport, such as Cambridge postgraduate student Jeannie

[33] Article, 'The Art of the Possible: Ira Magaziner '69' *Brown Political Review*, 20 May 2014 [online] <https://brownpoliticalreview.org/2014/05/the-art-of-the-possible-ira-magaziner-69/ > [accessed online 04 January 2020].
[34] Article, 'A Liberal Gets Rich Yet Keeps The Faith', Fortune, 31 August 1987 [online]: <https://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/1987/08/31/69480/index.htm> [accessed 04 January 2020].
[35] Article, 'The Art of the Possible: Ira Magaziner '69' *Brown Political Review.*
[36] Adams, Lucia: *Memoria Academia 1960 – 1976*, p. 81.

Pfaelzer, would travel to nearby bases in Cambridgeshire and stand outside the main gates passing the paper to GIs.

Recalling the activity of the American civilians, Duval said he did not have 'a sense of their active involvement [in the group], but…they were the infrastructure which let us do it', through supplying information about British protest activity and collecting the paper for distribution.[37] There is no doubt those involved were committed anti-war activists, willing to stand 'on the sidewalk at Mildenhall or Lakenheath, our toes freezing [and] our bellies grumbling,' but their motivation also lay in breaking down the 'walls the military buil[t] between soldiers and civilians' as well as the sheer fun and excitement of it. Much like activists discussed in previous chapters, the American civilians affiliated with PEACE were determined to voice their anti-war feelings, but did so while relishing the social aspect of it. They met regularly and, as is revealed below, invested much of their time in organising concerts and social gatherings. Beier remembers the time as 'enormously exciting' particularly when there was a sense of danger – being, as they were, often photographed by the military police.[38] This sense of fun in face of danger was also shared by many of the GIs. Duval recalled that for him 'a large element…was I really enjoyed it – it had the thumbing your nose at the authoritarians, it had the camaraderie, it had…thrill and danger,' adding that he had 'a belief…that the place I lived in in Bury St Edmunds [was] under surveillance for a while,' by the intelligence wing of the USAF, the Office of Special Investigations (OSI), who parked in a car outside his house.

Although accounts and recollections of American students being monitored by the OSI were widespread, they were rarely approached by either the OSI or military brass.[39] A

[37] Oral History interview with Robert Duval.
[38] Oral History interview with Lee Beier, interview by author, MP3 digital recording via telephone, New York City 17 January 2018.
[39] See also the recollections of Jack Stauder in chapter 1, in addition to excerpts from his FBI file which reveal significant monitoring of the students by the OSI.

minor altercation did take place outside RAF Mildenhall as Jeannie Pfaelzer was distributing the paper, however. Having refused to hand over a copy to a USAF Colonel, stating it was for 'first-termers' only, Pfaelzer 'struggled' with him as he tried to take it from her, resulting in the paper being ripped and Pfaelzer 'considering pressing charges against him for assault, attempted theft, and for destruction of property'.[40] It is not known whether charges were pressed, or a complaint made, but the reporting of such an insignificant event in the twelfth edition of *P.E.A.C.E* serves as an indication of the largely harmonious relations between civilians and the military brass. The same could not be said for the brass and GIs. As the unique collaboration between servicemen, students and celebrities continued, and PEACE grew in notoriety, relations between the GIs and the military hierarchy worsened. By the late Spring of 1971, the GI movement in Britain had reached its apogee. Their eponymous publication reached all nine Air Force bases across the country; affiliated underground publications such as *Alconbury Raps* and *Chicksands D.I.T.S* had begun printing; and a large gathering of committed anti-war GIs were meeting in London with a petition to end the war. The commitment of the GIs was met, though, with an equally resolute officer class determined to shut the group down and expunge those involved.

Protests and Petitions

In the months leading up to the widely reported London petition hand in held by GIs on 31 May 1971, USAF servicemen were involved in various smaller scale actions of rebellion, they held concerts to raise money and awareness of the GI movement, and hosted guest speakers. The actions, rebellions and concerns of the GIs are best revealed through the copies of *P.E.A.C.E* and in interviews with group members. Between the covers of the paper were letters and articles written by GIs, as well as artwork, news clippings of the war, and

[40] Letter, Jeannie Pfaelzer to *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 12 July 1971, p.4, GI Press.

copy from other underground papers. Gripes were shared and concerns voiced. A recurring frustration was one of hair – growing it long or wearing a beard or moustache – featuring as it did in many of the eventual 14 editions of the paper. To the servicemen it was a question of free expression – or as the historian Beth Bailey recently commented, it was about '[laying] claim to a meaningful identity…[which] seemed to challenge the primacy of military identity'.[41] While in the fourth edition of the paper, Robert Duval wrote of it being an issue of morale, affecting as it did the social life of many GIs, with cases of being called 'skinhead' and having 'garbage thrown at you' while walking off base.[42] Reflecting on the issue years later, Duval said the hair restrictions were about 'breaking down your individuality to turn you into a functional cog in the machine,' and that having 'absolutely hated it,' he still to this day loathes getting his hair cut.[43] To many of the GIs such as Duval, the imagery of Mario Savio's 'Bodies upon the gears speech' was particularly apt. In an age when the US Army began to be referred to as the 'Green Machine', the dissenting GIs saw themselves as putting 'their bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels…upon the levers, upon all the apparatus…to make it stop'.[44] To grow their hair was to throw a middle finger up to authority, challenge it to respond, and slow the gears of the machine.

It may have been a question of identity and obstruction for the GIs, but to the brass it was one of discipline. Those who refused to comply could be subjected to a non-judicial punishment under Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), with punishments ranging from a reduction in pay or rank, to 'arrest in quarters for not more than

---

[41] Bailey, Beth 'The U.S Army and "the Problem of Race": Afros, Race Consciousness, and Institutional Logic', *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 106, Issue 3, (December, 2019), p. 656.
[42] Article, 'Why Not Us?', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 4, 1 November 1970, p.8, GI Press.
[43] Oral History interview with Robert Duval.
[44] Savio, Mario: Sproul Hall Steps, 2 December 1964 [online]: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tcx9BJRadfw> [accessed 5 May 2020]; and Dalzell, Tom (ed.): *The Routledge Dictionary of Modern American Slang and Unconventional English* (Routledge, 2008) p.460.

30 consecutive days'.[45] A *P.E.A.C.E* article titled 'HAIR LIKE JESUS WORE IT' and written with the customary irony of the editors, revealed the enthusiasm which officers upheld these regulations. The week commencing 4 January 1971 was one which would 'live long in the memories of airmen at R.A.F Alconbury,' due to the brass 'roaming the confines of [the base] performing the vital task of checking haircuts'.[46] It was, though, an issue not easily suppressed – particularly when it came to race. In her work on 'The U.S Army and "the Problem of Race"', Bailey identified that 'More than one-fifth of [black] soldiers surveyed at Fort Carson, Colorado, in March 1970 listed haircuts as a top concern. Almost two-thirds put hair in the top four'.[47] The problem of hair stretched far and wide 'absorbing an enormous amount of military time and attention'.[48] This at a time when the crisis in the military was reaching epidemic proportions. By 1971 the desertion and AWOL rates were higher than at any point in the history of the US military, with '7 desertions, 17 AWOL cases, 2 disciplinary discharges, 12 complaints to Congressmen, and 18 non-judicial punishments in every group of 100 soldiers'. Meanwhile, as the air war increased in ferocity over Cambodia, the desertion rates in the USAF increased by 300% compared to 1968 levels.[49] Conscious the military had a wide-scale rebellion on its hands, military leaders such as Admiral Elmo Zumwalt began relaxing restrictions placed on servicemen in the hope of increasing recruitment and retention. Zumwalt's famed 'Z-grams' were issued in which he spoke of the importance of equal rights and opportunity. In his 57th such message, Zumwalt said that he would not 'countenance the rights or privileges of any officers or enlisted men being

---

[45] Subchapter III – Non-judicial punishment, 815. Art. 15, Commanding officer's nonjudicial punishment, Uniform Code of Military Justice, *Manual for Courts-Martial United States*, 1969 [online]:<https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/manual-1969.pdf> [accessed 20 April 2020].
[46] Article, 'HAIR LIKE JESUS WORE IT', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 7, 1 February 1971, p.4, GI Press
[47] Bailey, Beth 'The U.S Army and "the Problem of Race": Afros, Race Consciousness, and Institutional Logic', p. 647.
[48] Bailey, Beth 'The U.S Army and "the Problem of Race": Afros, Race Consciousness, and Institutional Logic', p. 641.
[49] Cortright, David: *Soldiers in Revolt*, p. 24.

abrogated in any way because they choose to grow sideburns or neatly trimmed beards or moustaches'.[50] The decision to allow an easing of restrictions lay ultimately with the Commanding Officer (CO) of each individual base or Navy vessel, however. Unfortunately for the servicemen in Britain, restrictions on facial hair and hair length remained strictly enforced up to and beyond the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam in 1973. So much so, that in early 1974 an airman from RAF Alconbury was court-martialled for refusing eight times to get his hair cut; a case which, as we shall see, gained huge popular support for the airman, and press attention from across the world.

A close analysis of *P.E.A.C.E* reveals widespread harassment of GIs and a litany of complaints regarding the actions of officers over servicemen's haircuts, their affiliation with PEACE, and anti-war beliefs. As the group grew in notoriety, so too did the accounts of harassment from the officers, military police or OSI. Conscious of the harassment, and aware that the OSI knew 'the name, rank, etc., of each member of P.E.A.C.E,' the editors of the paper included advice on how to act and what to say if the OSI apprehended you; what your rights as a GI were; and avenues of recourse under the UCMJ.[51] A key piece of advice included within its pages was that of filing an 'Article 138' (A.138). This little known and rarely used right of US military personnel under the UCMJ, was the right of complaint against a CO and was considered a 'powerful tool' to be used by rank-and-file members of the military if they felt they had been wronged.[52] This advice – and further words of warning such as 'keep your mouth shut', if called in by the OSI, and 'never believe the pigs', in reference to all military police or OSI officers – is revealing of the increasing distrust and

[50] 'Elimination of Demeaning or Abrasive Regulations,' Z-gram no. 57, 10 November 1970, in Berman, Larry: *Zumwalt: The Life and Times of Admiral Elmo Russell 'Bud' Zumwalt* (New York, 2012), p. 244-50.
[51] Article, 'A System of Fear', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 12 July 1971, p.6, GI Press.
[52] 'Do It Yourself 138', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 10, May 1971, p.3, GI Press.

resentment between servicemen and their superiors as the GI movement in Britain grew in size and scale.

Events such as concerts, film showings, and speeches were also organised by PEACE as a way to bring GIs together, to strengthen the movement, and to further offer advice to those being subjected to harassment. The group drew on its celebrity connections to host a couple of events where the folk singer Barbara Dane sang and Vanessa Redgrave spoke – with one concert attracting over a hundred airmen joining Dane in singing GI movement songs.[53] Of most help to GIs, though, was a special visit to Britain from one of the GI movements foremost legal advisors, Ken Cloke. Having spent much of the 1960s working as an organiser, activist and leader in the student, civil rights, and anti-draft movements, Cloke, began counselling GIs on their legal rights while working for the National Lawyers Guild in New York City. Here, he began 'collecting materials' which he turned into *The Military Counselling Manual*: a book 'to provide services to the GIs who were coming to the Lawyers Guild offices'.[54] Once again drawing on their celebrity connections, PEACE were able to secure Cloke's visit thanks to his relationship with Jane Fonda. Arriving in February 1971, the young lawyer stayed at Redgrave's house and was driven around the air bases by Ira Magaziner. Cloke recalled visiting 'five or six different bases…[speaking] about the UCMJ and various ways in which GIs could refuse conscientiously to go to Vietnam, [and] talked to them about the coffee house movement'.[55] Turnout varied between 10 and 40 servicemen at each event – a figure markedly different to that in the US where the number was in the hundreds. Cloke put this down to the fact 'a lot of the people were Air Force in England, and the Air Force was one of the safest places to be'.[56] Despite the lower turnout, Cloke was

[53] 'Barbara Dane in Concert', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 5, December, 1970, p.6, GI Press.
[54] Oral History interview with Ken Cloke, interview by author, MP3 digital recording via telephone, New York City, USA 16 January 2018.
[55] Oral History interview with Ken Cloke.
[56] Oral History interview with ken Cloke.

surprised by the level of anti-war activity on bases, suggesting there were 'hundreds potentially thousands…who were opposed to the war at this point [in Britain]'.

In May 1971, just a few weeks after Cloke's visit, a series of A.138s were filed by airmen based at RAF Lakenheath, home to the USAF 48th Fighter Wing. The A.138s were a prelude to what was to become a major political action of PEACE, and one David Cortright identified as 'the largest in the history of the Air Force movement'.[57] One of the men who had made the formal complaint, Jack Kleinfelder, had been 'quietly and politely' asking other airmen to sign a petition protesting the Vietnam War, when he was apprehended and '[illegally] kicked off the base.[58] The petition stated that the:

> undersigned members of the U.S Air Force and Navy, stationed in England [were] opposed to the American war in Indochina. Because Vietnamization is increasing the Air Force and Navy role in the war, it is more important than ever before that we voice our opposition.[59]

The signatures Kleinfelder had been collecting were to be added to further signatures gathered from US airbases in Britain, and, once compiled, taken to the US Embassy in Grosvenor Square. There is no record of whether the confiscated signatures were later re-collected, but collected or not, the petition including the names of over 1000 airmen calling for an end to the war was delivered to the embassy on 31 May 1971.[60] Much like the Stop-it Committee, Group 68 and the Union of American Exiles before them, PEACE chose a date of national American significance on which to hold their petition hand in. Celebrated on the last Monday of May every year, American Memorial Day honours and mourns the military personnel who have died in the United States Armed Forces. The message was clear: 'let us not add to the number we mourn'.

---

[57] Cortright, David: *Soldiers in Revolt*, p.128.
[58] Article, 'We've Got Them Running Scared', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 10, May, 1971, p.1, GI Press.
[59] 'PEACE petition supplement', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 10, May, 1971, GI Press.
[60] Article: 'US servicemen protest against the Vietnam War', *The Guardian*, 1 June 1971.

Travelling to London by bus from nine bases across Britain, over three hundred airmen from the USAF met at the pre-arranged meeting point at Speakers' Corner, Hyde Park before making their way down Park Lane and up to the square where the embassy stood. In an attempt to circumvent the law which prohibited servicemen from participating in demonstrations in foreign countries, the airmen had been provided with clear guidelines by the editors of *P.E.A.C.E*. The presentation was to be entirely legal so long as attendees were off duty, wore civilian clothes, and carried no placards with them. Further advice was issued such as not bringing 'dope,' adding 'So as long as we are clean and don't make any trouble there is nothing wrong coming to the presentation…[we are] just a group of G.I.s presenting a petition to the local representative of our Commander in Cheif (sic) and our Congressional representatives'.[61] It was also made clear on all documentation relating to the day's activities that what was taking place was a 'presentation' rather than a demonstration.[62]

Walking up to the front of the embassy in small groups, the airmen wearing white armbands emblazoned with the PEACE logo of a clenched fist over a military helmet, handed the petition to the embassy representative before returning to Hyde Park. Here they boarded busses and travelled to Victoria Park for 'entertainment and a rock concert' which had been organised by PEACE and promised a line-up of entertainers, writers, and cultural luminaries including Tony Curtis, Jane Fonda, Roald Dahl and Vanessa Redgrave.[63] During the concert, and in defiance of the 'narks' taking photos from side-lines, six GIs stood up and and read in turn from a statement delivered to US Ambassador Walter Annenberg which had accompanied the petition:

---

[61] 'PEACE petition supplement', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 10, May, 1971, GI Press.
[62] *Thomas S. Culver v. Secretary of the Air Force*, United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit: Argued 31 March 1976 [online]: <https://openjurist.org/559/f2d/622/culver-v-secretary-of-air-force> [accessed 17 April 2020]. Also see documentation in J. Askins Papers, box file MSS.189/V/2.5. 13 – 25, MRC.
[63] 'PEACE petition supplement', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 10, May, 1971, GI Press.

> Being active duty members of the US armed forces, we are more fully aware of military activities and the realities of war than most civilians. Many of us have been in Indochina. We know what American air power has done. We have witnessed mass destruction caused by indiscriminate bombing: the nauseating sight of bodies charred beyond recognition by napalm and phosphorous bombs; and the total destruction of crops and vegetation with defoliation chemicals…We tell the people of Indochina that we are there to preserve their right to self-determination and yet we prop up a military dictatorship which profits from the mass destruction.[64]

The event received widespread coverage in Britain's newspapers and television news, in addition to international attention including the *New York Times* which featured a story under the heading 'G.I Unit in Britain Assails Vietnam War'.[65] The day had been a success: it was peaceful, there were no arrests, the petition had been handed over, and the airmen had enjoyed a day out with their families. To those who took part, delivering the petition had been an honourable action and one which was exercised under the right to freedom of speech as enshrined in the first amendment of the Constitution. To the military, however, it was an action which violated the UCMJ and one which was punishable by court-martial.[66] Just three days after the petition had been delivered Tom Culver was arrested at his home in Cambridge. It was Culver who had advised on the legality of the petition, and it was Culver who was now to be made an example of.[67] Charged with 'violating [Air Force] Regulation

---

[64] Article, '1000 GIs Tell Nixon: Quit Vietnam', *Morning Star*, 1 June 1971; interview with Tom Culver.
[65] Article, 'GI Unit in Britain Assails Vietnam War', *New York Times*, 1 June 1971.
[66] Culver v. Secretary of the Air Force: Restriction of Servicemen's Individual Freedoms Abroad for Foreign Policy Reasons, *William. & Mary Law Review*, Vol. 19, Issue 1 (1977) [online]: <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr/vol19/ iss1/8> [accessed 17 April 2020].
[67] Pamphlet: 'Are you a free American citizen?', produced by PEACE in support of Tom Culver, June 1971, in J. Askins Papers MSS.189/V/2/4/1, MRC.

35-15 which prohibits demonstrations and soliciting signatures for illegal petitions', Culver was taken to RAF Lakenheath where he awaited his fate.

Captain Culver

The arrest of Culver sparked outrage from many within the British anti-war movement. Group 68 spoke of the action as 'transgress[ing] a basic American right as well as trying to stop a genuine GI movement against the criminal war in Vietnam'. They delivered fliers in London calling for supporters of the GIs to attend a meeting where they would be told how best to help the 'GI RESISTANCE', as well as urging both Britons and Americans to write to General Bell, Commander, Third Air Force in support of Culver.[68] Furthermore, Heinz Norden used his parliamentary connections to encourage Frank Allaun and a further 13 Labour MPs to write to General Bell.[69] The letter, sent just days after Culver's arrest, spoke of the great concern the MPs had regarding the arrest, stating they found 'certain aspects of [the] case highly disturbing', and asking for the opportunity to speak with him.[70] The letter received no response. The issue of Culver's arrest was raised once more during a meeting between Group 68 and American embassy's press attaché, Eugene Rosenfeld, the following week, also to little avail.[71] Meanwhile, believing the arrest to be a 'deliberate attempt to intimidate them,' Culver's friends from PEACE were swift to respond.[72] Within days of Culver's arrest, stickers stating 'Free Tom Culver' were 'everywhere you looked' on the base, while members also distributed leaflets calling for servicemen to support a 'Free Tom

---

[68] Leaflet, 'Group68/P.E.A.C.E', in file 'Captain Culver', TAM 122, Box 4, HN Papers; and 'Who Is Captain Culver?', in file 19.3 'The Uses of Treason: Assorted research materials, 1969 – 2007, CS Papers.
[69] Article, 'Culver: plea by Group 68', *Hampstead & Highgate Express*, 9 July 1971, p. 1.
[70] Letter, Frank Allaun to General Bell, July 5, 1971, in file 'Captain Culver, 1971', TAM 122, Box 4, HN Papers.
[71] Article, 'Protesters demand apology at US Embassy', *Hampstead & Highgate Express*, 11 June 1971.
[72] Article 'GIs rally to their antiwar captain', *Morning Star*, 7 June 1971.

Culver' petition.[73] The leaflet listed four ways in which people could help, including writing to their senator or congressman telling them of what was happening, and 'fil[ing] a 138 against the commander for being deprived of your legal counsel'.[74] The arrest generated significant press attention both sides of the Atlantic, with *Time Magazine* naming Culver 'Man of the Week', and many left-wing newspapers such as the *Guardian* and the *Morning Star* tacitly supportive of the young military lawyer.[75]

Representing himself at the RAF Lakenheath trial 'as far as [he] could', Culver was reported as saying prior to the proceedings 'I am not afraid of the consequences. They cannot stop what is happening here. If they arrest every one of us they will not stop our movement,' adding the authorities were 'foolish if they think they can stifle legitimate protest by making people prisoners'.[76] He was confident he would be acquitted, stating: 'A verdict of not guilty would mean that American servicemen all over the world – Vietnam, Thailand, Germany – will be joining in anti-war marches'.[77] Yet with the judge defining a demonstration as 'any gathering of three or more people to express a common purpose' (a view Culver believed 'an insane definition', considering three or more people could meet at a 'church service a football game…to express a common purpose') he had little chance of avoiding the inevitable. Unfortunately for Culver – and others in the US military who believed the first amendment applied to them – he was charged and convicted by an air force court-martial of 'conduct unbecoming of an officer and a gentleman' under Article 133 of the UCMJ, reprimanded, and ordered to pay the fine of $1000.[78]

---

[73] Tom Culver interview and article, 'US officer accused after demo', *The Guardian*, 10 June 1971.
[74] 'Are you a free American citizen?', in J. Askins Papers MSS.189/V/2/4/1, MRC.
[75] A collection of headlines includes 'Air Force Captain Against the War', *New York Times*, 9 June 1971; GIs rally to back their antiwar captain', *Morning Star*, 7 June 1971; 'Officer confined to base, but defiant', *The Guardian*, 7 June 1971; and Culver oral history interview.
[76] Article: 'Officer confined to base, but defiant', *The Guardian*, 7 June 1971; Culver interview.
[77] 'Article: 'GIs rally to back their antiwar captain', *Morning Star*, 7 June 1971.
[78] *Thomas S. Culver v. Secretary of the Air Force*, No. 75-1468, (argued 31 March 1976 – decided 10 January 1977) [online]: <https://openjurist.org/559/f2d/622/culver-v-secretary-of-air-force> [accessed 17 April 2020].

In Joseph Heller's satirical war novel *Catch-22*, a US Air Force colonel asks 'Didn't you whisper…that we couldn't punish you?' 'Oh no, sir,' the defendant replies, 'I whispered…that you couldn't find me guilty'. Interrupting, the colonel says, 'I may be stupid, but the distinction escapes me'. It is a standout moment in a classic work of fiction, yet its message is clear and irony all too real.[79] Like the defendant in the novel, many GIs believed they were being found guilty simply because they were accused. The various controversies surrounding the Vietnam War led to a number of court-martial and civil suits which revealed an antagonism between first amendment freedoms of speech and assembly and the military's need to control its servicemen. The view of the military operating as a separate community outside civilian constitutional freedoms was first recognised by the Supreme Court in 1953. In *Orloff v. Willoughby*, the court declared that 'the military constitutes a specialized community governed by a separate discipline from that of the civilian,' and that the government 'requires that the judiciary be as scrupulous not to interfere with legitimate Army matters as the Army must be scrupulous not to intervene in judicial matters'.[80] It was not until 1974, however, that the notion of separate legal spheres for civilians and the military became entrenched in legal thought. In 1968, Captain Howard Levy, was convicted of 'conduct unbecoming an officer' for telling the special forces men he was expected to train that they were 'liars and thieves and killers of peasants and murderers of women and children.[81] On trying and failing in 1974 to have is conviction overturned on the grounds it was 'unconstitutionally vague' during *Parker v. Levy*, the Supreme Court wrote:

---

[79] Heller, Joseph: *Catch-22* (Vintage Classics, 2004) p. 58.
[80] *Orloff v. Willouby*, 345 U.S. 83 (argued 13 January 1953 – decided 9 March 1953) [online]: <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/345/83/> [accessed 29 April 2020].
[81] Article, 'Political Dissent in the U.S Military', February, 2007, *ABC News* [online]: <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/story?id=2857017&page=1> [accessed 29 April 2020].

> While the members of the military are not excluded from the protection granted by the First Amendment, the different character of the military community and of the military mission requires a different application of those protections. The fundamental necessity for obedience, and the consequent necessity for imposition of discipline, may render permissible within the military that which would be constitutionally impermissible outside it.[82]

In *Culver v. Secretary of the Air Force*, 1976, Tom Culver similarly challenged his conviction on the grounds there had been 'vagueness and overbreadth' in the Air Force Regulation 35-15, 3e (3) (b) which prohibited Air Force personnel stationed abroad from participating in demonstrations. As in the earlier *Parker v. Levy* case, the court-martial was sustained.[83]

In the days and weeks following Culver's arrest and court-martial, debate over first amendment freedoms reached new heights among the British based GIs. In the June edition of *P.E.A.C.E* the editors spoke of how far the government had 'strayed from [the] ideals of democracy,' and that the constitution had 'proven inadequate to protect our rights'.[84] The following edition continued the debate, while also featuring a cartoon of Lady Justice shackled to a chair under guard. The caption read 'Keep her quiet…she's not relevant in this case!' It also carried a front page story on the Culver conviction and encouraged GIs to attend a concert on 1 August organised to support the convicted captain.[85] On the day of the concert, 100 members of PEACE, many wearing 'Floppy hats and dark glasses…to foil the telescopic lenses', delivered the group's final significant act of defiance against the USAF

---

[82] *Parker v. Levy*, No. 73-206 (argued 20 February 1974 – decided 19 June 1974) [online] <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/417/733.html> [accessed 2 May 2020].
[83] McAlinn, Gerald P., 'Culver v Secretary of the Air Force: Demonstrations, the Military, and the First Amendment', *Military Law Review*, Vol. 84, (Spring 1979), pp. 91 – 117.
[84] Article, 'Government of the people, by the people, and for the people', 1971 *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 11, June, 1971, p. 1, GI Press.
[85] Cartoon, *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 12, July, 1971, p. 8, GI Press.

and US government.[86] Once again, the GIs filed into Grosvenor Square, the site of so many demonstrations, speeches, and acts of theatre against the war in Vietnam, and delivered a further petition. It read:

> We, the following members of the U.S Air Force and Navy stationed in England, feel that we are being denied the rights guaranteed us in the constitution of the United States. We, by signing this petition, demand that the Uniform Code of Military Justice be amended to apply the same standards of Constitutional protection to servicemen as does apply to civilians.
>
> In particular we feel that ARF 35-15 jeopardizes our freedoms provided by the First Amendment. Further, the conviction of Captain Thomas S. Culver for violating this regulation necessitates immediate action to rescind this regulation and guarantee the Constitutional Rights of all U.S. Servicemen as American civilians.[87]

The GIs were under no illusion their petition alone would make a genuine difference – just as they had 'know[n] that no petition of airmen in England would cause the president to stop the war'.[88] At best they hoped their voices would combine with the many thousands of GIs stationed at home and across the world who felt disenfranchised, and that together they could force a change in military law. The action had rather more to do with the message it sent to the brass: that the court-martial and conviction of Culver had not frightened them; that they were not cowed by the threat of punishment, and were as confident as ever to raise dissenting voices.[89] Having handed the petition to a Marine Gunnery Sergeant, the GIs headed to the Royal Court Theatre, Sloan Square. They were pleased with their action, full of

---

[86] Letter, from Heinz Norden to Dave Mandel, in file 'Captain Culver, 1971', TAM 122, Box 4, HN Papers.
[87] Copy of petition in *Chicksands DITS*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 29 July GI Press.
[88] Article, 'Government of the people, by the people, and for the people', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 12, June, 1971, p. 1, GI Press.
[89] Meeting notes, Group 68, 19 September in file 'Captain Culver, 1971', TAM 122, Box 4, HN Papers.

anticipation of the planned PEACE concert, and oblivious to the disintegration of the GI movement in Britain which lay just months away.

***

Having briefly returned to the US 'to go through the process of leaving active duty,' Culver flew back to Britain where he became the American Civil Liberties Union's (ACLU) representative for 'all of Europe' defending GIs.[90] With his wealth of experience working as a Judge Advocate in the US, Vietnam and Britain, Culver was ideally placed to offer assistance to those in the UK who required his help. The relationships he formed with the 16 Judge Advocate Generals (JAG) working in Britain at the time, in addition to individuals in the anti-war movement, ensured he was able to make a living through court-martial defence, charging $350 for a special court-martial and $500 for a general. When JAGs had a 'troublesome client…or [a client] who said "I don't want a soldier representing me, I want someone independent"', they were referred to Culver who defended them.[91] Meanwhile, his friendship with Dennis Stuckenbroeker from SUPPORT provided a steady stream of GIs who had absconded from military bases. Recalling these cases, Culver said 'They deserted from all over. Some of them deserted from bases here in the UK, some from Germany and some had been to Sweden then come here because they couldn't speak Swedish'. Of these cases – 'a couple of dozen at the most' – not one ended in a court-martial. Instead, Culver negotiated with the military authorities who would invariably say 'if he'll come back we'll give him an honorable discharge, we'll give him a general discharge and send him back to the States' – most of whom appeared happy with this arrangement.

[90] Notice in *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol. 2, No. 1, August, 1971, p. 7; and oral history interview with Tom Culver
[91] Oral history interview with Tom Culver.

Cases ranged from assaults, drugs and then in 1976 the defence of Philip Agee in his deportation trial. None, however, garnered as much attention as the trial of a young GI who liked wearing his hair long. In late 1973, two years after PEACE ceased to operate effectively as a group, the case of Dan Pruitt became something of a *cause célèbre*. Pruitt, a sergeant in the USAF based at RAF Alconbury was arrested and charged with eight 'criminal specifications' arising from his refusal to have his hair cut. With the assistance of the London chapter of VVAW/WSO, a 'Dan Pruitt Support Committee' was soon established and leaflets featuring Pruitt with moustache and hair beneath his ears under the rhetorical heading 'Criminal?' began appearing on RAF bases across the country. On the leaflet's reverse, a letter written by Pruitt to GIs spoke of the 'human rights that we are constantly denied,' and the desire to have the 'same protected rights that are granted our civilian brothers and sisters by our constitution'.[92] As the leaflets were snapped up, signed and returned, the British media descended on the case encouraged by Fritz Efaw of VVAW/WSO. By the time of the court martial on 28 January 1974, Pruitt had appeared on British television news broadcasts, and his face adorned both national and regional newspapers across the country.[93] Underground newspapers across the world such as *Winter Soldier* and *Helping Hand* in the US, *Amex* in Canada, *Lutte Anti-Militariste* in Paris, and *Omega Press* in Japan were also covering the case. Meanwhile, over 800 signatures had been collected for the petition supporting Pruitt's stand, including 200 from the US, and letters of support from British citizens were 'pouring in from all over the country'.[94]

Despite attempts by the military brass to prevent supporters attending the trial by

---

[92] Leaflet, 'Criminal?', Dan Pruitt Support Committee, January 1974, GI Press.

[93] The coverage was widespread and continued beyond the court-martial. A selection of headlines includes: 'Slogans back long-haired U.S airman', *Liverpool Echo*, 25 January 1974, p. 5; 'Long-haired GI Fights Jail Threat', *Daily Mirror*, 26 January 1974, p. 9; 'Cutting Blow', *Belfast Telegraph*, 2 February 1974, p. 3; and 'Hard labour for "haircut" airman', *Newcastle Journal*, 29 January 1974, p. 2.

[94] Article, 'Sgt. Fights Hair Reg.', *Winter Soldier*, Vol 4, No. 3 (March, 1974), p. 6 GI Press.

'putting airmen on special duty and turning civilians away at the gates', over 100 'cheering supporters and newsmen greeted his arrival at the courtroom', with some having queued since 4am for seats in the spectator gallery.[95] Presiding judge, Major Robert Wright, allowed 18 of the supporters and newsmen into the court to witness Culver argue forcefully that the hair regulations were 'unconstitutional and abridged Dan's rights of self-expression'. He further insisted that the regulation for men constituted 'sexual discrimination' considering women worked in the same field, therefore the rule enforced a 'double standard of appearance' which violated section 30.1 of the UCMJ – an equal employment provision.[96] Appearance was not solely a question of gender, however. Much like Duval and others in the military who wished to grow their hair, Pruitt wished his appearance to blend with those of his generation with whom he shared ideals and beliefs – they were citizens first and soldiers a distant second. In his defence of Pruitt, Culver raised the concept of the citizen-soldier in a desperate attempt to convince the judge to acquit the airman. He conjured images of citizen-soldiers in previous American conflicts, and provided others including a picture of General Custer with long hair. The theatre failed to move the judge, and Pruitt was sentenced to 'four months' imprisonment and a dishonourable discharge'.

In 1971, Culver joined PEACE to allow his 'conscience free play…not in the sense we were going to do anything spectacular,' but to let people know 'there is a movement within [the military]'. Failure to successfully defend himself, Pruitt and others in the early 1970s did little to dampen his anti-war activism. He continued representing dissenting GIs such as Pruitt, he gave speeches and delivered talks on the GI movement, he maintained close bonds with Group 68 and the UAEB, and he persisted in organising anti-war events. It was evident, though, that by 1972 the fire had gone out of the civilian anti-war movement in

[95]Article, 'U.S Airman Court-Martialed On Haircut Reg.', *Amex-Canada*, Vol. 4, No. 6 (January/March, 1974), p. 28 GI Press.
[96] Article, 'U.S Airman Court-Martialed On Haircut Reg.', p. 28.

Britain; meanwhile the unsteady movement within the military was being crushed by the officers. An attempt had been made by Culver and others to hold an anti-war concert with the agitprop group 7:84 in 1973, but with little success. A truck with a stage and tent had been rented for the purpose, but as Culver recalled, when the brass caught wind of the plans they 'went bananas trying to suppress it…put notices up saying anyone who goes to this will be court-martialled'. Consequently, the event was 'the most embarrassing flop,' with only about 30 people attending, most of whom were civilians from Cambridge.[97] It is likely the officers were successful at dissuading anti-war GIs to attend; however, Culver saw a further reason behind the concert's failure. Ever since the May petition hand in, the brass had been discharging anti-war soldiers and returning them to the US. The concert failed, to Culver's mind at least, because there were almost no dissenting GIs left in Britain after the US Air Force's targeted cull.

Destruction by Discharge

There is little doubt that most, if not all, of those who joined PEACE were against the Vietnam War. Their motivations also lay in the founding principles of the ASU: a desire for a more humane military achieved through the rights of free political association, collective bargaining, and refusal to obey illegal orders. It is certainly possible, however, that interest in the group grew as GIs saw a route out of the military. Following the successful petition hand in and concert in May 1971, the brass set about issuing discharges – both general and honourable – to members of PEACE and those affiliated with it. Robert Duval viewed the discharges as 'creat[ing] some enthusiasm for [PEACE],' because 'people began realising it was a ticket out of the military'.[98] In this sense the activism of GIs in Britain reflected other

[97] Oral history interview with Tom Culver.
[98] Oral history interview with Robert Duval.

areas of the wider anti-war movement by shifting from a moral movement to a self-interested one. For years, American citizens had resisted the war out of an opposition to the draft – some because of its inherent unfairness, but others because they simply did not want to go to war.[99] The surge in group numbers soon tailed off during the summer of 1971, and by September of that year few members of PEACE remained, ardour had evaporated, and the movement had all but collapsed. As we shall see, the destruction of the movement in Britain was certainly caused in large part by the successful discharging of GIs, but, much like the Stop-it Committee and Group 68 before them, PEACE was built on the shaky foundations of disagreement, distrust and divergence. This, too, contributed to its eventual demise.

The historian Martin Klimke has written extensively on both civilian and military protest in Germany during the Vietnam War. In his landmark work, *The Other Alliance*, Klimke examines the transnational alliance between American and West German student movements during the 1960s and early 1970s, and the influence of the Black Power struggle on protest in West Germany. Following the Detroit riots in July 1967, which erupted among black residents following police aggression, the German SDS declared its support for Black Power at the 22nd national convention during September 4-8, 1967 in Frankfurt. As a means of 'overcoming merely rhetorical solidarity and support for black nationalism', however, the German SDS sought to forge alliances with the 'internal colony' abroad, namely the black American GIs stationed in West Germany.[100] The ultimate goal of the German SDS was the 'abolition of imperialism after the model of, and with the help of, the national liberation movements'. To achieve this it was clear to members of SDS that they could learn from the tactics and strategies of Black Power, while also engaging in 'GI-work and desertion

[99] For more on opposition to the war and self-interest see: Hall, Mitchell K: *Vietnam War: People and Perspectives* (ABC-CLIO, May, 2009), p.6; and Wasburn, Philo C, and Adkins Covert, Tawnya J: *Making Citizens: Political Socialization Research and Beyond* (Palgrave Macmillan, January 2017); and Card, David and Lemieux, Thomas, *'Going to College to Avoid the Draft: The Unintended Legacy of the Vietnam War'*, *American Economic Review*, 2001, Vol. 91 (2), pp. 97-102.
[100] Klimke: *The Other Alliance*, p.106.

campaigns all over Europe'.[101] Once a Black Panther Solidarity Committee was founded on 23 November 1969 'solidarity [between the SDS and Black Power] became institutionalized in West Germany'. On declaring the committee, the founders saw several aims, one of which was 'Agitation and propaganda among the GIs stationed in West Germany'.[102] The German context has been further elaborated by Maria Hohn, who has explained that by the late 1960s the morale of the 30,000 African-American GIs stationed in Germany had 'reached an unprecedented low point,' with many dealing with their anger and alienation through the foundation of 'dozens of militant black organizations…in military bases across West Germany'. [103] It was these GIs, Hohn demonstrates, that became the 'primary hope for radical German students,' who believed that by collaborating with them they could 'bring about revolutionary action to unseat the centers of American empire in both Germany and the US'.[104]

The central difference between the West German and British contexts was that the 22,000 GIs based in Britain were almost entirely from the Air Force, while the 200,000 GIs in Germany were in the Army. During the Vietnam War, the Air Force and the Navy became 'substantially white enclaves', whereas the Army and Marines were disproportionately black. Of the 7,262 black GIs who died during the war, 6,955 or 96% were Army or Marine enlisted men.[105] However, despite far fewer black GIs – both in total and proportionally –.based in Britain compared to Germany, there are hints that PEACE was similarly shaped by the Black Power movement. The archives only tell us so much, but it is clear that the tone of *P.E.A.C.E*

---

[101] Klimke: *The Other Alliance*, p. 107.
[102] Klimke: *The Other Alliance*, p. 112.
[103] Hohn, Maria, 'The Black Panther Solidarity Committee and the Trial of the Ramstein 2', in Davis, Belinda; Mausbach, Wilfried; Klimke, Martin; and MacDougall, Carla (Eds.): *Changing the World, Changing Oneself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the US in the 1960s and 1970s* (Berghahn Books, 2010).
[104] Hohn, Maria, 'The Black Panther Solidarity Committee and the Trial of the Ramstein 2', p.218
[105] Vietnam War Casualties by Race, Ethnicity and National Origin, [online]: https://www.americanwarlibrary.com/vietnam/vwc10.htm [accessed 25 June 2020].

was distinctly influenced by black rights from the outset. The first edition featured the famed Eldridge Cleaver quote 'If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem'. Also, under the heading 'DIG THIS' was written: 'Can you expect the black man to walk through the fields of Vietnam like a dragon. And then tiptoe through the streets of his homeland like a fairy…?'[106] In the second edition of the paper, a GI who signed his name 'Brother Jesse' wrote an article titled 'About Violence' which began with the hypophora 'many brothers and sisters ask, Why should the revolution be violent?' and proceeded to argue only violence would 'stop these mad capitalists who look on you and I as dollars and cents'.[107] Many of the gripes shared were also written by black GIs, with one in September 1970 complaining of 'white lifers get[ting] priority over black enlisted men'.[108] Meanwhile, the October edition featured an article on racism in the military. The addresses of organisations 'concerned about the problems of the black G.I' were also published, while the 'c' in America was often replaced with a 'k' in reference to the Ku Klux Klan and used to convey the notion the US was a place of racism and repression.

It is clear through oral history interviews, as well as the articles that appeared in *P.E.A.C.E*, that the principal architect of the paper's focus on black rights was Jerry Gutowski. In the fifth edition of *P.E.A.C.E* Gutowski wrote that the 'Real Enemies to the GI' being the 'racist Pigs who occupy the Pentagon'. Specifically, he was referring to the military policy of 'Go, Divide and Conquer' which he assured readers was also being used as a tool to keep black soldiers and white soldiers separated in order to limit the threat to military authority. To Gutowski, black and white soldiers 'must join forces and understand each other' in order to change the system and benefit all people 'not just a…few white racists'

[106] *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 1, August, 1970, GI Press.
[107] Article 'About Violence', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 2, September, 1970, p. 2, GI Press.
[108] Letter, *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 2, September, 1970, p. 7, GI Press.

who ran the country for 'their benefit'.[109]

Evidently, the focus on black rights rankled with certain members and supporters, and in the May 1971 edition the editors posted a response to those who believed PEACE had 'gone too far to the left,' and others who thought it too 'over-concerned with racial problems'. The editors stated that there was no editorial policy and that what was printed was 'what has been written, by those who have taken the trouble to write'. It continued 'So, if you think that it is too radical or too concerned with the Black Revolution that is because the radical and black revolutionary guys are the ones who have done something for the paper and you haven't'.[110] Considering the tone of the paper from its very inception, statements made directly by the editors, and later comments in oral history interviews, this rebuttal rings rather hollow. It is perhaps rather more reflective of the schism opening within the group between Jerry Gutowski and the likes of Robert Duval who attempted to chart a single-issue course.[111]

The issue of women's role in PEACE and a desire among some members to incorporate the feminist movement into the group's manifesto was also present – particularly in later editions of the paper. In the February 1971 edition, the editors included a section titled 'WHAT IS A WIFE TO DO?' which focused on the practical ways in which women could help the movement, such as demonstrate and 'distribute literature or…anything which doesn't violate English law'. Reassuring the wives that they should not worry about their husbands 'being "hauled over the coals" because you speak your mind', as they would not be 'liable for [the wives] wrongs'.[112] Meanwhile, in the following issue a letter was published from a woman working for PEACE which spoke of 'rumblings of discontent' among the wives of GIs and women who worked for PEACE. Headed 'MALE CHAUVINISM IN THE

[109]Article, 'Who the Real Enemy is', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 5, December, 1970, p. 4, GI Press.
[110] Non-Manifesto, *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 10, May, 1971, p. 2, GI Press.
[111] Oral history interview with Robert Duval.
[112] Article, 'WHAT IS A WIFE TO DO?', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 7, February, 1971, p. 6, GI Press.

P.E.A.C.E MOVEMENT', the author continued by saying women felt 'peripheral' to the movement and 'convenient when required for babysitting, typing, distributing (mainly it seems the former so that men can go to meetings), but not for anything "important" like decision making'. The letter also spoke of the stupidity of alienating 'potential enthusiasts because of sexist attitudes,' stating that women were the most oppressed group in the world, and reminding the editors the women's liberation movement in the US 'started mainly because women felt discriminated against in left-wing organisations'.[113]

The frustrations felt by the women of PEACE echoed the earlier anger of Meredith Tax and Linda Gordon in the Stop-it Committee, who felt increasingly marginalized, relegated as they were to typing and the distribution of leaflets. By the early 1970s, though, the burgeoning feminist movement was impossible to ignore. The horrifying verbal abuse suffered by Marilyn Saltzman Webb being perhaps the most 'infamous eruption of New Left contempt for feminists' during an anti-war protest in January 1969.[114] Occupying one of only two slots for women speakers during the protest, Webb rose to speak about child care, abortion and the mistreatment in the movement by men. Barely had she begun speaking when boos erupted from the audience, and 'people were yelling, 'Take her off the stage and Fuck her!...Fuck her down a dark alley.'[115]

Perhaps mindful of this incident and others like it, the editors of PEACE featured a contrite editorial response, acknowledging the group had 'many hang-ups in relating to women as equals,' and urged female members to speak up if they felt discriminated against so they could 'see your oppression'. It also stated the women's struggle could not be 'divorced from other liberation movements. To do so makes the word "LIBERATION" stand

[113] Letter, *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 8, March, 1971, p. 8, GI Press.
[114] Orleck, Annelise: *Rethinking American Women's Activism* (Routledge, 2014), p. 112.
[115] Orleck, Annelise, p. 112.

for something less than freedom which we wish for all people'.[116]

Despite acknowledging their shortcomings, not all members of PEACE were enthusiastic about incorporating the women's struggle – or black rights for that matter – as part of their protest. Robert Duval spoke of how the PEACE movement began 'expand[ing] the social context,' with coverage increasingly being devoted to 'feminist issues and African Americans in the military'. Although 'very sympathetic' to other causes, Duval wanted to focus on 'enhance[ing] the quality of what we're doing so that we can get our message across in a more effective way'.[117] Although impossible to say definitively how much the wrangling over causes contributed to the group's eventual demise, it certainly did not help. What is certain, however, is that having a group divided made it much easier for the brass to conquer.

In their decision to begin discharging GIs from the Air Force in order to destroy the anti-war movement, the American military in Britain were following a tried and tested method. In his seminal work on GI dissent during the war, Richard Moser identified that by 1972 'the military began large-scale systematic repression of activists,' with 'the first wave of [Navy] discharges alone targeted three thousand service people for "mutual benefit" discharges'.[118] Meanwhile, James R. Hayes wrote that while the military's 'inexperience with political resistance did lead them to err and overreact…they did learn from their mistakes,' and in the years following 1969 made 'greater use of administrative discharges'.[119] Following Tom Culver's court-martial, the brass were quick to identify those involved with PEACE and began discharge proceedings against them. The final edition of *P.E.A.C.E* revealed that 'As soon as someone becomes active [in the anti-war movement] he is threatened with a discharge,' and that they were 'being used wholesale in an attempt to crush the P.E.A.C.E

[116] Editorial response, *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol.1, No. 8, March, 1971, p. 9, GI Press.
[117] Oral history interview with Robert Duval.
[118] Moser, p. 101.
[119] Hayes, James R., 'The War Within a War: Dissent in the Vietnam-Rea Military,' *Vietnam Generation*, Vol. 2, No 1, Article 3 (1990), p. 16. Available at: <http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/vietnamgeneration/vol2/iss1/3.> [accessed 20 August 2020]

movement'. The article continued by stating regulations had been 'amended to provide for political discharges,' in cases where a GI is 'disruptive of morale'. In this instance, the discharge could only be considered 'Honorable', meaning the GI would suffer no loss of veteran benefits. The editorial also emphasised that the discharges levied had 'sapped the strength of PEACE,' reducing the number of active members by 90%, 'but even more damaging than the loss of the people is that others feel frightened of the discharge so don't participate'.[120]

Recalling the discharges some fifty years later, Culver commented 'they hustled them out of the service, but…they had to give them honourable discharges because there was no basis [for a punitive discharge] as they hadn't done anything wrong'; adding, they were 'very successful' at getting rid of those dissenting GIs'.[121] Meanwhile, Duval remembered that they 'discharged 39 people of the 40 people who were involved in [PEACE], the only one they didn't discharge from the military was me,' as 'to the Navy it was an Air Force problem. The Navy ignored me.'[122]

With such a great loss of members there was no hope for PEACE – consequently, the September edition of *P.E.A.C.E* would be the group's last. An attempt was made to reinvigorate the movement in 1974 but with little success. Writing in the UAEB/VVAW paper *The American Exile* in May 1973, the group's leader, Fritz Efaw, spoke of the Air Force 'shipp[ing] home hundreds of airmen [in 1971], reckoning to decimate the movement…But the brass didn't, and couldn't, change the basic conditions that gave rise to PEACE, and today GIs in England are organizing once again'.[123] He continued by saying a group of airmen had met in February to produce the first copy of a new underground paper,

[120] Article 'Discharges', *P.E.A.C.E*, Vol. II, No. 2, September, 1971, p. 3, GI Press.
[121] Oral history interview with Tom Culver.
[122] Oral history interview with Robert Duval.
[123] *The American Exile*, Vol. 2, No. 5, April/May, 1973.

Stripes and Stars, and that despite its 'modest effort' it was enough to 'frighten the brass'. The paper produced six editions between February and November 1973, averaging 4 pages and written in much the same vein as *P.E.A.C.E*. Gripes were shared, democratisation of the military was demanded, and advice was offered. It is clear through interviews with Fritz Efaw and Tom Culver, however, that beyond the paper and the small coterie of supporters, the GI movement in Britain did not exist. The only exception being the trial of Dan Pruitt – an event which sparked considerable interest, then died as quickly as it had risen.

Conclusion

Having grown from within the US Army in 1967, the GI movement finally infiltrated the Air Force and Navy in 1970. With the increased withdrawal of ground troops, combined with a dramatic escalation of bombing raids and a widening of the war into Cambodia, many airmen and Navy personnel began to openly revolt. Britain, with its nine US air bases and 22,000 airmen, played a significant role in this development of the movement. With the assistance of celebrities such as Jane Fonda and American student activists at British universities, the PEACE group and its eponymous publication reached all US bases in Britain by the end of 1970. Drawing much of its inspiration from the ASU, PEACE encouraged disobedience among the ranks, it published seditious material, protested the war, offered legal assistance to GIs, challenged the authority of the brass, and worked alongside the British American groups UAEB and Group 68 in an effort to bring the war to a close.

The GI movement which emerged in Britain shared many characteristics of the wider movement. It not only developed through a collaboration with civilian anti-war activists, as it had in America, it was also influenced by, and attempted to collaborate with, the Black Power movement. Despite the military landscape being markedly different to that of Germany, the activism in Britain bore the hallmarks of Black Power through the group's

symbols and language. It was also, consequently, bedevilled by the factionalism and in-fighting which plagued the wider GI and anti-Vietnam War groups. Moreover, PEACE contended with the emerging feminist movement and made efforts to incorporate women in a more meaningful capacity.

Despite its brief life, PEACE achieved a significant amount. It organised the largest ever GI protest in British history, its publication reached thousands of GIs across the country, and it was central to the global debate of GI rights and freedom of speech. For all its strengths, however, the group stood little chance when confronted by the weaknesses it faced. Weakened by its factionalism and, to a degree, the self-interested nature of later members, PEACE was easily dismantled by the brass; its members discharged and returned to the US. Although there were a few, such as Tom Culver and Fritz Efaw, who championed a resurgence in 1973, it failed to gain traction. With the war all but over, there was, after all, no need for such a movement to exist

Epilogue

TO this day, Theodore Roszak's vast aluminium eagle looms ominously over Grosvenor Square; its perch, however, has altered. No longer does it stare down from America's London embassy, but a scaffolding clad luxury hotel in the making. With security concerns mounting following the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001, the embassy was relocated to a more secure site south of the river in Nine Elms. All that remains of the American presence in this leafy west London enclave is a collection of memorials to heroes of the state, and the memories of those who celebrated, commemorated and protested its actions.

As war raged across Southeast Asia during the 1960s and 70s, Americans in Britain, horrified by their country's military aggression, were drawn to Grosvenor Square. At times they joined tens of thousands of Britons in demonstrating against the war, but often they came alone. The modern, brutalist embassy building became a focal point of their frustrations, exasperation and anger. Draft cards were brought by students and discarded or burnt, names of the American dead were read out by protesters, petitions were delivered, meetings held, and tapes of the Winter Soldier investigation played. From the early days of the war right up to the signing of the Paris Peace Accords in 1973, this corner of Mayfair, popularly referred to as 'Little America', witnessed actions which mirrored those across the Atlantic and around the world.

The anti-war Americans who lived in Britain during the period were broad in age but rather narrower in socio-economic background. As well as being almost exclusively Caucasian, they were middle-class, well educated and politically liberal to left leaning. Their roots lay in the north-eastern US around Boston and New York City, but a few came from California, Chicago and elsewhere. These Americans travelled to Britain for a wide variety of

reasons. Many came to continue their academic studies, some to pursue careers, a few to avoid the draft, others because they were in the military, while there were also those who absconded from military bases in Europe. All, however, were united in their despair of the American government and the violent war it was waging in Southeast Asia. From 1965 up to the end of the war, these Americans were members of expatriate groups fiercely opposed to their country's actions. Formed in 1967 by students at the LSE, the Stop-it Committee was the first such organisation. Although it emerged from the crucible of student political ferment of 1960s Britain, Stop-it was built on the foundations of the civil rights and student movements erupting in America's streets and on college campuses. Many group members came from American universities busy making a name for themselves as sites of protest and political unrest, such as Amherst, Berkeley, Harvard and Columbia. Consequently, some within the LSE's hierarchy considered the likes of American students David Slaney and Danny Coleman to be 'outside agitators' intent on inciting British LSE students to protest – a view the group founders were all too happy to agree with. The protests which had begun as a result of the LSE's appointment of Dr Walter Adams, a man seen by many to have done little to oppose apartheid while principal of the College of Rhodesia, were, in the eyes of some Americans influenced heavily by them. To Slaney and others, the British protesting scene was 'moribund…old left', and they were determined to transplant forms of activism common to the New Left in the US, such as agitprop and Angry Arts.[1]

Over the following 18-month period, Stop-it would engage in many actions which typified the protest scene back home in the US, revealing itself to be a group deeply embedded with transnational protest of the time. So called 'guerrilla theatre' events were staged to raise the profile of the group, attract press attention and build their membership. Meanwhile the publication of a pamphlet titled *Vietnam, the United States and Britain*, and

[1] Oral history interview with David Slaney, interview by author, Boston, 29 July 2016.

produced to expose Britain's complicity in the war drew direct influence from similar publications produced at Columbia and Harvard. Stop-it also organised speaking tours of individuals such as Norman Fruchter, a man who had collaborated with Stuart Hall on the *New Left Review* and was an early member of SDS – where he had worked as an editor for their publication *Studies on the Left*. With his wealth of experience working as a 'channel' between draft resister groups in Europe and the SDS's National Secretary Steve Halliwell, Fruchter characterised this age of transnational cooperation and protest. The network he and Stop-it were a part of spanned the world, sharing ideas and tactics and drawing inspiration from one another. Stop-it also shared other characteristics with many of these global groups – not all so conducive to successful organising. Questions over the group's direction and how best to achieve their aims persisted from its inception. Foremost among these disagreements was whether or not they should channel their energy into the single issue of draft resistance, or whether they should broaden their mandate to include British governmental support for the war. Compounding Stop-it's difficulties was the intrinsic lack of structure common to New Left groups of the time, and a frustration among female members that their role was merely supportive, tasked as they were with typing and answering the phone. Despite the relative success of their so called 'March Project', which included the production of the British complicity pamphlet, Stop-it eventually split in the autumn of 1968.

In its short life Stop-it collaborated with British groups such as the British Campaign for Peace in Vietnam and the Vietnam Solidarity Committee, while also forging connections with the Paris American Committee to Stop the War. It also inspired other Americans young and old to form further groups which drew on the rich legacy of protest Stop-it left in its wake. Leading the charge to form a further American group was Harry Pincus, a young draft resister who had played a central role in both the formation and disintegration of Stop-it. Intelligent, enthusiastic, charming, and deeply troubled, Pincus gathered together other draft

resisters in Britain to form the Union of American Exiles. Choosing to live in exile rather than risk returning to the US and being drafted, members of the UAEB dedicated themselves between 1969 and 1973 to assisting draft resisters and military deserters. Forming close relationships with a collection of British politicians such as Fenner Brockway and Paul Rose, as well as influential individuals in the British peace movement, the arts and academia, the UAEB catapulted itself to the forefront of American anti-war activity in Britain.

An early aim of the UAEB, and one which was to dominate its activity for a year and a half, was to have the *Visiting Forces Act 1952* amended to allow deserting GIs to remain in Britain. Although the bill failed to pass, with the vote going 95 to 54 against, it served as a testament to the Americans' commitment to their cause, the influence they wielded, and their considerable ability to organise effectively. During the campaign, the UAEB generated enormous support for the bill from the spheres of politics, trade unions, students and churches, many of whom took part in an organised lobby of the House of Lords in November 1970. The organisational acumen displayed by Pincus, Frank Aller and others of the UAEB was also used to assist the hundred or so military deserters living in Britain, and others who were either passing through or drawn to London from the continent. Setting himself up as stationmaster on the underground railroad, Pincus provided a safe haven for these deserters at 56, Queen Anne Street in Marylebone. Over the following years, dozens of absconders would pass through the doors of this safe house and into heart of American underground existence in Britain. With Pincus increasingly erratic and ever more dependent on drugs, Clancy Sigal took over as stationmaster, and through his trips to France and Sweden and meetings with other stationmasters in Europe, Sigal helped develop strong ties with the wider movement assisting deserters.

Although the American anti-war landscape in Britain was dominated by a young, largely student based crowd, Sigal and Group 68 revealed it was not exclusively so. Heinz

Norden's group, which included Sigal as a member, worked alongside the UAEB and PEACE but their own activism reflected modes of protest associated with the Old Left rather than the New. Group 68 shied away from the theatrics and occasionally illegal methods of the other American groups, preferring to develop strong bonds with individuals from British political, public and religious spheres, while also working alongside the BCPV in peaceful, legal, protest. The Vietnam Vigil typified this approach. This year-long demonstration, the brainchild of one determined American woman and funded in part by Group 68, took place in Grosvenor Square opposite the American embassy on every day the embassy was open. Most certainly one of the longest continuous protests at any time, or anywhere, in the world, the Vigil shows that not only did the anti-war movement in Britain continue into the 1970s, but that it did so with gusto and consistency, driven largely by the coterie of American citizens in the country.

With the war winding down, Group 68 and the UAEB joined with dozens of anti-war groups in North America and Europe in turning their attention to the issue of unconditional Amnesty. Through connections forged with the VVAW, UAEB formed the first European chapter of the American group which was at the forefront of the fight, while Group 68 declared solidarity with the National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty. The cross-national bonds these groups developed, the synchronised protests which occurred simultaneously with those in the US, and the trips made by the UAEB's Fritz Efaw to Europe and Canada to meet with other exile groups, further reveal the transnational protest they were a part of.

For the most part the American anti-war activity in Britain was civilian based. However, with 22,000 members of the USAF operating from bases across the country it was only a matter of time before members of the military began organising. Familiar with the American anti-war movement in Britain through her connections with the UAEB, and heavily

influenced by her friend Jane Fonda, Vanessa Redgrave became further involved with the Americans by helping to found and fund the GI PEACE group. Drawing considerable inspiration from the American Servicemen's Union, PEACE became one of the most successful groups of the GI movement within the USAF. Shaped very much by the British context, it emerged later than movements in Germany where there was a large concentration of the US Army. With the air war increasing over Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, the movement in Britain reflected the wider movement developing within the USAF across the world. Despite its belated appearance, it shared many of the elements which characterised the movement in Germany and elsewhere: underground newspapers were produced and distributed, ties with the civilian movement were formed, it encouraged disobedience among the ranks, protested against the war, and organised petitions.

It is difficult to ascertain exactly what Harold Wilson and the government thought of the American anti-Vietnam War movement in Britain, or how much they were influenced by it. Judging by the government's reaction to the British movement, however, it is doubtful the impact was particularly significant. Wilson's biography says little on the anti-war protesters beyond his encounter with a 'yelling mob of demonstrators' who attacked the car he and his wife were travelling in following a visit to Cambridge in 1967.[2] Meanwhile the wider historiography provides little more illumination. Where the picture is clearer, however, is on how Wilson and the Labour government were influenced by the Labour Party as a whole, and those anti-war MPs from the Parliamentary Labour Party (PLP) who kept up steady pressure on the government from the backbenches, encouraged by British and American civilians alike. The historian Rhiannon Vickers stated that despite the rejection of Wilson's foreign and defence policies on Vietnam at annual party conferences between 1966 – 68, he felt no compulsion to act. This was made clear during the 1968 conference when Wilson said 'we

[2] Wilson, Harold: *The Labour Government: 1964 – 1970, A Personal Record* (Penguin, 1971), p. 567.

accept [the resolutions] as a warning. A warning, not an instruction'.[3] In regards to the PLP, Sylvia Ellis wrote of Wilson being 'well able to handle [his] backbench revolt'.[4] If the views of the wider Labour Party and backbench dissenters, of which there were at least a hundred, failed to shape government policy, it is unsurprising the anti-Vietnam War movement achieved little by way of influence. This is not to say the government was entirely free from concern, however. Through recently uncovered Special Branch files it is clear there was a fear in British security circles that America was unwittingly exporting the civil unrest erupting across the US. In the introduction of Special Branch report dated November 24, 1967 the following was stated:

> The rise in anti-Government demonstrations in the United States, which has been a feature of the past year, has been echoed by increasing activity by Americans in this country. As directed, enquiries have been made to review the extent of this activity.
>
> The three main spheres in which Americans have become involved are:
>
> (1) The 'Peace' and 'Vietnam' Movements
>
> (2) 'Black Power'
>
> (3) 'The Underground'
>
> (In addition, there is evidence that they are becoming involved in more specifically British organisations.)[5]

The report ended by suggesting that there was an 'increasing militancy among Americans in London over an expanding field of activity…and it must be anticipated that this pattern will

---

[3] Vickers, Rhiannon, 'Harold Wilson, the British Labour Party, and the War in Vietnam', *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Spring, 2008), p. 59.
[4] Ellis, Sylvia, 'British Opposition to the Vietnam War, 1964 – 68', in *The Insular Dream: Obsession and Resistance* (Vu University Press, 1995), pp. 166 – 182.
[5] Special Branch file, November 24, 1967, p. 1, HO file: 325/104, NA.

continue'.[6] As will be explored below, the fear of one country exporting civil unrest to the other was not a concern held by the British alone.

***

The activities of the anti-war groups analysed in this thesis and the ties they formed with the British anti-Vietnam War movement reveal not only an element of the movement thus far largely untold, but one which alters our perception of the British movement as a whole. Although dominated by the student and political Left, it was also one which included draft resisting Americans, professional expatriate citizens from the US, and members of the US military stationed at USAF bases across the country. The important role these Americans played in the British movement echoed the peace and GI movements back in the US and was part of a phenomenon which gave the global sixties its character. They were part of a transnational age of cooperation and protest which spanned the world, sharing ideas, tactics and strategy through underground newspapers, travel and speaking tours. Whether residing temporarily in the country as students and members of the armed forces, or permanently for work, these individuals brought a distinctively American character to the British anti-war scene, and in so doing helped introduce forms and modes of protest – such as Angry Arts – to British shores which were eye-catching, innovative and energetic. Influence did not just flow one way, however. Many members of these groups were affected enormously by their time in Britain, and carried back to the US organisational and tactical approaches to activism which they implemented in the anti-war, union, and burgeoning women's movements. Above all, these Americans were shaped by the New Left in Britain – a New Left which differed considerably from that which had emerged in the US during the same period.

There is a growing historiography on the New Left in both Britain and America which provides nuanced accounts of the distinctions between 'Old' and 'New' Lefts, the sociology

[6] Special Branch file, 24 November 1967, p. 10, HO file: 325/104, NA.

of the various groups, and the activism they were involved in through the late 1950s and 1960s. Notable among these works is Madeleine Davis' article which addresses the British New Left's attempt to 'mobilize a working-class constituency for its ideas and positions between 1956 and 1968'. Davis identifies that the younger, student cohort around the *Universities and Left Review* (*ULR*) were, from the mid-1950s 'committed to the primacy of working-class agency', and concludes by suggesting New Left efforts in Britain 'to propagandize and organize among working-class constituencies were more serious and persistent than is usually recognized'.[7] This clearly resonated with the Americans of Stop-it who were used to the American New Left and the views of C. Wright Mills. In his 'Letter to the New Left', the radical sociologist questioned New Left writers who 'cl[ung] so mightily to "the working class" of the advanced capitalist societies as the historic agency, or even as the most important agency'. To Mills, the 'labour metaphysic' was a 'legacy from Victorian Marxism that is now quite unrealistic'.[8] Although originally published in the British *New Left Review*, the 'letter' only gained traction in the US when it was published the following year in 1961 in the American New Left journal *Studies on the Left*. It proved enormously influential, particularly with the American SDS, who reprinted it in pamphlet form. At the height of the American student movement, an attempt was made by some members of SDS to orientate the group around the rank-and-file struggles of US workers during the annual SDS convention in August 1966. The convention drew delegates from across the country to Clear Lake, Iowa where they set about considering the group's future direction. A heated debate ensued regarding their role in labour struggles, but the position paper titled 'Toward the Working Class' lost out to the prominent SDS leader Carl Davidson's proposal 'for a new

[7] Davis, Madeleine, '"Among the Ordinary People": New Left involvement in Working-Class Political Mobilization 1956–68', *History Workshop Journal* Vol. 86 (26 July 2018) p. 138 and p. 155.
[8] C. Wright Mills, 'Letter to the New Left,' *New Left Review*, no. 5 (Sept. – Oct. 1960), p 22.

student syndicalist movement that emphasized SDS's focus primarily on the campuses'.[9] With such divergent views between the American and British variants, it is no wonder the Americans in Britain were surprised by what they discovered in New Left circles in London, Oxford and Cambridge. George Bernard Shaw's comment that the countries were 'divided by a common language' rang true.

In his recent PhD thesis, Joshua Cochran identifies a significant concern among American authorities that Americans returning from abroad could pose problems to civil order; that the social and political context they were exposed to abroad could infect American society. Cochran reveals that CIA reports at the time 'reflect[ed] the long-standing assumption that the longer US citizens remained overseas, the more susceptible the citizens were to "corrupting" influences,' showing an evident fear that Americans would return as a 'fifth column'.[10] The concern was not without good foundation. Many of the young members of Stop-it returned to the US and continued their organising and activism, very much influenced by their time in Britain.

Core members of Stop-it, Linda Gordon and Meredith Tax found their time in the group remarkably informative and enlightening. Tax remembered that from the outset 'most of the…organising work was done by girls…we kept the communication going, we raised the money, we built the mailing list while the guys were out protesting and posturing'.[11] Undeterred by the male dominated, chauvinistic and occasionally toxic atmosphere of Stop-it, Tax recalled Gordon would 'argue as much as the boys' and became an 'important example' of how to stand up as a woman in a male dominated organisation. On returning to the US, the women became founding members of the Boston based socialist feminist group Bread and

---

[9] Allen, Joe, 'Between Students and Workers', *Jacobin*, March 2017 [online]: <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/03/students-democratic-society-antiwar-vietnam-workers-unions-kim-moody> [accessed 10 July 2020].
[10] Cochran, Joshua D., PhD thesis, '*Beyond the Water's Edge*', p. 115.
[11] Oral history interview with Meredith Tax, interview by author, New York, 5 April 2017.

Roses. Emerging as an offshoot of second wave feminism, socialist feminism maintained there was a 'fundamental interconnection between women's struggle and what is traditionally conceived as class struggle', and argued that women were unable to be free as a consequence of being financially dependent on men.[12] For socialist feminists the only route to liberation was through working to end both the economic and cultural sources of women's oppression, and it was to this end Bread and Roses began working in September 1969. With an activist core of over a hundred white, middle-class, college-educated women, the group is said to have 'inspired and shaped the consciousness of hundreds of women activists [of the late 1960s and 1970s] and, indirectly, of generations to follow'.[13] To a significant extent the activism Bread and Roses engaged in, and the influence it enjoyed, developed out of the socio-cultural milieu of the post-war British Left, particularly that of the International Socialists (IS). Having worked for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and been an active member of the American New Left during the mid-1960s, Linda Gordon arrived in Britain surprised to find a New Left with working-class rather than civil-rights roots. Shaped by her experiences in Britain and relationship with individuals in IS Gordon spoke of how they:

> influenced my thinking in Bread and Roses…and this affected what Bread and Roses did enormously [such as] an organised strike of restaurant workers, waitresses. So we were more than the other women's movements very very oriented toward working women who were not

[12] Ehrenreich, Barbara, 'What Is Socialist Feminism?' [online]: <www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/CWLUArchive/socialfem.html.> [accessed 20 July 2020]. For more on socialist feminism see Gordon, Linda 'Socialist Feminism: The Legacy of the "Second Wave"', New Labor Forum, 22(3), 2013, pp. 20 – 28.

[13] Ewing, Tess 'Bread and Roses', paper presented as part of 'A Revolutionary Movement: Women's Liberation in the late 1960s and early 1970s,' a conference organised by the Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies Program at Boston University, March 27-29, 2014 [online] <https://www.bu.edu/wgs/files/2013/10/Ewing-Bread-and-Roses.pdf> [accessed 20 July 2020].

> privileged or not professionals…we did educational projects in high schools in working class neighbourhoods[14]

Due in part to the intrinsic lack of structure which characterised many New Left groups of the time, Bread and Roses ceased operating in January, 1971 'after an informal set of meetings (dubbed 'crumbs and petals') could not reconcile differences'.[15] However, one of the group's largest projects which involved the organising of female clerical workers went on to become the 'pre-union' Nine to Five – an organisation the American sociologist Ruth Milkman has called one of the 'most successful [organisations] devoted to advancing the specific interest of women workers within the labor movement'.[16] Like much of what Bread and Roses organised, the founding of Nine to Five was – in Gordon's telling at least – 'enormously' influenced by both her and Tax's British experience.

Although perhaps not as influential in directing the course of later American groups, the British left was fundamental in shaping the politics and activism of other members of Stop-it. Recalling his time at the LSE during the height of the student movement, Danny Coleman recently spoke of how impressed he had been by Ralph Miliband's seminars, finding the Marxist academic to be someone who 'never waivered…never got confused by momentary events. There was a steadiness [to him]'.[17] The American also socialised with notable members of the International Socialists at the LSE, such as Steve Jeffries, Laurie Flynn, and Joan Smith. Sitting in London pubs discussing left politics and activism with the young British socialists, Coleman found it 'extraordinary' to be 'living in a country that had

---

[14] Linda Gordon, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Manhattan, New York City, 4 April 2017.
[15] Antler, Joyce: *Jewish Radical Feminism: Voices from the Women's Liberation Movement* (New York University Press, 2018), p. 121.
[16] Milkman, Ruth 'Labor Movement', in Mankiller Pearl, Wilma et al (eds.): *The Readers Companion to US Women's History* (Houghton Mifflin, 1999), p. 301.
[17] Oral History interview with Danny Coleman, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Brooklyn, New York City, 5 April 2017.

an actual organised working class tradition…in a way which that just did not exist [in the US]'. A moment which typified the difference between the American and British left for Coleman, occurred while he walked home from a strike held at the LSE in March 1967:

> Everyone participating in the strike wore a yellow daffodil, and I was walking down…Holloway Road…and two guys in London Transport uniforms…walked up to me and said "You at the LSE mate? Keep up the struggle it's all the same struggle", that would never happen here [in the US]. Ever. In a million years.[18]

In the US Coleman believed the working class viewed students as 'not being part of the world they're in', yet in Britain he experienced the opposite. He was not alone in this perception. Stop-it members, Bob Brenner, Henry and Shelley Wortis, Dave Slaney, and David Holmstrom were all surprised to find a Left in Britain markedly different from what they had experienced in the US. Wortis spoke of the New Left in America having 'no meaningful connection with the American working class, zilch zilch,' whereas in Britain he found the connection 'real and palpable'.[19] Slaney spoke of the British Left as having ' much better connections with the working class than we ever did [in the US]'.[20] While Brenner identified the left in Britain as:

> something that had no equivalent in the US which was a really dynamic labor movement, people building rank and file labor organisations…there was a very good connection between people who were in the university…and the labor movement…the SWP, IMG.[21]

---

[18] Oral history interview with Danny Coleman.
[19] Oral history Henry Wortis, interview by author, Boston, Mass., 29 July 2016.
[20] Oral history interview with David Slaney, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Boston, Mass., 29 July 2016.
[21] Oral history interview with Robert Brenner, interview by author, MP3 digital recording, Los Angeles, 10 April 2017.

Brenner continued by saying that on returning to the US, 'many of us [Stop-it members] began to orient to labor', stating that for him personally the experience of the New Left in Britain was 'absolutely critical' on his later organising in the US. He added:

> what was attractive to these Americans [in Stop-it] when we came back we also kind of followed a trajectory that was sort of like in Britain but behind that of Britain…we felt rightly or wrongly…we had to send people into labor to organise…we thought the only way the movement could go forward, the peace movement, the student movement, was to connect with the working class…so we found ways to organise rank and file workers.[22]

In 1970 he helped form *Picket Line*, a newspaper dedicated to the rights of steel, auto, and rubber workers in the Los Angeles area, and delivered it to the workers at factories. Similarly, in addition to setting up an anti-war group on returning to the US, Coleman picketed General Motors – something he said he would not have 'set aside other kinds of organising [for] had [he] not been in England and seen that the working class…can be an organised entity'. Meanwhile, Slaney began working as a welder in a Boston factory and entered the union leadership. He remained in the industry for 35 years, and stated that this was 'partly I think [influenced by] all my involvement with the Trotskyist left at the LSE'.[23]

Not all the Americans in Britain were as influenced by their experience as these members of Stop-it, but many went on to successful – and in some cases very high profile – careers back in the US. Danny Schechter, a founding member of Stop-it, returned to the US where he founded the Africa Research Group (which also included Stop-it members Linda Gordon and Igor Webb) – an organisation concerned with 'exposing and fighting American

[22] Oral history interview with Robert Brenner.
[23] Oral history interview with David Slaney.

imperialist penetration of Africa'.[24] Jean Kilbourne of Stop-it became a filmmaker and activist and is today recognised internationally for her work on the image of women in advertising and her critical studies of alcohol and tobacco advertising. Her documentary series, *Killing Us Softly*, is regularly used in schools and universities to inform students of gender stereotypes and the effect of advertising on women's self-image. Clancy Sigal of Group 68 also worked in film, co-writing the screenplay for the Oscar winning 2002 movie *Frida*, while continuing to work variously as a journalist, academic at UCLA, and successful author up until his death in 2017. Meanwhile, Ira Magaziner of PEACE returned to the US and entered politics. He served as Bill Clinton's senior advisor for policy development during the president's administration, and is currently the CEO of Clinton's Health Access Initiative. The post-Britain trajectory of Fritz Efaw of the UAEB/VVAW, however, was perhaps the most dramatic of them all.

A man at the very heart of American anti-war activism in Britain during his seven years as an exile in the country, Efaw was also dedicated to the needs and rights of the exile community up to and beyond the war's end. As previously explored, Efaw's commitment to the young Americans who sought his help extended to fighting tirelessly for amnesty – a fight which would ultimately lead to president Carter's 'Proclamation 4483' granting pardons for violations of the Selective Service Act. With characteristic courage and tenacity, Efaw decided early in 1976 he would risk arrest by returning to the US and run as a delegate at the Democratic National Convention. Not with a view of obtaining office, but with an eye on broadcasting the amnesty issue to a broad audience of policy makers. His London friends in CAA and the UAEB/VVAW were only too happy to help. To generate support from Democrats Abroad, Efaw posted a list of registered Democrats living in London, along with

[24] Africa Research Group (Danny Schechter collection) archive, held at Mitchigan State University Archive. Catalogue online at: https://africanactivist.msu.edu/organization.php?name=Africa+Research+Group.

their telephone numbers, to those who supported his campaign. In a covering letter he thanked the recipients in advance for phoning the individuals, and stated the main purpose was to 'draw attention to my name on the ballot', but also to 'allay any fears among people who are thinking about voting for me, but aren't sure because they don't know much about me…I'm not a freaky radical, but someone who is running out of principle'.[25] In a memo to potential members of the group, CCA declared their support for Efaw, stating that although they were not affiliated with the Democratic Party they 'wholeheartedly support Fritz Efaw because he is campaigning on the issue of universal and unconditional amnesty for war resisters – a cause which has our unqualified support'.[26] Meanwhile, in a letter to amnesty supporters, the National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty (NCUUA) wrote that 'Fritz [Efaw] has decided to run as a delegate to the National Democratic Convention which is to be held in New York City in July, 1976'. It continued, 'NCUUA supports Fritz in his campaign and [we] hope you can help Fritz get elected as a delegate , and enable us to bring the issue of universal unconditional amnesty to the attention of the American public at the time of the National Democratic Convention'.[27]

On 1 April 1976, Efaw testified at the platform hearings – held to decide on issues which should be included in the Democratic National Platform – of Democrats Abroad in London. Concerned his long hair and beard would alienate the crowd, he shaved, got his hair cut and bought a tie on Bond Street. He explained, 'These people's sons look like hippies…I've got to look like they'd like their sons to look'.[28] At the hearing he spoke of the

---

[25] Letter, Fritz Efaw to 'Betty, Gloria, Blaine, etc.' in file 'Other Organizations UAEB/VVAW', Box 4, HN Papers.
[26] Memo, 'Who are CONCERNED AMERICANS ABROAD?, in file 'Concerned Americans Abroad', Box 3, HN Papers.
[27] Letter, NCUUA to 'Amnesty Supporter', 30 March 1976, GI Press Collection, Wisconsin Historical Society.
[28] Katz, Donald. R, '1976 Presidential Election: Draft Dodger and the Democrats – Fritz Efaw's unconventional campaign for the Vice-Presidency', Rolling Stone, 26 August 1976 [online]: <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/1976-presidential-election-draft-dodger-and-the-democrats-57595/ > [accessed 15 August 2020].

effects of the Vietnam War on American society, and then proceeded to concentrate on the issue of amnesty for three broad groups: war resisters, Vietnam Veterans, and GIs. The NCUUA reported his testimony as 'well prepared and extremely well received'.[29] Two months later, on 8 June, the primary results confirmed that out of 39 names on the ballot Efaw had 'tied for the third alternate spot on a nine-person delegation'.[30] After seven years living as an exile, Efaw boarded a plane for home.

On returning to the US, the fear of arrest never far from his thoughts, Efaw was met by members of his family, supporters of amnesty, and a pack of reporters and photographers – one of whom, Donald Katz, shadowed him for the following week for *Rolling Stone* magazine. Within days of his arrival, Efaw's name had been put down for nomination of the vice-presidency of the United States – an idea originally suggested by Professor Ronald Dworkin, an Oxford don who specialised in jurisprudence and a fellow member of the Democrats Abroad delegation. The following day Efaw stood at the podium and delivered a speech which spoke of the war, explaining that deserters were 'often people who simply didn't know that the war was wrong until they got to Vietnam'. He added that many were poor, uneducated and black and that many with bad discharges would be unable to find jobs. He ended his speech by saying:

> I am proud to come to this convention to represent war resisters. The risk involved was certainly worth taking. I respectfully decline this nomination for the vice-president of the United States. I seek no office and no further recognition.[31]

[29] Article, 'NCUUA Amnesty Update', No. 8, Spring 1976, p.12, in GI Press, Wisconsin Historical Society.
[30] Katz, Donald. R, '1976 Presidential Election: Draft Dodger and the Democrats – Fritz Efaw's unconventional campaign for the Vice-Presidency', Rolling Stone.
[31] Katz, Donald. R, '1976 Presidential Election: Draft Dodger and the Democrats – Fritz Efaw's unconventional campaign for the Vice-Presidency', Rolling Stone.

It is impossible to know how influential Efaw's speech was on the decision to ultimately grant the amnesty he sought. What is almost certain, however, is that without the relentless campaign he and the NCUUA waged, it would have taken many more years before hundreds of thousands of young Americans could be free from the fear of arrest.

This thesis has revealed that from the early years of the Vietnam War up to and beyond the end of the conflict, Americans in Britain drew together to form groups in opposition to the conflict. Like most expatriates, they were drawn together through their national ties. In a foreign country they found comfort in their fellow countrymen and women, and would meet, socialise and celebrate together. It was the commonality of purpose, their shared horror of the war in Vietnam, and a desire to protest their country's actions which bound them so tightly, though. Of course, these Americans could have joined British groups such as the BCPV or VSC to voice their opposition, but to do so would water their message down. To march as a contingent under their own banner spoke louder, they believed.

With a patriotic sense of responsibility, the Americans in Britain worked hard – some of them tirelessly so – in opposition to the war and in support of those affected by it. They formed strong relationships with many British activists, politicians, celebrities and religious leaders in order to further their cause. Through this support they were able to help many hundreds of Americans find work and housing at a time of particular hardship. The support they generated, and the bonds they formed, were far from confined to British shores, however. From the early days of American activism in Britain, right up to the end of the war, the Americans forged enduring relationships with Vietnamese citizens, peace campaigners and anti-war groups across the world. In this sense, the American anti-war activists in Britain were very much part of the global sixties. A period defined by the ease with which the young post-war generation were able to travel across borders carrying their ideas, motivations, and

political beliefs, and a time when the world of protest became enmeshed, ideas and experiences exchanged, tactics and strategies borrowed, and histories appropriated.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Archival material – Holland

International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam

Brünn-Harris-Watts Collection

War Resisters International Archives

Archival material – United Kingdom

BBC Written Archives, Reading

BBC TV news, 8.40pm and 10.30pm, 22nd October, 1967 in microfilm role October 1967.

BBC TV news, 10.30pm, 22nd October, 1967 in microfilm role October 1967.

BBC TV news, 1.45pm, 23rd October, 1967 in microfilm role October 1967.

BBC TV newsflash, 6.25pm, 17th March 1968 in microfilm role March 1968.

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Council for Democratic Alternatives, Papers

British Library of Political and Economic Science, London School of Economics

Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament Collection

Resistance Inside the Army Notes

Churchill College, Cambridge

Fenner Brockway Papers

Hull History Centre, Hull

Amicia Young Papers

Anne Kerr Papers

National Council for Civil Liberty Archives

Modern Records Centre, Warwick

Chris Arthur Papers

Jack Askins Papers

Lawrence Daly Papers

National Archive, Kew

Home Office Papers

People's History Museum, Manchester

Communist Party of Great Britain Archives

Archival material – United States

Amherst College Archives and Special Collections, Amherst

Marshall Bloom Papers

Harry Ransom Center, Austin

Clancy Sigal Papers

Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamiment Library, New York

Heinz Norden Papers

Interviews

Beier, Lee – interview with the author, New York City, 17 January 2018.

Brenner, Bob – interview with the author, Los Angeles, 10 April 2017.

Cloke, Ken – interview with the author, New York City, 16 January 2018.

Coleman, Danny – interview with the author, New York City, 5 April 2017.

Culver, Tom – interview with the author, Cambridge 3 January 2018.

Duval, Robert – interview with the author, Morgantown West Virginia, 9 January 2018.

Efaw, Fritz – interview with the author, New York City, 17 April 2017.

Freer, Jeane – interview with the author, via telephone, 13 November 2018.

Fruchter, Norman – interview with the author, Portland, Maine, 30 June 2016.

Gordon, Linda – interview with the author, New York City, 4 April 2017.

Griswold, Deirdre – interview with the author, Poughkeepsie, New York, 26 June 2016.

Holmstrom, David – interview with the author, Boston, Massachusetts, 28 July 2016.

Kennedy, Jocelyn – interview with the author, via telephone, 1 October 2018.

Kilbourne, Jean – interview with the author, Boston, Massachusetts, 13 January 2018.

Slaney, David – interview with the author, Boston, Massachusetts, 29 July 2016.

Stauder, Jack – interview with the author, New Bedford, Massachusetts, 8 April 2017.

Stukenbroeker, Dennis – interview with the author, Oxford, 6 January 2018.

Tax, Meredith – interview with the author, New York City, 5 April 2017.

Warshaw, Jack – interview with the author, Hedley, Hampshire, 18 July, 2018.

Webb, Igor – interview with the author, Long Island, New York, 27 July 2016.

Wortis, Henry – interview with the author, Boston, Massachusetts, 29 July 2016.

Wortis, Shelley – interview with the author, Boston, Massachusetts, 29 July 2016.

Newspapers and periodicals

Belfast telegraph

Chicksands D.I.T.S

Daily Mirror

Daily Telegraph

Evening Standard

Hampstead & Highgate Express

Independent

Independent on Sunday

International Herald Tribune

Liverpool Echo

Newcastle Journal

New York Times

P.E.A.C.E

Stripes and Stars

The American Exile in Britain

The American Exile

The Times

The Morning Star

Traveller

Winter Soldier

Online sources

Albert L. Colloms HUAC testimony, in *Hearings Before the Committee on Un-American Activities*, House of Representatives, Eighty-Fourth Congress, Second Session, p. 6198 [online]: <https://archive.org/details/1956HUACCommunistPoliticalSubversion/page/n65> [accessed 7 March 2019].

Amnesty Campaign Begins, Winter Soldier, Vol. 3, No. 5 July 1973 [online]: <http://www.vvaw.org/veteran/article/?id=1436&hilite=Amnesty> [accessed 22 January 2019].

Barry Romo addressing students at Antioch College in 1973 can be found online:<https://www.wyso.org/post/how-model-soldier-becomes-vietnam-protester-barry-romo-story-part-i-ii> [accessed 14 January 2019].

CIA file [online]: <https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP80R01720R000700090029-1.pdf> [accessed 22 January 2019].

Final declaration of the Geneva Accords, 1954 [online]: <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/1954-geneva-indochina.asp> [accessed 8 October 2020].

Gerry Condon interview, [online]: <http://www.innatenonviolence.org/readings/2011_11.shtml > [accessed 23 December 2018].

Hansard, United States Forces (Deserters), Vol. 805, 5 November 1970 [online]: <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1970-11-05/debates/ced7c3f2-7362-4003-85ce-e01070121426/UnitedStatesForces(Deserters)> [accessed September 28 2018].

'How Fritz Efaw was nominated to be Vice President', *The Ledger*, Wednesday 11 August 1976 [online]: <http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1346&dat=19760811&id=XlZNAAAAIBAJ&sjid=vfoDAAAAIBAJ&pg=7032,2927809 > [accessed 5 September 2018].

Interview with activist Max Watts [online]:
<http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/marxism/2005w31/msg00075.html> [accessed 30 April 2020].

John Kerry speaking before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 22 April 1971 [online]: <www.lib.berkeley.edu/videodir/pacificaviet/kerry.pdf> [accessed 5 September 2018].

Letter from Bill Clinton to ROTC officer, Col. Holmes, University of Arkansas [online]: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/clinton/etc/draftletter.html> [accessed 4 May 2018].

NCUUA Statemment of Purpose, published in the NCUUA Amnesty Update, issue no. 1, April 1974 [online]: <http://content.wisconsinhistory.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15932coll8/id/25090/rec/1> [accessed 9 September 2019].

Obituary, William G. Smith; Lawyer for Draft resisters, Veterans, in the los Angeles times, August 4, 1999 [online]:< http://articles.latimes.com/1999/aug/04/news/mn-62550 > [accessed 12 December 2018].

Obituary, 'Larry Adler: Mouth organ virtuoso', August, 2001, BBC [online]: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/198252.stm> [accessed 7 March 2019].

Organised lobby of the House of Lords, press photo and explanation' [online]: <http://store.historicimages.com/products/ksb18449> [accessed 8 May 2018].

Orloff v. Willouby, 345 U.S. 83 (argued 13 January 1953 – decided 9 March 1953) [online]: <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/345/83/> [accessed 29 April 2020].

Uniform Code of Military Justice, *Manual for Courts-Martial United States*, 1969 [online]:<https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/manual-1969.pdf> [accessed 20 April 2020].

Section 13 of the Visiting Forces Act, 1952 [online]: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6and1Eliz2/15-16/67/contents> [accessed 5 May 2018].

Overseas Citizens Voting Rights Act.: <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/94/hr3211> [accessed 22 March 2019].

Parker v. Levy, No. 73-206 (argued 20 February 1974 – decided 19 June 1974) [online] <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/417/733.html> [accessed 2 May 2020].

Savio, Mario: Sproul Hall Steps, 2 December 1964 [online]: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tcx9BJRadfw> [accessed 5 May 2020].

Special Branch report dated 16 October 1968 [online]: <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2494420-16th-oct-1968-weekly-report-on-preparations-for.html > [accessed 25 May 2017].

Special Branch report 'Vietnam Solidarity Campaign "Autumn Offensive"', 9 October 1968 [online]:< http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487404-10th-sep-1968-sb-report-on-vietnam-solidarity.html > [accessed 29 May 2017].

'The McCarthy Era Kept Him Away', *St Louis Post-Dispatch*, January 23, 1985, p. 64 [online]: <https://www.newspapers.com/newspage/140931321/> [accessed 7 March 2019].

Thomas S. Culver v. Secretary of the Air Force, United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit: Argued 31 March 1976 [online]: <https://openjurist.org/559/f2d/622/culver-v-secretary-of-air-force> [accessed 17 April 2020].

Thomas S. Culver v. Secretary of the Air Force, No. 75-1468, (argued 31 March 1976 – decided 10 January 1977) [online]: <https://openjurist.org/559/f2d/622/culver-v-secretary-of-air-force> [accessed 17 April 2020].

Vietnam War Casualties by Race, Ethnicity and National Origin, [online]: https://www.americanwarlibrary.com/vietnam/vwc10.htm [accessed 25 June 2020].

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

- Agee, Philip: *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*, (Farrar Straus & Giroux, July, 1975).
- Ali, Tariq: *Street Fighting Years: An Autobiography of the Sixties* (Verso, 2005).

- Antler, Joyce: *Jewish Radical Feminism: Voices from the Women's Liberation Movement* (New York University Press, 2018).
- Appy, Christian G.: *Working Class War* (University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
- Belinda Davis, Wilfred Mausbach, Martin Klimke, and Carla MacDougall (eds.) *Changing the World, Changing Onseself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the US in the 1960s and 1970s*, (Berghahn Books, 2010).
- Berman, Larry: *Zumwalt: The Life and Times of Admiral Elmo Russell 'Bud' Zumwalt* (New York, 2012).
- Blackstone, Tessa and Gales, Kathlenn: *Students in Conflict: LSE in 1967* (London, 1970).
- Buhle, Paul and McGilligan Patrick: *Tender Comrades – A Backstory of the Hollywood Blacklist* (St Martin's Press, 1997).
- Carter, April: *Peace Movements: International Protest and World Politics Since 1945* (Longman 1992).
- Caute, David: *Sixty-Eight: The Year of the Barricades* (Hamish Hamilton, 1988).
- Cooper, David (ed.): *The Dialectics of Liberation* (Verso May, 2015).
- Cortright, David: *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance during the Vietnam War* (Haymarket Books, 2005).
- DeGroot, Gerard: The 60s *Unplugged: A Kaleidoscopic History of a Disorderly Decade* (Macmillan, 2008).
- See Dmytryk, Edward*: A Memoir of the Hollywood Ten* (Southern Illinois Press, 2003).
- Falk, Andrew: *Upstaging the Cold War – American Dissent and Cultural Diplomacy, 1940 – 1960* (University of Massachusetts Press, 2011).

- Foley, Michael: *Confronting the War Machine – Draft Resistance During the Vietnam War* (University North Carolina Press, 2003).
- Fraser, Ronald: *1968: A Student Generation in Revolt* (Chatto and Windus, 1988).
- Gitlin, Todd: *The Whole World is Watching – Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left* (University of California Press, 2003).
- Hagen, John: *Northern Passage – American Vietnam War Resisters in Canada* (Harvard University Press, 2001).
- Hall, Mitchell K: *Vietnam War: People and Perspectives* (ABC-CLIO, May, 2009).
- Hall, Simon: *Rethinking the American Anti-War Movement* (Routledge, 2012).
- Heller, Joseph: *Catch-22* (Vintage Classics, 2004).
- Hoch, Paul and Schoenbach, Vic: *The Natives are Restless – A Report on Student Power in Action* (Sheed and Ward, 1969).
- Hughes, Celia: *Young Lives on the Left – Sixties Activism and the Liberation of the Self* (Manchester University Press, March 2015).
- Hunt, Andrew E.: *The Turning – A History of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War* (New York University Press, 2001).
- Jeffreys-Jones, Rhodri: *In Spies We Trust: The Story of Western Intelligence* (Oxford University Press, August 2013).
- Kassimeris, George: *Europe's Last Red Terrorists: The Revolutionary Organization 17 November* (New York University Press, December, 2001).
- Kelley, Robin D. G, and Tuck, Stephen G. N, eds.: *The other special relationship: race, right, and riots in Britain and the United States* (Palgrave, 2015).
- Kenny, Michael: *The First New Left – British Intellectuals after Stalin* (Lawrence and Wishart, 1995).

- Lewes, James: *Protest and Survive – Underground GI Newspapers during the Vietnam War*, (Praeger, 2003).
- Lewis, Penny: *Hardhats, Hippies, and Hawks: The Vietnam Antiwar Movement as Myth and Memory* (Cornell University Press, 2013).
- Malchow, H.L. *Special Relations: The Americanization of Britain?* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011).
- Matthews, Wade: *The New Left – National Identity and the Break-up of Britain* (Haymarket, 2013).
- Moser, Richard: *The New Winter Soldiers* (Rutgers University Press, 1996).
- Nehring, Holger: *Politics of Security – British and West German Protest Movements and the Early Cold War, 1945 – 1970* (Oxford University Press, 2013).
- Orleck, Annelise: *Rethinking American Women's Activism* (Routledge, 2014).
- Perrin, Dick: *GI Resister: The Story of How One American Soldier and His Family Fought the War in Vietnam* (Trafford Publishing, 2001).
- Prime, Rebecca: *Hollywood Exiles in Europe: The Blacklist and Cold War Film Culture* - new Directions in International Studies – (Rutgers University Press, January 2014).
- Rudd, Mark: *My Life with SDS and the Weathermen Underground* (Harper Collins, 2009).
- Sevy, Grace: *The American Experience in Vietnam – A Reader* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).
- Sigal, Clancy: *A Woman of Uncertain Character – The Amorous and Radical Adventures of My Mother Jennie – Who Always Wanted to Be a respectable Jewish Mom* – (Da Capo Press, 2007).
- Sigal, Clancy: *Going Away – A report, A Memoir* (Caroll & Graf Publishers, 1984).

- Squires, Jessica: *Building Sanctuary – The Movement to Support Vietnam War Resisters in Canada, 1965 – 73* (University of British Columbia Press, 2013).
- Stapp, Andy: *Up Against the Brass* (Simon and Schuster, 1970).
- Sweet, Matthew*: Operation Chaos: The Vietnam Deserters Who Fought the CIA, the Brainwashers, and Themselves* (Henry holt and Co. 2018).
- Taylor, Richard and Young, Nigel (eds): Campaigns for Peace: British Peace Movements in the Twentieth Century (Manchester University Press 1987).
- Tucker, Spencer C. (ed.): *The Encyclopaedia of the Vietnam War – A Political, Social & Military History* (Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Turse, Nick: *Kill Anything That Moves* (Picador, December, 2013).
- Uglo, Jennifer S. (ed.): *The Northeastern Dictionary of Women's Biography* (Northeastern University Press, 1999).
- Wasburn, Philo C, and Adkins Covert, Tawnya J: *Making Citizens: Political Socialization Research and Beyond* (Palgrave Macmillan, January 2017).
- Westheider, James E.: *Fighting on Two Fronts* (New York University Press).
- Widgery, David (ed.): *The Left in Britain, 1956 – 68* (Penguin Books, 1977).
- Wilson, Harold: *The Labour Government: 1964 – 1970, A Personal Record* (Penguin, 1971).

Articles

- Angelo, Anne-Marie, 'The Black Panthers in London, 1967-1972: A Diasporic Struggle Navigates the Black Atlantic', *Radical History Review*, Issue 103 (Winter 2009), pp. 17-35.
- August, Andrew, 'Gender and 1960s Youth Culture: The Rolling Stones and the New Woman', *Contemporary British History*, 23:1, (2009), pp. 79-100.

- Bailey, Beth 'The U.S Army and "the Problem of Race": Afros, Race Consciousness, and Institutional Logic', *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 106, Issue 3, (December, 2019), p. 656.
- Brown, Timothy S., '"1968" East and West: Divided Germany as a Case Study in Transnational History', *American Historical Review*, Vol. 114, No. 2 (February 2009), pp. 69-95.
- Bunce, R. E. R, 'Obi B. Egbuna, C. L. R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain: Black Radicalism in Britain 1967-72', *Twentieth Century British History*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (November 2011), pp. 391-414.
- Burgin, Say, 'Understanding Anti-war Activism as a Gendering Activity: A Look at the U.S.'s Anti-Vietnam War Movement', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, Vol. 13, Issue 6 (Dec, 2012), pp 18-31.
- Card, David and Lemieux, Thomas, *'Going to College to Avoid the Draft: The Unintended Legacy of the Vietnam War'*, *American Economic Review*, 2001, Vol. 91 (2), pp. 97-102.
- C.A Bayly, and others, 'AHR Conversations on Transnational History', *American Historical Review*, Vol. 111, No. 5 (December 2006), pp. 1441-1464.
- Clavin, Patricia, 'Defining Transnationalism', *Contemporary European History*, Vo. 14, Issue 4 (November 2005), pp. 421-439.
- Clemons, Michael L. and Jones, Charles E., 'Global Solidarity: The Black Panther Party in the International Arena', *New Political Science*, Vol. 21, Issue 2 (1999), pp. 177-203.
- Crossley, Nick, 'R.D Laing and the British Anti-Psychiatry Movement: A Socio-Historical Analysis', *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 47, No. 7 (1998), pp. 877-889.

- C. Wright Mills, 'Letter to the New Left,' *New Left Review*, no. 5 (Sept. – Oct. 1960), p 22.
- Davis, John & Warring, Anette, 'Living Utopia: Communal Living in Denmark and Britain', *Cultural and Social History*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 513-530.
- Davis, Madeleine, '"Among the Ordinary People": New Left involvement in Working-Class Political Mobilization 1956–68', *History Workshop Journal*, Vol. 86 (26 July 2018).
- Edmonds, A. O, 'The Viet Nam War and the British Student Left: A Study in Political Symbolism', *Viet Nam Generation* 5, 1 – 4 (March, 1994).
- Ellis, Sylvia, 'Promoting Solidarity at Home and Abroad: the goals and tactics of the anti-Vietnam War Movement in Britain', *European Review of History*, 21:4, (2014), pp. 557-576.
- Geary, Daniel, "Becoming International Again": C. Wright Mills and the Emergence of a Global New Left, 1956 – 1962', *The Journal of American History*, (December 2008), pp. 710-736.
- Glazov, Jamie, 'The Life and Work of David Horowitz', *National Review*, Nov. 10, 2015.
- Hayes, James R., 'The War Within a War: Dissent in the Vietnam-Rea Military,' *Vietnam Generation*, Vol. 2, No 1, Article 3 (1990), p. 16.
- Hughes, Celia, 'Young Socialist Men in 1960s Britain: Subjectivity and Sociability', *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 73, (February, 2012), pp. 170-192.
- Iriye, Akira, 'The Internationalization of American History', *American Historical Review*, Vol. 94, Issue 1 (February 1989), pp. 1-10.
- Ivan Jobs, Richard, 'Youth Movements: Travel, Protest, and Europe in 1968', *American Historical Review*, Vol. 114, No. 2 (February 2009), p. 376.

- Jurma, William E., 'Moderate Movement Leadership and the Vietnam Moratorium Committee', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68 (1982), p. 263.
- Marwick, Arthur, 'The Cultural Revolution of the Long Sixties: Voices of Reaction, Protest, and Permeation', *The International History Review*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (December, 2005), pp. 780-806.
- McAlinn, Gerald P., 'Culver v Secretary of the Air Force: Demonstrations, the Military, and the First Amendment', *Military Law Review*, Vol. 84, (Spring 1979).
- Mammone, Andrea, 'The Transnational Reaction to 1968: Neo-Fascist Fronts and Political Cultures in France and Italy', *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 17, Issue 2 (May 2008), p. 213.
- Man, Simeon, 'Radicalizing Currents: The GI Movement in the Third World', in *The Rising Tide of Color*, ed. by Jung, Moon-Ho (University of Washington Press, 2014), pp. 266-295.
- Marwick, Arthur, 'The Cultural Revolution of the Long Sixties: Voices of Reaction, Protest, and Permeation', *The International History Review*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (December, 2005), pp. 780-806.
- Maxwell, Donald W.: '"These Are the Things You Gain if You Make Our Country Your Country": US – Vietnam War Draft Resisters And Military Deserters And The Meaning Of Citizenship In North America In The 1970s', in *Peace & Change*, Vol. 40, No. 4, October 2015, p. 447.
- McGerr, Michael, 'The Price of the "New Transnational History"', *American Historical Review*, Vol. 96, No. 4 (October 1991), pp. 1056-1067.
- Mistry, Kaeten, 'A Transnational Protest against the National Security State: Whistle-Blowing, Philip Agee, and Networks of Dissent', Journal of American History, Vol. 106, Issue 2 (September 2019), pp 362-389.

- Myers, Frank E., 'Civil Disobedience and Organizational Change: The British Committee of 100', *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 86, No. 1 (March 1971), pp. 92-112.
- Myers, Frank E., 'Dilemmas in the British Peace Movement since World War II', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 10, No. 1/2 (1973), pp. 81-90.
- Nehring, Holger, 'The British and West German Protests against Nuclear Weapons and the Cultures of the Cold War, 1957–64*, Contemporary British History*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (January 2007), pp. 223-241.
- Phythian, Mark, 'CND's Cold War', *Contemporary British History*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (2001), pp. 133-156.
- Schechter, Danny: *News Dissector* (Akashic Books, June 2001).
- Steck, Henry J, 'The Re-Emergence of Ideological Politics in Great Britain: The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament', *The Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (March 1965), pp. 87-103.
- Thelan, David in 'The Nation and Beyond', *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 86 (December, 1999), p. 956.
- Thomas, Nick, 'Challenging the Myths of the 1960s: The Case of Student Protest in Britain', in *Twentieth Century History*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 2002, p. 289.
- Thomas, Nick, 'Protests Against the Vietnam War in 1960s Britain: The Relationship Between Protesters and the Press', *Contemporary British History*, 22:3.
- Tyrell, Ian, 'American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History', *American Historical Review*, Vol. 96, No. 4 (October 1991), pp. 1031-1055.
- Tyrell, Ian, 'Making Nations/Making States: American Historians in the Context of Empire', *Journal of American History*, Vol. 86, No. 3 (December 1999), pp. 1015-1044.

- Tyrell, Ian, 'Ian Tyrell Responds', *American Historical Review*, Vol. 96, No. 4 (October, 1991), pp. 1068-1072.
- Tyrell, Ian, 'Reflections on the transnational turn in United States history: theory and practice', *Journal of Global History*, Vol. 4, Issue 3 (November 2009), pp. 453-474.
- Vickers, Rhiannon, 'Harold Wilson, the British Labour Party, and the War in Vietnam', *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Spring, 2008), p. 59.

Essays in Books

- Bungert, Heike and Wendt, Simon, 'Transnationalizing American Studies: Historians' Perspectives', in Birte Christ, Christian Kloeckner, Elizabeth Schafer-Wunsche, and Michael Butter, eds., *American Studies/Shifting Gears* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2010), pp. 89-116.
- Che Wilkins, Fanon, '"A Line of Steel": The Organization of the Sixth Pan-African Congress and the Struggle for International Black Power, 1969-1974, in Dan Berger, ed., *The Hidden 1970s: Histories of Radicalism* (Rutgers University Press, 2010), pp. 97-114.
- Ellis, Sylvia, 'A Demonstration of British Good Sense? British Student Protest During the Vietnam War', in *Student Protest – The Sixties and After*, ed. DeGroot, Gerard J. (Longman, 1998), pp. 54-69.
- Ellis, Sylvia, 'British Opposition to the Vietnam War, 1964 – 68', in *The Insular Dream: Obsession and Resistance* (Vu University Press, 1995), pp. 166-182.
- Ellis, Sylvia, 'British Student Protest during the Vietnam War', in DeGroot, Gerard J. (ed): *Student Protest – The Sixties and After* (Longman, 1998), p. 59.
- Frankel, Oz, 'The Black Panthers of Israel and the Politics of the Radical Analogy', in *Black Power Beyond Borders*, ed. Nico Slate (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 81-106.

- Hoefferle, Caroline, 'A Web of Interconnections: Student Peace Movements in Britain and the United States, 1960-1975', in Benjamin Ziemann (ed.), Peace Movements in Western Europe, Japan and the USA during the Cold War (Essen: Klartext, 2007), p. 131-47.
- Hohn, Maria, 'The Black Panther Solidarity Committee and the Trial of the Ramstein 2', in Davis, Belinda; Mausbach, Wilfried; Klimke, Martin; and MacDougall, Carla (Eds.): *Changing the World, Changing Oneself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the US in the 1960s and 1970s* (Berghahn Books, 2010).
- Hohn, Maria and Klimke, Martin, 'Revolutionary Alliances: The Rise of Black Power', in *A Breath of Freedom: The Civil Rights Struggle, African American GIs, and Germany*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 107-122.
- Klimke, Martin in: 'A Growing Problem for US Foreign Policy: The West German Student Movement and the Western Alliance', in *Changing the World, Changing Onseself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the US in the 1960s and 1970s*, eds. Belinda Davis, Wilfred Mausbach, Martin Klimke, and Carla MacDougall (Berghahn Books, 2010).
- Mausbach, Wilfried, 'America's Vietnam in Germany – Germany in America's Vietnam: On the relocation of spaces and appropriation of history', in *Changing the World*, *Changing Onseself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the US in the 1960s and 1970s*, eds. Belinda Davis, Wilfred Mausbach, Martin Klimke, and Carla MacDougall (Berghahn Books, 2010).
- Milkman, Ruth 'Labor Movement', in Mankiller Pearl, Wilma et al (eds.): *The Readers Companion to US Women's History* (Houghton Mifflin, 1999).

- Murch, Donna, 'When the Panther Travels: Race and the Southern Diaspora in the History of the BPP, 1964-1972', in *Black Power Beyond Borders*, ed. Nico Slate (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 57-78.
- Slate, Nico, 'The Dalit Panthers: Race, Caste, and Black Power in India', in *Black Power Beyond Borders*, ed. Nico Slate (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 128-143.
- Street, Joe, 'Malcom X, Smethwick, and the Influence of the African American Freedom Struggle on British Race Relations in the 1960s', *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 6 (July 2008), pp. 932-950.
- Williams, Yohuru, '"They've lynched our saviour, Lumumba in the old fashion Southern Style": The Conscious Internationalism of American Black Nationalism', in *Black Power Beyond Borders*, ed. Nico Slate (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 148-167.

Encyclopaedia entries

Ellis, Sylvia, 'Anti-Vietnam War movement, Britain', in Immanuel Ness (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Revolution and Protest: 1500 to the present* (Wiley Blackwell, 2009), p. 218.

Online Sources

Allen, Joe, 'Between Students and Workers', *Jacobin*, March 2017 [online]: <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/03/students-democratic-society-antiwar-vietnam-workers-unions-kim-moody> [accessed 10 July 2020].

Coleman, Kevin J.: *The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act: Overview and Issues* (July 30, 2015) [online]:< https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RS20764.pdf H.R 3211 (94th) > [accessed 7 March 2019].

Culver v. Secretary of the Air Force: Restriction of Servicemen's Individual Freedoms Abroad for Foreign Policy Reasons, *William. & Mary Law Review*, Vol. 19, Issue 1 (1977) [online]: <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr/vol19/ iss1/8> [accessed 17 April 2020].

Ehrenreich, Barbara, 'What Is Socialist Feminism?' [online]: <www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/CWLUArchive/socialfem.html.> [accessed 20 July 2020].

Ellis, Sylvia, 'Anti-Vietnam War Movement, Britain', [online]: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/9781405198073.wbierp0100?saml_referrer> [accessed 10 October 2020].

Ewing, Tess 'Bread and Roses', [online] <https://www.bu.edu/wgs/files/2013/10/Ewing-Bread-and-Roses.pdf>
[accessed 20 July 2020].

Freeman, Jo, '*The Tyranny of Structurelessness*', [online]: <http://www.jofreeman.com/joreen/tyranny.htm > [accessed 4 June 2017].

Hardy, S. Timothy, 'Intelligence Reform in the Mid-1970s', CIA Historical Review Program, July 2, 1996 [online]: <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol20no2/html/v20i2a01p_0001.htm> [accessed 20 September 2019].

Katz, Donald. R, '1976 Presidential Election: Draft Dodger and the Democrats – Fritz Efaw's unconventional campaign for the Vice-Presidency', Rolling Stone, 26 August 1976 [online]: <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/1976-presidential-election-draft-dodger-and-the-democrats-57595/ > [accessed 15 August 2020].

Macdonald, Simon, 'Transnational history: a review of past and present scholarship', p. 6 [online]:< https://www.ucl.ac.uk/centre-transnational-history/sites/centre-transnational-history/files/simon_macdonald_tns_review.pdf> [accessed 20 October 2020].

'Political Dissent in the U.S Military', February, 2007, *ABC News* [online]: <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/story?id=2857017&page=1> [accessed 29 April 2020].

Spector, Ronald H., 'Vietnam War – 1954-1975', *Encyclopaedia Britannica* [online] <https://www.britannica.com/event/Vietnam-War> [accessed 11 October 2020].

'The Art of the Possible: Ira Magaziner '69' *Brown Political Review*, 20 May 2014 [online] <https://brownpoliticalreview.org/2014/05/the-art-of-the-possible-ira-magaziner-69/> [accessed online 04 January 2020].

'The Boys Who Said NO!', a documentary on The Resistance [online]: < https://www.boyswhosaidno.com >[accessed 25 April 2017].

Documentaries

- Documentary produced by the BBC – *True Spies* episode 1: '*Subversive My Arse*', 27 October 2002.

- 'The Boys Who Said NO!', a documentary on The Resistance [online]: <https://www.boyswhosaidno.com >[accessed 25 April 2017].
- *Sir! No Sir! – The Suppressed Story of the GI Movement to End the War in Vietnam* (Dir. David Zeiger, 2006).

Theses

- Cochran, Joshua D., PhD thesis, *'Beyond the Water's Edge: US Expatriates and the Vietnam War Movement'*, University of Iowa, August 2014.