Radicals list demands, vote “complicity” vow

By Don Arkin

A new list of demands and a complicity statement supporting the participants of the sit-in at President Johnson's office were the result of a mass meeting held Sunday.

Several hundred members of RLSDS, MTSID, Westheimer, and who support last week's occupation of Administrators of the campus attended the meeting in the Reading Room of Student Center at 3 p.m. to discuss the action already taken, to plan further activities.

The meeting voted in favor of four points. The first, in response to the belief that 10 to 30 people were to be arrested on Monday and charged with trespassing, was to circulate a complicity statement stating that all of the signers participated in the occupation.

Demands

The second proposal was for a petition with a list of demands which would be used as a basis for future action. The demands will be:

1. An end to war-related research, specifically CAM, MRI, MIT, the helicopter project, AHI, and International Communism.
2. No GE recruiters on campus until the end of the strike.
3. An end to the harassment and speed-up of campus workers and the removal of Sal Guilla as supervisor.
4. The restricting of past punishments, and the reinstatement of Alberts father, with no new discipline or legal action against participants in the occupation.
5. The abdication of the Disciplinary Committee.

The petition will end with a statement of solidarity with the demands of the Harvard OBU including their demand for 20% black workers on construction projects.

The meeting also approved two mass rallies. The first will be tomorrow at noon in the lobby of Building 7. The second will be on registration day.

Vandalism discussed

The discussion started with questions about damage to the occupied offices. It was stated that during the occupation a vote had been taken and that a 5 to 1 majority were against vandalism, but that a few people had broken discipline and done some damage; still, the group had attempted to make some cleanup before they left. The general sense of the meeting was that although the damage done was irrevocable and miniscule compared to that done by the US and MIT in Vietnam and Roxbury, still it was a bad thing politically because the Administration could use it as an excuse to ignore the real issues.

Although no vote was taken, it was suggested that people might want to participate in demonstrations next week at Northeastern when S. I. Haykawa, President of San Francisco State gave a speech there.

Alberts father scores trial

(Ed's Note: The following are excerpts from letters sent by Mike Alberts father to The Tech and President Johnson and are reprinted here with his permission.)

The letter was prompted after a New Year's Eve one-hour telephone conversation with President Johnson in which he suggested that I come to Cambridge to confer with him on Friday, January 2nd, at 2 o'clock. I informed him that it was impossible for me to be in Cambridge, not only because of professional engagements, but particularly because of the condition of my health. I requested a week's adjournment, which was refused. When I suggested that I be permitted to deliver a memorandum on the subject, and suggested the impossibility of preparing that prior to Monday January 5th instead that I make every effort to mail it on Friday January 2nd. I received a phone call on Monday January 5th, at about 10:30 am informing me that the letter had not been received, and later in the afternoon my secretary received a message that it had been received. On January 5th the letter of the President the Disciplinary Committee was mailed.

The second point:

Rule 1 (That no member of the Committee is involved in the particular case other than as a member of the Committee, will sit in judgement) is clear, unequivocal and categorically in recognition of the accepted truism, whether of fact in a court of law, that as accuser may not be the judge. The principle and the rule admit of no exceptions or compromises.

The defendant (a legal term used by Professor Lamson, the Chairman of the Committee) was charged with disrespect towards Professor Lamson. When challenged to disqualify himself in accordance with the propriety, Professor Lamson stated that he would sit in judgement. Such little disqualification is no more adherence to the mandate of the principle and the rule than a claim of a warrant to chastity because she is only a little pregnant. That Professor Lamson is a gentleman as (Please turn to page 7).