Students plan for Seabrook protest

By Kent Pitman

"On April 30 the Clamshell Alliance will undertake the first mass citizen occupation of a nuclear power plant in the US," deduces the Seabrook Occupation Handbook distributed Wednesday night at the first planning session at MIT.

The purpose of the weekend's events, according to the Alliance, is to demonstrate to the American public the concern on the part of participants about the possible ill effects on society of the construction of a nuclear power plant in Seabrook, New Hampshire.

Honesty, openness and communications are the three elements stressed by the group as essential to their goal of non-violence in their activities.

To accomplish this aim, meetings such as the one at MIT Wednesday are held to acquaint ralliers with potential situations and consequencens, so that they will be able to deal effectively with eventualities in an organized manner.

The members of Clamshell who handled the meeting used a variety of methods to introduce the crowd of about 60 to the events which await them. A lecture on last year's demonstrations, role-playing games and quick decision simulations were all used.

Wayne Christian '74, arrested of offense of possession of weapons signatures for a petition outside a vinyl building, addressed those listening in Seabrook (See the Tech, Feb. 4), told those present about similar demonstrations held last August. The first involved 18 persons, and the next one, only three weeks later, drew 196 regular protestors for this weekend's trip to "anywhere from 1,000 to 2,000 or so," including people from everywhere in the US. What the Clamshell members propose is to once they reach the site involves a clear legal risk. They will occupy the proposed site of the nuclear plant, blockingHannan again restated positions under which the Program's faculty and there is no choice by the Committee on Educational Policy.
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