During the 1960's the Amerikan government was on trial for crimes against the people of the world.

We now find the government guilty and sentence it to death in the streets.
WHEN the hand-picked jury of American Fascism goes out to have their say on what the CONSPIRACY will be doing for the NEXT TEN YEARS

WE will decide for ourselves by SEEING THE SPACE we occupy

by the THOUSANDS (across halls, Rock Halls, churches, open fields, parks lots, IBM offices, the WHITE HOUSE, etc etc etc)

ALL OVER FUCKED UP AMERICA to stick together as SISTERS and BROTHERS to get stoned make love make rock imperious boring speakers liberal NUNS make FRIENDS confess and PLAN OUR ACTIONS when the PIG jury returns a "verdict" and at the beginning of a new deed write it down release it and carry out our DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

"WHEN IN THE COURSE OF INDIGENOUS EVENTS* from the PIG EMPIRE of DEATH EXPLOITATION RACISM TIGHT ASSKETT AND YOUR old red uncle

AMERICA has been on TRIAL for TEN years the COURTROOM has been the streets the universilies the ghettos the bars the WASHINGTON MONUMENT

the government offered a defense of thugs mad dogs GILLY clubs shot guns JAIL racism many fences and SPEAK agnew

WE THE PEOPLE'S JURY
Find the GOVERNMENT GUILTY of genocide against everybody except pledgers

CHANG KAI CHEK war criminals demagogic politicians JULIUS HOFFMAN high school principals the CIA the POPE of ROME INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CAPITAL J. EDGAR HOOVER the CHICAGO TRIBUNE effete mobs and TRICIA NIXONS scrapbook

We sentence the GOVERNMENT TO DEATH by REVOLUTION In the 1970's In our life time to Fight-in LONG-IN WIN-IN

WE WILL BE as part of a CONTINENTAL CONGRESS of REVOLUTION INTERNATIONAL DAYS OF SELF DETERMINATION WE will meet ANYPLACE YOU and YOUR FRIENDS LIBERATE!

JUDGE HOFFMAN is dying
JOHN MITCHELL is dying
Rez Kilmelkstoa is dying
the Empire is dying

We are its ORPHANS We are its EXECUTIONERS,
We know that with all the bullshit out there, you can come to consider yourself on the mountain top. I may even consider myself one day on the mountain top. I may have already. But I know that in the valley there are people like Benny and there are people like me, people like Mickey White and people like Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale. And that below the valley are people like Bobby Hutton, people like Eldridge Cleaver. We know that going into the valley is a dangerous thing. We know that when you go out to the valley you got to make a commitment.

A lot of people think the revolution is bullshit, but it's not. A lot of us think that when you get in the revolution you can talk your way out of things, but that's not true. Ask Bobby Hutton, ask Huey Newton, ask Eldridge Cleaver, Mickey White, and Dennis Mora. Ask these people whether it's a game. If you get yourself involved in a revolutionary struggle, then you've got to be serious.
It's all over but the fighting

"Amerikan justice is like Amerikan money; once you stop believing in it, all hell breaks loose."
Conspiracy

It was a different trial when Bobby Seale was there. A trial that spoke clearly to the realm of pig America: One black man raped is an exception, a charge for giving speech in Lincoln Park. The State’s continuing attempt to assimilate the Black Panther Party to jail—or murder—with its leaders, to stop the rise of the Black Liberation struggle as a whole. And the image of Bobby Seale bursting the trial wide open. When Hooftmuth Hoffman had Seale unmasked and shackled in the courtroom, it was not only something out of the barbarism of the 1820s, but something as well out of the very contemporary slavery black people face in Watts and Detroit and Harlem today. The scene of Seale is the courtroom was in an image that spanned the whole history of American racism and black rebellion.

But now the past is on trial in Chicago’s Federal Building. While there are still some elements of the present within it (Hayden’s militancy, Abbie’s “hoosick notion”), the trial is most of all an anachronism—a morality play out of the history of the middle ’60s, when some of us still believed the State could be charged by words and signs and marches—for something short of the gun. It is a trial of the innocence of the white peace movement—an innocence which died with the Detroit riot, with Tet, with Columbia, with the tear gas explosions of the Democratic Convention itself. One morning in the courtroom—2/4—all with movement celebrities, Chicago red squad pigs, a few hippies—defense attorney Larry Washington was putting in a motion to get White Panther John Sinclair out of jail to testify at the trial. John is hustled inside a Michigan prison for possession of some grass. He’ll be there for 9 1/2 years. So the Conspiracy? It was trying to get him a couple of days off.

The motion was denied by Magno Hoffman as everybody knew it would be. But the festivities began. It’s critical to the defense. Jerry Rubin mumbled angrily—and a bit too loud—to lawyer Bill Hunter.

“Who said that?” Hoffman snorts.

“Mr. same as David T. Dellinger and I said, and what’s more…” Dellinger is on his feet giving a speech about “What Bobby Seale meant when he called this place a fascist court.” The marshal restrains Dellinger and sits him down, while Hoffman swears andiane Leeke

“You gonna gag all of us, too, Judge?”

“Who said that?”

“Bobby Seale.”

“Let the record show that the remarks have been made by Defendant Davis.” Hoffman is now getting furious. “Are you gonna let the Prosecution carry out our defense, too, Judge?” This time it’s Abbie on his feet heckling.

“Who said that?”

“I did. My name is Abbie. I don’t have a last name. I just did.”

And that’s how it goes. Little plays within a play. Outbursts now and then, long silences, boredom. The defense will play upon its case soon and attempt to prove that the demonstrations and Festival of Life were planned to be peaceful. Hayden describes it: “During the ’50s the American government was on trial for crimes against the people of this country and the people of the world.” And now we find the government guilty, and condemn it to death in the streets.”

The trial that should have happened two years ago will go on for several more months. In the balance is the next ten years of several people’s lives. But it is the last trial of its kind. It has been and will continue to be war from here on in, all the way home.

Like Abbie said: “American justice is like American money: Once you stay believing in it, all hell breaks loose.”
with powerful backing from its American-European home base. British reaction was highly restricted, especially following the Zionist terrorist campaign inside Palestine and Zionist pressures abroad coupled with the "enforced" Western world's ignorance of the "Jewish problem" in the American-dominated UN, which in 1946 the Jewish Agency had proposed a partition plan to the US and British Governments, and the majority UNSCOP Report now also advocated partition. Scandalous Zionist and US pressure on UN delegations (crassly pressuring for offices and salaries) never resulted in compelling the General Assembly—whereby the necessary votes had been lacking three days earlier—to adopt the Partition Resolution, November 29, 1947, by the narrow margin of three votes. Only three Afro-Asian states voted for it: South Africa, and in a last-minute switch achieved by US arm-twisting, Liberia, and the Philippines. To the Arabs and other Afro-Asians the partition vote was only a new form of European-American dictation.

The resolution foreseen for internationalizing Jerusalem and creating an independent Jewish State (400,000 Jews and 497,000 Arabs) and an independent Arab State (721,000 Arabs and 10,000 Jews), it awarded the Jews, barely a third of the population and owning less than 6% of the land, 56% of the total area of Palestine, including its most fertile parts.

The Arabs rejected partition on the grounds that 1) partition of a country against the will of the majority of its inhabitants violated the UN Charter, the right to self-determination, international law and practice; and 2) Jews exclusively were to rule a state that was 50% Arab and in which Arabs owned more than 80% of the land. Arab and Jewish demands for a plebiscite in Palestine and for a World Court decision on the competency of the UN to decide partition were brushed aside.

The Zionists embraced partition "with all the fervor of a commitment born on the crest of Mt. Stait" not because they were satisfied with this allocation, but because it offered a bridgehead for the seizure of all Palestinian land. As late as the day that the Hague had told the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry: "If you accept the Zionist solution but are unable or unwilling to enforce it, please do not interfere, and we ourselves will secure its implementation." Is this not a challenge to the Yemeni, the Zionsists, by their own admission, decided to hold on to all 33 Jewish settlements outside the boundaries of the proposed Jewish State as well as other isolated settlements. Former Hague Commander Netanel Lorch, pointing out the "far-reaching dimensions of this decision," said: "It was realized that the defense of Tel Aviv must start at Netanel's Ono and Mount Hebron Mountains (Arab State area) and of Haifa at Yezlamin in Western Galilee (Arab State area). Those settlements became defense bases and offensive bases of the State which was about to be established."
In peace, to ensure its same the Zionist machine had to change them. On the mower of the partition vote, Professor Hocking pointed out:

"Diaspora broke out from both sides. In the confusion of the world, began to emerge, an organized military campaign systematically directed toward two major objectives: first to confirm Jewish domination over the Arabs within the proposed limits of the Jewish State, and second to enslave these limits. The Iron, the Stern gang, and the Haganah... began openly to attack Arab villages and cities, driving out the inhabitants or massacring those who stood by their homes and fields... What was this? A planned military maneuver here is no longer the slightest doubt."

Israel sources—Ha Sefer Ha Palach, Volumes I and II, and Qurvat 1948 (Haitz 1943)—describe this military campaign—Plan C and Plan D—in detail. Zionist strategy was based on the timetable of British withdrawal. The British decision to maintain de facto authority over Palestine, but to evacuate their forces from successive areas by stages, permitted the Zionists to exact the Arab population and seize strategic points within the Arab state area behind the Slim of Britain's authority, which prevented any interference from regular Arab armies. The Zionist offensive was facilitated by the fact that the British handed over more and more Jewish areas but Ummar in Arab areas where they imposed Arab defense preparations and did nothing to stop Zionist attacks on the Arabs. Plan C, the first phase of the Zionist strategy, involved 1) putting constant pressure everywhere against the Palestinian Arabs to attack Jews and 2) maintaining contact with the Jewish settlers outside the Jewish state area. Palanah Commander Yehuda Aloni explained that this contact was necessary for the coming offensive to unite with these settlements. Plan D, the second phase, was an all-out offensive to conquer and hold territory in the wake of the withdrawing British forces. Qurvat 1948 defined Plan D's purpose as "control of the area given penetration of our forces into Arab areas... If it wasn't for the Arab invasion, there would have been no stop to the expansion of the forces of the Haganah, who could have, with the same drive, reached the natural borders of Western Israel..." (our emphasis)

On May 15, 1948, the Zionists were indeed on their way to complete military dominance of Palestine, and had expelled 300,000 Palestinian Arabs. Zionist propaganda maintains that the Arabs left of their own accord, although in 1948 it said nothing whatever about these alleged orders and has never produced a single piece of primary evidence. Erasmo Chabri's study of the records of the BBC—which monitored all Middle East broadcasts throughout 1948—and Professor Khalid's study of the Arab press and Arab radio broadcasts during this period, have completely refuted this Zionist claim. Zionists found not even one appeal or order from any Arab leader calling on the people to leave, but many appeals, even flat orders, to the civilians of Palestine to stay put. Zionist sources themselves, moreover, describe the terrorist and psychological warfare used to expel the Palestinians. Of the effect of the massacre of Deir Yassin, April 7—called by Togmore "comparable to the crimes committed by the Nazis against the Jews"—Manachem Begin boasted: "Of the about 300,000 Arabs who lived in the present territory of Israel, only some 165,000 are still there. The political and economic significance of this development can hardly be exaggerated."

Palmach Commander Aharon described the tactics: in use before May 15: "to clean the inner Galilee": 1) gathered all the Jewish milkmaids, who have contact with Arabs in different villages, and asked them to wash the clothes of some Arab women that a great Jewish reinforcement had arrived in Galilee and that it was going to burn all of the villages of Galilee. They should inform on the Arabs, as their friends, to escape while there was still time... The tactic reached its goal completely... The whole area was cleaned..."

The outcome of the war between Israeli forces and the army of the National Union, which tried to prevent this, was determined by the support that the army received from its European-American homes. In violation of UN truce orders prohibiting supply of arms, Israeli importers of produced weapons from West and East, in violation of UN directives stipulating no alteration of battle lines and no gains for either side, supplied the army with arms and continued to do so during the truce. Israeli gained immensely from military effectiveness in the Negev, to the Gaza Strip and through Central Galilee, while the British cut off ammunition supplies to Arab armies.

THE PALESTINE ARABS

By the end of 1948, Israel had expelled nearly a million Palestinian Arabs—shorn of their homes, lands, and most personal property. Even if one chooses to believe in face of the evidence that the Arabs had "voluntarily" moved—only so as to use the words of the Zionist Ian Ritchie—"the cry of looting and wanton destruction which hangs like a black pall over almost all the Jewish military successes"—what of it? Since when, asks Professor Erwin Fromm, is flight "justifiable by confiscation of property and by being barred from returning to the land on which a people's forfathers have lived for generations?" International law and equity guarantee the rights of individuals in such circumstances whatever their nationality or creed. Moreover, because there were to have been as many Arabs as Jews in the Jewish state, the Partition Resolution had specifically guaranteed the civil, political, economic, religious, and property rights of the Arabs.

Of the first 170 Jewish settlements established after 1948, 350 were on the property of expelled Arabs. Israel took over 588 Arab towns and villages containing nearly half the buildings in Palestine, 10,000 shops, businesses.
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and stores, and some 36,000 acres of crops grown (from which it drew a fourth of its foreign-exchange earnings). Araratian officials claimed to have lost more than $2 million, this. In Teynian's words, is robbery and that Israel was more responsible both for the murder of the massacre and expulsion of the Palestine Arabs because "they have taken the land and the property which is legally and rightfully still Israeli-Armenian property."

Israel's government, to whom all these have belonged for 20 years in refugee camps for a total of 1,900 calories a day and without a penny of compensation.

Israel's government has the responsibility for all the refugees on the Arab states is designed to hide its own crimes against these people and to confuse the real issues: the differences between Israel and the Palestinian Arabs, citizens of a nation that has been obliterated from the map but which lives in a continued state of destitution and poverty. It is only secondarily its dispute between the Arab states and Israel.

The Arab State conflict with Israel has to do primarily with Israel's expansionist character. "To maintain the status quo will not do," said Ben-Gurion. "We have set up a formally peace Israel's red lines have placed a red lid on the Partition Resolution. The Partition Resolution the Israeli state could not accept its second proposal, by presenting the provisions of the Partition Resolution on May 12, 1948, it joined the Arab states in signing the Lausanne Protocol in which both states agreed to negotiate a settlement within the framework of the Partition Resolution, Ben-Gurion later explained that this was done only to influence the UN to approve Israel's admission. Once it was admitted to the UN, almost immediately with its signature of the Protocol, Israel promptly repudiated its obligations under the Protocol. The UN, however, made Israel's admission conditional on its compliance with the Partition Resolution (on territory and internationalization of the Jordan Valley) and the December 15, 1948, Resolution demanding that it repatriate the refugees. Since Israel has never complied with these resolutions, its membership in the UN is illegal.

THE ARMS TRAFFIC AGREEMENTS

"Every step in the establishment of the Zionist State has been, for example, the Elino Batatichon, it was an attempt perfectly right to this wrong that led to the Armistice Agreements of 1949. These, in turn, have given birth to the UN Security Council Resolution, Israel's position has consistently been that it would comply with this resolution if it had an agreement with the UN resolutions guiding it to do. These include the following which remain unimplemented to this day: Partition, Repatriation, and Compensation of the Refugees (May 11, 1949), Internationalization of Jerusalem (December 22, 1948), Protection of Rights, Property, and Interests of the Refugees (December 14, 1949), which is available to the citizens of Israel for use outside the river bed and which is necessary to fulfill Israel's ambitions for unlimited immigration and economic-military expansion.

The Johnson Administration encouraged Israel's aggressive reaction, and a new Western arms build-up in the Middle East began. In Tel Aviv apologized to Foreign Minister Miel for "most unfortunate declarations of high State Department officials that US arms deliveries to Israel were linked to promises not to react with force in the Arab direction.

Israel's threats, bombardments of the diversion works, and US refusal to condemn these attacks induced President Nasser to announce the abandonment of the Arab project, May 15, 1966.

This should have satisfied Israel and the US if their aim was solely to protect the Jordan-Negro division. On the contrary, the US government increased its support. With US and British backing it began a campaign to open the Suez Canal. In Israel shipping was demanded by the UN Security Council Resolution, Egypt's position has consistently been that it would comply with this resolution if it had an agreement with the UN resolutions guiding it to do. These include the following which remain unimplemented to this day: Partition, Repatriation, and Compensation of the Refugees (May 11, 1949), Internationalization of Jerusalem (December 22, 1948), Protection of Rights, Property, and Interests of the Refugees (December 14, 1949), which is available to the citizens of Israel for use outside the river bed and which is necessary to fulfill Israel's ambitions for unlimited immigration and economic-military expansion.

Israel's threats, bombardments of the diversion works, and US refusal to condemn these attacks induced President Nasser to announce the abandonment of the Arab project, May 13, 1966.

The hidden dynamic of Israel's 1947 aggression was revealed in the Affirmation of the 1969 Israeli Government Yearbook, where he declares that it will not be enough to bring "two or three or even four million Jews to the promised land, to make the Jewish state a secure and glorious symbol of the existence of the State are involved."

Israel's present government has said its new aggression began in January 1941 coincident with the Arab summit decision to divert the Jordan waters of the Jordan River to the Arab countries, which the UN gave 70%, arguing that the Arab states therefore have a right to these waters. The planned Arab diversion would have meant a political, social, and economic disaster to Israel, which is based on appropriation of most if not all of the sweet waters of the Jordan for use outside the river bed and which is necessary to fulfill Israel's ambitions for unlimited immigration and economic-military expansion.

Against political risks.

In the period from mid-1969 to April 1967, Israel was confronted by more than 30 military attacks by its regular armed forces into Arab territory, attacks aimed at destroying Arab homes and villages. No Arab state has ever made an attack by its regular armed forces into Israeli-held territory. The Arab states have been engaged in the main in individual crossings by farmers and shepherds to retrieve their livestock and belongings. Responsibility for such violations lies with Israel since it bars the refugees' return and with the US, which has given Israel the go-ahead, in such a way to cut off villages from their water sources or fertile lands. Israel used these incidents as a pretext to compel the Arabs to accept "peace" on Israel's terms, Israel's aggressions also served to make financial sweeping from Arab countries a prelude to military and larger aggressions.

Israel has always tried to hide its aggressive policy from world public opinion, and is never more eloquent on this subject than just before or just after some military attack or massacre. If Arab leaders have called war they did so only to hide their impotence before the international power affront against Israel and its aggressions.

THE JUNE 1967 WAR

President Johnson has said that the immediate causes of the 1967 war were the following: Johnson's messages made perfectly clear the defensive character of these actions and his desires for a political solution.

Israel refused, as it always has, to submit its case to international law or the UN since its existence is based on the right of conquest. "No one looks on it with regret," said the US Secretaries of Defense. Hence there is no nothing to "regret" except that Arab state violence. Israel's 1967 aggression was another map to attain this end. Closure of the Gaza Strip was only a long-term protest. Israel's presence on the Gaza Strip is illegal and in violation of the Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement, which specifically excludes Israel from the Gulf. Israel seized its position on the Gulf by armed force 11 days after signing the armistice in one of its many "calculated violations" to occupy additional Arab land. Enforcement of the Armistice Agreement would compel Israel's withdrawal from the Gaza. The question of whether or not to the Sinai Strip is an international waterway should be referred to the World Court. Closure of the Suez, through which passed no more than 8% of Israel's foreign commercial traffic, poses a threat not to its existence but, as the Jewish Observer and Middle East Review (June 2, 1967) revealed, to its plan to build an oil pipeline from the Gaza Strip to the Mediterranean to compete with the Suez Canal and breach its monopoly. (This project is now underway.)

Statements of Israeli leaders since the war and Israel's systematic policy of attempting to empty the occupied territories of Arabs show clearly that its demand for "direct peace negotiations" is simply a smoke screen behind which it will ease its pressure to make all of the territories. The US fully supports Israel's dictators. A State Department official commented after the June War:

"Israel has probably done more for us in the Middle East in relation to money and effort invested than any of our so-called allies and friends elsewhere around the globe since the end of the Second World War. In the Far East we can get almost no one to help us in Vietnam. It is in the Middle East that we see the most intense and effective use of the US military and the economic power of the West. It is there that we have had the most success in moving the Arab states toward a position of acceptance of the existing Middle East situation and toward the strengthening of the Middle East security system."
When we expelled PL from SDS last June, we found that we were taking the first steps on a political struggle. That act opened the possibility of SDS becoming a vital revolutionary force in mass movement. Since then, the Chicago police, followed by the Venceremos Movement, the Washington Mobilization, and general development of political theory and strategy, have created conditions in which the National Congress, December 16-18, will be the birth of the new SDS.

The last five years has been a succession of isolated flashes. Now, in this instance in which motion has been expressed through individuality, individual or collective self-interest, or narrow base orientation has proven sooner or later to be a defeat. We have never been able to sustain masses of people’s involvement in struggle.

The growth of political consciousness among kids in general has happened not because of any coherent strategy of our own, but despite its non-existence. The most shifting characteristic of the failures of the past is that these struggles—the majority—which were not victories and did not raise the level of action and consciousness suffered from a fundamental misunderstanding of power. “Political power grows from the barrel of a gun.” People’s movements around the globe have understood where power is, and it is their armed struggle for liberation which will bring American Imperialism down. Our task is twofold: to understand and organize where power is, and to make ourselves part of the international war which is a self-conscious struggle for selling it. The success of the revolution—realization of our highest aspirations for a better world—demands a strategy of international armed struggle.

The role of SDS as a national revolutionary mass organization is crucial. The youth movement, now moribund and fragmented, has to become a strong and offensive political force. We need SDS as a forum for the ideological struggle that will build our understanding of how struggle is won, how we can provide political leadership for the white kids in this country. Our program should provide a context for the support and interpretation of the highest levels of struggle in the country and the world. This is especially key to building a revolutionary movement in the mother country, in Watts or Bolivia, when a black is blown up, everyone can dig into—living in a colonial society gives them a basis for understanding US Imperialism as their enemy, and for seeing others as a part of their struggle. But part of the purifying effect of our white skins privileges is our inability to clearly define the source of our own oppression. White Americans do not immediately see an act of sabotage or a colonial people’s war of liberation as a blow against our society.

Changing people’s consciousness can only happen if at the same time we are changing the political reality of the country. We should be leading large numbers of young people on the campuses and in the streets in struggles that focus on fighting for power. The highest act of armed struggle of course is the most damaging to the man. But lower level actions, like violent street actions, have a real effect on the ability of big America to function all over the globe. We have to create chaos and bring about the disintegration of pig order, the future of our struggle is in the future of crime in the streets.

Through the practice of struggle we become revolutionaries. The concrete, social reality of fighting an urban revolution/counter-revolution is teaching us the identity between survival and transformation. The heavy social forms we come out of turn out not so surprisingly, to be unity counter-revolutionary. Creating new forms for living, for the collective, for the community, for the people is the way to destroy bourgois consciousness by ourselves that keeps us from being able to think, love, and struggle with each other against the man is part of and necessary to destroying Imperialism.

We see the SDS as a new coming together of people who are cut from the same cloth, from the revolutionary youth movement. With all the shift that SDS are bringing about, it’s almost to get hung up in parliamentary forms and the old notion of what a political convention should look like. We’ll use any strategy, revolutionaries, and parliamentary procedures that help us teach each other. But we see other forms too, a lot of flexibility, and this for different groups of people to move together, things like films, music, etc. It ought to be a gas. See you there.
EXCEPT OF PROCEEDINGS on the above-entitled cause before the Honorable Chester S. STRICKLER, held on the 13th day of November, 1969.

APPEARANCES:

MR. LAWRENCE CAMBELL
Assistant Corporation Counsel,
Presented on behalf of the People;

MR. DONALD CAVELL
Appeared on behalf of himself.

MR. CAVELL: Mr. Van Sistine, you have a family, have you?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir, I have.

M.R. CAVELL: Do you have a wife, or are you single?

MR. VANCE: I have a wife.

MR. CAVELL: How many kids you have?

MR. VANCE: I have two.

MR. CAVELL: When was your wife born?

MR. VANCE: She was born in 1945.

MR. CAVELL: Do you have any relations, nephews, nieces, or those friends that are on the police force?

MR. VANCE: A friend or two.

MR. CAVELL: Do you have any newspaper that’s in the armed forces presently?

MR. VANCE: No.

MR. CAVELL: Do you read the newspapers regularly?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Which newspaper do you read?

MR. VANCE: I don’t read the newspapers regularly.

MR. CAVELL: Did you read any headlines, articles about the SDS demonstrations on October 6, 9, 10?

MR. VANCE: No.

MR. CAVELL: Did you hear any of the reports of the demonstrations?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Do you know what the SDS is?

MR. VANCE: I think I do.

MR. CAVELL: What do you know about it?

MR. VANCE: I just know that it’s a political movement.

MR. CAVELL: Do you know what we stand for?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: And you would be able to support a policy like that?

MR. VANCE: Yes.

MR. CAVELL: In the Viet Cong war?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: And I was to tell you that I stand behind those positions, do you think you would prejudice in making judgments if I were to tell you this case?

MR. VANCE: No, sir. It would not.

MR. CAVELL: What do you think about the people in the organization of SDS?

MR. VANCE: I don’t know anybody personally, so I can’t say any opinions.

MR. CAVELL: But you disagree with their opinions?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: In what context do you mean, specifically?

MR. VANCE: I meant specifically, I don’t stand with them.

MR. CAVELL: Did you ever see them as a group?

MR. VANCE: No.

MR. CAVELL: What did you think about them?

MR. VANCE: I thought they were a group of radicals.

MR. CAVELL: Do you know the name Bernardine Dohrn?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: What do you think she is?

MR. VANCE: I don’t know.

MR. CAVELL: What do you think about her?

MR. VANCE: I think she’s a member of SDS.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think she’s a radical?

MR. VANCE: Yes, I do.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think you would be able to support a policy like that?

MR. VANCE: Yes.

MR. CAVELL: Are you aware of any of the other SDS people, do you think of them as radicals?

MR. VANCE: No.

MR. CAVELL: What do you think about them?

MR. VANCE: I think they’re radicals.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think the demonstration in this case is enough to make you understand that they’ve changed their policy?

MR. VANCE: I really don’t know how to answer that.

MR. CAVELL: Mr. Palmer said he heard there was property damage.

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Then I disagree with that.

MR. VANCE: I think so too.

MR. CAVELL: Mr. Palmer also said that some other knowledge of what happened during those days, do you think that would prejudice you in making a decision on the case?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think about that, considering that I am a member of that organization, considering that I do believe the things you disagree with, considering that I am believed to be honest with the police who have committed—

MR. VANCE: I think the demonstration was illegal, I think it was wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Do I think it was right or wrong?

MR. VANCE: I don’t have any reason to believe it was.

MR. CAVELL: I really don’t know how to answer that.

MR. VANCE: Mr. Palmer said he heard there was property damage, I think he’s wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Then I disagree with that.

MR. VANCE: I think you’re right.

MR. CAVELL: Mr. Palmer also said that some other knowledge of what happened during those days, do you think that would prejudice you in making a decision on the case?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think about that, considering that I am a member of that organization, considering that I do believe the things you disagree with, considering that I am believed to be honest with the police who have committed—

MR. VANCE: I think the demonstration was illegal, I think it was wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Do I think it was right or wrong?

MR. VANCE: I don’t have any reason to believe it was.

MR. CAVELL: I really don’t know how to answer that.

MR. VANCE: Mr. Palmer said he heard there was property damage, I think he’s wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Then I disagree with that.

MR. VANCE: I think you’re right.

MR. CAVELL: Mr. Palmer also said that some other knowledge of what happened during those days, do you think that would prejudice you in making a decision on the case?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think about that, considering that I am a member of that organization, considering that I do believe the things you disagree with, considering that I am believed to be honest with the police who have committed—

MR. VANCE: I think the demonstration was illegal, I think it was wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Do I think it was right or wrong?

MR. VANCE: I don’t have any reason to believe it was.

MR. CAVELL: I really don’t know how to answer that.

MR. VANCE: Mr. Palmer said he heard there was property damage, I think he’s wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Then I disagree with that.

MR. VANCE: I think you’re right.

MR. CAVELL: Mr. Palmer also said that some other knowledge of what happened during those days, do you think that would prejudice you in making a decision on the case?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think about that, considering that I am a member of that organization, considering that I do believe the things you disagree with, considering that I am believed to be honest with the police who have committed—

MR. VANCE: I think the demonstration was illegal, I think it was wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Do I think it was right or wrong?

MR. VANCE: I don’t have any reason to believe it was.

MR. CAVELL: I really don’t know how to answer that.

MR. VANCE: Mr. Palmer said he heard there was property damage, I think he’s wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Then I disagree with that.

MR. VANCE: I think you’re right.

MR. CAVELL: Mr. Palmer also said that some other knowledge of what happened during those days, do you think that would prejudice you in making a decision on the case?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think about that, considering that I am a member of that organization, considering that I do believe the things you disagree with, considering that I am believed to be honest with the police who have committed—

MR. VANCE: I think the demonstration was illegal, I think it was wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Do I think it was right or wrong?

MR. VANCE: I don’t have any reason to believe it was.

MR. CAVELL: I really don’t know how to answer that.

MR. VANCE: Mr. Palmer said he heard there was property damage, I think he’s wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Then I disagree with that.

MR. VANCE: I think you’re right.

MR. CAVELL: Mr. Palmer also said that some other knowledge of what happened during those days, do you think that would prejudice you in making a decision on the case?

MR. VANCE: Yes, sir.

MR. CAVELL: Do you think about that, considering that I am a member of that organization, considering that I do believe the things you disagree with, considering that I am believed to be honest with the police who have committed—

MR. VANCE: I think the demonstration was illegal, I think it was wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Do I think it was right or wrong?

MR. VANCE: I don’t have any reason to believe it was.

MR. CAVELL: I really don’t know how to answer that.

MR. VANCE: Mr. Palmer said he heard there was property damage, I think he’s wrong.

MR. CAVELL: Then I disagree with that.

MR. VANCE: I think you’re right.
This is the text of the letter we got from Don

Comrades,

"The monster is belching and choking on its own oppressive spurt. I wish everyone could have seen how red that Mr. Fitch, the representative of jurisprudence, was when he blew his cool. The steam and snot just burst out from under them black curtains behind which are hidden the last decaying remnants of the "white ivory tower". Dig in on high tier. Who wouldn't be under the circumstances!!! Those rooms of deceit and hypocrisy are now punctuated with shouts of "pull and ever 81 and 81 sung with true fervor. Ron! the sounds need to be made louder and more incessantly, but with more skill louder and conscious. Until they become a deafening roar! I was in the bullpen with a hip y.c., pacifist, droogie, a lakeview Rym tobe, accused of throwing a blade at a pig (he missed), a persons up for 8-5 on draft refusal. (The suggested I head then little blue book) what a quartet much org. work to do it's about limited up here, sorry tomes queens party online, 17th. Perot to the people.

Don
"CALL ME MR. PARADISE"

On November 17 24 Boston Weather people were hauled on charges of conspiracy to murder. Earlier in the day the pigs had boasted and boasted to a 16-year-old friend, Jimmy Paradise, who had been running with us and digging our politics and our collective—Jimmy allegedly gave the man information linking Boston Weatherman with a grupee attack on the Cambridge pig station.

The hearing began when pig Judge Viola called for the State to present its case against Jimmy Paradise. Jimmy had been held in "protective" custody for two weeks, alternately beaten and bribed.

Next to the witness stand stood a dozen pigs whose Hate and chills Jimmy had been in touch with during the previous 10 days. The DA started questioning Jimmy. With the strength of the resolution in front of him in the packed courtroom and the collective he's run with depending on him, he came through. Pointing his finger at the DA, he told the greedy hog to "Call me Mister Paradise, not this Jimmy staff," and to speak to the female defendants as "women, not girls." He began cross-examining the DA: "Dude you tell me last night I'd be one sorry kid if I didn't play ball with you?" 20 pigs' jaws hit the floor, and Jimmy went on when the piglet DA signed the affidavit he was wearing it to the dick.

"Of course I did, under force. These four pigs right there had just beaten me. That big fat one—Could you please identify yourself?—He put them up to it. He put a ten on the table after they hit me." Pig Scavenger—the BIGGEST ONE—shook his head in disbelief and tried to smile nervously, but the revolution had him quaking. Judge Viola called a recess, but afterward Mr. Paradise went right on, right over these pigs—shouting their cases wide open. Our lawyers moved again to suppress the State’s evidence, since the warrant and the whole case was obviously such a framew and because Jimmy had been beaten and denied counsel. The judge, getting desperate, called it off until Saturday morning.

Although most charges were dropped (one attempted murder charge remains), Jimmy will be in jail for some time for violating juvenile probation, Many people have been inspired by Jimmy’s dynamite strength, and brought close to Weatherman.

THE YOUTH WILL MAKE THE REVOLUTION, THROUGHOUT AMERICA AND THE WORLD, BE STRONG!
BE BEAUTIFUL!

FIRE!

FIRE is published bi-weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 West Madison Street, Chicago, Illinois 60612. Subscriptions are $3 included with the SDS membership fee or cost $10 for non-members. Signed articles are the responsibility of writers; desperate, called it off until Saturday morning.

Mark Rudd, National Secretary; Jeff Jones, Inter-organizational Secretary
Bill Ayers, Education Secretary
been estranged from the educational pro-
cess to the same degree that the students
have been denied it.
Professors are consistently prodded by
their administrative superiors to pro-
duce professional work (i.e., volume of
publication). They are continually ex-
posed to the carefully cultivated atti-
duе that recognition can only come through
being accepted as an "expert" in some
particular area of the university's jour-
ney. This insecurity brings about intense
specialization as they scramble to stake
out their claims on some minute area of
interest. The situation is paralleled
by the grading system for students.
There is a constant prodding, intensified
by cut-throat competition to achieve in
accordance with pre-defined standards.
The criteria of success are defined arti-
ficially so that very few are able to meet
them. Under this pressure the tradition-
al forms of education break down and the
faculty too often finds itself isolated
with little meaningful contact with stu-
dents or fellow professors. Thus, the
instructors find themselves thwarted in
their efforts to teach and their energy
and talents are channelled into forms
with little self-relevance where the pri-
mary motivation stems from social stan-
ards which do not reflect the needs or
wants of the people involved. It is not
accidental that I talk of channeling
with respect to our faculty. As students
are blatantly coerced by the draft and
grades to direct their capacities into
areas accepted by the institutional power
structure so are professors. In their
case the institutions of "publish or per-
dish", tenure, academic recognition and
the control of purse strings serve the
identical purpose. Faculty, as well as
students, are deliberately separated from
the means of policy control with all mean-
ingful decision-making originating not
within themselves but the so-called tradi-
tional institutions of "representative"
power.
Why should the educational process
have been distorted in this way? Is
it because the society requires such a
perversion in order to perpetuate itself?
Would supposed men of learning turn their
talents to weapons of war and terror with
out being anesthetized to the import of
their work. Would universities undertake
biological and chemical warfare projects;
shore up totalitarian regimes throughout
the war (in the name of Overseas Projects)
and ruthlessly stifle dissent if there had
been no program for dehumanizing the par-
ticipants. Specifically could MSU, in its
pursuit of knowledge, have performed in
Vietnam as the armor of the Viet regime.
Would we, today, be involved in overseas
projects in Thailand, Venezuela, Taiwan,
Pakistan, and Nicaragua (Somaza dynasty)
under the direct auspices of the State De-
partment? Would elements of our faculty
be involved in computing bombs over
Hanoi? Would our university be opting for
ever greater complicity with the govern-
ment under the guise of Project Thesis? Could
the corporations function without the ser-
vice of all the "cogs" who acquiesce so
willingly to their own exploitation? Prob-
ably not. "Corporate capitalism actually
needs shattered and atomized men...in order
to maintain its system of centralized bur-
cauratized and militarized hierarchies, so
as to perpetuate its domination over men
not only as workers but also as consumers
and citizens."
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It is not difficult to see why John Han-
nah considers the university closely akin
to nuclear bombs. For it too is crucial to
the maintenance of the caricature that con-
temporary America has become. As bombs
protect the system from the emerging forces
of the third world, so the universities
serve to protect the system from its own
citizens who would not countenance this
corruption of the American dream.
And as we must realize that Michi-
gan State is not an accident. Its seeming
inadequacies are not unfortunate failures
of our administration to cope with obvious
problems. It is a malevolent attempt to
prepare us for service in a society with-
out a conscience, dedicated to the preservation
of a global status quo in the face of mas-
sive inequalities and tremendous human suf-
f ering, a society dedicated to suppression
from Detroit and Watts to Vietnam and Guat-
amela, a society in which stability and or-
der are supreme and human life and human
suffering are inconsequential. Are we go-
ing to tacitly support this process of glo-
bal oppression and suppression by our own
inaction, or do we going to be parties to
our own oppression as well? The time to
act is now and the path is clear: throw out
the military recruiters, end overseas pro-
jects which support oppressive governments,
end research for military and counterinsur-
gency purposes, throw out the ROTC depart-
ment, confront apologists and defenders of
oppression, resist arbitrary authority, be-
gin to build a university dedicated to a
new humanism, a bastion of knowledge and
noble ideas, not a bastion of global crime.
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