

NOVEMBER 11, 1968

# ROOT AND BRANCH

WHOLE # 2

## MSU RESIST

THIS THURSDAY, November 14, is the fourth national day of resistance. At 4 P.M. on this date, the MSU Resistance has scheduled a ceremony at which several MSU students will turn in their draft cards, or announce that they have done so. Those who have already freed themselves of the draft will reaffirm their stand.

TO EXPRESS their solidarity and support for these resisters, a group representing views on resistance from moral support to political support has called a three day, round the clock vigil. It will begin in front of the library at 4 P.M. Monday with the annual W.I.L. vigil for veterans, past and future. From there through Thursday, it will be carried on by MSU students, faculty, and members of the University community. Anyone is welcome to join--the weather may be cold, but the fellowship will be warm.

EACH DAY has been given a theme toward which the thought and action of the vigil will be directed. Monday, being Veteran's Day, is a day of mourning for past and future veterans. Tuesday has been designated a day of reflection on war, and Wednesday a day of Peace. Thursday, with the resistance ceremony, is the day of freedom.

INFORMATION will also be available for those who wish to be present in Flint, November 18, in support of the first MSU resister to be sentenced. Leaflets on resistance, the draft, and other subjects will also be available.

IF YOU'RE INTERESTED, COME PAST THE LIBRARY PLAZA. YOU'LL BE WELCOME!

\*\*\*\*\*

ROOT AND BRANCH is published when the need arises by a group of MSU students. We hope to be out more regularly when we are better organized.

EDITORS: Don Mader and Thom Peterson.

NOTE: We are not now, nor were we ever, financed by loans from Hannah!

only

You

can Prevent

Napalm Fires

Protest at Dow

May 8

Join the thousands of students from all over the mid-west who will be demonstrating at the Dow Corporation stockholders meeting in Midland on Wednesday, May 8th.

The committee of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam has collected thousands of stock proxies. Members of the committee will be voting inside the meeting while students protest outside. YOU are needed. Transportation will be provided.

For bus reservations call: days--Clergy Concerned IV 5-8035  
Linda Eultin 355-1105  
nights--Janice Ninan 355-6089  
Merle Malkoff 355-2025

The events that took place during finals week of spring term, and their subsequent repercussions, have left the old university shaken. The dissatisfaction felt by an increasingly large number of students and faculty over the administration's actions will never permit the university to return to its previous state. The first step in analysing the effect these events have had and determining what the future holds is to establish a precise account of what took place. The following chronology compiled by the editors of ~~THE~~ <sup>THE</sup> ROOT includes the events of finals week, and all action since then that has had a bearing on the case.

MONDAY, 3 JUNE: Twelve persons were arrested, eleven for the alleged sale of pot, the other for the alleged sale of LSD. Five were registered as students; four were ex-students. This brought to sixteen the number busted ~~since the preceding~~ <sup>within the past year</sup>.

At least one of the arrests was made with a defective warrant. Several appeared to have been based on information provided by police-paid informers in the dormitories. The arrests were made by a combination

of campus and local police forces, not always within their own jurisdiction.

Speculation held that the students had been victims of a university attempt to influence the legislature by showing how tough they were on drugs. Further suspicions were aroused by the apparent guilty conscience shown by timing the arrests for after the State News had stopped publishing for the term and when students would be too busy to care.

TUESDAY, 4 JUNE: Before a crowd of students who had been alerted by a flyer prepared during the night, Judge William K Harmon held the preliminary examination of those arrested. In a scene described as "insulting" and "disgusting", the defendants were led into the East Lansing City Hall chained hand and foot. Three waived examination and were bound over to Circuit Court on \$10000 bond. A 26 August examination was set for the others, and their bond set at \$5000 or \$10000--the maximum permissible.

This harshness, and the rumored abuse of students' rights of privacy, freedom from self-incrimination and illegitimate search, climaxed long-

Mc Case

### Reflections on the May Case

The investigation, absence, and contested reinstatement of MSU's Vice-President for Business and Finance, Phillip J. May, has all the markings of an old-fashioned scandal; and unfortunately this is how it has been received. Unfortunately-- because a scandal is essentially an emotional affair, built on half truths, flaring into personal accusations which ignore the issues, and soon dying away. Quite aside from what this may do to the University's name, it is in general a poor approach to a potentially serious problem. Instead, such an occurrence such stimulate reasoned inquiry, not only into the morals of the alleged offend, but also into the institutions responsible for the situation. Some insight into the nature of the Administration is afforded by an analysis of their reaction to the problem; and the response of the candidates for the Board of Trustees should be carefully considered both in order to judge their qualifications and to prepare oneself for any possible changes in our governing body.

Presumably everyone by now has read all the available information on the case. Those who may care to think about the incident as well as talk about it may begin with such questions as these:

--May, as Treasurer of the University, certainly should know the laws concerning business interests; why then did he allow himself to fall into such a vulnerable position to begin with?

--Why would four of the Trustees of a university which has strict ordinances concerning the molestation of ducks vote for the reinstatement of a man of even questionable morals in so high a position?

--Is it true, as the Republican candidates imply, that the problems of the Administration should be handled secretly? Isn't that contrary to the entire spirit of an academic institution, with its emphasis on open discussion of the facts? Is the reputation of the University so feeble that we cannot admit the faults of our members (if such they prove to be) without threatening the institution?

These are questions of far greater importance than the particular case of Mr. May. They deserve cool consideration rather than moral indignation or spicy gossip on the part of the Trustees, faculty, and students.

The San Francisco Mime Troupe represents the latest trends in the Theatre. Now that Theatre of the Absurd is apparently passe, the most exciting movements in the Theatre are what can be called Theatre of Involvement and Theatre of Commitment.

The first seeks to involve the audience in the creative process of making the play; the second seeks to involve the audience in a political point of view. The two are not mutually exclusive, but they can be distinguished.

The Theatre of Involvement seeks to break down the traditional barriers between the actors and the audience, to invite the audience to participate actively--even physically--in the theatrical event. While this technique is often ~~used~~ applied to plays with revolutionary content, it need not be: one need only consider last year's New York production of Dionysia '68, a presentation in g-strings of Euripides' The Bacchae, or the Living Theatre's current production of Antigone, or the fabulously successful Hair, or Arrabal's Labyrinth. It tends to make use of mixed-media techniques; and it makes heavy assaults upon the sensibilities of the audience (anti-bourgeois-repressions demonstrations, to use the Living Theatre's terminology). Thus, we are treated to the famous nude scenes in Hair and Tom Paine, a nude playing Tarzan over the audience of the Labyrinth, and a nude group-grope of actors and audience in the Living Theatre's Paradise Now. All of this is intended to yank the audience member out of his traditional mood of detachment and force him to become personally involved in the play-making process.

The Theatre of Commitment, on the other hand, has a more polemical function. It may try to involve its audiences in the creative process (Tom Paine or Viet Rock), but it is primarily concerned with educating the audience to New Left politics, or stirring it to a sense of commitment and solidarity, or, at its most extreme, stirring it to action. A typical example is MacBird. (The equivalent in film is the work of Jean-Luc Godard.) Essentially, Theatre of Commitment tries to make revolutionaries of its audiences.

Obviously, if this is its goal, the Theatre of Commitment cannot anchor itself in New York or London or Paris or San Francisco. It must go out and reach audiences not ordinarily reached. In recognition of this fact, ~~many~~ several groups have begun to tour, calling their movement guerilla theatre or revolutionary theatre. One such group is Francois Jeanson's, now touring the French provinces, trying to create a broad popular base for revolution. Another is the Becks' Living Theatre which will soon begin to tour this country. And another group is the San Francisco Mime Troupe. In their own words, "We have placed ourselves outside; outside the commercial market and outside in the streets and parks, because outside is the only place a revolution can grow." Although the political aspects of the Troupe will be discussed elsewhere, permit me to raise a slightly impertinent question: does playing the universities really fulfill the goal stated above? The audience Thursday night was a pre-sold audience; no minds had to be changed, because everyone agreed with the political point of view of the group. Until the Mime Troupe and



other groups like it begin to persuade the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, instead of feeding on the adulation of hippies and intellectuals, I shall not be convinced of their revolutionary potential.

The Troupe performed Pantelin Thursday night. ~~Vants/In/Is~~ It was an evening of Theatre of Commitment, although before the play began the actors led the audience in certain exercises designed to involve the audience in the proceedings by breaking down the barriers each of us encompasses himself with and creating a bond of sympathetic unity among the members of the audience. The exercises worked well in this case, primarily, I suppose, because the audience was predisposed to be receptive. I wonder if ~~these~~ these exercises--clapping, singing, and so on--would work on an older, more middle-class audience. (I attended a fine performance of Tom Paine at the Kalamazoo College Festival Playhouse this summer, in which the fat cats embarrassedly read their programs whenever it was audience-involvement time.)

Pantelin itself is a 15th-century French play in the Commedia del'Arte tradition. It has the typical stock characters--the greedy Jew, the nagging wife, the cunning hero, the nonsense-mouthing dottore. The Mime Troupe has retained the 15th-century setting (even playing on a postage-stamp sized stage as the travelling troupes of that day did), but ~~has~~ has updated the play by additions of topical and "vulgar" material. The play thus becomes primarily an attack upon bourgeois principles, ~~the~~ morals, and institutions. Such updating is proper: plays such as Pantelin are <sup>only</sup> of historical interest ~~only~~ if presented as museum pieces; but they originally were designed as vehicles for <sup>farce</sup> scatological, social, and sometimes political humor. They were the 15th-century equivalent of The Laugh-In. Hence, if ~~we~~ we are to appreciate them as they were appreciated in their own day, they must be relevant to our lives as they were to the lives of 15th-century audiences.

The style of the play is slapstick and broadly vulgar. To be done well, ~~the/actors~~ this style needs actors who are well trained physically and have a good sense of timing. These two requisites most of the Mime Troupe fulfill. In addition to the live action, the Troupe makes use of <sup>a</sup> "cranky", whereon picture stories are unfolded with narration to emphasize the ~~the~~ anti-bourgeois sentiments of the Troupe. It was not necessary to the performance, but it did provide a change of pace from the frenetic doings on stage. Altogether, the Troupe's performance of Pantelin was expert and enjoyable, although not, I think, particularly illuminating in a political sense.

After the intermission, we were treated to a performance of the Gorilla Band and a series of Center Puppet Shows. These dealt with such subjects as the draft, parking meters, the War, Black Panthers, etc. They were mostly amusing, though sometimes a bit long. The anti-War "cranky" crusade was maudlin and obvious. The evening closed with a plea that we all join together, keep our cool, and Act if necessary. The warm glow of

# ROOT AND BRANCH

SEPT. 20, 1968

There are opinions about the University which we have long held, despite the disbelief of liberals. Since last 3 June, three of these have become so obvious that even the blindest liberal cannot disbelieve. The salient points are these:

- 1) The Administration is in the grip of a 'Columbia Complex'.
- 2) The faculty at MSU are powerless.
- 3) The student exists without any rights.

Even many radicals expressed surprise that John Hannah lost his cool last spring. Now the liberals are wringing their hands about liberties and asking why Br Hannah should act so illiberally. The basic reason is the same: Hannah and the men around him are frantic in the grip of a nightmare: Columbia might happen here. Their power is threatened, and they haven't got time for plans to keep the students peaceful, or even for liberal sentiments.

This 'Columbia Complex' is a self-fulfilling prophecy. Every time the administrators lash out blindly at some 'Columbia', the massive force and their unreasonable actions alienate more people, and move the campus closer to a state of eruption.

There is evidence that as far back as mid-May, the Administration began laying plans for putting down the students, following Grayson Kirk's advice to hit hard and fast. When faced with a sit-in on 4 June, they panicked, and the wheels started rolling after Hannah gave the word by phone from Detroit. Campus police, and a handful at that, were sufficient to give what protection from attack that was accorded to marchers that night--a potentially dangerous situation. But 120 off-campus troopers were felt necessary to arrest persons sitting in.

Nor would these men have been faced with any violence, had they not preceded the arrests by a most brutal and unprovoked attack on demonstrators packed onto the east porch of the Administration building. No warning to disperse was given before the state Troopers charged; indeed, they could not have dispersed had they wished to. Their only exit was blocked by the east Lansing Police.

No attempt was made to resist the charge violently. Violence on the part of the students came only after this attack enraged the crowd, turning them from onlookers into a mob. A University bus was damaged; more arrests were made. Hitting hard and fast had turned a minor dispute and sit-in into mob violence.

Doing this once hasn't been enough. In a series of moves over the summer, Hannah, the Board of Trustees, and the legislature competed to see who could sponsor the most repressive legislation. In protecting themselves from a second occurrence, they have only succeeded in angering more people, and making a second confrontation more of a threat.

And where was the faculty, supposedly the heart of the University? As Prof. Frank Pinner, MSU-AAUP chairman, noted, "...We of the faculty were not there, and that is part of the tragedy." The faculty had so long ignored the problem of student discontent that things had come to this, and they had so long ignored the problem that the Administration could safely ignore them.

Only one member of the faculty cared enough to question the wisdom of the Administration's actions by challenging the resolution submitted to a confidential meeting of the Academic Council, 7 June, which absolved the Administration of all blame, and supported the actions against students who 'didn't follow channels.' In a beautiful speech for the students he declared, "We can draft a large number of self-serving statements--We can decry what happened at Columbia--but it is the young people who have aroused our consciences...I want to keep listening to them, and I have not heard them here!" But only his vote was cast against it.

So when it came time for the next move, Hannah felt he didn't even need to run it through the right faculty channels. Faculty are to be consulted only when he needs a rubber stamp. In running the University, they count for as little as the students.

And the students count for damn little. They have an Academic Freedom Report, of course, granted by the beneficent Administration. The self-same resolution of 20 September, that so well shows where the faculty stands, exposes the farcical nature of this document. John Hannah imposes, and John Hannah disposes. So be it, Amen.

It never protected the student from abuses of his rights by police, which led to the incident this spring. It never stopped the long record of harassment and political information-gathering by campus police, as the Serge Keleher incident this summer indicated. (Father Keleher, a former MSU student now with a Baltimore parish, while visiting here was denied access to students in the Ingham County Jail, because, among other points, Undersheriff Moses had been informed of his 'communist leanings' by University police. For the record, the Undersheriff later denied that that was the source he stated--and a witness has contradicted him.)

It never protected the student from double jeopardy: in fact, it institutes it. One can be--as the sit-in participants are being--tried on a charge in civil court, and if the charge is dismissed, tried again before the Student Faculty Judiciary. Of course, as the University attorney explains, double jeopardy really is being threatened with the loss of liberty twice for the same charge. As S-F J can't jail you, it isn't double jeopardy. Clever, no?

It doesn't protect one from the repeated actions of the Trustees affirming that whatever they choose to protect--even if it's the ROTC destroying a simulated Vietnamese village on campus--is legitimate, and all protest is illegitimate, and possible ground for arrest and suspension. Now we are told that it was never intended to protect one from arbitrary administrative action. It can not assure what it institutionalizes--due process--much less human rights.

The protestors who didn't use channels last spring knew this. Let them be condemned for not using channels--by the same people whose reverence for channels vanishes when they want to act. Channels are bankrupt.

What is to be done? We cannot afford confrontation--the Administration has behind it enough repressive force to doom any attempt. Taking a building is both futile and wrong: buildings, and the administrators in them, are irrelevant to the University. To say that it is necessary to hold buildings is to fall into the delusion that makes MSU what it is.

Instead, let us use the discontent generated to organize. In the short range, organize toward an ultimatum to rescind the 20 September resolution, backed by a strike threat. When Hannah said at the 7 June Academic Council meeting, "This University costs \$.5 million a day... We cannot close it for a day..." he indicated the soft place to poke. It's a business enterprise--and can be dealt with like any other. Individual disruptors can be arrested, but a faceless mass not attending class or working can't be--and they can remain faceless, by organizing the faculty to refuse to hold class, or refuse to turn in names of strikers.

But this is only short range. The true end of the organizing must be restructuring the University so that students and faculty assume the power that is rightfully theirs. Were faculty members to unite and declare that they would respect no suspension under a rule they did not approve, and then formally notify the draft boards of expelled students that they, the true university, did not consider the suspensions valid, they would have established an alternate university, a step of civil usurpation which could bring down the old structure. How a new university, created in this or similar ways, might assume full control, should become the next topic of debate.--D. H. Mader

ROOT & BRANCH is published by a group of MSU students. Staff this issue: Jim Gaines, Don Mader, Jeff McCrae, Thom Peterson. Help from: Jim Albert, S T Tidwell, and others. Temporary mailing address: c/o Don Mader, P O Box 2251, Michigan Ave, Station, Lansing, Michigan, 48911. Articles or inquiries about help invited.



# Lost in the Stars

by Allen Williams

Any new Stanley Kubrick film is cause for high anticipation. For some years now, Kubrick has been the explanation point in intellectual's arguments about what Hollywood, with all of its resources, could be if it would. He is a director who has dared to use material much unlike the ordinary Hollywood cop, but he has not disdained the use of Hollywood's incomparable technical resources and practitioners. His work includes one very fine film — Paths of Glory — and one undeniable masterpiece — Dr. Strangelove.

2001: A Space Odyssey is Kubrick's first film since Strangelove. It is, alas, a disappointment; but it is still well worth seeing. Kubrick spent four years and several million dollars in making this film, and, from a technical standpoint, it was money and time well spent. But what has bothered both critics and audiences alike is the obscurity of the film's meaning. Reaction to this obscurity falls into two categories: there are those who dismiss anything they do not understand as pretentious nonsense; and then there are those who hail what they cannot understand as sublimely profound, under the mistaken notion that the mind of a creative genius is beyond the power of mere mortals to comprehend. The truth is that the film is neither nonsense nor profound. In fact, its meaning is not nearly as obscure as everyone seems to think. The essential clue to unravelling the film's riddle is to be found in the credits: screenplay by Stanley Kubrick and Arthur C. Clarke. Clarke, of course, is a notable science-fiction writer, and, since this is a science-fiction film, we may expect to find a typical sci-fi plot gimmick. Admittedly, Kubrick has not spelled out what it is — indeed, I believe that he has been deliberately obscurantist so as to hide the gimmick, — but it is unmistakably there.

Let us consider the plot. We begin with "the Dawn of Man." A tribe of ape-like animals are confronted by a huge black monolith which suddenly appears in their midst. Shortly thereafter, one of them discovers how to use a bone as a weapon. He and his tribe learn how to kill with the new tool. The animal has begun to think. Man is born. We find ourselves next in the 21st century. Man is well advanced into the space age. A black monolith has been discovered on the moon. What does it mean? The team which goes out to investigate is paralyzed by a powerful signal from the stone. We now find ourselves aboard a space ship bound for Jupiter. Aboard are five men — three in hibernation, and the captain and mate (played by Keir Dullea and Gary Lockwood) who are in charge of the ship — and one very human computer named H.A.L., who talks, plays chess, and runs the ship. Something is amiss aboard ship: H.A.L. begins to malfunction, and the two men decide to disconnect him. Before they can act, however, H.A.L. eliminates the three hibernating scientists by cutting off their life support and the mate by hurling him out into space. The captain ingeniously manages to outwit H.A.L. and disconnects him by removing his memory banks. The ship continues toward Jupiter. The purpose of the flight, we and the captain now learn, is to seek out clues to the origin of the black monolith, since the signal it emitted was directed toward Jupiter. When the spaceship reaches Jupiter, the captain finds another black monolith, orbiting out among the moons. He approaches it in a small craft. It shoots away, and he is immediately bombarded by a spectacular light show. He then finds himself in an 18th-century interior. He sees a figure; it is himself grown old. That self sees an ancient, dying man. It is himself again. That self sees still a new self — in embryonic form. The embryo is shown floating toward earth. Close-up of its wide, staring eyes. End of movie.

What does it mean? Very simple. Just as H.A.L. is an intelligence created and programmed by man, so man is an intelligence created and programmed by a greater Power: notice that the apes do not take their first step toward becoming man until the black monolith appears. H.A.L. malfunctions and has to be disconnected, by having his memory banks removed. Just so, man malfunctions and has to be disconnected. (The captain obviously represents everyone; and the representation of a new galaxy being born would seem to indicate that the old galaxy is wiped out when he is attacked.) His life cycle is rapidly played out to the end, and man becomes, like H.A.L., an embryonic intelligence, ready to be reprogrammed. What is the nature of man's malfunction? H.A.L.'s fault was that he fancied himself no longer a servant, but the master, self-sufficient and self-justifying. Man is guilty of the same fault. We are never told what the Greater Power which controls man is, but I very much doubt that the fact that it is to be found in the vicinity of Jupiter is merely accidental. A modern morality play.

Not very profound, is it. Clever, yes, but very little for a film as long as this. The spare plot is fleshed out with those two elements so dear to sci-ence-fiction fans -- an indication of what the man of the future will be like, and all kinds of fantastic gadgetry. Kubrick has always seemed pessimistic about the nature of man, and his view of the future is certainly chilling. If he is right, we may expect the space age to be ugly and sterile, a universe of Howard Johnsons and Moon Hiltons, of all-pervading Kuzak, peopled by men who all look and sound like advertising executives, full of glib phrases and phony sincerity. The gadgetry is spectacular: monstrous space stations wheel in majestic orbit around the earth; space ships of all shapes and sizes, filled with all kinds of intricate and colorful equipment, glide through the void. It is all so convincing that we feel a pang to think that we shall not see it. (It occurs to me to wonder when man began to have such a burning curiosity about the future -- not so much about what will happen, but about what life will be like. It seems like a good topic for a good thesis in intellectual or social history.) Equally spectacular are the astronomical effects -- Jupiter and its moons, the galaxy being seen, and so on, since the astronomical light show is indescribable. (I hear that this film is considered a space one to go to stoned.) At its best, 2001 is a film of breathtaking beauty.

And yet, and yet. The film fails to satisfy. There are no characters with whom one can identify and no acting we can admire -- not the actor's fault, since they are not asked to act. The story line is too attenuated, too curiously flat. Even the struggle with H.A.L. fails to generate tension. The enigma of the black monolith is so played down, that we forget to be puzzled by them in between their appearances. Kubrick appears to have become so entranced by his special effects that the plot became increasingly incidental to the film's structure -- indeed, almost unnecessary. He was right to assume that the gadgets and effects are more interesting than the plot, but wrong to assume that they alone could hold audience attention for two and a half hours. In short, 2001: A Space Odyssey is a film which, quite literally, gets lost in the stars.

Theresa and Isabelle: My friend Fred informs me that the director of this film seems to assume that repeated lesbian cunnilingus and pretty scenery suffice to make an interesting film. He reports that they do not: the film is dull, without artistic merit, and even fails to make it as pornography.

## Alma Mater, May 1

The investigation, absence, and contested reinstatement of HSU's Vice-President for Business and Finance, Phillip J. May, has all the markings of an old-fashioned scandal; and unfortunately this is how it has been received. Unfortunately -- because a scandal is essentially an emotional affair, built on half-truths, flaring into personal accusations which ignores the issues, and soon dying away. Quite aside from what this may do to the University's name, it is in general a poor approach to a potentially serious problem. Instead, such an occurrence should stimulate reasoned inquiry, not only into the morals of the alleged offender, but also into the institutions responsible for the situation. Some insight into the nature of the Administration is afforded by an analysis of their reaction to the problem; and the response of the candidates for the Board of Trustees should be carefully considered both in order to judge their qualifications and to prepare oneself for any possible changes in our governing body.

Presumably everyone has by now read all the available information on the case. Those who wish to think about the incident as well as talk about it might begin with such questions as these:

--May, as Treasurer of the University, certainly should know the laws concerning business interests; why then did he allow himself to fall into such a vulnerable position in the first place?

--Why would four of the Trustees of a university which has strict ordinances concerning even the molestation of ducks vote for the reinstatement of a man of even questionable morals in so high a position?

--Is it true, as the Republican candidates imply, that the problems of the Administration should be handled secretly? Isn't that contrary to the entire spirit of an academic institution, with its emphasis on open discussion of the facts? Is the reputation of the University so feeble that we cannot admit the faults of our members (if such they prove to be) without threatening the institution?

These latter questions are of far greater importance than the particular case of Mr. May. They deserve cool consideration rather than moral indignation or spicy gossip on the part of the trustees, faculty, and students. --(M) 17. 6. 26