"It has been made clear to me that by taking sanctuary I face more time in the stockade than I would if I turned myself in. To me it is worth it. I feel that if I can convince 100 people that the war is wrong, that it is an injustice against the basic freedoms of our country, then I will gladly serve the extra time. The ones that I hope to bring a better understanding to are those who say that the war and the military are wrong, but yet are not willing to do anything about it."

This is an excerpt from the statement made by Mike O'Conner as he took sanctuary at MIT on October 29th. By the time he was arrested 12 days later Mike had managed to involve more than 1000 people in his action, and it looked as though for many of them this involvement would become a continuing personal commitment to active opposition to the war.

Mike, 19, had been AWOL from Fort Bragg for 3 weeks when he visited the sanctuary for Ray Kroll in Marsh Chapel at Boston University. Deeply impressed by what he felt that sanctuary was accomplishing, he asked to join Ray. However, Ray and those around him felt the bust would come soon and convinced Mike to wait. (It did come the next morning.)

Mike spent the next several weeks carefully considering what he wanted to do. He then approached the New England Resistance to discuss arranging a sanctuary. The members of the Resistance discussed with him its possible detrimental consequences to himself. Mike could not be dissuaded; he had make a firm decision to make his statement against the war in this way.

Cont. on p. 3

We need money. This fall we ran ads in the New Republic and the New York Review of Books, and we have sent out a fund-raising letter, and the response has been very disappointing. Many people have told us that they appreciated the political analysis presented in the ad, but our appeal for support was largely ignored.

Demands on the national RESIST office are increasing. Many established groups still need support from us, and there are also many groups breaking ground in new areas of work, especially with soldiers and high school students who need funds to get started. I suspect two of the causes of the poor response to our appeal for money are the President's "peace offensive" and the fact that many people have shifted their contributions to local resistance work.

President Johnson's April Fool's Eve and Halloween speeches lulled people who oppose the war into a false sense of optimism and a dangerous relaxation. Optimism is premature and relaxation is dangerous because of what is happening in Paris, Vietnam and America.

Item: When American planes stopped bombing part of North Vietnam last spring, they intensified bombing of the rest of the North. In fact, American planes dropped more bombs on territory below the 19th parallel than they had been dropping on the whole of the North before. It now appears that after the Halloween announcement that bombing of the North would cease altogether, that air war in the South and in Laos has been rapidly escalated. Thus the war is not being scaled down, it is being concentrated. We must imagine what that means for suffering people in the Vietnamese and Laotian countryside.

Cont. on p. 2
Item: "Allied forces have surrounded 24 square miles of rice paddy land and foothills just west of here in one of the most concentrated efforts of the Vietnam war to root out enemy troops and Vietcong agents... The primary goal of the operation is the destruction of the Vietcong organization in the area."
(N.Y. Times, Nov. 23.)

Item: The day after the election, the Pentagon announced that draft calls for January were being increased to 26,800, by far the highest total since last spring. Calls of that size or larger are forecast for the rest of the spring on 1969. The college graduates spared in the fall will begin to go in January.

Item: Prosecution of war resisters is intensifying. Thirty-six indictments have been brought just in Massachusetts in recent weeks, and we have reports that prosecutions are being accelerated elsewhere, too. Meanwhile, Los Angeles has seen its first five-year sentence for a resister, breaking a long-standing pattern of maximum three-year terms.

In the second place, people who have previously contributed to RESIST are now giving their money to local groups. We think this development is important and desirable, and we have aided it in every way we could, by providing mailing lists, sending special fund appeals, and so on. Rochester, Long Island, Pittsburgh, Minneapolis, and Baltimore, among other places, have adopted monthly pledge systems similar to that of national RESIST. The strength of the resistance movement depends finally upon the strength of its roots in local communities.

Nonetheless, a sufficient flow of funds to the national office is vital to the movement as a whole. New areas of work are being opened. Many projects, because of their location and nature, find it difficult to obtain adequate local support, especially at first. In the last month, for example, we have provided emergency grants to tide over two GI coffee houses and a GI newspaper. Moreover, local support often comes only after a project is set up. The national office is one of the few places to which new projects can turn for funds to open an office and pay an organizer $30 a week to start the job. This is particularly true of high school projects which we think are extremely important just now. Besides, established projects do come on hard times: bail or fines eat up reserves, expansion takes new funds, full-time organizers don't have time to raise money. In such emergencies, it is YOUR money, flowing through the RESIST office, which keeps people going.

At the last Steering Committee meeting there were 14 funding requests totalling about $15,000. We don't have even a third of that to disburse.

If each person who contributes or pledges to RESIST (or to a local group) were to recruit one other person to contribute or pledge, we could help many more of the groups all over the country who are now requesting assistance from us. We also hope that people will review their own financial commitments and decide if the amount they "tax" themselves for resistance is commensurate with their ability and the movement's needs.
Sites for the sanctuary were then considered, and MIT chosen. With over $200 million per year in defense contracts, it seemed a particularly appropriate place to protest U.S. Vietnam policy and military procedures. A large hall, the Sala de Puerto Rico in the MIT Student Center, was chosen for the sanctuary because Mike's was a political action and it was felt it should occur in a secular atmosphere.

At noon on Tuesday, October 29th, MIT faculty, staff, students, employees, and administration on their way to and from lunch were informed that Mike O'Connor, with the support of the MIT Resistance, had claimed sanctuary at MIT. A sheet explaining Mike's stand and that of the MIT Resistance was distributed as all passers-by were encouraged to support Mike by joining the sanctuary. Those who did spent the afternoon discussing the tactics to be used when the federal authorities arrived to arrest Mike and finally decided to non-violently "sit to obstruct": When the bust came all present would surround Mike, sitting as close together as possible. The arresting agents would then have to remove them to get to Mike. An extensive security system and a communications system were also organized. Tuesday evening a previously scheduled teach-in was held in the Sala. Mike, Howard Zinn of BU, Father Bob Cunnane of the Milwaukee Fourteen, and others spoke to a group of 700. At the conclusion of the teach-in Mike thanked those present for their support and asked that all who could stay with him throughout the night.

As about 200 people spread out their blankets, the procedure for greeting the Feds was reviewed, safe sitting positions were demonstrated, and the procedure to follow if arrested was explained. These items were reviewed every night during the Sala phase of the sanctuary.

At about 2:30 AM Wednesday morning the first alarm came. From the security people came word that several police cars had pulled up to the Student Center and were discharging people. People gathered together and surrounded Mike. Mike, visibly nervous, thanked everyone for having come to support him and said that a part of him would always remain with the sanctuary community. As everyone sat quietly awaiting the Feds word came that the police cars had departed and the people left behind had dispersed without entering the Student Center. Everyone calmed their nerves and tried to settle down to sleep again. The next alarm came around 4 AM when everyone was abruptly awakened by an announcement over the loud speaker that "This is the police. Everyone stay where you are and no one will be hurt." Everyone immediately moved in close to Mike. It was thought that the police must be in Kresge Auditorium, the building next to the Student Center, but the Campus Patrol searched it and found nothing. Apparently someone had found a way to tie into the public address system being used in the Sala; the turning-on of a spotlight in a mezzanine box in the Sala was then chosen as a special signal to identify legitimate alarms. People relaxed again and the rest of the night was peaceful.

Breakfast was served on Wednesday morning, as the second day of the sanctuary began. (A kitchen had been set up in the Sala and money was collected daily to provide meals for those who were making the Sala their temporary home.) People began to bring their classes to the Sala; it is a large room and classes could be conducted in the back of it while other activities were going on at the front. Special seminars were organized to discuss topics such as imperialism, what MIT students can do to help end the war, and faculty and student life at MIT.

Wednesday evening several rock groups performed and three short movies were shown (including one on RESIST). The Cont. on p. 6
Milwaukee 14 - What is Support?

All of the men are now out on bail; federal charges have been filed and will probably take precedence over the state charges on which they were originally held. Their lawyers, William Kunstler and Percy Julian, have accepted a political strategy for the trial roughly similar to that used in Baltimore by the Catonsville Nine. We do not yet know when the Milwaukee 14 will come to trial; three or four months is a reasonable guess. That gives us just sufficient time to mobilize a nationwide campaign of support for them - and to see if the bombing pause and pre-election optimism bring us anywhere near peace, at least in Vietnam.

But just what is support? That has, of course, been a fundamental problem for us from the beginning. In some respects it is what we conventionally understand it to be: a major effort will be made to bring large numbers of people to Milwaukee during the trial and to provide for them the kind of experiences that so moved those of us fortunate enough to be in Baltimore Oct. 7-10. We will also be urging all of you to organize local demonstrations and other actions at the time of the trial.

Prior to that time, we will develop and circulate relevant literature, films, discussion guides, and other materials. It will also be particularly important to provide speaking engagements for the Milwaukee 14 (as well as for those of the Catonsville 9 still out of prison). Elsewhere is this issue is a list of their names and addresses; speaking requests should be sent directly to them, since that will be of aid in overcoming legal tangles, or through Linda Forest, who is coordinating speaking schedules, at the M-14 Defense Committee office: 2117 West Vliet, Milwaukee, (414) 933-3228. I hope people will begin planning out programs of speaking, literature distribution, surveys of attitudes toward such actions among high school students, and other means for raising, examining, and publicizing the issues focused by the Catonsville and Milwaukee actions. This is all "support" as we have known it.

But I believe these actions have opened new dimensions of support to us, as they have forced many of us to re-examine our own analyses and commitments. Florence Howe wrote, in the last Newsletter, of how the actions and the personal testimony of the Nine broadened many people's view from the particular vile war in Vietnam to the longstanding, widespread viciousness of American imperialism elsewhere in Asia, Latin America, Africa. Many of us are discomforted by the word "imperialism," but with what are we left after Marjorie Melville has described in quiet eloquence the fleet of Guatemalan police cars bought through U.S.A.I.D., the huge land reserves held by U.S. corporations from land-hungry peasants, the devastating effects of military assistance on Latin American "democracy," the use of U.S.-manufactured napalm in Latin America? This widening of perspective is all the more important with a Vietnam peace dangling before our lips. Similarly, the Nine and the Fourteen have challenged our assumptions about nonviolence, about property, about risk and jail.

We need to confront these challenges, to absorb the new ideas they present and to translate them into action. In this way, I think, we will be moving toward a new dimension of "support."

At the meeting mentioned above, the group agreed on the importance of helping stimulate the formation of quite small study-action groups to perform such tasks. Below is a description of these groups; it is, I think, a clear and compelling presentation. I would add only a few notes to it. First, it would be of special value, I think, if such groups took as their points of departure the Catonsville Nine
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and Milwaukee 14 statements, with all their actions implied. Second, we have only begun to identify in our own communities the institutions of militarism, imperialism, and racism, let alone the great variety of ways in which we can resist their continued operation. Such resistance may, third, prove to be as varied as it is increasingly costly; small groups of people who know and can depend on each other may be better prepared to absorb these costs and risks and provide mutual support than our usual loose-knit organizations.

Here then are the ideas concerning these study-action groups.

Explicit resistance to war and to exploitative and dehumanizing social practices may be mounted by persons committed to nonviolence both as to means and to goals.

For such explicit resistance to occur requires that people whose general commitment and philosophy requires adherence to the goals and disciplines of nonviolence are able to identify social needs and action projects consistent with such commitment and philosophy. It also requires considerable personal dedication and commitment. This is not something that can be scheduled like another event on one's calendar. What is required is very careful consideration of the social effects of one's action and also of one's readiness to engage in the action, meeting whatever it may involve in terms of personal response. To become prepared in this way suggests the need for people of like mind to meet together on a fairly regular basis to discuss, consider, make decisions and to act together in their own community out of a shared sense of opportunity and responsibility. As an example of what is being suggested, the people who engaged at Catonsville in Maryland when draft records were destroyed had many meetings before the event at which they probed their consciences, their sense of responsibility and responded to their perceptions of what it is to be really human in these times. It was out of these meetings that this action emerged with power not only to destroy draft card records but also to challenge in a creative way the courts, the mass media and the community as a whole.

Erich Fromm, in his newly published The Revolution of Hope, in connection with his discussion of the role of small groups in moving toward a "humanized technology" says:

"Ideas become powerful only if they appear in the flesh; an idea which does not lead to action by the individual and by groups remains at best a paragraph or a footnote in a book--provided the idea is original and relevant. It is like a seed stored in a dry place. If the idea is to have influence, it must be put into the soil, and the soil is people and groups of people.

Face-to-face groups must approach problems in a new spirit and with new ideas, but these ideas must be cultivated and spread so that they influence these groups."

It is therefore suggested that along with specific projects which the CADAR might propose it should also encourage local groups of nonviolent activists which would:

1. Consider the involvement of their community in war action (conscription, recruitment, weapons research, weapons production, organized military propaganda and displays, etc.)

2. Examine their responsibilities and opportunities to resist by deed.

3. Resist by deed.

"JUSTICE IS MERELY INCIDENTAL TO LAW AND ORDER."

--J. Edgar Hoover
crowd of people staying the night was even larger than that of the night before, and all were pleased to awaken on Thursday morning to the realization that no bust had come.

On Thursday classes and seminars continued in and near the Sala. When the Living Theater performance that evening in Kresge Auditorium was over, many of the members of the audience and of the Living Theater came over to the sanctuary. Though non-participants and curious on-lookers were encouraged to leave, nearly 1000 people were still there at 1 AM and were apparently planning to spend the night. Someone suggested that, in view of the large number of newcomers, the group's commitment to non-violent obstruction should be reviewed. In the discussion that followed the community was forced to rethink its reasons for choosing non-violence. At times Mike and his position seemed to be becoming overwhelmed by a trend in the crowd toward a more direct confrontation. Someone asserted that non-violence had not worked in the past and that direct action in the streets was the only answer. Mike retorted that the group need not be governed by the successes or failures of others when choosing its course of action. The voices in favor of violence, of attaining their own ends and forgetting about or merely using Mike, seemed to be dominant. Around 3 AM Mike, exhausted and fearful of the fragmentation that seemed to be occurring, finally asked that a vote be taken. He said that he would turn himself in if it was the consensus of the group that it wanted a violent confrontation; he would stay if the group was still committed to supporting him in the non-violent manner agreed upon on Tuesday afternoon. Faced with this decision, dissention seemed to vanish as the group voted almost unanimously to continue its non-violent support of Mike's resistance.

Now emotionally as well as physically exhausted, everyone settled down to talk or try to sleep (by Thursday there were people sleeping in rooms and corridors all over the Student Center). Within an hour, however, everyone was jolted awake by an alert. Someone suggested greeting the Feds with music, and a vote on the type of music was taken. Beethoven and hard rock tied, and both were played. However, the Feds didn't appear.

On Friday classes and seminars continued; in the afternoon Harvey Cox spoke of his recent trip to France and Sweden to visit American deserters and of plans for a campaign to obtain amnesty for draft resisters. Father Blaise Bonpane spoke of American counter-revolutionary activities in Guatemala.

On Saturday parents brought their children to take part in the sanctuary. Often they came up to meet Mike, explaining to the children that Mike was trying to do something to make the world better for them as well as for himself. In the evening the large number of people present were invited to form discussion groups. Various topics were suggested, and many of those present took part in the discussions. Reports on the discussions were presented around midnight and it was agreed that people interested in pursuing the various topics (such as "Who rules MIT?", investigations of defense contracts held by MIT, and looking for ways to end the war) further would meet again on Sunday evening. Saturday night there was another alert, which again turned out to be a false alarm. Since early Sunday morning seemed to be a very likely time for the bust, almost 1200 people slept in the Student Center, ready to greet the Feds on an instant's notice. No further alert came.

Sunday Mike declared victory. For six days he had been shielded from arrest by the large number of supporters always around him. He had thus been able, through radio, television, and newspaper reports and interviews, to
explain to many, many people his opposition to the war and to Army practices. He had debated his position with many people in the Sala. The success of the sanctuary had far surpassed any hopes he had had when it began. Now, he declared, he felt free to lead his own life until the Feds chose to arrest him, and he felt his supporters should resume their normal lives. He had received many invitations to visit classes at MIT and thought he would begin to do so the next day.

On Monday most members of the sanctuary community resumed their regular schedules. Mike did not attend classes. A faculty committee objected to his leaving the sanctuary area (i.e., the Student Center) and the administration recommended that any classes Mike would be attending be brought to him in the Student Center; the MIT Resistance, hoping to avoid a confrontation, tried to work out a compromise with the faculty and the administration. A meeting of the sanctuary community was held in the Sala Monday evening to decide how to react to this situation and to consider moving the sanctuary to another room in the Student Center (the Junior Prom committee had reserved the Sala and wanted to begin to decorate it for the Prom). After considerable discussion the group accepted Noam Chomsky's view of the situation - that the moving of the sanctuary to a smaller room with inadequate public address and other communications devices (which might not have been done so readily if victory had not been declared) irreparably damaged the sense of togetherness enjoyed by the community while in the Sala. Mike's exhaustion from the first week forced him to rest away from the sanctuary room much of the time he was not attending classes. Members of the MIT Resistance heeded Mike's recommendation that everyone resume their normal lives and, when in the Student Center, sanctuary community would take part in any demonstrations the following day, which was election day. It was finally decided not to do so: Mike was extremely exhausted from the previous week and his doctor felt he should have as much as rest as possible. Nothing that could be gained from attending or holding an outside demonstration was worth risking Mike's health and safety.

From Tuesday until Sunday morning, when Mike was arrested, the people who had formed the sanctuary community went about their normal routines while Mike rested as much as possible and attended classes. The new sanctuary room remained open until Friday afternoon and people were always wandering in and out, although few activities were planned and food and sleeping quarters were no longer provided. Mike was living in the offices of the MIT Social Service Committee (also on the fourth floor of the Student Center) with those who were closest to him; and it was there, at 7 AM on Sunday morning, that he was arrested by a single military policeman accompanied by the chief of the MIT Campus Patrol. He was taken to Fort Devens and is presently awaiting court martial there.

In retrospect: By declaring victory Mike and his supporters moved sanctuary in a direction it had not previously taken. While they were wise to focus on Mike's success rather than on anticipation of his arrest, some problems did arise from this decision. The moving of the sanctuary to a smaller room with inadequate public address and other communications devices (which might not have been done so readily if victory had not been declared) irreparably damaged the sense of togetherness enjoyed by the community while in the Sala. Mike's exhaustion from the first week forced him to rest away from the sanctuary room much of the time he was not attending classes. Members of the MIT Resistance heeded Mike's recommendation that everyone resume their normal lives and, when in the Student Center,
were secluded with Mike much of the time. For these reasons people visiting the sanctuary room could not find much sign of activity or support. There were very few activities scheduled that week, and it became evident toward the end that something should have been arranged each day (even if it were only a dinner together) so that people could show their continuing support for Mike. Those connected with the sanctuary knew that it had entered a new phase and that Mike's support had not dwindled. However, those looking in on it from the outside and seeing no sign of organized activity often concluded that his supporters had become bored or tired and had deserted him.

Nonetheless, in many ways the MIT sanctuary was an overwhelming success. Nineteen-year-old Mike O'Connor was an extremely articulate and persuasive person who talked willingly with anyone who approached him in the Sala and with quite a few television and newspaper reporters. His sincerity impressed everyone who spoke with him and compelled many who came to deride him to re-evaluate their reasons for opposing his action. When the discussion groups formed on the first Saturday night turned into research groups that would report within a month to the entire sanctuary community their proposals for projects the community could undertake, the sanctuary community had established, before the bust occurred, a framework for actions to be continued after Mike's arrest. Throughout the sanctuary the perspectives of the community remained oriented in the right direction: It kept attention focused on Mike's resistance to the war and managed not to get sidetracked into a confrontation with the faculty and administration. It kept a concern for Mike as a human being above the desire to get maximum effectiveness from his presence. When things seemed to begin to fall apart Thursday night the community realized in time that it was in sanctuary not to satisfy its individual needs but to provide witness and support for Mike's opposition to the war.

Asked at one point why he did not just leave the country, Mike replied, "This is my country and I love it. If something is wrong with it, we should try to change it." During the MIT sanctuary many of the people who came in contact with it were moved to seriously dedicate themselves to actively working for the changes we all desire.

—Arlene Siegel
(Member, RESIST Newsletter Staff)

MILWAUKEE FOURTEEN SPEAKERS

Members of the Milwaukee Fourteen are available for speaking engagements. They are:

Don Cotten, SDS, St. Louis University St. Louis, Mo.
Michael Cullen, Packard Manse, Stoughton, Mass.
James Forest, Catholic Peace Fellowship, New York City, New York
Jerry Gardner, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisc.
Robert Graf, co-editor of The Catholic Radical
Fr. James Harney, St. Jerome's Catholic Church, No. Weymouth, Mass.
Rev. John Higgenbotham, The Founding Church of Scientology and The Church of American Science, St. Cloud, Minn.
Fr. Alfred Jamieke, priest of the Archdiocese of St. Paul, Minn.
Douglas Harvey, Navy veteran and graduate student
Fr. Anthony Mullaney, St. Anselm's, Manchester, New Hampshire
Fred J. Ojile, draft counselor and church program organizer for the Twin Cities Draft Information Center
Brother K. Basil O'Leary, St. Mary's College, Winona, Minn.
Fr. Larry Rosenbluth, member of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, staff of Casa Maria, Milwaukee, Wisc.