

INTERVIEW WITH CLYDE BROWN

BY

DR. STANLEY YATES

HEAD, DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

Brown: My name is Clyde Brown. Events sort of started Wednesday, April 29th, when a few of us anticipating Nixon's Cambodian action, staged a demonstration inside the Commons in front of the Marine-recruiter's booth.

Interviewer: When you say a few of us, who was there?

Brown: It was myself, Kay Craig, Jim Hoagland, Ken Mills, and maybe 4 or 5 others. What it amounted to was I just sat across from the booth blindfolded with a sign. As the day wore on every so often a few people would sit for an hour and then move on. A few of us spent the entire day. There was no effort or intent to organize it into something bigger. A few of us wanted to try to say something on that day. A day later when Nixon announced troop entry into Cambodia many of us you know anticipated it but were still upset about it. At the same time we had a feeling that Nixon had gone off the deep end and it was going to be one step that the country wasn't going to stand for and finally it could bring the war to a conclusion by showing what we knew to be Vietnamization. The following day there was a large amount of discussion between the organizers as to whether to try and organize an event for Saturday, May 2nd, which eventually happened, or to wait till Tuesday, May 5th, where we have more publicity in the Daily and hopefully more people would participate. The decision was made that action had to be taken immediately.

Interviewer: How was the decision reached?

Brown: The decision is probably not reached very democratically and the decision was reached by 3 or 4 people, myself, Bob Trembly, primarily between ourselves, we just sort of decided that we had to call for an event. The call went out and a certain amount of people

responded on Saturday, with the march from the bandshell to the draft board.

Interviewer: What was the object of the rally?

Brown: The object of the rally was, well we called it a public outrage at Nixon's action, was the way it was publicized. Two things took place at the rally, one prior and one after which is maybe of significance. The first was a large community and faculty response is one compared to previous response by those communities. One individual, Carol Boast, a wife of a graduate student, an Ames resident, contacted large portions of the community through various women's groups and also the director of the music department, I can't think of his name Pritchard, was instrumental in contacting the faculty. Part of the decision on that day was, whether actually to stage a sitdown in one of the intersections as sort of a step in escalation in protest I guess. The decision was made just prior to the starting that the group was probably not large enough to attempt that end and still get away with it as far as the police department was concerned. So the sit-down was called off. We had a two hour parade permit. Two hours to walk about 10 or 12 blocks.

Interviewer: Did you speak at the rally?

Brown: I did speak at the rally when it got there. Statements that I made at the rally were two really. One was a counter argument for those people who were calling for violence as the only future effective activity. I spoke in favor of using non-violent protest as a means of facilitating change. The other statement that I made was the fact that protest tried to do two things I thought. One was communicate a message, and the other was to build a community among ourselves. I thought that day particularly, Saturday, May 2nd, approached October 15th in many regards as a group unity of

people that felt good about what they were doing. They felt that they needed to do it and therefore were happy that they were doing it. So it wasn't a case of being completely wasted because it didn't change Vietnam policy. It was something themselves that people needed.

Interveiwier: What happened at the draft board?

Brown: Well, nothing happened at the draft board on Saturday, May 2nd, but later on in the week--Sunday, myself and Rod Williams and Carol Boast got together at the Boast's house and talked about future activities and what could be planned. They were very in part, some of the suggested ideas which weren't used were one in publicly announcing--we were going to paint the draft board black and then going down and attempting to paint it black and knowing that we would be arrested, because of that activity. Other actions that we thought about were a week long consecutive sit-down strike at the induction center in Des Moines by three people a day working up to the seventh day when there would be a mass day wide call. Part of the thinking in all this and, I don't think it's masochistic, is that some of us felt the need and almost the desire to get arrested in what we felt to be a legitimate political protest.

Interviewer: Is this for publicity purposes?

Brown: I don't think for publicity purposes because the activities that were really planned were for one or two or three people. Primarily, I think it's the committment that we had to make at that time something more than we were doing before and some sacrifice you know was involved in that. Monday, May 4th, which is the day after discussions with the Boast's, I took three, well, six pieces of wood and made three crosses and drove them into the draft board lawn and had one sign of quotes of Abraham Lincoln that I had with

me.

Interviewer: Any significance in having three crosses?

Brown: The crosses were labeled Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos and the extent of the quote was "Sin by silence make cowards of men", one of the posters the Moratorium committee put out. I originally sat on the front part of the lawn with the crosses. Employees of Robert Pyle, who owns the building, called the police.

Interviewer: You were alone then?

Brown: Yes, I was alone and they came and informed me that I would be arrested for trespassing unless I moved to the other side of the sidewalk which I did do not feeling a certain amount of frustration and thinking, well, all I could get arrested for was trespassing. The word had gotten out, somebody had seen the police talking to me and the word had gotten to campus that I had been arrested for sitting on the lawn and a few people, maybe 25 or so friends, immediately came down to find out what was happening. They were sent back by me and told that nothing was really happening one way or the other. One individual, Doug Marks, decided to stay and then later on, an hour or so, Mrs. Norris Yates that lives a couple blocks away also came over. We had a discussion as to what we could do. Mrs. Yates being very adamant about wanting to go inside the board and myself trying to delay the action feeling that getting arrested for trespassing had no significance. After quite a bit of discussion we moved inside the board, first on the steps where again the discussion centered around whether we would be arrested for trespassing which I was still opposed to. It was then decided to move inside the draft board office where we did get arrested. It could be a greater penalty but the charge would be hopefully obstructing the process of the draft rather than tres-

passing which has a little more political significance to me and Mr. Marks, Doug Marks that is. We were in there, the police came. Apparently, the police weren't able to do anything because the complaint had been filed by Mr. Pyle, Robert Pyle's employees. We were as I said, inside the draft board, the police came, they were apparently unable to do anything because the complaint had been filed by the employees of Robert Pyle's accounting service rather than employees of the draft office. The police left, we spent an hour there, had conversations with draft board office personnel and also with three draftees that came in. At the end of the hour the decision was made to move back out to the spot that I was originally asked to move from. Once again, still thinking and wanting to be arrested for something that was non-violently protesting Cambodian, protests that day had no connection with Kent State. Actually it was straight Cambodian. The police were called and told that we were back on the original spot. They didn't come.

Interviewer: Do you know who called?

Brown: They were called once again by employees of Robert Pyle's accounting service.

Interviewer: Do you know why they were objecting rather than the draft board employees?

Brown: They own the ground, that's the only reason I can think of. The Daily informed me that Mr. Pyle's employees had called. We spent till 4:30 there, nothing happened and we decided to break it up for the day. The following day, Tuesday, May 5th, started out by being called to a meeting in room 39 in the Commons.

Interviewer: Who called the meeting?

Brown: The meeting was called by as far as I can tell, by Bill Swan and

Tom Potts, and maybe Bill Ringle. Swan is generally considered to be a quote, unquote, one of the more radical students at least in theory and talk. I was not specifically invited to the meeting and sort of just went as an observer. The talk there centered around going over to the ROTC drill which was supposed to take place at one o'clock and staging an activity there. There was talk about why we were going over there, how to go over, and which tactics to use to be effective and still not get arrested. The thought was to go over to the ROTC field and one at a time sit on the field, when that person was asked to move, another person would go and take his place. The theory here is that the University would give warnings to everyone before they arrested anyone. When you were warned you would move and someone would take your place and hopefully that this way we could, the decision was made that hopefully we could keep the drill immobile.

Interviewer: What was the object in preventing them from drilling?

Brown: Well, it was a mixture of why it was being done. Many people within the movement here wanted to express the dislike for the program, the dislike for the military, dislike for anyone that was supporting the military, so what I intend to call the hate motive for going over there was in some people. I mean, on the other side of the coin, what I have been calling the love motive was an expression of concern the people in ROTC and trying to express what we felt they were doing to themselves by allowing themselves to be in the military program. First of all decide what it was doing to them, their humanity and their individual characteristics and the other of course what the military does. So there was no unified motive in going over there. The differences were very adequately discussed at the meeting in the Union.

Interviewer: Were tactics pretty much agreed upon?

Brown: Tactics were pretty much agreed upon. We went there at 1:00 and and for some reason the program had already been canceled. Either that or the times had been confused. We never really checked to see which of those two were the reasons. When the people got there we went first of all over to the Naval ROTC building which is across from Beyer Hall. When we got there the doors were barred. Some ROTC instructors and personnel were outside of the door. There was a sit-in staged there and we started sitting on the steps. Entrance wasn't really obstructed to anyone who wanted to get through. At one point, one instructor officer of the program started to approach the door and some students sat in front of him. I talked to the kids and they sort of moved aside, but being still difficult and offered the instructor officer a hand in helping him up the steps. There was, people I don't know, meaning I don't know specific names, some people used chalk on the steps and chalk on the building to write various messages. There was a little bit of discussion but not much that I could see between protestors and ROTC personnel.

Interviewer: Did you attempt to talk to any?

Brown: I spent, I talked to two or three for quite a while but it seemed it came after the group had moved away and as far as I could tell that was really under very unusual circumstances, very few students tried to talk at that time to the ROTC people. There was talk there of moving it over to the Armory. It was agreed upon that one or two people would go over to try to see if the doors were open and if they were to be inside so the doors could be reopened if they were locked as the Naval ROTC building had been locked. That was done and the group moved over. I am not sure what happened

at the doors because I stayed at the Navy ROTC and talked to several of their personnel before going over to the Armory. In the Armory, people were already inside. A ROTC program drill had been called off. One of the student leaders of the ROTC drills came to me and recognizing me just sort of expressed the hope that no damage would be done to the building, that it was no big deal as far as he was concerned, that the drill had been prevented. What followed there was---

Interviewer: What time is it? Do you have any idea?

Brown: 1:00 or 2:00 I think, early afternoon. What followed was members of the Dean of Students Offices suggested that some of the protesters go up and talk to the 3 commanders of the 3 ROTC programs on campus. Most of the protestors felt that to be worthless. Myself and 4 or 5 other people did go up, Meg Connolly was one, two others were Tom Potts and Rick Thompson. Much of the discussion at that time, productive discussion I thought, was conducted by Rick Thompson, he's a Quaker and also the draft counselor on campus. After about an hour of group discussion, it broke into almost a one to one discussion between individuals, one of our individuals and one of the commanders of the ROTC programs. That eventually broke up with nothing I don't think really any productive results.

Interviewer: Did you yourself get any insight things in the military thinking that you hadn't had before?

Brown: No. I spent the hour there talking with Col. Barnett and I didn't get any real insight. They were arguments that I had heard before both ways. It was, they were the old conflicts that everyone agreeing that war was wrong. Their statement that that was reality and that had to be dealt with and our statement that idealism can come about if enough people participate in it and you have to have

the courage to do that. So you know I don't think there was any real insight into each other.

Interviewer: Do you feel it was a waste of time to have gone up there?

Brown: I don't think anything really developed but I don't feel it was a waste of time. We sort of see that any conversation we can get into now is sort of a ground breaking or seedling so the next time you talk to somebody because somebody did it previously will be easier and will be better understanding and we feel that works both ways. So the discussion went on but nothing was really resolved. I went from there over to the Union and killed some time and then as 4:30 approached went back over to the Armory. The word had been stated that at 5:00, the Dean of Students office was going to request people to leave and if they didn't leave they would be arrested. Getting there we were told at 5:00 we would be asked to leave at 6:00. What then started was a discussion of why we were there, what we could do and how we could do it with votes being taken whenever an issue was raised and majority ruled.

Interviewer: About how many students were there, do you have any idea?

Brown: Not many at that time. I would say about 50, that's pretty accurate. It was decided to stay and to get arrested. About 40 people were still there at 6:00 and committed to that prospect. There was once again a certain amount of disagreement as to why get arrested, myself stating the only issue at this time that we could get arrested for would be Cambodian. Bill Swan, Norm Burrell, Steve Ewoldt, and Barb Yates felt that it was a dual issue between Cambodia and Kent State. A lot of discussion revolved around whether or not Kent State was actually being used but at this time by members on this campus and also all over the country. Many of the more freaky looking radical students felt Kent State, well really,

had a fear of what had happened at Kent State in a way and felt that this might be setting the tone for the future. That student demonstrators were going to be liable or persecuted and particularly those that could be identified. There was a certain amount of factionalism that developed over that issue but it was resolved, well it wasn't resolved but it was both groups allowed the difference of opinion to be there at the time. Much protest in my mind is, you know, you hope it's effective but if it isn't effective it has to be somewhat purifying to the person that does it and therefore the reason should be very solid in his mind and also the way that he does it. This is I suppose the faction that developed there because I raised that issue.

Interviewer: Is this something that re-occurred throughout the remaining demonstrations?

Brown: It re-occurred throughout the remaining next week many times never really quite resolving itself. At 6:00, Wilbur Layton, Tom Goodale, and Art Sandeen came over, told us that we were not going to be forcibly removed, that disciplinary action would be taken against those people in the building and they started to take names. We found out later that a court injunction to remove us had been attempted to be obtained by the University and for some reason was not obtained and that's the primary reason, well that's the legalistic reason why the police weren't used to remove us. I am certain in my mind that the Dean of Students office didn't want to use force and have always had that attitude. That night, Tuesday, May 5th, the Government of the Student Body had the strike vote so I attended that.

Interviewer: Did you speak at that meeting?

Brown: I spoke at that meeting. The primary statement of my argument, and

I spoke twice very briefly, was the Government of the Student Body had no way to know how many students they represented. To ask for everybody or 511 of the University to concur a vote, you know, could never be authenticated. I just said that their statement would be, their expression that they were supposedly leaders of the Student Body and therefore they should act like leaders and because they were leaders they were supposedly the best of America and their expression did mean something. There was this discussion by the audience, with an open-mike which was probably harmful to the final vote. I don't think it would have been so close 15-11 if the vote had been taken before the open mike. Interviewer: In what way was it harmful?

Brown: Harmful in that the members of the audience made statements of what they thought might happen if action wasn't taken in sort of the mild, not so much the coercion there, but coercion in the future the thought of it. Certain students I am sure used language and also actions which alienated part of the student body. So the final vote of 15-11; I don't know if that was the a strict vote on the Cambodian incident. I think the sympathy was more than that among the members of the Government of the Student Body. It was partially defining their role and partially alienation from the people that spoke in favor of the strike from the audience.

Interviewer: After the vote did you go back over to the Armory?

Brown: Not immediately. We started immediately on a program of publicity for the strike. There was certain almost humorous problem involved there that I later heard about it and get into it that the more trying and Peace Now people were putting out a flyer which said the word "Strike" on it whereas the Government of the Student Body didn't want to use that word on the flyer, were using the

phrase "Come together". So there were two flyers going out and two separate people on the same issue and there was no animosity there. Many people felt that the Government of the Student Body was dodging the issue, at least on the flyer, they'd handled it pretty well before. The word had gotten out about the strike and a lot of people had gone over to the Armory, so I went back over to the Armory.

Interviewer: About what time was this?

Brown: It had to be almost midnight. The Dean of Students office had given up taking names. They decided there were too many people there to take action against.

Interviewer: Was there any resistance of giving an individual's name to the Deans' office?

Brown: No. Names were never withheld from the Dean of Students office. Previous in the year we had had this problem with name taking. At that time everyone voluntarily gave their names. Many people that didn't participate in the demonstrations came over and gave names to the Dean of Students office as sympathy. So there was no attempt to hide the actions of any person. That night, a couple things happened, I don't know if they're of any real significance. Some of us stayed up till 4:00 and brought back the Daily's for the people and also spent the night listening to the wire services over at the Daily office and Nixon open up three new fronts that night and that was announced to the body and it was like a commitment of 15,000 more American troops. A lot of people, well once again the community spirit there. People brought food, shared food, other people brought blankets for people, a record player.

Interviewer: Were there many people from outside the movement coming in to talk to you? Townspeople or students who were not involved?

Brown: There were very few townspeople there which I don't know if they knew about it. Students over the student radio station had heard about it. There were many students that we hadn't seen before there. There was some people just sight-seeing, walking in one door and out the other, but many people stayed. The crowd probably got about as high as 200-150 maybe during the night. People sat around. Well, some people played chess, frisbie, there was a football game going on. A lot of things which were the fun things, the fun things weren't really approved of by some people. Some thought that showed a lack of seriousness. Other people rationalized and said it was an effort to make the protest or the movement more livable, that they can do either or each.

Interviewer: What was your attitude towards that?

Brown: My attitude is that protest generally should be a 24 hour serious type thing endeavor, and that the releases, I generally tend to look down on the type of activities that went on there that night, not so, well I wasn't that opposed to what happened that night, but there are other nights, other activities, other days. I spoke out against that type of activity.

Interviewer: You spent the rest of the night there?

Brown: I spent the night there till 5:30 in the morning when we decided to head primarily, my suggestion that we move over to the flagpole to greet whoever decides to put up the flag. Went over at 5:30 spent a lot of time there. It must have been 8:00 or 9:00 before they got there, and tried to put up flag.

Interviewer: What time do they usually put up the flag?

Brown: The flag I think is supposed to go up at sunrise which would have been about 6:30 that morning if policy is followed by the University, but I am not sure.

Interviewer: Do you know why they were slow in coming out?

Brown: I think they were not too certain how to deal with 30 people standing around the flagpole you know at 6:00 in the morning. Part of the discussion, well the only organizational problem we had then was allowing people to go to the Union to get coffee without, in an organized fashion so we wouldn't weaken our numerical strength too much. When one janitor and a campus policeman arrived and approached the flag at about 8:00 or 9:00, there were three rows of people around the flag pole, myself and a kid named Bob Day went and talked to the patrolman and the janitor. The statement at that time, wasn't really a statement rather an observation, we wanted to talk to someone about where the flag should be on this day. Someone in the University or whoever makes that determination, being the janitor's boss or whether it be President Parks. The janitor was fairly adamant in wanting to put up the flag. My only statement, the statement that apparently changed his mind, was that it was going to be necessary for him to use physical force to put the flag up even though I guaranteed him that none of the students would use physical force to prevent him. Just that they were going to stand there and he'd have to get over them somehow. That was enough for him to decide that he wanted to talk it over with his boss before anything happened. This is all taking place on Wednesday, May 6th. As the people stayed around the flag pole, we never had a chance to talk to President Parks about the flag. Jerry Schnoor and Jerry Parkin who are Government of Student Body President and Vice-president had contacted President Parks and had reached an agreement that the flag would go to half mast at noon when the rally started and that was agreeable to us when we heard it.

Interviewer: Was it to be raised before that?

Brown: It was not to be raised before then but there was no discussion that we were in with that fact. If there was any I don't know about it. The only incident involving the flag was I guess at 11:30 or somewhere around there. Dick Bjornseth and Bill Augustine came over with a flag of theirs and made a decision to try and raise the flag. There was a certain amount of scuffling when trying to get ahold of the chain.

Interviewer: How many people were on the flagpole at that time?

Brown: There were probably 50 people around the pole at the time. I wasn't at the pole when it started but as soon as I saw a crowd there and noise started I came over. I grabbed the chain well, put my hand on top of everyone else's hand. Mr. Augustine was making a speech, or I mean Mr. Bjornseth was making a speech about the position of the flag being only determined by the President of the United States. I made a statement similar to the one made to the janitor that there was no way at this time if he was smart that he could put the flag up without using physical force to simply remove the people standing there even-though they weren't about to harm him.

Interviewer: Did you tell him about the agreement made with Schnoor?

Brown: I also told him about the agreement. The agreement didn't seem to have any real influence on his thinking. The fact that he was confronted with making a decision of whether to use force or not, I think is what prevented him from doing any more. The sense that that would have been thrown in his face, as soon as he'd been, well, maybe correctly or incorrectly, but he was isolated as the individual who had to make the decision whether to use force or not and once he had been identified as that, fairly or unfairly, he decided to stop and said something like they had made their point and then

he left. At 12:00 the flag did go up as had been agreed upon. The flag was raised as agreed by one of our people, Doug Marks, who is sort of put in charge of flagpole detail when some of us left. What followed was a mass rally which---

Interviewer: Had you or did you have a hand in organizing the rally?

Brown: The rally had been called for in the student strike. The only thing I was involved in was organizing publicity campaigning the night before which just meant putting up flyers on everything you could find and making sure resident groups got the flyers, making sure the Daily got a good story. So I organized the groups that went to the resident groups but that was just, you know, finding people in charge of the resident groups, 5 people.

Interviewer: Did you have a hand in picking the speakers?

Brown: The speakers were not picked by me. The program was apparently assigned by Jerry Schnoor. Part of the, as I understand what happened, there was a minister who started the program---

Interviewer: Were you there when it started?

Brown: Yes, I was there when it started, the program was started. Professor Ogg spoke on economics, made a statement about him and his son being together for the first time on an issue in a long time. I mean they were both abhorred by Cambodia. Professor Allan then spoke. As I understand, Professor Allan wasn't scheduled to speak. Professor Allan is a peace native of at least 50 years going back as far as World War I and a man that is admired by most of us, at least by myself. He gave sort of a dry speech and a few people in my mind were very discourteous to him. The discourtesy in part that was shown to Professor Allan in part prompted Bob Trembly and myself getting ourselves into the program even though we weren't scheduled to speak either. There was a fear that the program was

going to be too long the way it was. Trembly, myself, Richard Bender, Doug Pritchard and Rick Thompson and a few other people while all this was going on were talking about what we could do with the crowd after the rally. Bob Trembly was adamant about wanting to take them over to the ROTC field and I was adamant about wanting to take them over to Lincoln Way and staging a sit-in on Lincoln Way.

Interviewer: Why didn't you want to go over to the ROTC field?

Brown: It was the old issue again of deciding what you wanted to protest about, doing it in as direct manner as possible. This is the original actions in the Armory I thought were confused with Kent State. It was my opinion that the actions we were doing, the actions that Trembly wanted to do after the rally were confusing the Indochina war with the ROTC program, and that it was preferred to isolate one of those issues and strike at it. I've always had a reluctance to try to identify the University as the institution to be fighting which at sometimes people have and so I wanted to try and keep it away from the University at this point.

Interviewer: Did you speak to the crowd at all?

Brown: I spoke to the crowd later. The important thing that happened I guess maybe sociologically when the discussion was going on is that Mr. Trembly and myself weren't able to reach a decision as to which activity to do. I decided without informing Trembly to let my issue die simply so there would be a certainty as to what we were doing so that I knew what he wanted to do and I was going to allow him to do it so I would know the total activity whereas I didn't want to start into something and then find myself confronted with his activity. So there was a reluctance in backing down on my part and I didn't bother to inform Mr. Trembly about that. Following Professor Allan at the initiative of some of the crowd, some people

because of the length of what had happened and the crowd was dispersing, Trembly went up and spoke at the mike and put out a call for the people to attend the ROTC program. He had informed me that he was going to do that following after he did that, I followed him to the mike, endorsed the call to go over there, made a speech on what identified earlier as the love motive for going over to the ROTC demonstration, making sure that people went over there without hatred and went over there with an expression of concern. I'm not sure how much of the crowd heard that or how much of a motive that was of the crowd for going over there. Trembly and myself have somewhat different images and followings at the University. The size of the crowd is probably a large part in determining because both of us had endorsed, if one of us had and the other hadn't, you know, it wouldn't had gone over as well as it did. When we got there some of us that had bullhorns, such as myself encouraged people to try and talk to the ROTC people that were in ranks. Not to harrass them, not to yell at them, or scream at them, not to make any threat towards them but just simply to try to rationally talk to them. They didn't talk back, but still I encouraged people to talk. Tried to make some humor over the megaphones, try to keep people calm. I didn't witness any incidents of harrassment there. A couple weeks later, one individual had a camera that had taken films showed me some pictures of a friend of mine, a sympathizer to the peace movement, showed me a film of students first of all, expressions of hatred on their faces and also minor incidents of harrassment so it did take place.

The ROTC people decided to break ranks and then walked over to the Armory. There was a call by someone to follow them over to the Armory. The Armory was re-occupied by a couple thousand people

at least. All the bleachers on one side, the south side, were full of people plus the floor was full of people probably to midcourt. There was still some talk there as to what to do next. Sue Osborn, whatever wanting to kill time, sang some songs. There was some more cheering done. Somebody in the audience started the cheer "All the way to Lincoln Way" which is used in football games. So the crowd packed up and walked up by way of Union drive past Morrill Hall and Beardshear over to Lincoln Way. They picked up a lot of people on the route and there were probably maybe 3,000 people, an estimate at Lincoln Way.

Interviewer: Did anybody know what was going to happen?

Brown: Nobody knew what was going to happen. When we got to Lincoln Way and Beach as the head parade marshall, I got the crowd to stop hoping at this point, my original activity to sit-in on Lincoln Way---

Interviewer: What was the object of having a sit-in on Lincoln Way?

Brown: The sit-in was pretty much becoming the common tactic across the country in doing something that was non-violent, agreed disruptive of a tactic of I don't know if you want to say inconveniencing people, but just as much of an expression. Part of the theory of stopping the war is to figure out the dilemma of disrupting a society but doing it non-violently, of making governments difficult of their functions, difficult to function particularly over those people that are protesting. So I guess it was just a method of trying to inconvenience the government. Part of the problem that developed here, well part of my fear of not wanting to take the crowd downtown was that if there was physical damage, you know, if any physical damage was going to be done it was going to be done in the business district and the opportunity would present itself and we didn't want to see that. I originally called for a, when

I got the crowd to stop, for a ten minute symbolic sit-down for 1 minute for each year the war continued which isn't quite historically true as it stands. The first couple rows of people always tend to be the most enthusiastic activists types, started to continue downtown. Once again I used the tactic of isolating that group of pointing them out to the crowd. I got the crowd to ask them to come back and sit down which the crowd did and the first couple of rows did. Because of this incident of the first rows wanting to go downtown a certain amount of factionalism developed as to what the next action would be. I was still hoping that the crowd would just sit there. Other members wanted to continue downtown. Other members wanted to go back to the University and talk to the heads of the particular departments about allowing students to get out of school. What resulted was a vote being taken by the crowd. The sound system that was used was the sound system from one of the police cars that was sitting on the corner. He was very willing to allow the sound system to be used by those individuals who were advocating going back to the University. He was reluctant to let the sound system to be used by those people who advocated a sitdown and those people who wanted to go downtown. But he did allow that. The vote was taken and the vote was one-way about going downtown. The discussion that took place, part of the vote was explaining options, not explaining rationale behind options so it wasn't you know fight for an idea it was just letting people know what they could do.

Interviewer: Do you know how the police got there?

Brown: No, I'm not sure how they got there.

Interviewer: Did you need a parade permit?

Brown: There's a, as my understanding and we checked this out, there's no

condition in the city code which requires a parade permit for any activity. City Hall will issue a parade permit if you go down and ask them for one, but they never prohibited any activity taking place without a parade permit. Usually we have been courteous enough to inform them prior to an event. This time not knowing we would end up on Lincoln Way, there was no prior informing. After the vote was taken there was sort of a split cause in the crowd, mainly by people who didn't understand I suppose the situation at Lincoln Way. The Jugband who is a local musical group put on a small concert type I guess at the intersection there for those people that stayed, and the rest of the crowd moved downtown.

Interviewer: You went down with the crowd?

Brown: I went down with the crowd as the head marshall of the parade. There was a, what was attempted to do in the parade was to convince people that they had to stay together, that that was the best position to find themselves in. That they were a unit and they had to do things as a unit and anytime anyone broke off from that unit they were harming the total activity. So there were many cheers or many instructions from the people with megaphones of stay cool, be calm, be smart, get together, you're beautiful and stuff like that of trying to develop this once again, this unity. Unity also included linking arms, keeping ranks, even when one row, particularly the front row which controls usually the pace of the crowd tended to slow, but keeping them even so that everyone followed behind.

Interviewer: Did you know where you were going?

Brown: We made an agreement as we were going on the route we used in October which was down Lincoln Way to 69 then over to main street and then back up to the draft board. So the route was agreed upon. There was some difficulty in dealing with traffic in that you know,

it hadn't been cleared and there weren't enough police to keep it and the crowd was so large that we took up the entire highway rather than two of the four lanes. Members of the Government of the Student Body primarily were up in the front of the parade directing traffic at the intersection. There was some obvious displeasure shown by some people in cars. One truck took a turn way too fast obviously and could have posed as a threat to some students if they hadn't been awake. Only one incident arose along the route; over by the Highway Commission there was an American flag at full staff and maybe four or five people decided that they wanted to lower it to half staff. Prior to the flag, I had anticipated the problem and instructed three or four marshalls to go to the flag and stand around it. Also, when people left to try and take down the flag, once again with the megaphone, I verbally said to them, the crowd, well I asked the crowd to cheer them back. When that was done, you know when they knew the crowd, that they were leaving, that they were no longer together completely, they came back into the crowd. So the flag did stay up. We continued down the route and came back up main street. Came up main street and once again as we did the Saturday before, May 2nd, slowed down the pace along the route because when it slows down people would be conscious of our presence. There was a lot of, always going through main street cheers are picked up. The people along the crowd, the townspeople don't seem to have any real animosity. A few people did join the parade, there was a lot that asked them to. There was a lot of, the people with the dialogues, excuse me, the people with the megaphones have one-sided dialogues towards the people in the rally group of talking directly to them in a very audible fashion, sort of a loud fashion, sort of raising rhetorical questions,

you know, asking them is this what they wanted to happen, did it have their approval, would it have their Congressman's approval, acting independent of the world. So I think that a lot of what was happening even though it was dialogue communication that was taking place, we finally ended up at the draft board and once again we had the problem of figuring out what to do. We hadn't planned an activity. When we got there, we had the Jugband stall for more time. One individual, well first of all there were two patrolmen, armed patrolmen inside the draft board with sidearms, helmets and clubs. One individual was very adamant, he didn't express it publicly but he did express it three or four times to me of wanting to go in and destroy files. He was completely convinced that the police weren't going to try and stop anyone from doing that. I was in no means that convinced and never made that proposal. There was the old feeling as always, when you have a crowd of deciding what to do with them, but not really knowing what to do.

Interviewer: About how large was the crowd now by the time you got to the draft board?

Brown: I've heard estimates from about 800-1,000. I've always had trouble figuring out crowds. March and October, we had it was estimated around 1,900, but this crowd we had looked quite larger than that in October so I don't know which figures to believe. Eventually, and my suggestion again was the action which we decided to take, didn't come off real well was I made a speech on Nixon being trapped in Southeast Asia and the youth of America being trapped in the draft and that now we had an opportunity to trap the draft inside the board where the patrolmen and also the personnel of the draft board. The action planned was to sit in front of the door and not allow them out. Make them spend the night in there or longer than

that, if it proves worthwhile to do so.

Interviewer: Was this directed towards the personnel and clerks?

Brown: No, the activities at least as an organizer, the activities at this time the activities that come up in the following days are never directed towards the personnel or the institution. There's always talk to the personnel of asking them to leave the institution, of not assisting it anymore. But there's always not a guarantee but a statement of purpose of no coercion being directed towards the personnel inside the building. Many times the personnel had difficulties accepting that statement, believing that statement, but then as an organizing principle it's been used the entire year. Well, in October we came up with several statements of guarantees and one of those guarantees were no force or coercion will be used and it's still a principle in my mind.

Interviewer: If we assume, you did that and they wanted to get out would you have allowed them to get out?

Brown: I don't think you know, forcing them to stay in there, there's a dilemma there of attacking the war for individual rights. There was a dilemma that was very real at the ROTC demonstration. The ROTC demonstration is not pure in my mind but was justified on depending upon whether you had the hate motive or the love motive, it didn't make it right it was just because you can justify it in some way although none of them really come off well. All protest is sort of an experiment and because you do it one way you're not committed to do it that one way another time so time forces you to do things ill-prepared sometimes or I guess not as prepared as you'd like to be.

Interviewer: Did you propose this, did they follow it?

Brown: We staged a sit-in in front of the draft board door. The crowd sort

broke up at that time. I mean, we didn't have the thousand people we had which is probably understandable. After the call for the sit-in outside the draft board to trap the personnel in.

Interviewer: Do you know what time it approximately was?

Brown: It must have been 4:30, the board closes at 5:00 and that's when the personnel attempted to get out.

Interviewer: How many were sitting in front of the door?

Brown: There were maybe 40 or 50 people around. There were only maybe 5 or 6 of us at 5:00, a half hour after everything had happened, there were only 4 or 5 of us sitting directly in front of the door while the rest of the people were standing around. There were organizing efforts going on to secure food for the night, sleeping bags, blankets, getting the word out to people. At 5:00 the two patrolmen on the inside pushed the door open. The people sitting in front did not push back. Because of where we were in relationship to the door made it a little bit more difficult to open. There was no force used to keep the door shut.

Interviewer: Had this been agreed upon?

Brown: It hadn't been agreed upon, but it was consistent with other activities or with philosophy at least with myself and with the people that were there at the time. The door was open and the people did get out. There was sort of mixed feelings about allowing them out. The decision to trap them in was done, not because it was thought to be a good activity, but because there was a crowd there and we had to find something to do with the crowd. So it wasn't interpreted as a major defeat that they did get out. When they were out, the talk, well there was another factor there. There was an argument of the fact that people were trapped in particularly middle-aged ladies who primarily were trapped in, of the concern

of how that was going to go over in the press and for publicity at least. Would it be better to come back the next morning, not letting the board open without inconveniencing a particular person or type of person. So when they did get out the discussion immediately started or centered around coming back the next morning doing the same thing from the opposite viewpoint of stopping them from going in. The talk centered around trying to inform people, getting the word out so people would be there in the morning.

Interviewer: Now, this decision then to keep or prevent the draft board from opening the following day was then reached through sort of a general discussion or was there some leadership?

Brown: There was a discussion among the group of people that were still there at 5:00 which is probably representative of the most activists portion of the student body but it doesn't represent the media thinking of most of the people that participate in these events. There was leadership provided in the fact that Mr. Trembly, I guess, Bob, sort of lobbied and favored the idea. There was no active counter lobby and I don't think there was any thought of a counter lobby that I knew of. So Trembly was probably the organizer of the particular event but it was a popular event. Some people, I'm not sure how many spent the night at the draft board.

Interviewer: What did you do after the decision was made?

Brown: I went back to the Union and then went home. I'd spent like four days with very little sleep of only two or three hours a night. So I went home and went to sleep. I went to the draft board Thursday, May 7th at about 8:30. Got there after there had been some arrests made and after the police department had arrived.

Interviewer: Had anyone called you?

Brown: No one had called me, and after people were already inside the draft

board. When I got there at 8:30 my roommate, Jack Concannon, dropped me off about a block from the stop sign and I ran the distance when I saw the police were there. Went inside the draft board immediately.

Interviewer: Was there tear gas in there yet?

Brown: Tear gas hadn't gone in yet. What was going on in the building at the time was several people were sitting at the bottom of the steps by the draft board door, I guess maybe 15 to 20 people. Dave Lendt of Carl Hamilton's office was talking to them, to the students in part and was also talking to the police department in part. When I went into the building I engaged Mr. Lendt in some conversation to start off, first of all I thought Mr. Lendt at that time was Robert Pyle and didn't find out that they were different people until a couple days later and also engaged assistant Chief Lyttle in a conversation. Mr. Lyttle had just decided to start moving students out.

Interviewer: Do you think that was his decision?

Brown: No, it became, with the conversation with him I spoke maybe 5 or 10 minutes. I sort of talked him out of taking any action at that time. He was sort of in no rush to take action, sort of agreed with that. His only reply was that he was doing his job and that I should talk to City Attorney Bishop, but I hadn't at that time gotten assistant Chief Lyttle to delay his actions until I could hopefully talk to Mr. Bishop. At that time, just as we were finishing that, Mr. Bishop came in and started to go up the stairs which overlooked the stairs going down, we were on the first landing. He said in a loud voice "Let's move them out men!".

Interviewer: Now were there police inside?

Brown: There were police inside the building. There were patrolmen in

front of me, 3 or 4, between me and the students. I was on the first landing along with Lendt and Lyttle and there were stairs going down to a basement landing or a lower landing where students were and there were patrolmen on the top stairs going down. When Mr. Bishop walked in he went up a few stairs going to another landing which was above us. As I said, he said "Let's move them out men.".

Interviewer: Who said that? Mr. Bishop?

Brown: Mr. Bishop, yes. I started to engage him in conversation at that point asking him to just take it easy for a minute, let's talk about it. He wasn't in a mood to talk or at least or maybe it's possible he didn't know who I was or what connection I had, that's also possible. In a louder voice, "Let's move them out." The patrolman in front of me, I tapped one on the shoulder the one on the far left of the stairs there and asked him to excuse me that I would like to go down and join them. Mr. Bishop gave a command saying "Get him he's the first one" and I was out of the building. I went limp when I got to the door, I was drug out with my back first by just one patrolman I think. When I got to the car they attempted to lift me into the car. The belt on my pants broke at that point and I said to Mr. Sandeen who was standing on the side, "Mr. Sandeen you saw it, they owe me one belt," and he said "yes, that's true". They eventually got me into the car, pushed me in.

Interviewer: As far as resisting arrest or anything like that all you were was being limp. Is that right?

Brown: Yes, that's the only action I took, was going limp. When I was in the car I was partially in the car, my feet were still outside the door. They tried to close the door and weren't able to do so

because of where my feet were. I didn't move, they asked me to move, and I still didn't move and they eventually went around to the other side and pulled me in farther so they could close the door. Prior to going around to the other side, one incident that went on before they went around to the other side and pulled me in was that when they first couldn't close the door, one patrolman, an un-uniformed officer that had tried to put me in had gotten in the front seat and asked me if I wanted to be maced. I asked him why he wanted to mace me and I said the one thing I would not respond to was threats and he stopped at that point and got back out of the car and went to the other side and pulled me in farther. The first thought that I had when I was originally put in the car, didn't do anything about it, but the first thought you had when you're put in the car is wanting to immediately jump out the other side. As a conjecture I think many of the resisting arrest charges that students ran up against were a basic unseriousness that many of the kids get I think watching James Bond, and James West and TV shows like that where you can almost always play unrealistic games. They put me in the car alone, I was in the car and they pulled me in from the other side and I was now sitting up in the back seat away from the driver's side of the wheel. The individual that had pulled me in on that side, tried to put handcuffs around my ankles. They didn't fit and I told them that they weren't going to fit. They then put the handcuffs on my hands.

Interviewer: Did they give you any reason for that?

Brown: No reason. He then closed the door, got around to the other side, and then got into the back with me, this is a un-uniformed patrolman.

Interviewer: How do you know it was a patrolman if he wasn't in uniform?

Brown: I'm not using the word patrolman as a...

Interviewer: But he was a policeman you say?

Brown: He was a policeman but he wasn't wearing a uniform. He was either a detective or what ever other designation the police department has. At that point another uniformed patrolman got in the front seat of the driver's wheel and then drove to the police station. On the route to the police station there was a lot of one-sided conversation. I did a lot of talking of in my stating that I thought they were making a mistake to use the actions they were using. I made suggestions that I thought many of the students at the university would respond that were making arrests that actions be counter-productive for the police department. Made a lot of talk about what I thought about Richard Nixon's decision to go into Cambodia. The only sentence I ever got back from either of the two law enforcement officers was one saying he had a son and that he didn't want him to go either but that he probably would. I answered that nobody ever wants to go but they all do, something like that. We got up to the police station. Just prior getting to the police station I told the plain clothesman officer that they would have to once again, well that I would not assist them in getting into the police station just as I had not assisted them in getting into the patrol car. He said "O.K.", and told the uniformed patrolman in the front seat to call in and ask on the radio for them to send out a couple of men which is what he did. He got out of the car, went to the front. We had some more conversation and he said something about asking me if I wanted to be arrested for resisting arrest and told me that that had a one-year sentence and a \$1,000 fine. It was posed in the form of a question and my answer to him was that I had a long time ago resolved that

I was going to spend five years in jail for draft refusal and that I would be happy to trade him one for five anytime. When the other patrolman came out they started to pull me out of the car. The way I was sitting my head and shoulders, when I was pulled forward, were wedged against the frame of the car. I said this isn't going to work. To get me out you're going to have to move my head. And at that time one of them or both did reach up and pull my head down to the side so they could get out of the car. They had to carry me up the steps and laid me on the floor near the police desk, frisked me of my billfold, comb, and watch and then later on, of a button that was on my shirt that they had missed earlier. They asked me for my name and address and I just sort of looked at them and said that I wasn't going to assist and they said that's fine, **well** get it later. The plain clothesman told them what the charge was and also at that time for the first time said that he was going to file charges of resisting arrest. They then asked me to walk downstairs and I said once again that I wasn't going to assist, that I thought they were making a mistakes and therefore I couldn't. So they drug me down the stairs and put me in a cell. There were four people inside the cell that had been arrested earlier prior to 8:30, on Thursday, May 7th. As I recall they were Terry Humeston, Rod Williams, John Hersey and Mel Creb. Their first concern was whether I was hurt and what was going on. I said I wasn't hurt. The only possible physical harm that came to me during this whole incident which was minor was being drug into the police station by the handcuffs. One gentleman pulling on the handcuffs and one gentleman holding my legs up and it hurt. It did leave a little bit of a scar but nothing that amounted to anything. I told them what I had seen, that there were people

sitting at the bottom of the steps and the police weren't able to remove them because they had their arms locked. That's as far as much action as I had in this particular incident.

Starting maybe mid-afternoon they started taking people up one at a time and arraigning them in front of Judge McKinney and setting bail. There was a lot of concern on our part whether there was enough bail money and the decision was sort of that nobody should accept bail money until everyone had determined theirs so that the maximum number of people would be let out; it didn't work out that way but that's what we were talking about. I was the second to the last person as far as the male members, the male persons in the cell to be taken up for arraignment. When I was taken up for arraignment, I was first filled out with what they call an information list, a term the police use. A sheet with name and address and that's pretty much it. The charge and the arresting officer I guess. There was, once again when they asked me questions I didn't answer the questions and they got the information out of my wallet. One of the things that apparently resulted and this was later brought up and ended up as one person's charges being dropped against that person in that one of the 23 arrested, Jeff Klomp, I had had his driver's license in my billfold which was a duplicate that he had so that the original resisting arrest charge against me had been written up as Jeff Klomp so that when I was taken up to Judge McKinney, they had a disturbing the peace charge information sheet on me but they didn't have a resisting arrest charge or information sheet on me. Judge McKinney somehow knew that there was another charge against me at least under that name and therefore had asked where it was and they weren't able to find it so I was taken back downstairs and they wrote out another information

sheet on me for resisting arrest. I was taken back out.

Interviewer: Now, who's name was this?

Brown: This time under Clyde Brown. The first one apparently had been written up for Jeff Klomp...

Interviewer: On the basis of the duplicate driver's license and they...

Brown: Yes, and they had charged him with resisting arrest. The second time I was taken up they used my name. They'd asked me how I wanted to plead. I said that I wasn't sure what the charge meant, and Jerry Jones at that time who was supposedly entering pleas somehow either panicked or did something but thought that his official duty ended so he left. Judge McKinney read me the charge and then offered me four alternatives as to the pleas I could make and the actions I could take. I requested entered a not guilty plea and asked for a preliminary hearing. I don't think, I can't be sure, but I don't think if I hadn't questioned what the charge meant I know I had the right to a preliminary hearing. Maybe Judge McKinney would of informed me of that later but at the time I was asked of a plea I didn't know that. I was taken back downstairs, sort of just sat around and the police department was very disorganized. They still had to finger-print me and still had to take a mug shot. I spent about twenty minutes sitting on a chair doing nothing, sort of being ignored by everyone, nothing seemed to matter. Eventually they got the finger-prints taken and the mug shot taken. Because of the delay of twenty minutes I wasn't returned to the cell as most of the other arrestees had been. Usually you were booked and then taken back and bond was posted and then found out and released. Because of this delay I wasn't taken down. After I was released I waited around to wait for Trembly's arraignment to take place, and also requested somebody

to go over and buy an Ames Tribune and they did. Ames Tribune had a lead story, well not a lead story but one of the front page stories of praising the actions of the police department, the lead head. Trembly's bond was posted and they set bail at \$2,000. I had a conversation with detective Capture who I had met earlier commenting on the size of the bail, just sort of expressing disbelief that Judge McKinney would do that.

Interviewer: Your bail was set at what?

Brown: My bail was set at \$500 for resisting arrest. I had asked Capture if he was interested in being municipal judge in a jokingly way and that was pretty much the extent of the conversation there. When we left the police department, myself, Chris Moline and Kay Craig, we went over to the Ames Tribune. I talked to one of the assistant editors about the make-up of the story that I had commented earlier on. Not claiming that it was inaccurate journalism but that it was inappropriate and impartial in editorializing and that it hadn't been substantiated in that there could have been found people that would have said the contrary to the article.

Interviewer: What did they say to that?

Brown: Their only rebuttal was that the information was factual and that one person had said that and that's all the story claimed. So they expressed the thank you for bothering to take the time and come up and voice criticism and I thanked them for spending the time with us and we left, everybody happy. Went to central campus where we found out another rally had been planned.

Interviewer: About what time was this?

Brown: It must have been 6:00, 6:30. The equipment was still set up from the previous day when GSB, all memorial service had been held. Trembly and I spoke.

Interviewer: What did you say?

Brown: Sort of what we set the tone for was a thank you for the money that had been raised, a description of what had gone on. From what I saw which was very little and what had been described to me more, I was making a pitch that students had responded appropriately;; that the students were non-violent even when they were what I described as isolated restraint instances of police force being used. I make statements that I thought the police had acted reasonable, that they had tried a little bit of everything that they knew how to do, but in no uniform manner. There were instances of mace being used and the tear gas used and the clubbing used ...

Interviewer: This is what others had told you?

Brown: Yea, but they were so infrequent that they didn't amount to much. I opened the mike up so that other students that had been arrested could give descriptions as to how and why they were arrested and a series of that followed. I asked people to be at the draft board the following morning, not saying what action would be taken but we should get together there to plan whether there would be an action there tomorrow morning. Trembly spoke primarily about why the police set his bail that high. And it's his opinion that he had been picked out as the head, the number one leader or the leader and also that I and Jeff Klomp had been arrested for resisting arrest that that was also an indication they were trying to arrest leaders. He spoke on his opinion that the leaders could be taken out and that people would still be around to know what actions to take, that there was no lack of leadership in the group and that if they busted one person there would more than one person to replace, so that it was a growing movement experience-wise other than hindering the movement which he thought the police department

wanted. Sally Bennett who was charged with contempt of court had been bailed out and she was there and she spoke making statements that she hadn't cursed the judge but if she had she wouldn't have been sad about it but that there were reasons to yell at the judge and that she applauded the person who had the nerve to do it. There was some singing by Sue Osborn and that was pretty much it for that particular incident, at the rally. After the rally, myself and a half a dozen other people went to the draft board and spent the night on the lawn. When darkness approached the police requested us to move, part of the side of the grass that was the far side of the sidewalk of the draft board. The reason they gave was that someone had either cemented, glued, or epoxied the lock on the door the night before and he had caught Cain from his superiors about that. We moved. During the night there was considerable conversation, interaction between ourselves and members of the police department.

Interviewer: Did any townspeople stop by and talk to you?

Brown: No townspeople stopped by. Townspeople drove by that night, really the next morning and students were always giving passerbys the peace symbol or the strike fist symbol, and sort of applauding or booing depending on whether or not the citizens that went by responded positively or negatively. One incident of someone who sped by us with the horn honking we were told that the patrol car across the street stationed there all night long had radioed ahead and that that individual had been picked up and booked with the charge of honking the horn, something like that. That night, where my thoughts were, trying to come up with something that would result in people not getting arrested the next morning. That was one thought. The other thought was making wanting something

whereby people had been arrested earlier wouldn't get arrested a second time. We were fairly certain that anyone arrested a second time would not be out on bail again. Really didn't resolve anything, in my mind. The next morning was still uneasy in my mind as to what I was going to do or what I was going to ask people to do. At 8:00 or 9:00 in the morning on Friday, May 8th, Pyle arrived and tried to open the door and had gone in and had come back out. Told assistant Chief Lyttle that the draft board offices weren't going to be used that evening. Mr. Lyttle relayed that information to me.

Interviewer: Now was Pyle the first one to go in that morning?

Brown: Yes, Pyle was the first to go in that morning. There were three patrolmen standing in front of the door.

Interviewer: No one tried to stop him from going in?

Brown: No one tried to stop him from going in. When Mr. Lyttle told me that, well Mr. Pyle had first said that his offices were going to be open. One of his secretaries arrived, she was let in the building. About five minutes later she came out of the building with Mr. Pyle and they decided the tear gas was too strong for anybody to work at all that day. The building would be closed to everyone. Mr. Lyttle, I told him again that we would believe him, that his word was as good as gold, that nobody would go in there for that reason, you know, that I would not encourage any action to be taken by students against selective service. Students were on the other side of the street, on the east side near the tulips and had been gathering. I had gone back and told people that because of the tear gas it wouldn't be opened and it wasn't going to be opened, but we would have a meeting in a little while anyway just to talk about action or activities. Mr. Trmebly, Bob was once again re-

lieved in his mind. I don't know this for fact, but when I told him it wasn't going to be opened, he was very enthusiastic and preceded to energetically tell people that victory had been won, that police had closed it down, that they had done the job for us. My thinking is that he was relieved that people weren't going to be arrested also. I did two things next. I first of all went to Pyle. Explained to him, tried to tell him what we were doing, not so much what we were doing but the way we were doing it. Said in my mind that I thought we were lacking in an area of being able to convince himself and his employees that no force was going to be used against them. That I thought this was the major area that our tactics needed to be improved in. He didn't really respond to much to that, but I did make that attempt. I then went over to Mr. Bishop who was standing or who had just pulled up in a car and parked about a quarter of a block away and was walking back. I stopped him where there was a conversation between him and I . My thinking here was wanting to confront him with my criticisms but doing it in a manner where it wouldn't be publicly embarrassing to him, where he wouldn't have to be defensive in front of other people. I told him what I had heard the day before about the negotiation and about his ordering my arrest and also commenting about the statement that was in the Ames Tribune and his tactics of dealing with demonstrations by eliminating the leadership. I told him that in my opinion much of what happened yesterday was precipitated by him and tried to express some criticism. He was mildly, well in no way agreeing with my statements but was mildly defensive and some sort of conversation that was at least not antagonistic..

Dr. Metzler from Biophysics and one of the political science professors, Robert Wessel, political science

department showed up at that time. Tried to engage them in conversation. The only restriction in conversation at this time was whenever more than one of us tried to get a conversation going, Mr. Bishop was very adamant about wanting to talk to one person at a time. I left the group at that time with Dr. Metzler talking to Bishop. Went back over to our group of people over by the tulips and conducted a meeting.

Interviewer: About how many students were there, do you have any idea?

Brown: I would think there were maybe a 100 students, maybe not that many. I reiterated that the draft board wasn't going to be opened, that it wouldn't be opened all day long. Students were, once again, relieved to hear that. We had some discussion as to whether to trust the police department when they stated that it wouldn't be open, or to leave a palace guard there to make sure. My position was to say that no one needed to stay, that we could trust the police department and that if they were stupid enough to do contrary to their word that we could politically take advantage of that later. Bob Trembly and Bill Ringle wanted to keep a guard. The body eventually voted for people to stay there, which some people did for the rest of the day.

Interviewer: Did you stay there?

Brown: No, I didn't stay there. Prior to leaving there we passed a group resolution expressing disapproval of Attorney Bishop's actions the day before and also disapproval of Judge McKinney's actions in Sally Bennett's case.

Interviewer: You say the group passed a resolution. Did you intend to publicize it?

Brown: The intention was to relay it to Bishop and McKinney. I doubt if it was ever done. Probably just got lost in the shuffle.

Interviewer: How were you going to characterize the group then? Were you going to give it a name?

Brown: No, I don't think it would have been identified as such. If it had been relayed, as I said approximately 100 people were there in the morning, and they had the understanding vote to endorse such a statement. One of the students said they would talk with cake and it was voted that the cake be given to City Attorney Bishop. I asked people to wait a couple moments so that I could inform the police department and Mr. Bishop of what was happening. I went to officer Lyttle and told him first of all that in five minutes time the students in mass would walk over and give the cake to Bishop, and then I just wanted to inform him of that so that they could anticipate it and would respond advisably. I then went to Bishop, waited for whoever he was talking to finish his conversation so that only one of us would be talking to him at a time. I told him that the students were coming over. He asked me what sort of cake it was. I said chocolate. He told me he was allergic to chocolate. And I didn't have any answers to that, I just said they were coming over to give him the cake. The students brought him the cake over singing for he's a jolly good fellow, gave him the cake, just sort of a satire and so pictures could be taken. The cake was then taken to the patrolman standing in front of the door. When Bishop told him he was allergic to chocolate, then he gave it to the other patrolman. The group stood around for a while and were instructed by us to disperse other than those...

Interviewer: When they are instructed by us, who do you mean?

Brown: Primarily myself, but other people. I guess I started asking people and saying there was no reason to stick around and ask people to relay that information. I left and took a shower and

and then came back to campus in the afternoon. That night, WOI and Veisha central committee came to me and asked me to assist them in making a statement on the 10:00 o'clock news telling people that there was no reason not to come to Veisha the next day; that no violent activities were planned and activities so far had not been violent.

Interviewer: Had they contacted anybody else, Trembly or anybody else to make a statement of this effect?

Brown: The only person they did contact was myself. I agreed to make a statement to that effect and myself and one of their co-coordinator's named...

Interviewer: Of the Veisha central committee?

Brown: From the Veisha central committee along with Mr. Harl who's on the faculty here and faculty advisor for Veisha worked out a statement where we each would speak for a minute or two. We drove over to WOI studio's. Once again Mr. Lendt from Hamilton's office was also there. First of all I had some problems on timing to make the statement. We'd gotten there ten minutes to nine and were told it would take an hour to develop the film, that it was a one-shot deal. We were told we had only two minutes which made some problem as to whether and also the fact that they only wanted to interview one person instead of two, made some problems there. We reached an agreement where we'd both speak. We were interviewed, the Veisha co-coordinator for about a minute and twenty seconds speaking prior, so that I had about forty seconds left. The question in my mind was very ill-worded. The question was "What guarantee do I have that violence would not take place at the Veisha parade as it had down at the draft board today?". I tried to make some statement about it, violence not taking place

the day before, that it was a non-violent activity and made a guarantee that no violence was planned and that non-violence had a stronger pull on this campus than it had ever had and we would pledge both intellectually and morally to continue that process. When that had finished we had a talk with whoever the interviewer was, the guy that does the weather all the time. We talked a little bit about what was going on. About Cambodia. The interviewer, whatever his name was, said two years ago he cast a vote for a certain individual and maybe two years from now he wouldn't cast his vote for that individual again which was I guess expressing his disapproval of Nixon. I said that was fine but more was expected than casting a ballot every four years. He expressed a lot of immediate disapproval at the fact that I made that statement, but he really didn't take it anywhere. Dave Lendt then drove me down to the draft board office where I spent the night.

Interviewer: You mean outside the office?

Brown: On the grass. We had some general conversation about tactics and what he thought it was doing to the University as particular disapproval of actions that he had seen individuals take. The previous statements about the TV interview with Veisha central committee took place on Thursday, May 7th, at about 9:00 rather than May 8th. As a further amendment, also on May 7th, about three minutes after I had been arrested, a telegram arrived from Harold Hughes which was a form telegram that he was sending out to known student leaders across the country asking for non-violent protest, but continued concentrated action and activities on the political scene and also support for amendment 609. On Friday, May 8th, after I got back from taking a shower, I ran into Dave Lendt who said that Harold Hughes had tried to call me through

Hamilton's office and that I should go over to use their Watts line and call Washington and try to get a hold of Hughes. We tried that and he wasn't in his office, so a note was left for Hughes to call back and we waited around for an hour or half or so. Hughes's call was just again sort of a pep talk type thing of just encouraging people to keep working.

Interviewer: You did finally talk to him?

Brown: Yes, I did talk to Hughes and asked me for any actions, anything that I thought that he could do. The only suggestion I made was that in many parts of the country protest was still looked down upon and that the protest march of just the congressional legislatures, congressmen and senators either just picket at the White House or just that type of personnel would probably legitimize protest in people's eyes. He just said he would think seriously about it. I don't know if he ever did. That night was spent on central campus near the Campanile along with varying numbers of people, lots of people maybe a couple hundred up to 1:00 or 2:00 in the morning and then after that maybe only 25 to 30 people spent the night there.

Interviewer: What did you talk about?

Brown: There was a little bit of talk about what was going on? Really it was just sort of the people taking a breather finally, at least myself, that's what I was doing.

Interviewer: Why didn't you go home if you wanted to take a breather?

Brown: Well, part of it was wanting to stay around to make sure nothing went wrong. And the other was not wanting to walk home probably. The year before was the first year that anti-war sentiments type students decided to use central campus as a meeting ground for new people. The year before there was almost continual talk all

night long about the war, about protest with various people, some sober, some not sober that happened to come over that either wanted to talk to us or bother us. Sort of anticipating that sort of repeat, I stayed that night. There were no incidents of controversy or hassling. It was one small group of students who were drunk that showed up and when they did I went over and sat in on the conversation for awhile and saw that it wasn't going anywhere and that everyone was handling themselves reasonably and went back and laid down. The next morning, Saturday, May 9th, was the morning of the rally, I mean of the Veisha parade. Ralph Gross and myself had talked about the prospect of doing a sit-in on Lincoln Way again involving about 800 people which was the number of Iowans killed in the war in Southeast Asia. We made up wooden hand crosses.

Interviewer: Whose idea was this?

Brown: The specific idea of this incident was Ralph's but it was not a new idea. It was some of things we had talked about earlier back in February, the thought was raised about doing something like that, but it wasn't done then. So Ralph, along with a few other people had gone ahead and made the crosses and also had mimeographed off a flyer explaining what it was with a quote from Lincoln and then they had titled these leaflets "Lincoln's Way" which would be the sit-in on Lincoln Way. Also Richard Bender was contacting Bolton, trying to get him to speak on Saturday, May 9th, which he did do. So I went from the Union where Ralph was working with his project over to the beginning of the parade which is where the Prairie Primer was just starting. Prairie Primer contingent was many of the antiwar students who with Prairie Primer's agreement were using it for...

Interviewer: What is the Prairie Primer?

Brown: Prairie Primer is originally and still is an underground newspaper that comes out at the University of Northern Iowa. They have one editor on every campus and the one here is John Uban. John had sort of dropped out of the newspaper business but had continued to use the name of the organization for what he called environmental happening which was just sort of his personal hang-up for getting people close to nature and he would organize sensitivity sessions among people and also rock bands, entertainment.

Interviewer: They had permission from the Veisha Central Committee to have that contingent in the parade?

Brown: Prairie Primer had permission for a contingent in the parade amounting to a motor escort and a synchronized drill team. Motor escort amounted to kids on motorcycles and the drill team amounted to the protest parade. I went over there, marched about a third of the route with the Prairie Primer, serving as a marshall and asking motorcyclists not to do wheelies in front and back of the parade which is what they were doing.

Interviewer: What was the reaction of the spectators to the Prairie Primers?

Brown: The reaction of the spectators was probably negative.

Interviewer: Was there enough peace signs to indicate the general nature of the Primer's?

Brown: I think there was enough there to identify the group. One group for some reason or another had decided to join the group either as an opportunist endeavor or support endeavor or just I'm not sure what but members of the Campus Crusade for Christ had attached themselves to the end of the Prairie Primer contingent and also had their signs so there were maybe one respected group and one unrespected group in the eyes of the audience, but, there were two

groups there. I would think that generally the audience had to be turned off by the whole affair. I was very upset by the amount of effort it took on my part to stop the motorcyclists from doing stunts but eventually they did stop after being told several times to stop. I left the parade at that point and went back to Central Campus to help set up the sound equipment and also had discussions as to who was actually going to be there. I was told President Parks wanted to make a comment and was told that Fulton had arrived and that also Bill Plymat who was candidate for Republican fifth district congressman wanted to speak and tried to work them into the program. Also, I was having problems, the old problem of what you do with people after you get a crowd. Ralph still had his crosses and wanted to do a sit-in. Eventually I vetoed that idea after conversations with Ralph and talked him into it.

Interviewer: Why did you veto the idea?

Brown: The idea was primarily vetoed because the crowd was as-large as it was there were several thousand people at least, the action had called for 700-800. Also the thought of save the idea for another day. All the resources were ready to work with done and not having any fear in my mind that we could get the people to do it whenever we wanted to. So we just put it off thinking we'd do it another day.

Interviewer: It never did come off?

Brown: No, we never did use it. It's still a known contingency plan which may some day be used. The rally came off.

Interviewer: Did you march in the march at this time that came at the end?

Brown: No, I was not in the march at the end. The only part of that march was when people came onto Central Campus after finishing up over by East Hall.

Interviewer: So then the rally met on Central Campus and there were talks by Parks and others.

Brown: There were talks by several people. I spoke, just sort of repeated things they'd been saying at other times during the week. Made comments that we would continue to have actions to protest the war and ask for support from the crowd either here or anywhere else they happen to be.

Interviewer: Was there any request for financial support?

Brown: There was no request for financial support that I can think of something I was aware of. There was a booth set up by the History Club whatever that happens to be. They were having people sign petitions and send letters. They collected something like 500 letters that day, letters and postcards, which were later mailed. The people were talking, the rally sort of ended unexpectedly in sort of stupid fashion. Partially because they were not understanding any of it. There were several speakers still going. The Iowa State carillonneur told us that the Harvard carillonneur had come out at his own expense for the purpose of doing a special concert which was scheduled at that time.

Interviewer: As part of the rally?

Brown: No, not as part of the rally, as part of the Veisha program.

Interviewer: Had you known about this?

Brown: I hadn't known about it before. When I heard about it not thinking if I call it stupid I thought it was one of the five, ten minute programs that our carillonneur puts on every day at one o'clock. It turned out to be an hour concert which once he got started just sort of killed the rally. I'm sure it wasn't done, well, I don't know what their thinking was.

Interviewer: This was after a good number...

Brown: This was after maybe a half a dozen people had talked.

Interviewer: Were there going to be some more speakers?

Brown: There were other people that wanted to talk. One individual started to talk while the carillonneur was playing not understanding what the set-up was and I asked him to stop and he got upset that he wasn't allowed to speak, until I had explained what was going on and then he understood even though he wasn't happy. So the rally sort of died unplanned. The rest of the day was sort of spent... END OF SIDE 6B

Brown: On Sunday night, May 10, at Jerry Parkin's request myself, Jerry Parkin, and Jerry Schnoor went over to Veisha Central Committee re-evaluation meeting which was taking place in Mr. Harl's home, the faculty advisor to Veisha. They'd had some discussion about optional classes, also what Veisha Central Committee could do and had decided that they could do something because of the clause in their by-laws which said that they were to promote and explain the educational process at Iowa State University. Their thinking was that protest and political expression of concern was as educational as going to classes, that that part of the educational process, the non-academic part should be explained to the people of Iowa so that the people of Iowa would not, in part I guess, counter react against Iowa State University and therefore hurt it financially. I think this was maybe Carl Hamilton's interest in the meeting.

Interviewer: Did he express this?

Brown: No, he didn't express this. There were, well, I'll mention them later, several which amounted to straight PR jobs for the university done out of Hamilton's office in the next couple ensuing days; next couple of days, some of which I was involved in, that

I participated in others where I was specifically excluded from participating in.

Interviewer: But at this meeting, what did Mr. Hamilton say, if anything.

Brown: Mr. Hamilton just sort of sat on the sidelines and didn't really comment on anything one way or the other, but didn't leave until it had broken up. He offered services of the extension services that his office had, information office, so that it would be possible to contact people in communities outside of Ames for the prospect of speaker bureaus and speaker tours and things like that. That's the only proposal that he suggested. Veisha had agreed to re-light the torch for Tuesday, May 12. They'd also agreed to try to set up a speakers program and had also agreed to try to contact Iowa Congressmen for the prospect of getting them back to talk to students. They were very critical on Government of the Student Body's resolution, feeling that the students would leave Iowa State if it was made easier and that it was their hope or their desire that students would be given free time but would not be free to leave the University. Their proposal was students be allowed to drop all but one or two classes, or students be allowed to get credit for all but one or two classes, and those classes be the ones they chose so that people would have to stay at the University. There was discussion on that, that GSB did not revise their original resolution.

Interviewer: There was just the president and vice-president from GSB then?

Brown: Yes, just Schnoor, Parkin and myself was the only member from any of the peace groups and then a dozen to fifteen members of the Central Committee, Carl Hamilton and Dr. Harl, that was the extent of people participating. There was a meeting set up for Monday, May 11, at three o'clock. On Monday, May 11th, there was

50 the meeting between VCC, GSB and peace groups.

Primary representatives from our group were Ralph Gross, Doug Marks, Mary Kundrat and John Uban. I didn't attend the meeting. That night about a dozen of us spend Monday evening sleeping in the basement of Frisbee House so that we could get up at six o'clock and go over to the draft board. Discussion as to what to do on Tuesday, May 12th had insued for several days before. There had originally been plans for Tuesday, May 12th, at six o'clock in the morning an all general ROTC Review on Central Campus in preparation of Governor's Day. Originally we planned action against that review similar to the ones that had been earlier over north of Beyer. That had been cancelled in enough days in advance so that we knew about it, I don't remember how many days in advance. Also the people knew that the bus was going to leave from the draft board. The cancellation of the ROTC Review must have taken place sometime between May 8 and May 12. I'm not sure which day. There was discussion between myself and particularly about Trembly as to which of the two events to attend. Either the ROTC Review or the bus or the draft board. I had, prior to the cancellation, pushed the ROTC's Review. Partially my argument was we were being tied down to demonstrating one particular institution, the draft which because of its distance from campus, made it difficult to get students there and also there was greater chance of kids being arrested and that it wasn't, in a large part, any more effective. Trembly was very tied into the draft board. When the ROTC Review was called off, there was agreement to meet the bus.

Interviewer: You said Trembly was very much tied to the draft board. Did he express any specific reasons why he preferred that over ROTC drills? Brown: Not so much that, he just thought we had committed ourselves to

fine the draft board and that the morning when we did not do that would mark the morning that the draft board and the police had won and the students had lost. He just thought it was important for us to continue making our presence at the draft board. Monday May 11th, was very similar to Thursday, May 7th for me in that I spent the evening trying to think of ways of coming up with an event that would not result in kids being arrested.

Interviewer: This was when you were sleeping at Frisbee House, is that right? And did you discuss this with anyone there?

Brown: Discussion was almost all internal. Some discussion with Mary Kundrat but not enough to really amount to anything. The deciding factor appeared to be how many people we could get there at six o'clock in the morning. There was no way of knowing for certain.

Interviewer: Was there any idea, any agreed upon idea of what you would do once you got there?

Brown: There was no agreed upon idea. There'd been some talk, a couple of different talks earlier, nothing for certain. We talked about this straight leaflet as people got on the bus. We talked about sitting around the bus. We talked about the prospect of damaging the ties of the bus so that the bus would be unable to move and be required to get another bus. The only real advantage in damaging the tires was the hope that one person could do it and not get arrested and therefore we stopped the bus and nobody would be arrested, not that there was any glee in damaging private property.

Interviewer: The bus was not a federal, government owned bus?

Brown: No, this was a chartered bus. There was no agreed upon plan of what was suppose to happen when we got there. Myself and the people that came with me, I think, were the first people there in the morning. No, we weren't the first. There were people there

also, there were members of the police department there.

Interviewer: Do you know why the police were there? Is it usual for them to be there when the draftees are going to go off to Des Moines?

Brown: It's not usual for them to be there when draftees are going. My understanding is that since this incident, to this date, which is June 1, the police department has had personnel there at six o'clock in the morning when the buses have been leaving. I don't know how long they intend to carry out this practice. When I got there people were standing around. Still no decision had been made as to what we should do.

Interviewer: When you got there, there were students there already? There were police there already? About how many policemen, would you say?

Brown: There were lots of police.

Interviewer: All in uniform?

Brown: No, many of them were not in uniform. I would say maybe ten police with at least five of them not in uniform.

Interviewer: Were the draftees there already?

Brown: Some of the draftees were already on the bus, several others arrived while we were there. There was some conversation with the draftees, but none that I was in, but some people were talking. Two people that were known sympathetic members of our group were going to Des Moines that morning for their pre-induction physicals. They took arm bands from us, we were giving out arm bands to the kids that got on, and took some and passed them around.

Interviewer: Did any others, except the two you were sympathetic to...

Brown: Some other people, I'm not sure how many, but I did hear stories afterwards of conversations and kids accepting arm bands and kids that gave other kids peace symbol buttons to go to Des Moines with. So there was some interaction there. Somewhere, at some point, a

a bunch of kids sat in, in front of the bus.

Interviewer: How did they come to this decision to start to try to stop the bus by sitting in front of it?

Brown: As far as I know, nobody actually made a determination. I know that I didn't give any order to sit-in.

Interviewer: Did you try to stop them?

Brown: No, I didn't try to stop them. Also, I don't think Bob Trembly was there that morning.

Interviewer: What were you doing when they were doing this?

Brown: I was in the middle of the bus just sort of watching things, really trying to figure out where it was going. It didn't appear that any one was going to try to sit-in and I wasn't happy by it but I wasn't saddened by it. When the kids started to sit-in at the front, several students also sat at the back of the bus. The first thing that the bus tried to do was to back up. I had also, previously to the move, gone to the back of the bus because if any one was going to get run over by a bus it was going to be at the back. That was the most dangerous position for students, any way.

Interviewer: Did you try to get them out from behind the bus?

Brown: No, I just...

Interviewer: Did you sit down there?

Brown: No, I didn't sit down any time. Most of the kids at the back were standing, a few were sitting. Kids closest to the bus were standing, were just sort of edging back as the bus went back. There were kids sitting there, they weren't put in jeopardy, whether they would have decided to move or not, I didn't quite get that close. When the bus started to back up, I went to the front on the opposite of the driver's side, walked all the way around the kids in the front, to the driver's side and tried to yell into the window, "If you

back any further you're going to start running over people." He stopped I'm pretty certain that he didn't hear me yelling at him either because his windows were rolled up and the bus was going. But he did stop. Prior to the bus going back, when the kids had stood in front of the bus, originally it was a stand-in and not a sit-in. There was a tactic used by the police which might have been an effective tactic but sort of backfired at this point, I think. What they decided to do was try to make a quick get-away or a quick pass so the bus could get out. What they did was, went into the crowd, grabbed the person by an arm or a leg and drug them out or threw them out, let them go, did not make any attempt to arrest them, and went back to grab another person and did the same. They were trying to move as many people in as short a time as possible.

Interviewer: Did you see any resistance by those being moved that way?

Brown: I don't think there was any resistance at this time. What this did, in part, was that it roughed up some people a little bit, nothing at all serious, but the kids when thrown came back, this time just a little bit madder. This project didn't work, and it didn't work primarily because people started sitting down rather than standing.

Interviewer: As soon as they started trying to remove them they began to sit.

Brown: Then the kids sat down. At this point the bus tried backing up and I went to the back and then around to the front.

Interviewer: Okay, now the bus is stopped from backing up, what happened then?

Brown: The bus is stopped. I'm on the street side, sort of in the middle, watching. Police started making arrests, dragging kids out. I was yelling to the group when they were being arrested, things like: "Stay calm, be cool, keep your hands in your pockets, go with them so you won't be arrested for resisting arrest." Sort of trying to

keep the crowd, not so they wouldn't get arrested, but making sure they don't get arrested for resisting arrest." Sort of trying to keep the crowd, not so they wouldn't get arrested, but making sure they don't get arrested for resisting arrest, was my primary concern. And making sure that no one that had been arrested before got arrested again.

Interviewer: How were you going to make sure that no one got re-arrested?

Brown: Well, I was just keeping an eye. A couple of people were in the original sit-down that had been arrested before and they had been smart enough when things had stopped to get up and walk away. This was an agreed upon tactic by everyone participating that it was vital that no one get arrested a second time.

Interviewer: So everyone had agreed to this and acted accordingly.

Brown: There was never an official statement by anyone saying, "Do it this way." But it was generally accepted mores by everyone. When people were being arrested and drug out one incident that I was involved in was one student, I'm not sure of the name even, was drug out and was lying on his back. When he started to sit up a detective put a knee in his chest and forced him back down onto the ground. Then the detective removed his knee and started to stand up and the kid started to stand and the detective put his knee in his chest again.

Interviewer: Now this was a detective because he was in civilian clothes.

Brown: Yea, he's definitely with the police department because I know the face. He stood up again and the kid did this once more, the knee came back in the chest and I walked over to the kid and said, "Stay down, it's not that much different and it's not worth the trouble." The detective asked me what I was doing. I said I was trying to help. He said, "Sure you are." He then said, "Brown, get the

hell out of here. If you don't get out of here you'll be arrested for violating due process." I didn't have any real answer for that; I just sort of walked away to the back of the bus and continued to do what I was doing, telling kids to stay limp. There were some instances, in my mind, on Tuesday May 12, which were tactically lacking. Meaning that I thought there were instances where students responded, other than going limp, both verbally and physically. I was distraught with that. After this had all busted up, when the bus had left, people had been arrested, relayed that to people, students that were standing around and had participated and hadn't got arrested. They were--most of the students were agreed that the thing hadn't been totally non-violent. Some of them regretting that fact, others not so much regretting the fact. One incident that I witnessed that I judged to be other than non-violent was one individual who ran across and sort of put a foot in a patrolman's back and bounced off and ran into an Ames Tribune photographer.

Interviewer: Now why was he putting a foot in a policeman's back, was the policeman doing something then?

Brown: First of all he ran into the photographer who dropped his camera who then proceeded to hit the student and the student just sort of ran away from the photographer. In a talk with the student afterwards asking him why he did the action...

Interviewer: Was he arrested?

Brown: He was arrested and he was charged with resisting arrest. He said that this particular incident that I witnessed was a result because the patrolman was pulling a girl by the hair. I didn't see the patrolman pulling the girl by the hair but that doesn't mean it didn't happen, I just didn't see it. But I did admonish the individ-

ual for his actions even though he did justify them and he still continues to feel that he justified them. There was a meeting after all of this was sort of busted up still at the draft board there. The police hadn't left yet but the bus had left. Everyone who was going to be arrested was arrested. Well, it amounted to me talking. I expressed some displeasure, not in the fact that the sit-in had been done, but at some of the actions of the individual students. We made a quick run-down of trying to determine who had been arrested which was really very hard to do. Many of the people arrested at this time, were the first time I'd saw those people. Particularly the three or four people that are from this fraternity system that I didn't know before. There was some sort of discussion as to whether we would be able to raise bail knowing that this instance wasn't as pure in the sense of being non-violent as the first incident at the draft board had been. My determination and the expression I gave was that we make no attempt to hide our mild displeasure at some of the students activities, that we be honest in saying that it did happen. That we go back to campus and try to raise the bail money needed. People went back to campus. A booth was set up...

Interviewer: Did you go back with them?

Brown: I went back to the campus. Made one call to one person that I knew had a thousand dollar savings bond and asked of him to take it out. They wanted to know if I had been arrested and I said, no, but other people had and they agreed to do that. There was a lot of talk just between Ted Lawrence and myself and a few other people as to what, just theorizing, what effect this demonstration was going to have. We went, after collecting the money, after we knew we had enough money which only took three or four hours, we went down to

the jail and bailed the kids out. At that same time when bailing the kids out, myself and two or three other people, walked half a block to watch the Patriots Rally.

Interviewer: Did you participate in it?

Brown: No, the only thing I did was stand on the side and watch it and sort of commented with the people I was with. The Daily reporter asked me for an opinion on the size of the parade and I told him three hundred at most and he told me that was the determination he had made. Then we went back to the police station and waited for the police to allow the rest of the people out. When they did get out I talked to Steve Ewoldt about his role in it particularly, since we went back in the same car and mentioned one other incident that I thought was violent on the students part but was unable to identify the person. We just sort of had a discussion of theory, whether, how a student should respond. There was an expression on my part on thinking that Ewoldt was lucky that he got off with out being charged with assault and battery to an officer of the law which is what one patrolman told me was going to be or would be filed, which would have meant several years in jail. We just sort of talked that. They took me home and dropped me off at my apartment. Only the other thing that happened on Tuesday, May 12th, that wasn't mentioned earlier was right after the meeting to decide to go back and raise bail money was decided, in a conversation with one of the patrolmen who was sitting in a car, who is also a part time student. He donated three dollars to the bail fund and said that he sort of knew that if we had stayed there that both students and police would loose their cool more than they had the day before and ...

Interviewer: You mean the time before?

Brown: Yea, the time before, excuse me, and made reference to the difference in in experience between the day force and the night force and that... because the kids were arrested at six o'clock in the morning that was the night force that was making the arrests and they were, in his mind, not as experienced in dealing with students as the day force had, who had spent a couple of weeks or even a year watching students march up and down main street. Also, had some more talk about Bishop. This particular patrolman was very anti- to attorney Bishop. We made some talk about the prospects of requesting that City Attorney Bishop not be on the site of student demonstrations in the future even when less were going to take place. And who in the hierarchy of city hall I could make that request to. He said he didn't think there was any way to stop it but he thought it was a good idea, too. On Thursday, May 14th, the first thing I did that morning was, Ken Mills, Meg Connally, and Jo-Jo and myself went to Nevada to see ...

Interviewer: You're all students?

Brown: Yes, went to Nevada to see Sally Bennett. We took her a Daily. Meg, had the day before had gone to Judge McKinney and told him that she was the one that had swore at him other than Sally...

Interviewer: Meg told you this, is that right?

Brown: Meg told McKinney this. She told us this in the car and she also wrote letters to the Editors of both the Daily and the Ames Tribune stating that she was the one that had called McKinney...

Interviewer: Were these ever published?

Brown: I'm certain that the one in the Daily was published and I think the one in the Ames Tribune was published. I saw the copy in the Daily. Meg had told us that she had written letters while we were driving to Nevada. When we got to Nevada, we all one at a time, went into

Sally. Had to sign our names in a ledger and address and were all allowed to spend a couple minutes with her. This was her first day in jail and of course, she was okay, she wasn't taking it-bad at all. We then drove back to Ames. Ken left me off at the post office with Doug and I sat there in the post office with Doug from about three to five. Yes, Doug Marks. Also Mary Kundra came a few minutes after I was there, so the three of us were there for that day. On Friday, May 15, Bob Trembly, myself and Jeff Klomp went to court with our lawyer, Dan Johnston for preliminary hearings in Ames city hall before Judge McKinney. These three, myself, Trembly and Klomp were the ones charged with resisting arrest for the first series of arrests. The night before, on May 14th, I had had a conversation with Jim Hannah as to why we'd been charged with resisting arrest. Jim Hannah pointed out the fact that Klomp had gotten the charge because I had Klomp's driver's license with me, I hadn't thought of that until that night. The next morning, the 15th, when we went to court, I told Dan Johnston, the lawyer, that Klomp had been charged because I had his driver's license and it was a mistake. Johnston went in to talk to McKinney, he explained about the driver's license and consequently the charges were dropped against Jeff Klomp, Bob Trembly and I went in and Johnston asked for ten days allowance for him to post or ask for a bill of particulars and then we were told that our jury trial date would be set for either the end of June or the end of July depending on how the docket lined up. Interviewer: Did you request a jury trial?

Brown: No, we haven't specifically requested a jury trial but it is my understanding that that's the way it's going to wind up. When we left the court room we spent just a minute talking to Dan Johnston,

letting him know where we would be over the summer so he could contact us. I went down to the bottom of the stairs. When I was at the bottom of the stairs the Assistant County Attorney, Bill Gibbons, who was prosecuting Trembly, and I and Klomp earlier, came up to me and informed me that a warrant for resisting arrest had been filed for Freiberger. Asked me if I saw Freiberger to tell him about it and ask him to come in and turn himself in so as to make their job at the police department easier. I told him that if I saw Freiberger I'd tell him about it. I then went to the police desk and tried to find out who was the arresting officer in Freiberger's case. I couldn't find out there and went up to City Attorney Bishop's and he wasn't in so I didn't find out there either. Went to campus, called Freiberger and told him about it. He said he'd be in earlier, later in the day. I met him at about noon, maybe earlier maybe eleven. Ask him what he had decided to do. He said he hadn't decided. I asked him if there was anything important that he had to do today. He said there wasn't. The only thing he had to do was get out of one course and he had an appointment with his instructor at one o'clock. So we made an appointment to meet back in the Union at two o'clock to talk about what he should do about the resisting arrest charge. I had an appointment that same day over at Carl Hamilton's office with one of Carl Hamilton's assistants who is a writer for Alumni News, who was doing a story on student leaders at Iowa State and their philosophies and spent some time talking to him, giving him material for the story. I came back at two o'clock, met Freiberger along with Bob Trembly, Ted Lawrence, Jerry Schnoor and Jerry Parkin.

Interviewer: How did all the others find out about this?

Brown: The meeting took place in Jerry Schnoor's office, GSB President's

office. Myself, Trembly and Lawrence all knew about the meeting, the other people happened to be around when it happened to take place. There were a few other people that walked in and out such as Denny Forsythe that really weren't in on it but happened to come in on it. There was discussion as to how to respond. Bob Trembly wanted Freiberger to not turn himself in on the 15th and rather just stay low for the weekend so that we could organize a rally for Monday the 18th. His feeling there was to hold the rally to inform the police that Freiberger would be there and ask them to come and arrest Freiberger. The thought was just to let a lot of people, at least, witness an arrest so that they would have some feeling for it, and just sort of give a mass witness to Freiberger's being arrested. My thought was that Freiberger should turn himself in immediately so that we could get him out on bail. There was no real tactical disagreement with Trembly. There was an attitude difference in that my argument and thought was important for us to come across straight to the community as a pragmatic point of view and the other point of view was that everything you do in organizing should be open and up and that hiding out for a weekend was not that and regardless of whether we got away with it public-wise or that it was incorrect as a principle for organizing.

Interviewer: Did you intend to publicize his voluntarily surrendering himself?

Brown: We did intend to publicize his voluntarily turning himself in. There was almost complete agreement among everyone there, particularly among Trembly and I since we had such different ideas, that Freiberger's arrest was unusual and maybe even bordered upon, we felt that Freiberger was being charged because they had lost Klomp. Not that Freiberger was any more innocent or guilty than anyone

else, but they had just decided to throw a trap at somebody, a week after the original incident and that it was very improper or at least not typical of police action. So we wanted to make that point known, there was just disagreement as to which way was best to do it. Freiburger originally concurred with my opinion. Trembly gave a rebuttal and Freiburger changed to Trembly's idea. I gave a rebuttal and he changed to my idea.

Interviewer: How did you rebut Trembly's idea of a mass demonstration and forcing the police to come to Freiburger?

Brown: The rebuttal was the police probably wouldn't come and probably let us sit there forever until the crowd went home. Two, that the rally could be held any time after Freiburger had been released on bail, that he could explain what he thought was happening. And three, the guiding principle idea that I expressed earlier. Also problems that would arise if he was arrested over the week end. There'd been contact made...

Interviewer: You mean before any mass demonstration could have been held?

Brown: Yea, there'd been contact made with City Attorney Bishop's office informing him that I and also Jerry Parkin was in verbal contact with Freiburger or that we were going to be in the immediate future and asking for a guarantee that if he turned himself in by four o'clock that he could be arraigned and out by five. Because if he wasn't out by five he'd have to spend the weekend, until Monday and this was one thing that Freiburger didn't want to do. So finally it was agreed that he would turn himself in. The Daily and WOI and the Ames Tribune were informed and asked to be there. Freiburger went down, was booked--finger prints, mug shot--Ted Lawrence posted bail...

Interviewer: And bail was \$500.000?

Brown: Bail was \$500.00 Freiberger was released and he made a statement for WOI and the Ames Trib and afterwards we went over to the Daily and made the same statement. The statement amounted to his belief that he was being arrested just sort of as an after thought and as a response to Klomp being released and also the prospect of County Attorney Gibbons using him as a sort of a political pawn in that Gibbons was trying to run for county attorney against Smith rather than remaining assistant county attorney.

Interviewer: How was this statement agreed upon?

Brown: The statement wasn't so much agreed upon but what was stated or what was agreed upon was that the person talking to the press had to be Freiberger and that he should say whatever he thought or believed. And he made those two statements or those two thoughts in his presentation. So he was arraigned and released. We went to the Daily and made the same statement and then back to the Union. The rest of Friday evening...

Interviewer: Did you at any time attempt to set up a rally for him to talk directly to the students?

Brown: There was thought about it but it was never set up. I think--Saturday, the 16th, I, Carol Epast, Rod Williams and Richard Bender who had been involved in the activities were at the State Democratic Convention. On the 16th, on the University, there were workshops for the marshalls and organizing car pools to take people to the Des Moines rally on the 17th. On Sunday, May 17th, the rally in Des Moines started at Veteran's Auditorium. Iowa State University provided about fifty marshalls for the parade which was the bulk of the marshalls. The parade went off very quiet.. It was one of the quietest parades I've ever been in, nobody said anything.

Interviewer: Were there many spectators?

Brown: Almost no spectators. Very orderly rows with five or six people in a row. And it had 3,000 people and it drug out four and five people in a column, it drug out for a couple of miles. We congregated on the Capitol grounds. Governor Ray spoke first once again, endorsing our efforts but saying many of his constituencies, un identified with student protestors or radicals. That we were alienated both by our thoughts and our looks and that we should take that into consideration maybe modify it if we had hopes of ever reaching those people. That was met with mixed reaction from the crowd, a large part of the crowd definitely not liking it. After that, Senator Hughes spoke, gave approximately the same speech he had given at the Democratic convention the day before, was met with favorable response. Sort of gave a lecture or sermon on morality which was sort of nice but unusual. On Monday, May 18th, two things happened. One was Professor Kernan put out his mailing to the faculty at Iowa State University also a group of students under Bernice Black leafleted University Village, Pammel Court and Hawthorne Court with literature for Bill Plymat.

Interviewer: Were you active in...

Brown: I wasn't in on the leafleting or mailing, what I did do that night was went to the town meeting at the public library which dealt with dissent and its role in American Society.

Interviewer: Did you speak at that?

Brown: I spoke, not to the body as a whole, but I did speak. We had three smaller workshop type sessions afterwards. Mr. Newbrough was the moderator at the one I was in and I spoke a little bit there. When they discovered who I was I related what went on at the draft board the time I was arrested. Mr. Newbrough is also Robert Pyle's

lawyer so he was able to talk a little bit about what Mr. Pyle was feeling and the question of the need to speak versus the norm of individual property and rights was the center of our topic and really wasn't resolved to anybody's satisfaction in what little time we had. One thing that did come out of the meeting was a list of townspeople who stated their willingness to get out of bed at any time of the day or night to attend as an observing team a student demonstration or any type of activity similar to that. The thought there was to have people around who could watch the actions of both the students and police and hope that that type of watch-dog activity would modify or tone down both groups responses. On Wednesday, May 20th, B. J. Weber, John Wagstaff and myself went to Des Moines to talk to Senator Miller's Iowa staff aide, whose last name is Cramm, I don't remember the first name. We spent about two hours talking to him. We didn't go with the intentions of converting him, we sort of just went with the intentions of meeting the gentleman so that we would be able to talk to him in the future if we decided to for any issue...

Interviewer: Did you have any difficulty arranging a meeting with him?

Brown: The meeting was arranged through his daughter who is a student at Iowa State University and a friend of B. J. Weber so that B. J. arranged the meeting and John and I went to talk. The only thing that we tried to do and was done pretty much on the suggestion of his daughter. She had stated that she'd heard her father and her mother make references to students in the belief that they didn't think students were informed on the issues that they were trying to tackle so John and I made an effort at all times to set up instances where we could show that we were informed and we were concerned rather than trying to pressure him one way or the other

at this time. It lasted for a couple of hours and was generally, I would say, worthwhile. It probably didn't change anybody's mind but maybe set the stage for a change in the future. Then we went to Collegiate Methodist Church which had a panel that evening that myself and Jeff Klomp participated in. Also Attorney Newbrough was there along with assistant pastor, Jerry Smith. The talk was the same issues of what dissent is. This time the emphasis was different that the town meeting in that the emphasis this time was, "Did we believe in non-violence and if it is, what and how did we attempt to use it." That meeting I think was productive and could have been further productive except for maybe some unfortunate events that happened a couple of days later. That started to set the stage where I think we talking to Ames community more than we'd ever been and had several invitations that evening to speak to themselves and to groups they belonged to later on about the same things we were talking about. On Thursday, the 21st, the BSO on campus organized the Jackson State memorial service. There was no real organization done on the part of Peace Now and Moritorium other than just telling people that we knew about it. The rally took place at Beardshear on Thursday and the lowering of the flag for the service went off pretty much without incident. There was a certain amount of feeling that Blacks and Whites were together for a little bit, at least for that one day, more so than they had been at any other time. Friday, May 22nd, was when the bomb went off at City Hall. I was called at my apartment by Rich Bender...

Interviewer: Now at this time I'd like some reactions and opinions of your own to these events that you have participated in. First of all, what were your ideas and aims when you began participating in all these

events that happened on campus this May?

Brown: First of all, this has been for myself and almost all the people that were involved in the primary organization of what went on in May, a year long endeavor and we'd been involved in it all along. We had tried to make an issue out of the issue of the expansion into Laos when it came up about a month previous. It fell sort of on its face, with no one being interested in it. So some of us were individually protesting the Cambodian action. We had no idea that it was going to blossom as big as it did either here or any where else in the country. We thought it deserved to blossom as big as it did yet we hadn't counted on it. Every action sort of just built, day by day, and every decision on an action usually took place five minutes before the called action was to take place, where people had been told to show up.

Interviewer: Would you say that these decisions to act were group decisions or influenced by a few individuals? How can you characterize them?

Brown: I would say that the decisions were usually made by a few people. In some regards I think the few people that made the decisions were not a cross section but were extremeties of thought that were very different from one another but still could survive with one another and act and sometimes bow out and sometimes take a stand and everyone was able to work within that small decision making body. There were, I really can't think of any instances where the final decision that was made was contrary to the wishes of the group. Usually there was enough give and take that it was at a level of committment that people were able to participate in. There were two thoughts, some which I expressed earlier, one of trying to come up with effective protest and the other. was coming up with personal committment,-in purifying that. Along with personal committment is an

organizing principal that any commitment however small the person makes, that person is going to have to justify in his mind later even if he makes it without a whole lot of thinking to start with. Meaning if somebody goes on a march which doesn't really mean anything sometime someone is going to ask him why he did it and even if he can't answer if immediately he is going to have to think about it and that builds. So there is encouraging commitment and then purifying commitment when you have, expanding it. There was a thought of just needing, to a certain extent, of trying to get out of normal daily routine. Of doing something to break that. In some forms it took maybe disruptions such as the ROTC field and the sit-down on Main Street and Lincoln Way. Disruption wasn't the primary motive for either the two, either the draft board or the draft bus. I think both of those cases where people were actually getting arrested, personal commitment was the primary motivating factor that people felt a need for something extraordinary out of themselves.

Interviewer: Was there, do you feel, any desire for becoming any kind of martyrship by individuals, making an example to serve as a rallying point?

Brown: I think not. Everyone just sort of stayed away from that developing. There's enough people that keep everyone in check and prevent some sort of "Trash--unrational" action on somebody's part. I don't anyone was working for that type of activity. There were certainly instances where we capitalized upon situations. Some we turned down such as in Freiburger's case. So things built, some different motives. Like I said, there's getting attention, raising a question, trying to be effective politically and trying to be meaningful to ourselves. I think those were the factors that motivated and determined what actions were taken.

Interviewer: Are you speaking primarily for yourself or do you feel you're sort of expressing a consensus of opinion of others?

Brown: I'm sure it is a consensus of opinion, I think, of the organizing decision makers and I think pretty much so of the general body. Those factors come out in general mixtures and various instances but I think those are the primary ingredients.

Interviewer: How effective in furthering these general aims do you feel these various actions have been, demonstrations, rallies, marches, sitins, and actually being arrested?

Brown: I think the actions are generally--a couple of levels considered effective--and always because they are part of a larger picture. An action in Ames, Iowa, doesn't mean much but the action of 500 colleges across the states did mean something. In 609 Cooper Church [Amendment] they came up at the same time, may be passed maybe not, but they're definitely keeping the heat on. Nixon has to play with June 30, that's currently in everybody's mind. On that level, the pressure was on the top. We assisted that effort. Locally as far as communicating with towns people, there was a lot of give and take, I think, there. Very few of the towns people approve of the tactics used. I think many of them probably mis understand and misrepresent both what we did and who we were.

Interviewer: Was this misunderstanding perpetuated or enhanced by mass media handling of it or was it just something you feel is inherent in their conservative attitudes?

Brown: I think I would blame one segment of the mass media, that being the Ames Tribune for that image. I think there's a certain amount of contrast between citizenry and students in Ames already and I think that probably doesn't help.

Interviewer: Do you think the Tribune reflects in any way the feelings of most

of the townspeople?

Brown: I think it probably reflects the feeling of the townspeople but the fact that I don't think it's a true reflection is what rates a question in my mind.

Interviewer: Do you mean it's distorted or exaggerated?

Brown: I think it's exaggerated. In that regard it may have been across the board, our actions were immediately counter-productive as far as the total Ames population is concerned. I think the tactics were necessary whether they were these specifics or not but these did have pressure at the top, that we talked about earlier. There was increased communication among specific segments of the population. Particularly students and city government is probably as strong as it's every been and the understanding between those groups and individual respect. I think students and police department right now, on a good degree of communication going on, it went on that week. Sort of when everyone was doing their job but when you weren't doing your job everyone was talking about their jobs and trying to understand the other guy's job which I think was beneficial. Some public officials, in the minds of students were propped up as being undesirable. I'm fairly certain that probably on the other side of the coin some of those undesirables might have come off well to the Ames general public, but there were some controversies centered around certain public officials. Communication between clergy has improved. It's usually been pretty good but I think in this instance it improved even more so.

Interviewer: What about the university administration?

Brown: The university administration sort of sat it out. Differing feelings on that--many of the students would have approved of setting President Parks in the stink in the middle of fire making him perform orders

to get out of it. That is something we refrained from doing way back as far as October and something I refrained from doing this time. The Dean of Students Office, we've concluded that they are sympathetic with us usually--they do their job but we think they are very reasonable and we've felt that all year long. The faculty is still usually pretty pathetic. They've done some things all year long but they haven't---Well, I wish there were more of them that had differing opinions than they have and that more of them would work with those opinions.

Interviewer: Meaning that more of them don't respond at all one way or the other.

Brown: The general conclusion that I get from people that were both at Iowa State and at Iowa City is the make-up and the difference of the student body but it's not all that great and that the fundamental difference in this University and Iowa City is faculty response. At Iowa City faculty were strongly behind student protest for Cambodia and for how the University responds as far as letting students become politically active. So I think the faculty here isn't quite pulling its load, in my mind. The faculty that are, we're very grateful for and they're doing a good job. But communication still between the faculty and students over this incident and other incidents is lacking. Even more surprising is administration and faculty communication. It appears, after this last series of incidents, in my mind, that there is even less between faculty and administration than there is between administration and students. The faculty is just sort of left out of everything. We don't see that as the role of the faculty both our selfish interests but we feel they need a bigger role in the University.

Interviewer: What about, if you look back on it now, do you think there are some things you would have done differently?

Brown: There's still a lot of reflecting and trying to evaluate what went on. I still think the protest, at this stage of my life, is an experiment in trying to find a viable means that is still moral. There were a lot of things done which had never been done before. I'll recap them. This last incident involving Cambodia was the first time that there was a sit-down in Ames, the first time a building was occupied, the first time that a strike call actually came off, the first time there were mass arrests, the first time mass bail was raised, so a lot of things were done the first time which leads one to conclude you progress from there. There are so many bridges that we don't have to pass again so that there was a feeling of some sort of progress taking place whether it was correct or not. There was and there is several incidents where I tried to tone down a particular action, not that I thought it was particularly incorrect but in trying to prevent people from getting arrested. I was arrested--dealing with the arrest issue--in an incident when I didn't really expect to be arrested. Leadership has problems and leadership tends to be conservative in committing large numbers of people to actions that it would be willing to take. Getting yourself arrested is easier to decide than deciding that you want to get 25 other people arrested, particularly when you can't request that from those 25 people.

Interviewer: The assumption is that they go into this with their eyes open or that they go into the situation, explained to them and they know what to expect.

Brown: I think that takes place. I don't think that in any way there is a blanket truism. People get caught up in things and you have to play with that too, and try to prevent it. Because there is always the possibility of mistakes you try to take small steps even though

you're trying to always go forward and you're trying to--you don't always have time to make certain where you're at. This was one of the crisis institute lectures. One of the speakers spoke of the greatest ally for the protest movement was the military in that she conduct protest strategy in almost military fashion and that you set out a front and you attack in that front. If it's being shown that you're losing in that front or you're getting beat on that front don't be stubborn minded about it but retreat and find another front.

Interviewer: Are arrests, for example, signs of defeat?

Brown: No, arrests aren't signs of defeat. What I see as, not a pragmatic defeat but maybe an intellectual defeat, was that the group became tied in to the actions of the draft board when there was no thought to what sort of counter response somewhere else we could possibly use or give, if that had gone badly. Meaning that kids could have gotten arrested forever which isn't a bad idea but we should have made decisions like whether we wanted to get out on bail prior to the arrest so that we were prepared. The primary factor that arrests were as small as they were was the tear gas stayed in there for three days and the fact that the draft board was moved to the post office, the Jackson State event probably detracted from possible actions at the Post Office, also the bombing put a lid on a lot of things that might have happened. Then dead week and finals, all of this. So a lot of circumstances prevented some things from happening and it's not so much that I disagree with what we did, it's that I didn't think we were as prepared as we should have been going into them--is the question I'm raising.

Interviewer: Your moritorium group which sort of formed the nucleus for this was sort of inactive up to this point--the activities had died

down considerably. Matter of fact, on the national level, moritorium groups had disbanded so that wasn't an on-going thing.

Brown: In describing the group, the group had broke up maybe forty days before this incident--right before early April. The group had gone solid for six months before that, at least internally. The group had all the abilities necessary to sustain--both the abilities and committments--to sustain something like what came off during the Cambodian thing. There was, to a certain extent, known and tested leadership which could have been a problem hadn't they been known and tested. There were communication channels and special abilities in certain people that were utilized. I think it's fortunate that the moritorium committee had existed for six months prior. That that group of people had a philosophy that they were acting with and I think that philosophy sort of predominated most of what went on. I'm not sure it would have been any different if they hadn't existed but I think it's fortunate that they did exist.

Interviewer: Well, considering the existence of a tested leadership how would you characterize the events on this campus in May compared to events that have occurred elsewhere in the country?

Brown: In some regards the incidents weren't that different. My understanding is there were over 400 colleges that were on strike and of those 400 on strike there were only eleven in the country that there was actual violence--well, reported violence--I don't know what's determined as violent or destruction of property. So the violent-non-violent aspect--there was an overwhelming predominance of non-violence. I think the actual expression and identification of a philosophy of non-violence which our group did at some points sincerely and maybe even did communicate that to some people was probably very abnormal.

Interviewer: You say very abnormal? You mean in relation to what happened elsewhere.

Brown: In relation to what I think went on on other campuses.

Interviewer: You mean the commitment to non-violence was not characteristic elsewhere.

Brown: Not so much the commitment but the actual advocating, lobbying and expression of it through mass rally type of things. On this campus, the commitment for non-violence was there all year in the moritorium committee but this was the first time, at a rally, where a speaker actually stood up and said "I believe in non-violence. I believe it should take the following forms and therefore it will be successful and therefore I encourage you to participate in it." I think that actual witnessing of philosophy and advocating a philosophy is abnormal. I could be wrong in that.

Interviewer: So in other words, you're saying that one of the reasons there was non-violence here is because leadership openly expressed to the participants the ideals of non-violence.

Brown: I think the stage was set over and over again--that the terms were set down by...

Interviewer: Were there any persons active in this who advocated a more violent approach to the demonstrations--burning buildings or similar acts of violence?

Brown: I think there are people that think that way and some people that may have among their own small crowds talked about the prospects. My position is so well-known to people that very seldom was that brought forward to me.

Interviewer: Was it ever expressed at one of the rallies over the mike?

Brown: It was expressed by some people over the mike usually many of the rallies came down to that point--of violence versus non-violence.

It took various forms. Many of the advocates of the violent--of the use of violence--have sort of a twist in that they think it's fundamental and important that the non-violent advocates be heard. That they have a message. But the only way that those people will be allowed to give their message is if there is a threat of violence--hand in hand. That the threat of violence protects the non-violent speaker from both character damage and physical damage. So the violence people think they are setting the stage. There's at least a group of people here that think that believe that.

Interviewer: So they're not really serious about. If they were suddenly given the leadership they wouldn't go marching off to some destructive act. That they are just sort of setting up a strawman for the nonviolent group.

Brown: There's not the group that are setting up the non-violent or think they're setting them up. I don't really believe that's necessary, some people do. There's the group that talks--burn down a building a day for peace. There's probably some sincerity in that belief. I've often expressed both displeasure and ridicule for that position in a mild form and I've never really seen the actions to substantiate or prove their sincerity and I hope I never do.

Interviewer: Now, there was a report of a fire bomb being found in one of the buildings.

Brown: There was a report, I guess in building E or H, the night that the Veishea torch was relit. I've never been able to find out or no one has ever informed me who was responsible for it. I haven't actively tried to find out.

Interviewer: Was it a serious attempt? Could it have actually gone off?

Brown: My understanding is that it could have.

Interviewer: You don't know how it was discovered?

Brown: I don't know. I heard two stories. Maybe they're both true. Orgy of an unbroken Molotov cocktail type device found inside a window that had broke the window but didn't break when it got inside and the other of one edge of the building being seared which meant there was a flame on the outside but it went out when the rain started.

Interviewer: Now is there any other reason why you would call it non-violent aside from leadership expressing this idea openly at meetings?

Brown: I think in a large part the student body--people--are non-violent except when such as war, when an institution asks them or when it's legitimized by government that they are non-violent so I think that's the way the student body is on an issue. I think you'd have trouble getting support for anything other than that at least mass support, where you're talking of thousands of people. When you've identified as person as activist and you're probably talking of 200 people or less on this campus. Those are the 200 people you're vying for, particularly I think, at this point, of getting them on your side of the violence--non-violence issue because they're the people that would set the tone for the action by the New Left-it would never be a uniformed action because the issues are too important for some people. It's those 200 people that are still in overwhelming numbers in in the non-violent camp, that are probably primarily responsible for making sure violence didn't take place. Violence is a very singular thing, anyone can do it.