Reaction to Abby precipitates crisis at Rice

By JACK MURRAY

The Abby Hoffman crisis erupted by fireworks Sunday when a group of non-students and university personnel attempted to storm the Allen Center business building. The group was made up of no more than 20 persons, and included members of the Students for a Democratic Society, the Houston Student Association, some faculty, and university security personnel.

The attack on the Allen Center was repelled after a few tense minutes by students, faculty, and university security personnel. Some of the attackers were wounded, although Dr. Paul Pflieger, professor of electrical engineering, was thrown down and kicked during the scuffle.

The group of dissident students had gathered at the Allen Center last weekend to discuss tactics and a course of action in the light of the student security personnel. They were involved in the November 1969 incident in which the Rice Memorial Center was invaded by the Rice Student Association and Bartee Hall, a former student, was held captive.

The group of dissident students was prevented from entering the Allen Center at 11:30 pm; by police action and in connection with a robbery.

The group of dissident students was prevented from entering the Allen Center at 11:30 pm by police action and in connection with a robbery.

Curriculum proposal faces second faculty reading

By MIKE SMITH

The faculty approved basic curriculum changes recommended by the committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum at a regular faculty meeting March 18. The proposal must pass on a second reading at the next faculty meeting. The committee said it is possible that the proposal could be put into effect at some time, but it hopes the changes can be implemented as soon as possible.

The proposed changes were accepted as written by Dr. David Baker of the Physics Dept. and the Curriculum Committee, except for one amendment by Dr. D. A. Ward which eliminated the requirement of English 100 and substituted a non-credit tutorial for those entering students who cannot demonstrate adequate English comprehension and composition. With this amendment the new curriculum would include no specific required courses (except physics education).

New Freedom

Generally, the new curriculum would give the student greater freedom to design a set of courses better suited to his individual needs and interests. Some distribution courses (normally eight) still would be required, but courses would be classified for this purpose individualized. The "concentration" requirement normal to 20 courses including prerequisites and related courses.

To accommodate less conventional students, the proposal states:

"It may be, however, that the educational goals of a student would be better served by a curriculum which is not specified by an existing major program. In this case the following is an informed meeting to discuss tactics and a course of action in the light of the student security personnel. They were involved in the November 1969 incident in which the Rice Memorial Center was invaded by the Rice Student Association and Bartee Hall, a former student, was held captive.

The group of dissident students had gathered at the Allen Center last weekend to discuss tactics and a course of action in the light of the student security personnel. They were involved in the November 1969 incident in which the Rice Memorial Center was invaded by the Rice Student Association and Bartee Hall, a former student, was held captive.

The group of dissident students had gathered at the Allen Center last weekend to discuss tactics and a course of action in the light of the student security personnel. They were involved in the November 1969 incident in which the Rice Memorial Center was invaded by the Rice Student Association and Bartee Hall, a former student, was held captive.

The group of dissident students had gathered at the Allen Center last weekend to discuss tactics and a course of action in the light of the student security personnel. They were involved in the November 1969 incident in which the Rice Memorial Center was invaded by the Rice Student Association and Bartee Hall, a former student, was held captive.

The group of dissident students had gathered at the Allen Center last weekend to discuss tactics and a course of action in the light of the student security personnel. They were involved in the November 1969 incident in which the Rice Memorial Center was invaded by the Rice Student Association and Bartee Hall, a former student, was held captive.
The people in the Abbie Hoffman Free Speech Center did not leave the building because of this ultimatum which were expressed by Rice's Dean of Students. At some time before 7 pm Sunday, a glass door on the second floor was broken. Within hours after that Mr. H. Malcolm Lovett visited the building and expressed the worries of the people who were occupying the building. Mr. Lovett and the administration agreed to a process and surely imperils the "order" it is intended to preserve.

A decision was agreed upon. The decision was that the occupying (7) students would ask the campus security police to leave, thereby completing their occupation, and facing the new amended threat of university disciplinary action. Later, at about 10 pm, Dean Wiersum announced that the occupation of the building had ended, and the campus would be closed Monday, April 12. This was his decision. We were in contact with his secretary, and learned that he would do nothing unless the Trustees made the final and final judgment of his bail. We also knew that the campus would be closed and that the decision to leave the building would lead to some action of legal action against him which would jeopardize his freedom. It is quite evident that Hoffman recognized this and he was acting on this basis until restrictions were removed.

The question remains the same and the same question is extended to this question. Why did we withdraw our invitation? Why did we not insist in our course of inviting him and then move a vote in the Board of Trustees? But that was the reason we were here was which was the overwhelming demand for and attendant power for the academic community. It is quite evident that we had agreed to compete with the Board in such affairs. But could we get power through a confrontation Sunday, especially if it had turned to violence? Talking about the answer to that question was a serious one in which the possibility existed that we would lose the support of a large number of students and faculty.

We could, however, take a step. Student autonomy was in existence in University affairs through the united efforts of all segments of the people by forming a community. We could not afford to act that they were on the road.

These events can now serve as a rallying point, the symbol of many things that are wrong with this University. By acceding to the Board's power now we can use this to show the Board that they have misused their power.

Suppose for a moment that the invitation had been extended and the people in the building withdrew without an incident. Would have there been the same problem—the possibility of misuse of power by the Board? We would have lost any incident because of it. If we ever do, we can now keep our unity and begin to see that point where we have real power.

I might add that this is my purpose. This position ofuni-

dation to withdraw the invitation to Hoffman, I don't try to speak for individual members of the Senate, besides my-

role on this issue. I do hope that something does come out of this crisis and I believe it will.

Kolenda claims students also guilty

Two segments of the Rice community have been chafed for this action: the students who occupied the Hoffman-Weinglass case: the faculty, especially some of its representatives, for delay, hesitation, inconsistency, and the trustees, for ultimately taking the matter in their own hands. Only the students appear to have escaped unscathed. Un-

fairly so, I believe. As far as I can understand the facts of the whole case, the whole mess is to be laid right at the feet of the students, especially those who initially sponsored the whole affair. The decision was originally planned, was far from being a chaotic and unplanned academic session—with an address, dis-

cussion, debate, etc. The purpose was to be the basis for a political rally or a "chop-

propaganda rally" in the inner community, the establishment of which effectively comes directly from the Trustees to the Student Association creates a precedent which marks due process and surely imperils the "order" it is intended to preserve.

But even more disturbing is the unpardonable intercession by the Trustees (or Lovett speaking as the Trustees in the internal traditionally administrative affairs of the university. This action, which effectively comes directly from the Trustees to the Student Association creates a precedent which marks due process, and surely imperils the "order" it is intended to preserve.

And yet, perhaps the most deplorable aspect of the statement is the attitude toward the university implied among other ways by variously repeated promises that "our campus" four times, etc., simultaneously in these words the arrogant assumption that Rice is really after all a corporation, and we not customers but submissive employees.
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Williams clarifies Sunday action
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Horstman calls for action by Board to restore Rice

My term of office as President of the Student Senatorial Association during this past year cannot be adequately described in terms of good feelings, but it certainly bridged a hill between two routine campus activities of a university, and I wish to put my point of opinion on the record.

The first crisis was the Mastermian situation involving the vie for power on the part of the board in an area where it always preserved its independent character. The selection of a President—albeit for a three-year term—showed that the Republic in these vital selections were made in complete disregard to the interest of the Rice community.

By contrast, the Hoffman situation has been controlled by a lateral action on the part of the Board. The Hoffman affair is not only a matter of principle, but it also involves a vital principle of this or any other university, the center of intellectual inquiry. It has been said that in the administration of Acting President Vanderhe, who has not altered a peep about this outrage since last Friday, we are led to ignore the three faculty resolutions about the Hoffman affair, which I think requires. The immediate problem is that the Board's threats were not fully investigated, and no cause of action among the people of Hoffman, involving the non-Rice crowd in the occupation. The surrender to Hoffman by the Board itself was simply postponed for Rice University a sham between the dictatorship of the Board and the necessary demands for free speech and self-governance by the students and faculty of Rice University.

In the interests of preserve. the principles of Rice University, elected representatives of the faculty and the students—as well as the administration—which brought the Board's callameans to light in the first place—complied to formulate our university's principles in the interest of "normal operations." It is for common knowledge that last Friday, the Board threatened to destroy Rice University functionally as well as in terms of principle. The Board's threat was an absolute terror to what they consider their local monopoly of the social system about which, we, as President V, in any way a man of principles. The Board's excess for noding were the threats and madness of Hoffman's impinging visit—or, as Hoffman regarded that visit. However, the only result of Hoffman's visit was the threat or bullet is to encounter Hoffman in the halls of his "safe" university which puts no embargo behind its principles as a university than as a despicable diploma factory.

Who disrupted and how come?

Confusion and ill feelings have surrounded the campus reaction to the Hoffman affair. Dr. Horstman sum- marily to call off the Monday meeting between the Faculty Council and the student Senate. The popular press has reported that about 15 radicals "disrupted" the meeting. Yet a meeting, as Dr. Horstman, never had a violent temper, never had a chance to express his opinion on the Board's action of Hoffman. The Faculty Council and the student Senate are meeting to discuss the Hoffman affair.

Half of the members of the Faculty Council and the student Senate support Dr. Horstman; the rest backed our plea to rationalize the issue and restore Rice University to its proper status. Particularly, we were saying that people cannot have decisions that affect them made in secret without their participation. They called for open discussion of all issues, where we could present our ideas and solutions. Only in this way can we be fruitful, new ideas and new ways of thinking about problems generated. The likelihood of arriving at a decision in the board in a decade of a diversity of ideas are presented for con- sideration by all interested members of the university.

The occupation of Allen Center was an unwise, perhaps a necessary, step to express the absolute need for the restoration of Rice University's integrity. The occupation sought to force a dialogue of Hoffman on Rice which Hoffman failed to initiate. Namely, a sit in by the Hoffman Center. The Board has needed structural reforms of the Board, and about restoring Rice as a university than as a despicable diploma factory.

When we fail to live up to our social system, more than a few must successively arise to contribute their point of view, the point of view of citizens. If the Board's treatment of Hoffman, the Hoffman affair, the Hoffman Center, and the Hoffman Center's history of this University's integrity is the press of force, and then only to say "so." Until, of course, the American Revolution—whether quickly or slowly—overwhelms the Board and their path in the political system, this is the only answer for any principle segment of this university. Apparently, the Board listens only to forces and threats of force, and then only to say "so."
Gregory jabs US money-worship

KATIE DESSOMMA

“When Hitler was busy win-
ing out the Jews, most of the Ger-
mens didn’t do anything to do with it. But they didn’t do anything. They knew about it, but they didn’t do anything.”

This was Tuesday night, in the Chess Lecture Hall, where Gregory talked to an audience two doors down and standing in the back. “Well, when the bombs started falling over Berlin, some German- gens were looking up, and they found out that the bomb wasn’t marked ‘For Bad Germans Only.’ This kind of optimism, ironic, and often extremely funny illustration marked Gregory’s speech.

Gregory talked of human problems rather than of black problems, of the Indians intruding in Mississippi, rather than and said that they stood with the Indians, set up classrooms in a condemned building, and then a number of Indian kids walked up on the roof of the building and left. “My grandmother, when I was about four years old, taught me that when I grew up some white kid would call me Nigger,” and not to let him bother me. “Well, I got seven kids. And they say to me, ‘Don’t you teach us anything?’”

Non-violence was what Gregory was talking about when police blazed, but rather American money-worship. “It’s not the niggers who are getting the money, it’s the Rockefeller’s, the De- mocrats, the Jews, the people making the air unbreathable and the seas uncatchable. You can’t teach them. They get the dollar, the Jelly Green Jesus.”

“Not only have the old folks left the country to become folk in this condition, he said, but used up all the tricks. Nixon was the last one. White people play until he can’t please them. “Do you know that he has managed to get into a depression and a recession at the same time?”

Gregory’s free ranging easily lent itself to very humorous, much applauded satire on Nixon and Agnew, and softened the audience for continuous blows. “If democracy is such a good game, then why are we having to rummage through the pockets of the people in Vietnam with guns?” he asked. Gregory talked of a country where indoctrination replaces education, and in which newspaper editors, following the burning of certain buildings in New York, warned against leftists. “They’re not even clear about who was responsible.”

When the President of the U.S. comes out before Congress avowing the death penalty after some empty buildings in N.Y. got burned, rather than after a church in Arizona fall of blacks got burned, then you know that something is wrong.”

Broken by innumerable bursts of applause, it was only at one point that Gregory’s speech was actually halted by a stand-

clear. He was talking about the first words of the Declaration of Independence. “We hold these truths to be self-evident — that all men are created equal — that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.”

Budweiser is the King of Beers.

(But you know that.)
Hoffman—
(Continued from Page 1) of 150 students to comply with the administration's security needs in anticipation of Hoffman's Rice appearance.

Several cardinals of people who said they were from the University of Houston warned later "to help their brothers inside buildings" but most of the action was over by the time they got there.

No Separation

At about midnight the occupi- cations of Allan Cline filed out, saying they could not separate themselves from their support- ers outside and those who wanted to join them.

"Shake's can't come in," said Dan Rosenberg, a graduate student in Behavioral Sciences, we have decided to come out and join them.

By this time a number of individuals armed with weapons, cameras, and walkie-talkies had arrived at the scene. They were later identi- fied variously as campus investig- ators, plain-clothesmen, and FBI agents, although none of them would divulge their identi- ties.

At about 12:30 am, an hour after the disturbance started, Wierum told the large group which was still gathered around the Center to break up and "return to your colleges and residences." He said this would simplify identification of the non-Rice elements still on com- munity.

The students, faculty, and administration have always acknowledged the principles of academic free- dom and freedom of speech on the Rice campus.

Mr. Wierum also conveyed Act- orial's intentions and the administra- tion's decision.

The Senate met in closed quarters for three hours after the Board statement was issued and issued a statement of its own.

"The students, faculty, and administration have always acknowledged the principles of academic free- dom and freedom of speech on the Rice campus. Mr. Wierum conveyed the principles to the student body over KTRU.

As you know, over 150 students have signed a petition to the Rice University administration to request that Mr. Hoffman be permitted to speak at Rice. The petition was placed in the hands of campus security on the Rice campus, and the Rice administration has been under pressure to permit the speech.

The petition was turned over to the Rice University administration on March 30 for permis- sion to host the two radical speakers on campus April 12. Development Office director Lee Estes released a statement which read, "The administration has not been given a decision which could have been made at the time."

The Senate met in closed-quarters for three hours after the Board statement was issued and issued a statement of its own.

Mr. Wierum also conveyed the principles of academic freedom and freedom of speech on the Rice campus.

Mr. Wierum told the students, faculty, and administration after the Board statement was issued.

"Mr. Wierum conveyed the principles to the student body over KTRU. The administration has been under pressure to permit the speech.

The petition was turned over to the Rice University administration on March 30 for permis- sion to host the two radical speakers on campus April 12. Development Office director Lee Estes released a statement which read, "The administration has not been given a decision which could have been made at the time."

The Senate met in closed quarters for three hours after the Board statement was issued and issued a statement of its own.

Mr. Wierum also conveyed the principles of academic freedom and freedom of speech on the Rice campus.
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The petition was turned over to the Rice University administration on March 30 for permis- sion to host the two radical speakers on campus April 12. Development Office director Lee Estes released a statement which read, "The administration has not been given a decision which could have been made at the time."

The Senate met in closed quarters for three hours after the Board statement was issued and issued a statement of its own.

Mr. Wierum also conveyed the principles of academic freedom and freedom of speech on the Rice campus.
Farmer seeks for precinct office

Ted Farmer, a junior in Economics, is running for Demo-
cratic Executive Committee of Precinct 40, which in-
cludes the Rice campus.

The office, also known as election judge, or precinct judge, is that of a member of the Democratic Party. He is presently
serving as the precinct judge for the precinct in the Demo-
cratic Primary. It is presently held by a 2-year-old conser-
vative Party. It is presently
determined in a KTRU music special, which is broadcast on
KTRU-FM, 90.1. The programs, on the air from nine to ten pm on Thursday, April 16, Monday April 20, and
Thursday April 30, are designed to give listeners a sample of
the type of music and news programs that are broadcast	on KTRU, but which are presently served only to members of
the residential college. The programs will include the mixed
variety of music pre-

Funding is pivotal for KTRU-FM

KTRU, the Rice radio, as a preliminary to applying for an
FM license next year, will be broadcasting three special pro-
grams this month, facilities of KRTU-FM, 90.1. The programs, on the air from
nine to ten pm on Thursday, April 16, Monday April 20, and
Thursday April 30, are designed to give listeners a sample of
the type of music and news programs that are broadcast
on KTRU, but which are presently served only to members of
the residential college. The programs will include the mixed
variety of music pre-

order.

“Our only change of position
was the decision to withdraw
the invitations. " Parks says.
‘We have defined the issue.
The Board of Trustees can no
longer have the arbitrary
powers which they now have." He
said the Board had laid
the groundwork for the de-
solution of the University by
covering their administrations,
and parties, and by
interfering in a matter which
has traditionally been the prov-
inence of students, faculty, and administration.

“The only course of action
which we can see at this point
is some sort of legal action on
behalf of students and faculty," Parks said.

The Senate was to meet this
week with lawyers to discuss possible legal ave-
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10% STUDENT DISCOUNT
COLLEGIATE CLEANERS
A Friend of the Student for Over 25 Years
2420 Rice Blvd.

ATTENTION POOL PLAYERS
YOUR RICE I.D. IS NOW YOUR
MEMBERSHIP CARD AT
THE CHU
America's Finest Billiard Clubs
No Other Memberships Necessary.
"In The Village"—2439 Rice Blvd.
LOCATED ABOVE THE
Little-Big Horn Western Bar
OPEN 8:00 AM—2:00 AM DAILY
2 WOCE her MIDNIGHT SUNDAY
Downtown—1104 Rusk at Fannin
25 Tables—Open 24 Hours, 7 Days a Week

TRAVEL UNLIMITED, INC.
Complete Worldwide Travel Service
• Airline Reservations & Ticketing
• Group & Individual Tours
• Steamship Cruises
• Business Trips & Arrangements
• Hotel, Motel & Resort Reservations
• Auto Rentals & Purchases Abroad

"Now In Our Thirteenth Year"
2476 Bissonett Drive
"In The Village"
Phone: 526-3164

"Invite a real Prince!"
When the right one comes along, the
right one is Gittings, America’s
leading bridal photographer, to capture
all the excitement, ever so elegantly.
When Gittings does your formal
wedding colour portraits and
wedding glossies for the newspapers are complimentary
And, of course you’ll want Gittings colour candid’s;
and wedding reception to re-live
happily ever afterward.

An idea of price: Formal wedding colour portraits start
as low as $85. Exciting colour candid’s begin at
just $75, each with duplicates available.
Send your name, address and home address for free
bridal portrait brochure with full details: Write to
Gittings Director of Sales, P.O. Box 537, Amico, Texas 77019.
Studios in Houston, Atlanta, Phoenix, and
in Nelsman-Marcus/Dallas-Ft. Worth.

Bridal Portraits/Candid’s
Gittings