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The following article is being run for the benefit of all of our brothers and sisters who sell underground newspapers. It is a quote from the Police Regulations of the District of Columbia, Article 6, Section 2, and in essence it means that;
1. No license is needed to sell papers anywhere in Washington, on all days but religious holidays, newspapers can be sold from 7am to 8pm and the prospective buyer can be asked, if he wants to buy the paper.

3. Papers may furthermore be legally sold in special areas including the Dupont Circle area (not in the Circle itself), Georgetown, and most Downtown N. W. Washington on nonreligious days. From 8am to 11pm you can again "hawk" the papers (shout out that you are selling them.)

"No person within the District of Columbia shall make any noise or outcry or sound, use or operate or cause the same to be sounded or operated any of the things or devices defined in section 1, hereof for the purpose of advertising wares or enticing the patronage or attention of any person for or to any business or any vehicle or aircraft whatsoever.
Provided, however, that newspapers may be cried between the hours of 7am and 8pm on secular days of the week and not otherwise except as hereinafter provided and provided further that it shall be lawful for the sale of newspapers to be cried between 6am and 11pm on secular days of the week and not otherwise on the Union Station Plaza, and in the area bounded by the following:
H street, east to the north line of New York Avenue, east to east line at 7th st., streets and avenues in the Northwest section of said Districts - Madison Place Intersection with North line at south to south of Penns. Ave., west to west line of 15th st., north to south side of Penns. Ave., west to west line of Madison Place, north to it's intersection with H st., 14th st. between U and Park Road."
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Local board #53 could be called many things: a clasp-board fire-trap located in Jessup Blair Park in Silver Spring, Md., a place of employment for three areas Government clerks, a place where all 18 year old Silver Spring males must register their names and addresses, or as its most real and diabolical function — a working component of a sinister war machine, the Selective Service System. This machine was first conceived as an instrument by which young men were forced to fight and die for an "old-man's" war. Ever since the machine's last excuse for existence was exhausted in 1945, it has been responsible for the death of hundreds of thousands of people abroad and for the dislocation and injury of millions of others. One question all of us might ask of ourselves: "How can so many 'good Americans' permit this machine to exist?"

On an overcast Wednesday morning, three young men from the Washington D.C. area, paid homage to death board #53. On May 21st, upon entering the board, the three turned over file cabinets, dumped files on the floor, threw typewriters out the window, and liberally splashed their own blood and black paint, symbolic of the end-product of "53," on the walls and the interior of I-A files. The three young men then waited patiently for ten minutes for the Montgomery County police to come and survey the wreckage. By then the T.V. cameramen were on the scene taking shots of the smiling faces as they were led into the squadcars. As the cameras followed the cars speeding off to Rockville where the three were to be detained, we all knew that these three young men had somehow changed. Leslie Bayless, Michael Bransome, and Jonathan Bayless were to be booked as, known as, and in reality become "The Silver Spring 3."

In terms of concrete damage, the three perhaps weren't quite as successful as the draft board actions in Catonsville, Milwaukee, and Chicago; but the three tell us that they think the action was successful. Their point was well made, and the doors of the board are still closed to the public. We do know that some I-A files were completely ruined and that indications are that it will be a while before "53" will start to grind out death again.

In terms of publicity, the three haven't been as successful as the other actions, and perhaps this is our fault. One thing one must bear in mind about this group however is that this group has made no pretensions of being "respectable." None of them were clergy but perhaps one needed to be of the cloth to perform a holy act. All three were drop-outs, two from high-school, one from college — but maybe one needed a diploma to teach and learn about life. None of the three were by any means "movement leaders," but perhaps one needed "quality" to lead a movement. The three were nothing more than concerned draft-age men who couldn't bear to watch the death machine gobble up their neighbors and relegate them at the even more unfortunate peoples of Vietnam. The three have no credentials to present to the public except their beautiful, unashamed, naked souls.

**Leslie Bayless - 22, veteran of the crew. Les has been an agitator in the area for several years now, but says that he never fully accepted resistance as a tactic or pacifism as a way of life until he refused induction on January 32d 1969. On April 15th Les was found guilty of refusal and he was sentenced to five years on May 25th. Les is presently serving time at the Baltimore City jail, and despite the fact that boil is refused to him (he browned previously), Les is in good spirits and is doing his civilian occupation of agitating and writing poetry.

**Michael Bransome - known to his friends as a happy-go-lucky guitar player. Even Mike couldn't find anything particularly happy or lucky about the draft board down the street, so in accordance to regulations Mike registered (his complaint) at his local board ten days after his 18th birthday on the 21st. Out on appeal bond, Mike has been speaking and working with Washington Area Resist.

Jonathan Bayless - 17, was expelled from his high school in Virginia the day after the action for his extra-curricular activities. Jon is presently free on appeal bond but is being kept under strict restrictions by his father who is a civilian official on the planning board of the Defense Intelligence Agency. Jon prefers painting to wrecking draft boards and requests us not to refer to him as Les' "little" brother. He certainly isn't.

State trial for the three is set for July 7th at People's Court, Silver Spring. Support the three. Help the three support you.

Third, these people express their sincerity and hope, perhaps blind, by accepting the consequences of their action. Finally, corresponding to their goals, their action was motivated by, and carried out with, careful regard for the value of human life.

Concerning the facts of Dow's activities, napalm, nerve gas and defoliants are internationally illegal means of war ( Hague convention). Dow's subsidiary companies are in 22 countries. These include apartheid South Africa, dictatorship Greece, and seven Central and South American countries whose ruling classes are kept in power by American business policies. The subsidiary diaries are 100% controlled by American Dow. Many American industries have already rejected this practice as iniquitous. Dow's actions against America's own security and self-interest are the basis of the American government's monopoly and its connection with I.G. Farben of Germany during the 30's and 40's have been documented elsewhere.

The issue raised by the DC-9 is clearcut: does life have priority over property? Dow Chemical has presented a conflict of conscience between, on the one hand, the way it uses its technology to destroy human life with malice, and on the other, the law which requires respect for private property, where do our values lie? The American people must transcend their preoccupation with the profit motive and possessions and see that moral values must, at some point, check the free reign of business. Life is too precious to be wasted (or exploited); the DC-9 have asserted their "yes" to life.
Peru vs. U.S.A.

American oil wells seized;

Peru charges Standard Oil

with corruption

The United States had its imperialistic toes stepped on recently in Peru, when the Peruvian government expropriated several American-operated oil wells.

The new Peruvian government, a military junta, is dissatisfied with the International Petroleum Company (IPC), a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey and the U.S. Government because the regime expropriated the IPC at the Talara refinery six days after gaining power.

Briefly stated, Peru claims that IPC and thus the U.S. has exploited Peru since 1924 by enjoying immense profits and benefits made possible by bribes, pay-offs, and manipulation of past Peruvian government—often with the assistance of the U.S. Government. The argument that follows is based upon an interview with Senior Pinto of the Peruvian Embassy and several booklets and articles, especially “Petroleum in Peru” printed by the Peruvian government and Richard Goodwin's article appearing in the May 17th issue of New Yorker Magazine, all of which are suggested for those interested in a more detailed historical review.

The Peruvian matter is important because it touches upon the crucial issue of private U.S. economic interests and their unregulated control over the domestic and foreign affairs of our country and of other countries. It is not, as the Washington Post editorialized on May 26th, a matter of Peru's lack of courtesy or manners, or of Peru's actions being merely to "disrupt" hemispheric relations. The real issue are, first, the power exercised by the giant international corporations to make decisions internationally which affect the world, while being under the control of an isolated few for their own material advantage, and secondly, the interlocking relationship which has been revealed often during the past century between private, U.S. economic interests and our government. That the Washington Post is so deluded as to criticize Peru's manners in this affair is laughable, but that the Standard Oil lobby is able to effectively munter money and propaganda in an attempt to create a respectable and legitimate position within the American press and Congress stops a history of corruption and exploitation in Peru is frightening.

At the bottom of the dispute is the question of land ownership. Through a series of events, the IPC set a precedent by claiming ownership of the subsoil on which its refinery was operating. Also, it claimed as legal an arbitration decision in 1922 (for which there is no written record) which allowed the IPC to operate in Peru without paying profit taxes. As in the past, the U.S. government has been active in supporting the IPC. For example, during August of 1968, the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, Sol Linowitz, visited Peru to force an arrangement in IPC's favor. The agreement, which had never been fully revealed to the Peruvians press and people, was subsequently accepted by the new-deposed government and had the net effect of enhancing the IPC's position, while appearing to be a concession to Peruvian demands.

Since the time of the expropriation, Peru has requested the sum of $700 million, representing the extent of exploitation by the IPC since 1924, before Peru will pay the IPC for the expropriated property. Peru bases her claim on the "illegality" of IPC's foreign agreements involving the use of Peruvian resources.

At this time, the matter is still undecided. President Nixon, armed with the authority to cut-off extensive U.S. arms purchases and foreign aid (via the Hickenlooper Amendment), has decided to suspend official government action until later this year. In the meantime, the IPC has tried to turn the conflict into one between the U.S. Government and the Peruvian Government rather than allow it to remain a conflict between a private business and a foreign government. Peru, however, has continued friendly relations with other large U.S. interests on her soil—Dow Chemical, Gulf Oil, Mobil Oil, General Motors, Sears, Roebuck, and the American Smelting Company to name a few—in an attempt to pursue a program which is considerably less "radical" that the Standard Oil lobby would have us believe.

The U.S. termination of arms shipments to Peru in response to Peru's seizure of U.S. fishing boats violating her territorial waters further confuses the matter. Apparently, the U.S. government does not recognize Peru's right to claim a 200 mile limit to protect her fishing industry in much the same way the U.S. has acted to preserve exclusive American oil exploration off California. Nevertheless, Peru has, in turn, asked all U.S. military missions to leave her soil. The question now is: will the U.S. as in the past, apply economic and political pressure—or perhaps conduct secret military measures as in Guatemala in 1954—in another attempt at preserving "hemispheric relations"?

One thing is certain: a full review of the facts, obviously not presented here, reveals a history of unsavory behavior by the IPC in Peru—behavior the U.S. Government seems anxious to avoid. Need we wonder why Governor Rockefeller's "fact-finding" tour is unwelcome in Latin America? Need we ask why "the United States" and "economic aggression" are uttered in the same breath in most of the world?
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Take a Byrd, a Buffalo Springfield and a Hollie, record them and you've got one of the finest albums of the year.

Atlantic Records had done just that with Dave Crosby, Steve Stills and Graham Nash and the result is an attractive package, from cover to contents. "Crosby, Stills and Nash," unlike many albums that have been released recently, contain no virtuoso instrumental solos, just fine vocal harmony blending with an almost lyrical musical background.

The Buffalo Springfield may be no more and the Byrds and Hollies may have gone through many changes, but this album gives the listener the best of the three groups. All songs on the LP were written by Crosby, Stills or Nash and to hear any song on the album, one can readily identify who wrote it.

This group proves that to become a super-group you don't need a lead guitarist who at one time played with the Yardbirds (a la Clapton, Beck and Page) nor do you have to do at least one extended drum solo per album.

Steve Stills has done a lot since the Buffalo Springfield split up. His much sought-after talents as a studio musician have shown up on LP's by Judy Collins and an over-rated "Super-Session" LP with Al Kooper and Mike Bloomfield.

Stills' first break came when he and Richie Furay left a group called the Au Go Go Singers in New York and along with Neil Young, Bruce Palmer and Dewey Martin formed the Buffalo Springfield.

The Buffalo Springfield was one of the finest and least recognized American rock groups. They, not Poco or the Flying Burrito Brothers, were the real innovators of country rock.

Probably the best song on the "Crosby, Stills and Nash" album was written by Stills. "Suite: Judy Blue Eyes" is a seven and one-half minute love song that opens the album and assures that the next 45 minutes and 30 seconds will be spent wondering when the group's next album will be released.

Out of the three songs Graham Nash wrote for the album, "Marriage Express" stands out as the most commercial and will probably be the group's single release. "Deirdre Down," another Nash tune, sounds like it was lifted right off a Hollies album, but a good one at that.

Crosby's influence seems to be the least recognizable (although it is very present) on the album. He only wrote two songs for the album and collaborated with Stills for one other, "Wooden Ships."

Lead guitar, organ and bass are all played by Stills on the album, while Crosby plays rhythm guitar and Dallas Taylor plays drums. But, the most important part of the album, the vocals, are done by Crosby, Stills and Nash.
MARCUSE: An opposition which needs a separate women's liberation movement... does not make sense.

VFA: You say that there should be two separate women’s liberation movements. If I understand correctly, you believe that the struggle for women’s liberation should not be a part of the larger struggle for socialism.

MARCUSE: Yes, I think that's correct. I believe that the struggle for women's liberation should be a separate struggle. It should not be part of the larger struggle for socialism.

VFA: And you believe that this should be a separate struggle because the conditions for women’s liberation are different from the conditions for the liberation of men?

MARCUSE: Yes, I do. I believe that the conditions for women's liberation are different from the conditions for the liberation of men. Women have historically been oppressed in a different way than men have. Therefore, a separate struggle for women's liberation is necessary.

VFA: But why do you think that conditions for women's liberation are different from the conditions for the liberation of men?

MARCUSE: Women have historically been oppressed in a different way than men have. They have been subjected to different forms of violence and exploitation. Therefore, a separate struggle for women's liberation is necessary.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?

MARCUSE: I think that women's liberation should be organized and fought through grassroots movements, through direct action, and through the formation of women's-only organizations.

VFA: But if women's liberation is a separate struggle, then how do you think that this struggle should be organized and fought?
Edward Luttwak's book *Coup d'Etat*, just by its name and appearance at this particular time, leads us to believe that a method for radical movements has somehow emerged for public study. Not quite so, for Luttwak, himself, stresses in his book and in an interview that *Coup d'Etat* is directed for countries which have little or no public political activity, which suffer a backward economy, which are free from control by a more powerful country and, most importantly, those countries which have one vital nerve center of political control. Whereas most Third World countries qualify, most "advanced" countries, including the United States, fail to meet most or all of these requirements.

There is a second reason for saying Luttwak's book is not directed at radical movements, and it is because a coup d'etat - the only method Luttwak deals in - does not favor or seek the use of a "mass movement." In fact, at one point the author suggests that after the coup is carried out, "movements" are to be tactfully manipulated or eliminated. The reason for this is: Luttwak's definition of a coup d'etat - "infiltration of a small but critical segment of the state apparatus, which is then used to displace the government from its control of the remainder" - reveals a reliance upon a highly secret, Blaupunkt-like, group which is not concerned with political ideals. The group's main interest is the seizure of power, with "political content!" to come afterwards. A mass movement, so believes Luttwak, is unable to organize secretly and efficiently, it is, at best, a group of highly motivated and ideological people operating "outside" the power structure. The presence of such a group after a successful coup is likely to be or become a threat.

This is not to say that Luttwak's book is of no value. On the contrary, it is a well-researched and well-written handbook for planning, staging, and consolidating a coup d'etat. Most every aspect of organization is given attention. For example, recruitment of members, subversion of key military commands, vital targets for seizure, and the first tasks of the new government are all discussed. Perhaps on this score, mass movement can pick up something of value. The effective use of subversion and neutralization, which are the two "keys" to Luttwak's method; the solutions to organizational problems such as police spies; and an accurate view of a structure's power, as well as the exact locations of this power are just three points in Luttwak's presentation of which today's movements might make use. Except for those people who believe "the movement will succeed in the advanced countries via the passive-cultural route, most people are aware of the need today for new and advanced tactics. And even if a coup d'etat is dismissed as a possibility, the strategic advice Luttwak makes available is certainly versatile enough to be of some use in most all types of radical political actions.

There are criticisms to make, but they are directed at the method of coup d'etat, more than at Luttwak's presentation of the method. First, the method of coup d'etat, although the most frequent means of political change in recent history, does not embody the active participation of the people for whom it is presumably carried out. As Regis Debray, among others, has pointed out, this has the effect of producing a failure because the masses have not been prepared for the sacrifices needed to create revolutionary changes and progress. Edward Luttwak might argue that a coup d'etat is concerned only with seizing power, and therefore preparation of the masses is not important. However, in as much as world affairs are moving along the lines of anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, and self-determination - all of which involve the "mobilization" of the masses - the question of preparation of the masses for changes in society is certainly relevant.

Secondly, although focusing on the crucial factor - the seizure of political power - a coup d'etat fails to change the institutions or ideas in society, it merely changes the men in power. Especially in Latin America, this has been the major reason for the failure of past attempts at meaningful change by well-intentioned regimes. If anyone cares to study events in Bolivia since its "revolution" in 1952, you'll find one example of this point.

Third, and finally, a coup d'etat fails to provide a role to what has become a growing reality: the mass movement. In all parts of the world there is evidence that mass movements are increasing. So, any doctrine which considers such movements as a "threat" must be regarded as a threat itself. This doesn't mean, of course, that some blend of the two methods will not evolve.

Besides getting some tactical information, why bother with Coup d'Etat? In general, Edward Luttwak's book is good reading because it gives a clear view of society's channels of power and the problems involved in carrying through a meaningful change in personnel. After finishing the book, you are better able to see the full scope of existing coercion and repression, as well as their inner workings. While Luttwak offers no ideology, no philosophy, he does help you "know thy enemy."
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The New York Regional SDS and the High School Student Union are dispensing legal first aid in the form of a "Bust Book". The book attempts to give survival information for all legal hassles that might arise from street action, dope, being underage, etc.

The defense moves suggested are not always legal, since relying on legality alone leaves you defenseless against the pigs who will ignore legality themselves when it threatens their power.

With that realization as one of its basic tenets, the book is a good thing to have. To get one, send fifty cents to the High School Student Union, 208 West 85th Street, New York, N.Y.

If you're going to the city, watch out for pigs in unmarked cars on the New Jersey Turnpike searching and busting people. The two cars that have been identified are '68 T-birds, one white with a blue vinyl top, one tan. Watch out, there may be other cars. Stay clean on the turnpike.

Switchboard is a community service. If you need a place to crash, a ride somewhere, a job that doesn't fuck with your head, someone to talk you down from a bum trip, a hip lawyer, doctor, psychiatrist, call us. We have flies and people to help with all of that, plus a message board.

Switchboard belongs to you. Everything was started by somebody, so if you want to change things you've got to stop watching everybody else do it and start something yourself. Call us; we'll put you together with what you need to start your thing.

We know what's happening and when, like rock concerts, demonstrations, benefits, and be-ins. If you want something publicized, let us know.

Some of the things that people are into starting are:
1) a store for people who make things in the community (like clothes, jewelry, etc.)
2) a "media freak-out" (talk to Sue)

3ja rap situation for people in communes to share their experiences about what makes a commune work, their ideas about what a commune should be, etc.

4) some sort of a street survival list (places to cop free shit, where to panhandle, etc.)

Let us know your ideas; we can use them.

Rap with us. Call Switchboard, 638-4301, or come by, 1007 K St. NW. Regular hours are 5-9 PM daily. Hours and phones are always open to special problems.

NARRAGANSETT LEATHERS
305 Seventh St. SE
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337-9316
Q. How long have you been together?
A. Six years.
Q. How come you have been successful staying together and so many other groups have not managed to do that?
A. I don't know. It took us a long time to make it in the States and we always had ambition. That's one of the things that's held us together. We've been a big success in England for, I guess, about three years, but we only made it in England, oh sorry, the States for about two years.
Q. What was your first big hit ever here?
A. Happy Jack, and that wasn't the first "who" hit. It was just a hit record, nobody knew it was even. Our first big hit was I Can See for Miles and that was only four records ago and when you consider we've had fourteen hit records in England it's quite recent and I think this is definitely a reason why we're together, also, the other thing is that we've always had good audiences.
Q. Speaking about audiences, what differences do you find between British audiences and American audiences?
A. English and American audiences, I don't care what anybody says, are practically identical. I think the differences lie between British and American audiences and the rest of the world.
Q. How do you find them different?
A. Well, the difference is that they have not, well, rock never came from their country, you know. England and the United States have both given birth to the rock and roll forms that you find in most other countries haven't, and they're not in on the adrenalin, you know.
Q. In the United States do you find East coast audiences more uptight than West coast audiences?
A. I find the West coast audiences more stoned. I think the East coast audiences are more our kind of audience. We like an uptight audience. East coast audiences were like New York, Puerto Rican kids sticking fingers up at you. But now they've come our way a little bit and the West Coast kids have grown up a little bit. They've got out of the drug thing a little bit, mean the whole dope thing kinds fell flat on its face on the West coast, and now people have realized that dope is something which is groovy to relax with but not something to live your life by you know. And I think this is basically what is happening. I'm expecting some good rock from America soon. I think we're on the crest of the wave. I think the next big phenomena will come from the States.
Q. In reference to what happened at the Fillmore, you kicked a cop in the groin? (Editor's note: on May 18th a fire started in a super market next to the Fillmore East.)
A. I kicked him in his balls, him lower mid region, yes.
Q. Why did you do this?
A. Ah, well, let's put it this way, we were doing a show, right, the adrenalin, right with full assault, saying that we assaulted a police officer, saying that he identified himself, got up, showed his badge to us, and then we held him and kicked him. That really happened, he got up, he didn't show his badge, he was panicky and sweeping like a pig and he was going to run up and grab the microphone and yell, "fire, fire," and everybody was going to run out and probably several kids would have got trampled. Bill Graham did it his way, he got the guy off the stage, got him out of the way so he got sore balls, so what -- it's what every cop needs. We go to court day after tomorrow. (Editor's note: We have made an attempt to find out what happened in court. The Who are not in jail -- all alive.)
Q. Where are you going from here, musically, are you working on a new album?
A. No. We're fairly limp at the moment.
Q. Just doing a lot of personal appearances?
A. Yeah, we're doing P.A.S.
Q. Are you going to do any movies, television?
A. They're trying to make a movie of our album, trying to make a stage show out of our album, all sorts of things.
Q. Are you satisfied with that album, do you think that's where you all are at?
A. Not totally, not totally. I think some bits of it, labor on a little behind the chair, I think it laborers on a little bit. It's a very long instrumental passage which I don't think quite makes it. But you know the idea of it was to get a kind of dramatic, a musical continuity and yet still keep a rock theme throughout the album. It tells that... I think we were successful at that. I think its a rock album. It tells a story and it has a dramatic, literary feel throughout but its still rock 'n roll you know. It's basically what we wanted to do.
Q. How did you get the name for the rock opera?
A. Because in the First World War the English soldiers were nicknamed tom-mies and oh I think war is still a very prevalent item in today's agenda in England.
Q. How's the album doing, its only been out about a week and half?
A. Its sold $2,000,000 worth already.

In was high and the audience was groove and everything was going very, very well indeed and in the next building to the Fillmore theater was a terrible fire; but nobody told us because they didn't want us to shout out through the microphones there's a fire and so panic the audience so we didn't know there was a fire. There was a slight smell of burning and there was a slight bit of smoke around, but there always is when we do our show, and I really mean that. The Fillmore carries smoke machines which they intended to use that evening and we felt that they were just using them a bit prematurely and we had no idea there was a fire. Suddenly and let me emphasize, a plain clothes policeman without any badge got on the stage, right, so in other words we didn't know he was to cop got on the stage and grabbed the microphone from Rodger, pulling it across his mouth in a very rough manner, right, so he got what he deserved.

Q. Were you arrested?
A. Ahh, they arrested us on simple assault.
Q. Are you out on bail now?
A. Ah, no were not out on bail, there's no bail for simple assault.
Q. You just paid the fine?
A. They originally charged us with a felony, right with full assault, saying that we assaulted a police officer, saying that he identified himself, got up, showed his badge to us, and then we held him and kicked him. That really happened, he got up, he didn't show his badge, he was panicky and sweeping like a pig and he was going to run up and grab the microphone and yell, "fire, fire," and everybody was going to run out and probably several kids would have got trampled. Bill Graham did it his way, he got the guy off the stage, got him out of the way so he got sore balls, so what -- it's what every cop needs. We go to court day after tomorrow. (Editor's note: We have made an attempt to find out what happened in court. The Who are not in jail -- all alive.)
Q. Where are you going from here, musically, are you working on a new album?
A. No. We're fairly limp at the moment.
Q. Just doing a lot of personal appearances?
A. Yeah, we're doing P.A.S.
Q. Are you going to do any movies, television?
A. They're trying to make a movie of our album, trying to make a stage show out of our album, all sorts of things.
Q. Are you satisfied with that album, do you think that's where you all are at?
A. Not totally, not totally. I think some bits of it, labor on a little behind the chair, I think it laborers on a little bit. It's a very long instrumental passage which I don't think quite makes it. But you know the idea of it was to get a kind of dramatic, a musical continuity and yet still keep a rock theme throughout the album. It tells that... I think we were successful at that. I think its a rock album. It tells a story and it has a dramatic, literary feel throughout but its still rock 'n roll you know. It's basically what we wanted to do.
Q. How did you get the name for the rock opera?
A. Because in the First World War the English soldiers were nicknamed tom-mies and oh I think war is still a very prevalent item in today's agenda in England.
Q. How's the album doing, its only been out about a week and half?
A. Its sold $2,000,000 worth already.

Q. What would you suggest all these groups don't seem to be able to stay together, The Buffalo Springfield fell from here, and The Cream from your country and other groups - what do you have to do to be together six years its so rare today?
A. You have to understand what makes an audience come to see you, understand what it is that you play right and feel right. You've got to understand, you've got to be mature. You haven't got to smoke too much dope...
celebrate the revolution
FREE CONCERT

Why don't we do it in the Church

Friday June 27
8:00 p.m.
St. Stephen's Church
16 1/2 Newton St. N.W.
Rock by the FLAVOR and Big Red

Light show by the Support Group

free free free