



STANDOFF IN ALBUQUERQUE — Hundreds of demonstrators stand on what is called "Chicano Hill" in Albuquerque while New Mexico National Guardsmen watch behind rubble of school administration building that was put to torch by demonstrators Sunday night. Monday afternoon, guardsmen moved through area and cleared it of demonstrators. Fourteen persons were shot and 200 arrested in two days of violence. (AP Wirephoto)

Tension eases

National Guard, police patrol in Albuquerque

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) — Heavily armed National Guardsmen and police patrolled city streets today as violence appeared to ease after two days of tension between authorities and crowds of young people.

Police Capt. James LaRue said the parks were empty and the city was quiet.

He said 261 persons were arrested between 3:30 p.m. Monday and 8 a.m. today. They were herded into Montezuma Park Detention Center and the old city jail, reactivated to accommodate the prisoners.

Municipal Court Judge Harry Robins set bond for 271 of them but most still were in custody. Bond was set at \$300 on each charge against those arrested.

Since the trouble started in the city of 300,000 Sunday, more than 400 arrests have been made.

In the first day of the disturbance, 129 adults and many juveniles were jailed; 14 persons were shot and wounded; dozens were injured by flying debris, and some downtown area stores were looted and burned.

Some young people in crowded Roosevelt Park for public drinking.

At the height of the renewed violence Monday afternoon, state troopers and National Guardsmen roared a curfew, missile-busting crowd from the park.

Young people massed in the park hurled gasoline bombs and other missiles at the police and guardsmen who responded with tear gas and a charge that sent most of the crowd in retreat. Police made 10 arrests.

The confrontation came at Chicano Hill in the park. Chicano is the name given to Mexican-Americans.

Five persons, including two guardsmen, were injured during the clash at the park and a disturbance with marching young people earlier Monday on a corner of the University of New Mexico campus.

One young man was shot in the back by police in the campus area, police said. He was reported in serious condition.

After the combined efforts of all law enforcement agencies, including the National Guard, a curfew was enforced.

Don Daniel said Monday night. "It is quiet."

With darkness, however, came the fires. Guardsmen and police patrolled city streets but reported no organized disturbances involving large groups.

Early today fire officials reported eight fires burning and attributed most to firebombs thrown from cars.

"It's much, much worse than Sunday night," Ray Kuhn, city fire chief, told newsmen. He said a number of bomb threats also had been reported.

"We've had 24 fire alarms since 6 p.m.," he said. "The only major blaze was reported at an apartment construction site on the outskirts of the city."

Unlike Sunday night's disorders, he said, "We've had no problems with protesters' hampering firefighting efforts."

He declined to make an official estimate of fire damage but said it likely would approach \$3 million.

Fourteen persons, including a policeman, were treated for gunshot wounds Sunday night.

Two patrol cars were overturned and one was crushed.

Times rejects plea to halt Viet series

(Related stories on Pa. 10)

NEW YORK (AP) — The New York Times said that despite the threat of injunction it "must respectfully decline" a Justice Department request to halt the publication of a secret Pentagon study of the Vietnam war.

Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell asked the newspaper in a telegram Monday evening to refrain from further publication of the documents or the threat that it will cause "irreparable injury to the defense interests of the United States."

The telegram arrived about an hour after Robert C. Mardian, assistant attorney general in charge of the internal security division, conveyed the department request to Harding P. Hancock, executive vice president of the Times.

Mardian said that if the Times did not accede "the government would seek to enforce all applicable statutes, including seeking an injunction to stop further publication," a Justice Department spokesman said.

The secret documents are part of a three-year-old, 40-volume study of how the United States became involved in the Indochina war. The third installment of the series appeared in today's editions of the Times.

Replying to Mitchell, the Times said in a statement that it "must respectfully decline the request of the attorney general, believing that it is in the interest of the people of this country to be informed of the material contained in this series of articles."

Regarding a possible injunction, the statement said, "We believe that it is properly a matter for the courts to decide. The Times will oppose any request for an injunction for the same reason that led us to publish the articles in the first place."

"We will of course abide by the final decision of the court."

Earlier Monday Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird told a Senate committee that the publication of the documents "violates the security regulations of the United States."

The telegram from Mitchell, addressed to Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, president and publisher of the Times, said:

"I have been advised by the secretary of defense that the material published in the New York Times on June 14, 1971, captioned 'Key Texts from Pentagon's Vietnam Study' contains information relating to the national defense of the United States and bears a top secret classification."

As such, publication of this information is directly prohibited by the provisions of the Espionage Law, Title 18, United States Code, which reads:

"Whoever communicates, in any manner, information relating to the national defense which has been communicated in confidence to the government and which is classified as top secret, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both."

Laird said he did not know who gave the study to the Times but said that because there were a limited number of copies it would not be hard to find out. A Pentagon spokesman put the number at about a dozen.

The first installment of the series dealt with classification warfare carried on against North Vietnam before the Tonkin Gulf incident in August 1964.

The second report published Monday quoted the study as saying that Johnson administration reached a "general consensus" in September 1964 that bombing of North Vietnam would begin early in 1965.

Laird complained about the publication both in a Pentagon statement and in an appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He said that despite the articles, as far as he is concerned the study is still secret.

Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo., said the fact that he had to read the report in the Times was shocking. He said the study showed that "Congress had not known what was going on."

Sen. George S. McGovern, D-S.D., said the study tells "a story of almost incredible deception, deception of the Congress and of the American people, by the highest officials of the government, including the President of the United States."



Atty. Gen. Mitchell

...request denied

request that the Times return the documents.

Much of section 793 refers to spying on defense installations and to obtaining code books, blueprints, maps or other defense-related documents.

The section also states: "Whoever having unauthorized possession of, access to, or control over any document, writing, code book — or information relating to the national defense which information the possessor has reason to believe could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates, delivers, transmits or in any manner conveys to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it to the officer or employe of the United States entitled to receive it ... shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both."

Regarding a possible injunction, the statement said, "We believe that it is properly a matter for the courts to decide. The Times will oppose any request for an injunction for the same reason that led us to publish the articles in the first place."

"We will of course abide by the final decision of the court."

Earlier Monday Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird told a Senate committee that the publication of the documents "violates the security regulations of the United States."

The telegram from Mitchell, addressed to Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, president and publisher of the Times, said:

"I have been advised by the secretary of defense that the material published in the New York Times on June 14, 1971, captioned 'Key Texts from Pentagon's Vietnam Study' contains information relating to the national defense of the United States and bears a top secret classification."

As such, publication of this information is directly prohibited by the provisions of the Espionage Law, Title 18, United States Code, which reads:

"Whoever communicates, in any manner, information relating to the national defense which has been communicated in confidence to the government and which is classified as top secret, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both."

Laird said he did not know who gave the study to the Times but said that because there were a limited number of copies it would not be hard to find out. A Pentagon spokesman put the number at about a dozen.

The first installment of the series dealt with classification warfare carried on against North Vietnam before the Tonkin Gulf incident in August 1964.

The second report published Monday quoted the study as saying that Johnson administration reached a "general consensus" in September 1964 that bombing of North Vietnam would begin early in 1965.

Laird complained about the publication both in a Pentagon statement and in an appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He said that despite the articles, as far as he is concerned the study is still secret.

Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo., said the fact that he had to read the report in the Times was shocking. He said the study showed that "Congress had not known what was going on."

Sen. George S. McGovern, D-S.D., said the study tells "a story of almost incredible deception, deception of the Congress and of the American people, by the highest officials of the government, including the President of the United States."

Suspect drug motive in Detroit slayings

DETROIT (AP) — Homicide detectives sought four men and a machine today for the mass slaying of seven young persons in the bloodiest massacre in Detroit crime history.

The victims—three men and four women 19 to 27 years old—were shot to death and another man was wounded critically about 4:30 a.m. Monday in what police believe was a narcotics center on the city's Near Northwest Side.

Four men were seen fleeing the two-story flat shortly after neighbors were awakened by about a dozen shots. Police found cartridges of at least three different calibers at the scene.

Investigators said they did not know whether the four men were involved in the mass killing or if they were fleeing for their lives.

before the shooting by diving through the glass of a back porch and running down an alley.

Inspector James Bannum, head of a 20-man investigating team, said the three reported to police voluntarily shortly after the slayings. He declined to furnish their names or details of their statements.

There was speculation that the slayings were the outgrowth of a gangland struggle over control of the lucrative narcotics trade in the Detroit area. Up to 26 killings in recent months have been linked to an alleged drug war, some investigators say.

Bannum expressed doubt about the gangland war theory but did not rule out such a possibility. He indicated the rash of slayings may be the result of holdups at various locations, including where

Adams meeting kills renewal plan

By ROBERT E. LAMB

Project Pleasant Park is dead. It limped its last shortly before 9 o'clock last night and its demise almost certainly tolled the death knell for urban renewal in Adams.

In the aftermath of the decisive town meeting vote, burial of Phase Two includes two years of project planning at a cost to the Federal government of nearly \$200,000.

Despite strong support from most of the more than 400 persons at the special town meeting, Selectman Earl F. Kelley's plea for a referendum vote failed. Town Counsel Andrew J. Dilk ruled against Mr. Kelley's request.

The town council advised that Articles Eight and Nine must be voted on "as is" and, if approved, there could be a taxpayers' suit to have them placed on the election ballot.

With that effort dead, final votes were taken. An individual poll followed Moderator A. Edward Godek's ruling that a vote was had defeated Article Eight, the authorization for a cooperation agreement between the Selectmen and Adams Redevelopment Authority on Project Pleasant Park. The roll call tally showed 66 in favor and 77 opposed to the article.

The vote on Article Nine, for funding of Project Pleasant Park, was taken on a standing vote with 61 favoring and 75 opposing the measure. Article Nine required two-thirds of the meeting members' votes, or 76 in favor, for passage.

At the outset of discussion on Project Pleasant Park, Moderator Godek announced he would permit spectators in the two side aisles to speak but only after precinct members in the center had spoken.

Mr. Kelley's was the first comment from the floor. He said that due to the intensity of "emotional involvement both pro and con," town meeting members might not be able to register a rational decision. He proposed that the urban renewal warrant articles be approved and then placed on the ballot as a town-wide referendum question.

Loud and widespread applause greeted the suggestion from all over the Adams Memorial Junior High School auditorium.

Mr. Kelley concluded "The Board of Selectmen would guarantee this action by not signing the cooperation agreement until the people have had a chance to speak."

The moderator then turned the meeting over to Chairman Donald R. Sommer of the ARA who, with ARA Secretary Robert F. Morey, presented a brief outline of changes in the project plan since its first defeat in December and summaries of the Authority's responses to arguments by the opposition in recent newspaper advertisements.

The first precinct member to offer remarks was Francis E. Couture, who said the situation reminded him of Indians who speak "with forked tongues." He continued "It's all hearsay. They're clearing out from scratch. That's my opinion of urban renewal."

Veteran Selectman Fred Dabrowski then issued a lengthy statement pacing the front of the auditorium and periodically lifting and lowering the microphone. "Why disturb Park Street for six buildings?" he asked, and further noted, "The federal government and state government isn't giving us anything — we're giving it to them." He cited regional school costs and expenses of the sewage treatment plant and asked, "Another 20-year bond issue? But how many bond issues do we have?"

Precinct member John D. Mularz said all the arguments against Urban Renewal "were used in 1953 against social security."

Atty. Walter J. Donovan, in the profession locally for 60 years and a Park Street business property owner over 40 years, said he "never felt more concerned" though not a member of the

committee (Concerned Citizens of Adams). Tracing the history of the old street block which he bought over 40 years ago, he said, "Businessmen found they have to give a way buildings as good as mine — I think Park Street is a good lot."

He also urged that all meeting members "go out as friends" but added that the newly-elected meeting members "should feel their obligation is to the town of Adams, not any one group."

"I think it is the only opt for the town," he concluded, "Adams is in a very, very dangerous position at the moment."

At that point Mr. Morey asked for opposition feeling on the proposal for a ballot vote, but Moderator Godek said the meeting would proceed "on the main motion," which was an affirmative recommendation from the Finance Committee.

Mr. Kelley then asked to submit his statement as an amendment but Mr. Dilk said it was "not acceptable."

Mr. Godek ruled the vote vote in the negative and after explaining that seven meeting members could challenge the ruling, decided on the roll call vote when at least a dozen precinct members jumped to their feet with arms upstretched.

Mr. Dabrowski asked the moderator "what right" he had to decline Mr. Kelley's proposal "to bring it before the people". Mr. Godek replied that the town counsel ruled on it.

"I'll challenge him too," Mr. Dabrowski remarked, taking his seat. Mr. Kelley asked if his proposal could serve as an amendment if the prior motion and second were withdrawn, but Mr. Dilk ruled the two articles must be voted on "as is."

A trio of spectators in the side aisles was recognized for comment by the moderator. Former assessor Stanley F. Selazo said that his position in op-



Selectman Dabrowski
"Why disturb Park St. for six buildings?"



Walter J. Donovan
"I think Park St. is dying ..."



Selectman Kelley
Made for referendum fails

Other stories on page 4



KEY RULING—Adams Town Counsel Andrew J. Dilk (right) rules against Earl F. Kelley amendment that would put urban renewal question to referendum vote. At left is Moderator A. Edward Godek, who supported counsel's ruling.

The Weather

Variable cloudiness tonight and Wednesday, low tonight in 30's and high Wednesday in 70's.