Booze Boos: Students Weigh In on the New Alcohol Policy

By Jessie Grodstein
Kennedy

My feet stuck to the floor as I tried to make my way from the front door towards the kitchen, forcing me to stand by the doorway as my friend, a 1L of nearly a month, got ready to join me. We were headed to the reading room, ready to revisit the Commerce Clause. While I waited downstairs, the aroma of stale beer and the litter of Coors cans wafted towards me - pleasant reminders of the mayhem that occurred less than twelve hours ago.

Yes, law students drink. And while 1L's might be restricted to Coors, everyone looks forward to toasting over a glass of Mondavi come 3L year. Yet the controversy surrounding alcohol consumption still bubbles, despite the fact that most if not all students are 21 upon entering their first year of law school.

Recently, the Administration amended its alcohol policy, requiring at least 4 "alcohol hosts" at any law school sponsored event where alcohol will be served. The policy applies to all student groups, who are now required to send members to one of two "Alcohol Host" training sessions.

The policy has prompted sharp criticism from several leaders of student groups, however. Arguing that the restrictive policy will have very damaging effects on groups who host small gatherings, the executive board of the Public Interest & Community Service Organization (formerly the Public Interest Group) sent a letter to Assistant Dean of Students Charlotte Johnson voicing its alarm.

Jonathan Smith (2L), Daria Fisher (2L), and Dawson Williams (2L), the executive board of PICSO raise legitimate concerns, particularly with regard to the fact that the new policy is not sensitive to the number of students who might attend a given event. As stated in their letter, "Under the new policy, we are required to have four alcohol hosts, regardless of whether there are ten attendees or one hundred attendees."

Another problem with the new policy is that it creates an environment where students are treated as if they are naturally irresponsible with alcohol. And while it might be irresponsible for someone to attempt to purchase Milwaukee's Best or Shlitz Gold (some things just aren't worth it, no matter the savings), it is hardly a given that alcohol plus student equals stomach pumping.

Which raises the question as to why this new policy is needed in the first place. Other graduate programs, such as those at the business school and the school of public health, don't have such policies, or if they do they haven't made many of their students aware of them. One theory, posited by Smith, Fisher, and Williams, is that, by making it impractical for groups to advertise social functions where alcohol will be present, the Administration is saying that a strong and cohesive student body is not important. "By making value-based decisions like 'bar night is bad' you are telling a group of otherwise responsible adults that they are not capable of making decisions for themselves," the three concluded.

Responding to this criticism, Assistant Dean of Students Charlotte Johnson, David Baum, and Dean of Academic Affairs Steven Croley will hold a

Continued on Page 7
Getting in Touch With My Inner Gear-Head

By Andy Daly

Bloody knuckles and swearing. Those were the usual results of my father’s misadventures under the hood of our 1985 Chevy Celebrity wagon. As a kid, I remember plenty of Saturday afternoons during which my dad would drag me away from whatever dorky thing I was entertaining myself with to show me how to fix the old clunker.

Problem was, I was a smart-ass and not particularly interested. I would whine and argue, come up with reasons why I should not have to stand there and hold a lamp or find a long-lost tool. To me, it was a lot more fun to tease my old man as he tore the skin off of his knuckles and tried to stifle his Boston-accented torrent of curses than it was to watch and listen to what he was trying to teach me. I am paying for it now.

I am certain that I am not alone amongst my colleagues in entertaining the occasional daydream about what I would be doing if I were not a law student. I am also certain that I am not alone in doing so during class. For me, the most attractive alternatives are jobs in which I get to produce tangible things.

Luckily for my legal career, my latest fantasy involves building custom automobiles; a craft that I am singularly ill-equipped for.

Like the pursuit of so many other endeavors, an utter lack of skill has not deterred me, at least, not in my fantasy. In my daydreams, I am restoring a neglected 1972 Monte Carlo like the one my best friend’s father used to drive, or taking a 1966 Karmann-Ghia and turning it from a German economy coupe into the real Italian sports car that it always wanted to be. For the mother of all projects, I find dad’s old war wagon and restore it to its pre-kiddie hauling luster and pride.

In real life, I have taken to religiously watching the best show on cable, Discovery Channel’s “Monster Garage”, drawing (poorly) concept cars around my classnotes, and tinkering with a couple of model car projects. I read about cars on the internet, I talk to my brother about the best colors I should use on my fantasy projects and I call home to make sure my dad is watching the guys on “Monster Garage” tear apart some perfectly good car to make something bad-ass out of it. This has only fed the second stage of my daydreaming, the “we could make this work” part.

In my delusions, I have entertained thoughts of a midlife career change; using my lawyer money to send myself to trade school. I suppose it is nobler than the typical midlife crisis, seeing as I would be building my little red sports car rather than buying it, but it might be just as pathetic.

For the time being, I guess I will have to be content with being able to change a tire and check my oil, and try not to miss anything too important while I am doodling.

Have an Opinion?
Send us Your Submissions at rg@umich.edu
By John Fedynsky

Students, faculty and staff piled into Room 250 of Hutchins Hall to hear the William W. Bishop, Jr. Lecture in International Law on Friday, September 19th. The Honorable Charles T. Randt, Jr., U.S. Ambassador to China since July 2001 and a graduate of the Law School, delivered the lecture. From 1948 until his death in 1987, Bishop was a distinguished member of the faculty whose casebook on international law lead the field for decades.

Randt began his talk, titled “United States – China Relations: Two Years After 9/11,” with fond memories of Bishop and of being a student at the Law School. Though he recalled early problems finding work in international law, Randt has had a long career in Asia, working in both the public and the private sector.

America and China have an “increasingly complex bilateral relationship,” according to Randt. Much of the relationship is based on a consular agreement from 1980, but other aspects flow from non-formal understandings. In particular, Randt noted a partnership against terrorism. He recounted China’s diplomacy and support in the aftermath of 9/11, giving the example of how China closed its border with Afghanistan and urged Pakistan to distance itself from the Taliban regime. Randt also observed that America and China agree that real threats today come from non-state actors and not just from great states.

America and China have also worked together to neutralize threats from North Korea, which recently took the unprecedented step in January of 2003 of withdrawing from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Economically, China is a “work in progress,” said Randt, that is moving from isolation to integration, from a centrally planned economy to a free market, and from an agrarian society to an industrialized one. According to him, an early survey of imported goods in China consisted of Swiss watches that no one could afford and Cuban cigars that no one would want. Since then, China has acquired a car-driving, cell-phone-toting middle class. “A prosperous China at peace with itself and with the world is in America’s interests,” he said.

Randt noted intense high-level diplomacy going on between America and China, which includes multiple visits between President Bush and Chinese leaders. Still, Randt argued that China needs to respect international norms, especially with respect to human rights. He recounted a number of individual cases, punctuating the last with, “sadly, I could continue.” According to him, America is demanding results and not just dialogue, a proposition he supported by referring to examples of political prisoners freed in China.

Before taking questions on a number of varied topics, Randt concluded his prepared remarks with the following. “How we deal with China today will have a critical impact on what kind of world our children – yours and mine – inherit.”

“A prosperous China at peace with itself and with the world is in America’s interests”
Supreme Court Wrap-Up: Not Much Wrap, but Pizza was Most Excellent!

By Matt Nolan

While clearly holding the most un-checkable power, the Supreme Court still tends to be considered by most Americans as the distant third branch of government, the little brother of its Executive and Legislative counterparts. Despite the average citizen’s apathy toward the Court’s actions, however, there is at least one minor subset of the population that recognizes the role of the courts: those of us whose jobs it will affect, law students! With this in mind, the Federalist Society and the American Constitution Society joined forces (while maintaining significantly different interpretations of the Constitution of course) to present us their Supreme Court Wrap-up last Monday, September 22nd.

“The Federalist Society co-sponsors the yearly event to give our fellow classmates a snapshot of the practical side of constitutional law and federal court litigation,” said Brian Pandya, speaker chair for the Federalist Society. This year’s panel consisted of Professor Richard Primus and Professor Roderick Hills. Primus spoke first and briefly, discussing General Dynamics v. Cline, in which the principle that age discrimination suits can only be brought by those being discriminated against for being old is being challenged, and in his opinion, will likely be overturned. Hills then discussed the Court’s upcoming case of Davey v. Locke, in which they will decide whether a state can bar a student from receiving scholarship funds because the student’s studies are of a religious nature. Tenth amendment implications in a case!? You’d better believe it.

Room 218 was full to the point of suffocation for the event, a much larger turnout than last year, according to Pandya. Many students were forced to either stand on the walls of the room or simply leave and depend on a summary of the event from friends. Despite the quality of the analysis provided by both professors on the two cases brought to point, many left the event wishing that more of the court’s upcoming activity would have been discussed. “I expected more,” MNOP 1L Steph Burum told RG, “although for a first-year student not knowing much about the Constitution coming in, it was very helpful.” Many voiced similar thoughts that they thought the program would be longer, but still most left feeling they had gained something.

Was the Wrap-Up really less than expected, or was there just a ballooned expectation for the event? To be frank, did the people coming for the free lunch have unrealistic expectations because of unfamiliarity, or were all those people really there to hear about the Supreme Court docket? You may have your own opinion, but this reporter has been nothing but awed at the number of meetings sponsored both by the law school and its student groups that offer free food. Holding meetings on the lunch hour with food obviously boosts attendance, which likely has led to some inflated group email lists in these first few weeks. Is the recent enthusiasm for student group activity by the incoming 1Ls truly genuine, or is it just a reflection of the money being spent on free food for them? One day it’s the Federalist Society, the next it’s a seminar on money and success, with a celebratory dinner thrown in by the FYI program for “finishing our first memo”... is the law school really heaven (defined by free food and abundant time for alcohol), or is this all just a ploy to get us nice and relaxed before the first wave of finals hits us over the head?

Whatever the answer, I have but one reaction: keep it coming! It’s amazing how easily 4 hours at the law school beginning with 8am Contracts can pass by when you know that a free lunch is on the horizon. Food at meetings does not draw uninterested people to meetings, it ensures that interested people actually show up! A slice of pizza or two may be plucked by an uninterested 3L here and there, but I venture to bet that the aggregate discourse and networking that results from those slices of Cottage Inn yummy goodness benefit us much more than the cost.

On a side note – is it really ok for me to still say “most excellent”? Word.

Fall 2003
LSSS Election Results:

ABCD Rep: Aaron O’Donnell
EFGH Rep: Jay Surdukowski
IJKL Rep: Seneca Ann Theno
MNOP Rep: Damon Marcus Lewis
Jr. Board of Governors: Isaak Murshak
Dean Caminker Holds Forum on the Virtues of Public Service

By Michael Murphy

About 90 students explored the pros and cons of a future practicing law on behalf of the government last Monday, September 22nd at the Dean's Roundtable on Government Service in Hutchins Hall 150.

Presented by the Office of Career Services and the Office of Public Service, the Roundtable is to be the first in a series of discussions on public service law.

Dean Evan Caminker moderated a discussion between Professors Carl Schneider, Michael Barr and Joan Larsen.

Caminker opened the discussion with some commentary about the less-than-stellar reputation of government lawyers.

"The lay public opinion of government lawyers is that those that can do are lawyers, those that can't do teach, and those that can't teach are government lawyers," he said.

"The reality is that there are great challenges and opportunities as a government lawyer," Caminker said. "But they are not always easy to find."

"The question at end of day is, 'What is this all about? What kind of satisfaction do I have?,’” Caminker asked. "But they are not always easy to find."

"The question at end of day is, ‘What is this all about? What kind of satisfaction do I have?,’” Caminker asked. "But they are not always easy to find."
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"The question at end of day is, ‘What is this all about? What kind of satisfaction do I have?,’” Caminker asked. "But they are not always easy to find."

"The question at end of day is, ‘What is this all about? What kind of satisfaction do I have?,’” Caminker asked. "But they are not always easy to find."

Schneider suggested that entry-level government jobs offer a higher level of responsibility and training than private firms. He added that economic pressures in private firms preclude a large amount of mentoring, whereas government jobs provide more mentoring and accountability.

"People who get mentoring are people who go and get it,” said Barr, "but in government work, you don't go and get responsibility, it will come and get you."

The panelists agreed that in government jobs, graduates can expect to gain more experience in litigation and broader legal issues much more quickly than in a private firm.

Barr added, "In the government, you're more likely to be Willie Mays - to do more aspects of the law more quickly. You can do it these things the private sector, but only after you've attained a much higher level of practice."

The panelists said that a prevailing attitude is that students should work at a firm upon graduation to pay off loan debt then switch into public sector work.

"Private firms lure law students with big bucks,” Larsen said. "And if you're a student going to a firm, strapped with debt, and plan to pay it off and go into service, that can be [a good plan],” she added.

Larsen warned, however, that students can easily become accustomed to the lifestyle of higher-paying private firm jobs and change their career path accordingly. "If you're going to do it, you have to have a single minded goal. Keep your eye on the ball,” she said.

Larsen added that the happiest lawyers in public service she knew entered those jobs immediately upon graduation and made loan management work for them. Schneider said that most graduates he had spoken with in public sector jobs didn't make a initial job decision based on debt.

Caminker added that Michigan Law School has a program to deal with debt management, as well as a series of fellowships for students interested in public service positions.

The panel generally agreed that the initial workload is more manageable. "There are very few government jobs where [a graduate] will be working as much as in their first year in a private firm," said Caminker.

"The government offers such a huge range in size of jobs, one can choose a job that suits your lifestyle,” Schneider added.

Schneider warned students against keeping career options open for too long, and recommended that students pick a career goal and working towards it early.

"As an example, if you try to play the field your whole life, you can't get married,” Schneider said. "But if you get married, you can't play the field. Keeping your options open (in your career path) can foreclose positions that take years of work to attain."

For more information about Michigan's debt management and student fellowships, visit the Office of Public Service at www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/PublicService/index.htm.
So You Want to Win the Campbell Moot Court Competition

By John Fedynsky

If you are interested in signing up for the Campbell Moot Court Competition, you have until Friday, October 3rd. You can pick your partner ahead of time, or you can sign up individually and get assigned a partner. If you are waiting until the last few days to decide, consider the following recommendations offered by someone who competed last year. As I plan to compete again this year, it is advisable to take these words with a grain of salt.

Deadlines
They’re huge. You must sign up on time to compete. You must turn in your brief on time to have a shot at winning.

Time Commitment
This consideration is even bigger. Seriously competing in Campbell is like taking on another three-credit course—except you do not get any formal academic credit for it. Considerable research and writing is involved. If you do not think that you will have the time to do it right, then you probably should not do it at all.

Picking a Partner
Choosing a partner with whom you work well is key. There are some horror stories out there. For that reason, I do not recommend registering without a partner of your own choice. You will work hard, in close quarters and under pressure, so it helps to be friends.

Nit-picking
There are all kinds of rules about what font to use, page limits, etc. If you hate stuff like that, then Campbell is not for you.

Money
Printing 18 copies of your brief, which is required, costs money that you may or may not prefer to spend otherwise.

Subject Matter of the Problem
You don’t get to choose it and you do not get to see it before signing up. Bet on a constitutional issue involving one of the big amendments—Fourteenth, Fifth, First, you get it. One party will probably be a sympathetic individual and the other will be the big bad state. If you never plan to do appellate constitutional litigation, then Campbell is the best chance you’ll ever have to give it a go. By the way, you also don’t choose which side you represent. If you advance far enough, you will represent both sides.

The Judges
Alumni serve as judges in the first round and they are a mixed bag. Then it’s faculty in the quarterfinal and semifinal rounds. Finally, there is a distinguished panel of, usually, federal judges for the final round. As can be expected, the expertise and scoring of the judges vary. As a general rule, none of the alumni are constitutional experts and therefore simply enjoy hearing good arguments. Be prepared for sometimes puzzling questions. In the quarterfinal round, most of the faculty judges also are not constitutional experts. Only in the semi-final round do some of our con-law teachers volunteer their time. They ask tougher, more nuanced questions that pre-suppose a lot of knowledge.

Emotional Investment
This aspect of the competition is probably the most unexpected and, in my view, unavoidable. When you spend so much time on something, it is hard not to
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get wrapped up in it all. And unlike in real life, the judges are explicitly deciding how good you are as an advocate, not whose side prevails on the legal merits. The deeper I went into the competition last year, the more subjective the judging became. One panel asked lots of questions and gave great feedback. Another was cold and seemed to just want to go eat the free food afterwards. One judge recommended that I have more passion in my presentation whereas another complimented me on being coolheaded and projecting reasonableness. Sometimes you think you crushed the other side in oral argument, but the scores came out pretty even. Other times, you think you had an off night and you score well. Or you get a low score for no apparent reason.

More than anything in law school, Campbell made me sympathize with legal realists. Repeated experienced seemed to show that scoring depended less on the abilities and the performances of the competitors and more on who the judges happened to be. Cynicism and resentment crept in. Sad to say, there were feelings and perceptions among competitors of gender bias, racial bias, journal favoritism (remember, the faculty judges generally know who does what for what journals) and the like. I do not know if those feelings reflected the reality of the situation. But I know that those feelings were there and that some people would rather not have them or deal with them, which is reason enough not to enter.

Prestige.
Real federal judges come to score the final round. Lots of faculty and students show up. The stakes are high. Winning is a big deal. For that reason alone, many tolerate some of the negative aspects outlined above. Because of the prestige, though, people can be defensive, petty and downright mean. For the most part, though, everyone was civil last year.

A Note about the Board
The students who research and write the problem and who organize the competition deserve a lot of credit. They do a lot of work and add a lot to the academic community here. Yet they get overlooked. Worse yet, competitors, whether emotionally unstable or not, can be downright ungrateful. Kudos to the board!

In Conclusion
Personally, Campbell was a genuinely positive experience. There were drawbacks, to be sure, but I had a heck of a time and look forward to doing it all over again. Weigh the considerations above and see how things shake out for you. Most people who study here only get two shots at the prize. Life is short – take your best shots.
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discussion with students on October 15, at 5:40 in 120 HH, encouraging other students who might wish to submit written comments to do so before this meeting.

Liza Zamd (2L) of the Women’s Law Student Association (WLSA) weighed in on the issue, commenting that the Administration could have avoided this quagmire if it had tried to solicit student comments before formulating the new policy. Further complicating the initiative of students who wish to speak out about the policy is the fact that those responsible for editing the student handbook could not find room to squeeze the text of revised policy into their 89-page pdf file. As such, the average student will have to go to Academic Services or the Registrar’s Office to pour through its fine print.

Johnson did, however, make a more directly responsive move, by answering the e-mail written by Smith, Fisher, and Williams. In an e-mail circulated to all student organization leaders, she states, “I think we can all agree that events involving alcohol consumption are not the only method of building...community.” She further added that some of the purposes of the Law School’s alcohol policy are to encourage “responsible drinking behavior” and “address liability concerns.” Can it possibly be true that a school run by lawyers should come in conflict with those whom it is training to be lawyers precisely over the contours of a potential lawsuit?

Johnson expressed optimism, stating, “We’re confident we can, working together, pull this off.” Well then, I say we should all toast to that!

OUTLAWS

Will be Celebrating National Coming Out Day

Thursday, October 9th

Details to Follow

ACLU Presents

Books So Good They’re Banned in Texas (and elsewhere)

Wednesday, October 1st

12:20 - 1:00pm

218HH

Lunch Provided
Guided by Voices - Earthquake Glue

By Steve Boender

Guided by Voices
Earthquake Glue
Matador Records

I know, I know: every Guided by Voices record since Do the Collapse is a return to form. Bob Pollard and company release a proper GBV album every year, and every time, the critics chime in that it's the band's "best effort since Mag Earwhig". I'm not going to go there though. To say this record is a return to form is to say the band is dwelling in the past, and while they definitely aren't straying from Colonel Bob's secret recipe, Earthquake Glue is a step forward, rather than a trip down memory lane.

For those readers uninitiated in the cult of GBV, a little background is required. Guided by Voices is the genius of Robert Pollard. As a middle-school teacher in Dayton, Ohio, Pollard and a rotating cast of like-minded alcoholics would write The Who-influenced pop songs on a basement 4-track recorder. It wasn't until he was 36 years old that Pollard quit teaching and pursued music as his only job. He's now in his late 40s, and he's released somewhere between 50 and 70 records with GBV and various side-projects in the past 15 years (he once bragged that he could write 5 songs while on the toilet, and 4 of them would be good). Amazingly agile for a large-framed 40-something, Pollard infuses live shows with high-kicks, mic-swinging, and witty between-song banter, as he and the band drink more Miller Lite than a trailer full of NASCAR fans waiting out a rain delay. Musically and lyrically, the easiest comparison to make is to The Who, minus the concept albums and quaint British-ness.

I mentioned that the band is moving in a new direction, and nowhere is that more evident than in Pollard's lyrics. Known for his penchant for the whimsical (sample song title: "The Goldheart Mountaintop Queen Directory"), Pollard exhibits seemingly Ritalin-induced cohesion on the majority of the songs here. It's like he woke up one day and decided to write songs about real stuff this time. A lyrical highlight is "Useless Inventions", an up-tempo track questioning the benefits of the technological revolution. The song sarcastically touts technology's ability "to cover up the oldness in your eyes/from noticing the coldness in our lives." It finishes with a repetition of the line, "getting tired of useless inventions," a credible assertion coming from a band that still records to analog tape rather than digital hard drives.

Musically, the band (which changes every few years - more on that in a bit) has never meshed so well. Besides a drummer change prior to the last record, the lineup has stayed the same for the past 4 albums, and it keeps getting stronger. This continued improvement only makes the post-release departure of bassist Tim Tobias (who was half of the duo known as the Toxic Twins with guitarist Nate Farley) all the more troubling. Often overlooked, Tobias' bass melody is the driving force behind one of the best tracks on the record, "The Best of Jill Hives," anchored by the chorus, "I don't know where you get your nerve/I don't know how you choose your words/Speak the ones that suit you worse/keep you grounded, sad and cursed." Amidst the trademark rock-star posturing, "Jill Hives" stands out as Pollard at his most sincere.

The record's predominant theme is Pollard's recurring references to himself as a soldier. Coupled with his recent on-stage penchant for decrying the state of the music industry, one gets the impression that, as Pollard ages, he increasingly struggles to maintain rock's former glory. Continued on next Page
as the product of songcraft rather than marketing. Today’s micro-segmented radio formats can’t decide where to put GBV. Classic rock radio, the most fitting format for the band, dismisses them as hipster brats, while "alternative" [visible cringe from yours truly] radio doesn’t think they’re hip enough. Modern hard rock stations require bands to have a dj, and pop stations can’t really sell a 47-year-old white dude in a sea of Nellys, Britneys and Justins. Props given by Julian Casablancas of the Strokes, and an appearance in the Strokes’ video for "Someday", has given them more visibility, but the sad truth is that GBV are fighting the tide. Pollard’s high kicks will never see the arenas played by The Who. His lyrics will never be quoted with signatures in high-school yearbooks. His music will never be the soundtrack to a 16-year-old’s first summer with a driver’s license. But like a good soldier, Pollard will fight until he’s the last man stand-

In the Player This Week:

- Broken Social Scene – You Forgot it in People
  - ridiculously good music from 14-member Toronto collective. I dare you not to like this record.
- Polyphonic Spree – The Beginning Stages of...
  - The Vienna Boys Choir on hallucinogens
  - !!!! - Me and Giuliani Down by the Schoolyard
  - remember when guitar bands made music you could dance to?
- The Strokes – Is This It?
  - in obvious anticipation of the upcoming sophomore release
- The Pixies – Doolittle
  - in obvious anticipation of the upcoming reunion tour and possible recording

What I Learned in My First Month: Duck!

By Michael Murphy

Though extremely helpful and congenial, I’ve noticed that my professors possess interrogative skills rivaled only by those of my ex-girlfriend.

I expected that sort of game, and I think all of us freshmen (sorry, 1Ls) did too. What I didn’t expect were the hypothetical follow-up questions. My classmates and I will use up all of our brain power on some killer answer that really makes us look and sound like we’re smart (or that we actually read and understood the casebook), and the professor will just nod and say, “Okay, so what if the monkey was on fire?” or “What if the monkey was on fire in space?” or “What if the buyer set the seller on fire? Is there consideration then?”

As a result of this sort of treatment, and of some sort of "grades" on a “curve” people keep talking about, I’ve noticed some of my classmates are exhibiting seriously nerdy tendencies. And I’m not above suspicion. Hey, I own a study guide that I legitimately borrowed from my roommate. I’ve searched the internet for terms and cases. 1Ls – if you’re re-reading a study guide for Civ Pro – and you don’t have it until next semester, you might want to consider chilling out.

In my nerdiest moment this week, I read the first two chapters of a study guide for Contracts. I was so tired when I read it, I can’t remember a word. So, what that means to me is, while I don’t know Contracts – and if you’ve heard me talk in class you know that I don’t damn know Contracts – but I think I feel Contracts.

But even my Contracts homework was not the most useful piece of information I picked up on campus this week.

This is: Do not, under any circumstances, give a hysterically drunk undergraduate a business card. My friends and I were at a local establishment (let’s call it “Nick’s”) taking pictures of people for a newspaper. The plan was, we take their picture, give them a promo business card, and the professor will just nod and say, “Okay, so what if the monkey was on fire?” or “What if the buyer set the seller on fire? Is there consideration then?”

As a result of this sort of treatment, and of some sort of “grades” on a “curve” people keep talking about, I’ve noticed some of my classmates are exhibiting seriously nerdy tendencies. And I’m not above suspicion. Hey, I own a study guide that I legitimately borrowed from my roommate. I’ve searched the internet for terms and cases. 1Ls – if you’re re-reading a study guide for Civ Pro – and you don’t have it until next semester, you might want to consider chilling out.

In my nerdiest moment this week, I read the first two chapters of a study guide for Contracts. I was so tired when I read it, I can’t remember a word. So, what that means to me is, while I don’t know Contracts – and if you’ve heard me talk in class you know that I don’t damn know Contracts – but I think I feel Contracts.

But even my Contracts homework was not the most useful piece of information I picked up on campus this week.

This is: Do not, under any circumstances, give a hysterically drunk undergraduate a business card. My friends and I were at a local establishment (let’s call it “Nick’s”) taking pictures of people for a newspaper. The plan was, we take their picture, give them a promo business card, and the professor will just nod and say, “Okay, so what if the monkey was on fire?” or “What if the buyer set the seller on fire? Is there consideration then?”

As a result of this sort of treatment, and of some sort of “grades” on a “curve” people keep talking about, I’ve noticed some of my classmates are exhibiting seriously nerdy tendencies. And I’m not above suspicion. Hey, I own a study guide that I legitimately borrowed from my roommate. I’ve searched the internet for terms and cases. 1Ls – if you’re re-reading a study guide for Civ Pro – and you don’t have it until next semester, you might want to consider chilling out.
On The Fly, On the Cheap, and Healthy?

Hot, Healthy Lunches Under $3.00, Within Five Minutes of the Quad

By Sara Klettke MacWilliams

Law school is such a strange time for your stomach. Now that you’re mature enough to spend your summers eating free lunches in the hottest restaurants in town, you’re way too cool to eat the cheapest burritos the party store has to offer. You also can’t avoid the fact that all that free food and long hours sitting down are catching up, and you don’t think your arteries can manage much more $.99 sausage pizza.

Of course, you want healthy food, but that does not mean that you can survive on cold turkey sandwiches and rabbit food protein bars. Your stomach is in a difficult position, because your priorities are your bill collectors, your landlord, and those pesky people in Student Financial Operations.

Luckily, your stomach can still live like a health conscious attorney without breaking your grad student budget. The five minute radius around the law school offers many opportunities for healthy splurges that cost less than $3.00. Here is a helpful guide to a hot, satisfying, cheap, lunch that your stomach will also appreciate.

Amer’s Soup $2.19

Located on the first floor of the Michigan Union, on State St., and on Church St. by S. University

Amer’s sandwiches will set you back a few dollars, but their soups are better tasting and about half the price. There are usually three different choices each day, mostly low fat, vegetable-rich choices ranging from beef barley to black bean chili and pesto vegetable.

The soups are all served in large, two-cup bowls with a chunk of homemade bread large enough for two sandwiches. You can even make a sandwich to go along with the soup- Amer’s has free peanut butter and jelly packets. For pickle lovers, Amer’s deli-style pickles are wonderful, and if you ask, they will give you a plate of them for free or $.25, depending on who serves you. Bonus: unlimited clean, cold water if you eat in.

Einstein’s Bagel with Egg and Cheese $2.69

Located on State Street by the Michigan Book Store

Nutritionists have changed their minds in recent years – eggs are now good for your arteries and your waistline. Einstein’s will make a breakfast bagel any time of day. They will also for no cost substitute low-fat cream cheese, which is more filling and has less calories, for a slice of regular. A pickle for the side is also free if you ask.

Red Hot Lovers Mighty Dog ($2.90) or chili ($1.60)

Located on E. University Near South University

Red Hot Lovers is set up like a summer barbecue, with red picnic tables inside and out. The Mighty Dog is a pure beef, skinless hotdog served on a poppy seed bun. The chili, which is full of heart-healthy beans and tomatoes, is served in generous portions. A wide range of toppings are free, including the usual fixings and such goodies as sprouts, fresh tomato, lettuce, and grilled onions.

Lucky Kitchen Egg Drop Noodle Soup ($3.00)

Located on E. University near Ulrich’s

For $2.00, Lucky Kitchen will turn any of their homemade soups into hearty Chinese noodle soup, served in a bowl big enough for two. Egg drop soup ($1) is a low-fat, high protein classic. With noodle, egg drop is much more satisfying than plain lo mein. They chefs at Lucky Kitchen are generous and will usually slip some vegetables into the egg drop at no cost if you ask.

Oasis large soup ($2.60), wraps and pitas ($2.50-$3.00)

Located on South University across from TCF Bank

Oasis is Middle Eastern carryout with a touch of Asian (grilled tofu finds its way into some sandwiches). Unlike many of the Middle Eastern sit-down restaurants near the law school, Oasis never skimps on spice. The lentil soup is homemade and is spiked with carrots, tomatoes, and other veggies and is served with pita bread. There is a wide variety of wraps and pitas, all clearly labeled on the menu as low fat, vegetarian, or otherwise. Your food is cooked in front of you and the chefs are happy to make changes and substitutions.
Singing The Mantra of the Underdog

By Matt Nolan

Before you cross me off your study group lists and blackball me for all social events for the next year for "jinxing" the Michigan football team, I have one thing to say - it can still happen! True, last issue I predicted (as a true Michigan homer) that Michigan would go undefeated and win the National Championship this year, and they followed up with losses at Oregon and a pathetic pseudo-victory v. Indiana, but this highlights why college football is great and why we can still hope: anything can happen.

In their season opener, Notre Dame defeated Washington State. The week after Michigan slaughtered the Irish, which the team subsequently followed up by losing at Oregon 31-27. Despite all of this, this week’s Washington State at Oregon score: 55-16, WSU over Oregon. This is college football! Call me insane for saying so, but my prediction stands: we will win out, defeat Ohio State, get into the Sugar Bowl by being the top one-loss team in a year with less than two undefeated teams, and win. How can I predict such a thing? Because the unexpected always happens in college football, and it’s been happening lately in everything else as well. Well, and because I live my life in a blissful state of self-disillusionment and optimism.

The Cubs have won the National League Central Division Championship for the first time since 1989, and now have 6:1 odds at BoDog.com of winning the World Series. If this shocks you, sitting down may be a good idea before you read on – the Boston Red Sox have 7:2 odds. The odds on having a Boston v. Cubs World Series is 7:1.

To put this in perspective, the odds (according to the same betting experts) of Joe Lieberman of winning the Democratic nomination for president is 8:1. The odds of the Detroit Lions winning the Super Bowl are 100:1.

The last time the Cubs won a World Series was 1908, and the last time they even won the National League was 1945. Many people have come to accept the belief that Chicago winning the world series, or even the Boston v. Cubs World Series taking place, would be a sign that hell was indeed well on its way to freezing over. The sports world of late has brought us to expect these unimaginable things to happen, though, which is why we still watch the games. Examples: 2001-02 saw the New England Patriots win the Super Bowl with 4th string quarterback (and former Michigan quarterback) Tom Brady leading the way and earning MVP honors. 2002 saw the Anaheim Angels win the World Series with one of the lowest payrolls in baseball. We’ve always rooted for the underdog as a society, but lately they’ve actually been winning!

This past weekend alone saw the Cubs clinch the N.L. Central, saw the University of California’s football team defeat a Top 5 team (USC) for the first time in almost 30 years, and saw Arnold Schwarzenegger (who still swears it’s not a tumor) become the strong favorite to succeed Gray Davis as the next Governor of California.

Three teams from the Mid-American Conference defeated ranked teams from "major" conferences. We saw Wesley Clark come from nowhere to the lead of the Democratic pack for President in less than a week’s time. When do the underdogs become the favorites? When do we begin betting on the impossible to be more likely than what “should” happen?

If the Cubs have a shot at the Series and the Terminator has a shot to become the Governor, then Michigan can still win the national title. Miami, Oklahoma, and the rest of the remaining undefeated teams have many tough games ahead, and Cal showed this past weekend that even games that don’t look scary on the schedule (I’m sure USC wasn’t planning a 20T loss in that one) can knock off contenders. By losing early, and betting on the laws of improbability, Michigan is in great position to sneak in.

My laptop battery has 20 minutes left, so the odds that this article will end abruptly without any solid conclusions or morals or value to take from it are about 1:1. Two last items: odds that Gary Coleman will become the next Governor of California are 500:1, just slightly higher than the odds that Notre Dame football will finish with a winning record this year.

The Surfing Club’s 2nd Annual
Ceder Point Road Trip is taking place
Friday, October 17.
Experience the adrenaline-pumping,
vomit inducing roller coaster heaven
that is Ceder Point.
We will meet in front of Hutchins Hall, Room 150 at 3:45 and carpool from there. Cost is $12.50 (admission) plus a small gas contribution.
As we need to determine the number of cars to organize, RSVP at wildway@umich.edu or sign up on the Surfing Club’s bulletin board.
1Ls Lend Support to Detroit Nine

About 20 1Ls got their first taste of Foxtown at the Detroit Tigers game last Thursday, Sept. 25 at Comerica Park in Detroit.

IL Bryan H. Helfer organized the trip, and the group was recognized on the scoreboard during the 6th inning.

The Tigers won the game over the Minnestoa Twins 5-4 in the 11th inning on a walk-off home run by Shane Halter. They finished the season at 43-119, one loss short of the Major Leauge Baseball single season record of losses.

Photos courtesy of Gina Fraternali
Environmental Law Society Hits The High Seas: 2003 Annual Canoe Trip

1Ls Take in Carbs, Conversation

1Ls from section IJKL woke up to a First Year Information Program (FYI) Bagel Breakfast last Tuesday, Sept. 23, sponsored by the Office of Academic Services.

The next breakfast will be for students in sections EFGH on Friday, October 3, 2003; 10:00 - 11:00 a.m in the Lawyers Club Lounge.
## LSSS Funding Allocations for 2003-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>2003-04 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACLU</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Const. Soc.</td>
<td>$2,475.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APALSA</td>
<td>$9,520.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces Assoc.</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLSA</td>
<td>$6,200.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Law Club</td>
<td>$730.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Legal Society</td>
<td>$545.16</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Law Soc.</td>
<td>$2,340.00</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMALSA</td>
<td>$1,925.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law Soc.</td>
<td>$5,440.00</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federalists</td>
<td>$2,265.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headnotes</td>
<td>$4,485.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl' Law Society</td>
<td>$3,360.00</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSA</td>
<td>$1,850.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.Reuben Clark L.S.</td>
<td>$775.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino LSA</td>
<td>$12,756.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS Reproductive Choice</td>
<td>$3,060.00</td>
<td>$1,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALSA</td>
<td>$19,850.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLG</td>
<td>$2,180.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaws</td>
<td>$3,250.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIG</td>
<td>$5,070.00</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Gestae</td>
<td>$4,773.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFF</td>
<td>$2,061.80</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNARL</td>
<td>$2,470.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Law Society</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Law</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing Club</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLSA</td>
<td>$6,125.00</td>
<td>$4,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**                          | **$114,655.96** | **$39,950.00**

Please Note: These Figures Are Not Final and Do Not Reflect the Disposition of Any Appeals
ACROSS

1. Famous hedgehog
6. Contains coffee or ashes
9. Musician Ure
14. Suspended from soft palate
15. Duran Duran song
16. Negative ion
17. Lowest point
18. No room at the ____
19. Latin American plain
20. Collected bit by bit
22. Murphy Brown's boss
23. ____ Maria
24. Esse (freebie)
26. Priests and rabbis
30. Hard
34. Variety show
35. Painter Neiman
36. Wildebeest
37. Couple
38. Celebrity (Informal)
39. Actress Gershon
40. Prickly husk
41. Made by hand
42. Tangle
43. Small telescope
45. Unit of magnetic flux
46. After-shower garment
47. Not happy
48. Director Kiarostami
51. Housewives
57. ____ and Special Sauce
58. Five minus four
59. Dialect
60. Exam of finances
61. Limited company
62. Ring-like coral island
63. Tall grasses
64. Cease to live
65. I Dream of ____

DOWN

1. Model Hi Lee
2. Elliptical
3. Naked
4. Three ilium
5. Massacre
6. Waste product
7. Piece of jewelry
8. Not a secret
9. Sweet wine
10. Rock formation
11. Soap
12. Not here
13. Son of Seth
21. Poison
25. Slovenly person
26. MTV series
27. Ease
28. Not few
29. Caribbean liquor
30. Selves, improper
31. Painted arch
32. Opposite of outer
33. Pairs
35. Property by lease
38. Maryland crustaceans
39. Talk
41. Places for clothes
44. Pregnant
45. No longer is
47. Soft-napped leather
48. Gelatinous material
49. Fifth rainbow color
50. Predict
52. Against
53. Ceremonial act
54. Later
55. Tangelo
56. Shoe bottom
# Announcements

## Tuesday, Sept. 30

**Help Recruit The Class of 2007!**
Admissions Office Volunteer Info Session 5:45 -7:00 150 HH Refreshments Provided

The Federalist Society presents Roger Pilon Director of Constitutional Studies, Cato Institute 12:30-1:15 *pizza and soft drinks served*

## Thursday, Oct. 2

Fall 2004 South Africa Externship Informational Meeting 5:00 - 6:00 PM 218 HH

## Thursday, Oct. 9

**Section O:**
Meet With Your Assistant Dean of Students... David Baum & Charlotte Johnson at Dominick’s 2:35 -4:00

## Friday Oct. 3

**First Year Informational (FYI) Program**
Bagel Breakfast 10:00 - 11:00 a.m. Lawyer’s Club Lounge

## Friday, Oct. 10

**Transfer Students:**
Meet With Your Assistant Dean of Students... David Baum & Charlotte Johnson at Dominick’s 12:15 -1:30

## Monday, Oct. 13

**International Law Workshop**
presents

Ralph Regan Executive Director, Fund For Global Human Rights “Advancing Human Rights in an Era of Globalization: Threats to Front Line Human Rights Activism”

Send Your Student Organization Announcements to rg@umich.edu