

University of Michigan Law School  
University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

---

Res Gestae

Law School History and Publications

---

1970

October 16, 1970

University of Michigan Law School

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.law.umich.edu/res\\_gestae](http://repository.law.umich.edu/res_gestae)

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "October 16, 1970" (1970). *Res Gestae*. Paper 745.  
[http://repository.law.umich.edu/res\\_gestae/745](http://repository.law.umich.edu/res_gestae/745)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School History and Publications at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Res Gestae by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [mlaw.repository@umich.edu](mailto:mlaw.repository@umich.edu).

# RES GESTAE

LAW LIBRARY  
OCT 16 1970

Volume 4, No. 4 "Exhaust all legal remedies."

October 16, 1970

## PARADISE LOST

Yet another episode in the continuing struggle of good and evil was waged last week as the forces of light and the forces of darkness locked horns in the law quad.

Detroit Edison, benevolent bestower of brightness, answering the prayers of law school administration and with the blessing of the University Plant Department, had taken steps to install lighting in the quad. Noble workmen of the lighting company had toiled bravely to dig holes and install forms for the foundations of the lights. But as they worked, the afternoon shadows lengthened, and their enlightened efforts were interrupted by nightfall.

During the night a group of diabolical desperados undid the honest labor of the workmen. With darkness lurking in their hearts, they tore down the forms and filled the holes. Then in a frenzied climax the darklings fed the forms to a great bonfire--a monument of light commemorating their dark deeds.

But the tyrants' triumph was temporary. Their attempt to vanquish the light from the house of the law was futile. For their acts inflamed the righteous and kindled opposition in the minds of the lighthearted.

And in the end it was decided by those who live and toil in the law quad that the lights should shine, and so the word went out.

## THE WORD

The following are excerpts from Dean Allen's letter to David LeFevre, President of the Board of Directors of the Lawyers Club, on the lighting controversy.

After explaining the fears of women students and staff which prompted the administration's request for lights, Dean Allen went on, "Second, I strongly believe that an increase in the illumination in the quad is necessary. In my judgment we would be entirely unjustified to play Russian roulette with this situation. The question remaining, it seems to me, is how the result can best be achieved.

"Third, I am pleased that students are concerned about the aesthetic implications of any lighting program. I welcome any realistic suggestions about ways and means that take into account the considerations of needed illumination, aesthetic considerations, and financial feasibility.

"Fourth, I deplore the acts of destruction committed in the Law Quadrangle on the night of Thursday, October 8. If there is anyone in the School so misguided as to look with approval on these acts or to excuse them as harmless prank, I am not a member of that group. I regard the incident as a particularly infantile manifestation of malicious mischief. Any man or woman of an age to be a student in a law school capable of such conduct demonstrates that he or she does not even approach the maturity, good sense, or responsibility that will be demanded in a comparative,

(continued on page 6)

# JOB?!\$

Ed. note- This is, we hope, the first of several articles on law jobs, especially those available to first year students. Please contribute.

A seemingly perennial problem for freshmen law students is that of obtaining summer employment related to law. You really have to seek out such positions on your own, but a good place to look is with government agencies. Though the openings are necessarily limited, freshmen law students may find that they are not at a distinct disadvantage vis-a-vis second year students. As far as I can ascertain, the individual agencies determine their own policy on this matter. Accordingly, some agencies do consider freshmen students for their legal internships.

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, where I was employed last summer, has in recent years hired several freshmen students as interns. The work centers on international law and in particular on legal problems arising under disarmament treaties that are being negotiated. For this reason, some familiarity with international law will probably enhance your chances in applying for the position. The Office of the General Counsel for the Agency is a small one with a staff of approximately five attorneys. The size is a real asset, however. It contributes to a more informal atmosphere and a closer working relationship with all the attorneys. But perhaps the most important feature of this position is just the experience of

working in a government agency, particularly a politically sensitive one such as the Arms Control Agency. Undoubtedly many of the stories as to the incompetence and corruption of government agencies is true; but at this Agency I found a legal department composed of men who are both very competent and conscientious.

A summer internship with the Agency is not without its drawbacks. The legal department hires only one law student for the summer from several dozen applicants. You can probably increase your odds by arranging an interview sometime during the year to demonstrate your interest. The position also requires that you undergo a security investigation which, while not particularly onerous, does tend to delay the beginning of work until mid or late June. On the balance, however, I think working for the Agency is well worth the effort and I would recommend anyone who is interested to write to the Personnel Office, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C., for further information.

Paul Lee

---

The April 1970 edition of the Yale Law Journal contains a student note describing the number, type, scope, philosophies and goals of most of the major public interest law firms in the United States. It is essential reading for anyone interested in the current status of public interest law in America.

# responsibility

To the Editor:

Re: pro bono autocracy

When a man has a knife in his back you can come to his aid either by cleaning and anesthetizing the wound and doing nothing to remove the knife, or by pulling the knife out. The former remedy relieves him of the pain, but only the latter is sufficient for the wound to be able to heal.

The current debate about pro bono/"public interest" lawyering is really a discussion about ways to anesthetize and treat the wound without having to take the risks inherent in working to remove the knife altogether. While it is better that the wound should be cleaned and dressed than left to fester, dressing the wound cannot make it go away, and as long as the knife is allowed to remain, the anesthetic will, in the long run be at best meaningless.

It is admittedly better that people should be doing pro bono work than corporate work. The day to day problems of the oppressed are urgent and must be responded to because they materially affect those people's lives. But the discussion about pro bono work must also take note of its limitations, and in the context of the pro bono programs offered by legal service organizations and large firms, these limitations are fatal to any effort to remove the source of the harm.

Such activities deal primarily with the symptoms and not the causes of the problems, and any success is more likely to be a palliative than a cure. Secondly, they are only dealing with those problems of the oppressed that the ruling classes allow to be litigated in their courts. Thirdly, the corporate firms that permit "as much as 15%" of an associate's time to be spent on pro bono work are still spending no less than 85% of their time representing the interests that cause the harm the pro bono work is needed to undo.

Most important, though, is the realization that pro bono/"public interest" work in most instances is done to accomplish things for the oppressed and not to change conditions so that they may do things for themselves. The distinction is crucial for it denotes the difference between a benevolent autocracy and a democracy. The idea behind the requirement that "public interest" work should be designed to increase the power of the people to do things for themselves is as old as the form (though never the substance) of the American government. And it is no more "radical" an idea than democracy itself.

The rub comes in trying to give substance to this form, for this effort is risky. It means fighting, perhaps militarily, those forces that insist on the right to "stab" and oppress. It means fighting them about those things that lie at the heart of their power. It means not being in control since your work is as an equal and not parent surrogate of the people. It means losing the privileges you have grown accustomed to as an heir of the ruling classes. But if you had a knife in your back, which would you want your "friend" to do?

-- Ken Mogill

## DISCRIMINATION

To the Editor:

Law School Classroom Scene

Professor: "Class, let me give you two hypothetical situations."

First Hypo: Black law students, for the purpose of securing admissions for more Blacks, enter Hutchins Hall, disrupt classes, break chairs, windows, and commit other property damage. The law school faculty administration, and students express great alarm and distress, some calling for disciplinary measures, others bringing private actions against Blacks, all deploring hoodlumism, valdalism, and crying for law and order on the Law School campus. The Blacks act only after several months of negotiation with appropriate University committees, and

after all administrative procedures and remedies have been exhausted.

Second Hypo: White law students, for the purpose of preventing the law quad from "looking like Forty-Second Street", tear up equipment and structures used for light installations, destroying the materials in a large bonfire in the center of the Quad at 1:30 A.M. The faculty, administration, and students, express no alarm or distress, nor does anyone call for disciplinary measures, deplore hoodlumism, vandalism, or cry for law and order. On the contrary, a law professor helps the whites justify their actions on a legal theory that they are "leaseholders" of the Quad. After these white students speak to the administration, further installation of the lights is halted. In the day preceding the bonfire, the whites make no attempt to use administrative or legal procedures and processes to halt the installation. Miss Kuntz, how do we distinguish the results of the two hypos?

Miss Kuntz: Well, the purpose for the Black students' acts seems to me to be of greater social concern and necessity than the motivation for the white students' acts, but perhaps the administration, faculty, and students consider that aesthetics (a non-political issue) outweigh the guarantee of equal educational opportunities (a political issue). Although the administration said that the Blacks' actions endangered the safety of students in the classrooms, it would seem that a large bonfire in the Quad at 1:30 AM might also constitute a potential danger to students on the rooms adjoining the Quad. I guess I better pass, since I think the factual distinctions in the two cases can't justify the differences in result. I know this can't be correct, but I keep thinking that the real ground for distinguishing the two cases is that the law school is a racist institution: what is reprehensible and criminal for Blacks is simply laughable "high jinx" for whites. After all, "boys will be boys"(if they're white, that is.)

In great confusion,  
Karen Kuntz

# let there be light

To the Editor:

I was distressed to witness the expression of certain attitudes by certain persons present at the Board of Directors meeting on Monday, October 12, regarding the installation of lighting in the Law Quad.

I can empathize with the aesthetic objections voiced by some men to the proposed gargantuan "mono-testicle"-like light fixtures. Men may dislike being treated as sex objects in any way. However, everyone present agreed that these aesthetic objections could be overcome by the installation of light fixtures more compatible with the spirit and surroundings of the Law Quad.

Certain other objections were peculiarly distressing. It was generally admitted that there is some difference between persons being mugged, accosted, or murdered in the Law Quad. Some are more damaging than others. Objections were voiced to the "paranoid" motivation of the administration's decision to install the lighting: the murder of Jane Mixer, the mugging of a member of the Committee of Visitors (a big strong man), and complaints about and reports from the Ann Arbor police that certain women had been accosted and threatened, all in the aesthetically pleasing darkness of the Law Quad. To certain men present, none of the above could justify safety precautions in the nature of illumination of the Law Quad at night because the Quad would become "aesthetically unpleasing". As they would say in the golden olden days: "Caveat Emptor". But then, women are capable of protecting themselves. They can sprout wings! And after all, everyone knows that women are mere fungible goods, easily repaired and/or replaced. One ass is as good as another. Who ever for a moment believed women to be human beings? Who ever for a moment thought that this brave generation of male law students had advanced to the benevolent paternalism of the 19th century?

(continued on page 6)

# Femania

To the Editor:

I am writing in reply to Mr. Denny Mason's letter. I am doing so in the hope that such a reply will not be chauvanistic. Since Mr. Mason apparently believes that the libertarian theory of the press is in operation in the law school, I am sure he expects a reply.

A paragraph-by-paragraph reply follows:

In the first paragraph, Mr. Mason gives an example from the Peanuts comic strip that is apparently intended to show that telling the truth is not the best way to get ahead in the world.

In the second paragraph, Mr. Mason seems to say that the posters he puts up (telling what Mr. Mason sees as the truth) are not getting him ahead in the Law School.

In this paragraph he also assumes that anyone can post anything he wants to announce an event. No matter what the taste of the poster, Mr. Mason? Or a poster announcing a K.K.K. meeting, a Weatherman bombing of the library, a meeting of the local Communist cell? The examples are perhaps extreme, but those who have had Con. Law II know that there are limits to freedom of the press. Apart from legal limits, administrators in this Law School have been known to "deface and destroy" signs because they were in poor taste.

One would hope, too, that Mr. Mason has evidence for his allegation that "devotees of Women's Liberation" are those who "defaced and destroyed" his signs. Could it be perhaps that 'other' people resent signs that, in their opinion, are offensive and/or degrading. Or perhaps an authorized representative of Women's Lib signed a confession after receiving a Miranda warning.

More seriously (perhaps others don't like being the point of tasteless humor either, Mr. Mason) is the question of judgment. Does Mr. Mason seriously contend that any and all announcements of events or programs should be posted on the walls regardless of their effect on other people? Racist announcements, obscene announcements, libelous announcements? Even if it is possible, is it the type of thing Mr. Mason wants to have associated with his name? Or would he prefer to announce his events in a fair, balanced, non-chauvanistic manner? If he prefers to be chauvanistic, then perhaps Mr. Mason should expect to receive equally chauvanistic responses from others. If he intends to be fair, then maybe the hints on the first few signs should have been taken by Mr. Mason and the subsequent signs should have been less chauvanistic.

Paragraph 3. Mr. Mason states that he is Athletic Director of the Law School. As such, he states, he is supposed to bring as many students as are interested the opportunity to participate in an organized graduate sports program and inform all members of the Law School of facilities available for recreation. It is possible to do this only through conspicuous public notices.

Perhaps it is possible to do this only through conspicuous public notices as Mr. Mason states. (Perhaps an occasional "press release" might be given to the Res Gestae, too, Mr. Mason). But the myopia of paragraph 3 is appalling. "As many students as are interested...and inform all members of the Law School...of the facilities."

Women do have student status at the Law School. What opportunities are made available to women students? What information has been 'posted' to inform women of the sports programs available to them? Indeed, what has been 'posted' (or done) by Mr. Mason to make 'organized

graduate sports' available to women students? What information has been posted to make women students aware of recreational opportunities available to them through the Women's Pool, Waterman gym, and on Friday nights at the I.M. building. Where were those conspicuous notices?

Paragraph 4. The gist of this paragraph seems to be that since it's not all that serious why worry, or, at least, why steal the signs before expressing any discontent to Mr. Mason?

First, many of the signs were anonymous. Who does one contact and where does one go to complain?

Second, would it do any good? If Mr. Mason is insensitive to his duties to women students in the first place, would it help to have a nice, quiet discussion with him to urge a change of policy? Or would an immediate public protest be more effective? Mr. Mason in his first paragraph lays the blame for the events he complains of at the feet of Women's Lib. If he knew, and cared, why the signs were being taken down why didn't he modify the content of the signs?

Mr. Mason is understandably upset at public rather than private response to his signs. Might it be because the response was justified (in principle if not in means) and that Mr. Mason is especially sensitive to well-aimed and accurate criticism? Maybe the extreme stage of paranoia of which Mr. Mason speaks has reached the Law School Athletic Director.

--Somewhat less chauvanistically,

Michael D. McGuire

(Would Mr. Mason sign his letter racistly if it concerned the rights of Blacks?)

The Young Lawyers, seen Monday nights on ABC after the football game, has been presenting not only highly relevant, but also realistic settings for their plot developments. Escaping from the Perry Mason stereotypes that have become so prevalent on the boob tube, e.g. Storefront Lawyers, Iron-sides et al ad nauseam, this new series presents honest portrayals of real situations without the always cheery ending. It is especially important since its heroes and villains are law students participating in a clinical program gaining valuable experience, not only in finding misplaced files but in confronting real clients, real agencies, and real courtroom situations - a better hour than many for credit.

The Word

(continued from page one)

short time of all our students when they undertake the representation of clients and the performance of other professional obligations. I would expect to act consistently with this judgment should evidence of the act and its perpetrators be brought to my attention."

Light (continued from page 4)

It is reassuring that objections of the vigilantes who tore down the fixtures will not determine the Law School or Board of Directors policy in regard to the installation of lighting in the Law Quad. The newly-appointed ad hoc committee deserves your vote of confidence and no doubt will succeed in their quest for suitable alternative light fixtures of aesthetically pleasing appearance, light intensity, and placement in the Quad.

Paranoically yours,

Jenny Longo

# Liggett & Myers

I have been furnished a copy of the September 18th edition of your paper and, of course, read with interest the re-publication of your original article concerning the Liggett & Myers case together with the publication of my letter and then the comments of both Professor Miller and, presumably, a member of your editorial staff.

Just a few observations:

1. As usual, you have not bothered to ascertain the facts before making comments. While it is true the ad damnum was \$750,000 instead of the \$30,000 you stated in your article, the jury was asked for a verdict in the amount of \$444,825.00 by Mr. Cicinelli in his final argument. Nowhere was there a figure resembling \$30,000, and, while ad damnum may not be taken seriously, the final argument and request to the jury by plaintiff's lawyer most assuredly is. \* \* \*

2. Perhaps there is an excuse for not having looked at the transcript, but . . . your editorial staff apparently did not even carefully read my letter with respect to the "open court" statements of the judge. I not only did not state that they were made in the presence of the jury, but specifically stated that they were made in "open court" with the Press present and that they were published verbatim in that evening's Grand Rapids Press, which is the only paper of general circulation to which the jury has full access. I do not understand any possible manner in which a trained lawyer could read paragraph

eight of my letter wherein I expressly said, "and this is quoted verbatim that night in the newspaper to which all the jurors have access", and interpret the paragraph as though I had inferred that the statement was made directly in the presence of the jury. \* \* \*

3. With respect to your observations that I advocate "two wrongs do make a right", neither I nor others who have read the entire article have any idea of the two wrongs you are talking about, and from the vagueness of the comment I am not sure that you did either.

4. With respect to the impropriety of comments on the plaintiff's election of claim privilege . . . be aware that the law of Michigan not only expressly permits such comment, but requires a mandatory instruction from the Court to the effect that the failure to permit the introduction of the evidence by the plaintiff raises a presumption that the testimony, if produced, would be adverse. You should also be interested to note that comments and arguments concerning the claiming of even the Constitutional privilege of the Fifth Amendment in a civil case are fully permitted in the Federal Courts, as per the holdings of both the Sixth and Seventh Circuit Courts of Appeal.

5. Such other observations as "There are many, many other weaknesses in the letter which you should point out" are obviously vague as the comment that "The trade secrets sought to be protected proved to be illusory at trial", and cannot be intelligently answered. \* \* \*

I am writing solely to point out the fallacies which a lawyer or law student can fall into when one undertakes critical comment without first taking the trouble, time and effort required to learn the facts--and, in this case, the law.

If you people are actually interested in  
(continued on page 10)



# Greener Grass

News from other law schools sporadically trickles into the R.G. offices. Overall there is a disappointing similarity in tone and content, but there are some reportable exceptions.

Ralph Nader and William Kunstler are the folk heroes of law students everywhere! Muskie, Weinglass and Panetta are way behind.

A Columbia law student doesn't like the color of his law school (gray) or the barriers to human contact imposed by a cubicle existence. 80% of the students at Columbia favor some sort of pass-fail grading. The faculty apparently isn't so sure.

University of Virginia and Georgetown law schools have adopted group instead of individual class rankings.

At Harvard a study showed that non-disclosure of grades made it harder to get a job. Surprising?

Even Harvard students are unhappy with second-year job interviewing. A plan is under study there to replace second-year clerkships with internships. Interns would still get paid, but school administrators would help place students in a job well related to their studies, and there would be a course-related follow-up afterwards.

The University of North Carolina Law School, following the lead of good law schools throughout the country, is experimenting with a writing competition for 4 places on its law review.

The University of Miami has a "new law" program of seminars and workshops. The

program teaches the law as it presently applies to various social problems; students then attempt to pioneer new paths that the law could follow for better solutions.

N.Y.U. law school has a 2-semester, 4-credit program for all second year students giving them clinical experience in legal problems. The students are assigned in small groups to prisons, public prosecutors, juvenile half-way houses, narcotics clinics and the like. They spend about 4 hours a week in field work, meet weekly in seminars with professors to discuss their field experience and related readings, and write a paper at the end of each semester. The program is 3 years old and working well.

At Indiana University 3 students act as "commissioners" to the Marian County Municipal Court overseeing lockup procedures, setting bail, and releasing prisoners on their own recognition.

And here at Michigan there's talk of a clinical law program and there has been some hesitant fumbling with the idea of opening up the law review with a writing competition.

-- Mike Hall

The United States Senate has confirmed the nomination of Roger C. Cramton as chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States. Cramton, currently professor of law at the University of Michigan, was nominated for the position by President Nixon in September.

The Administrative Conference is a permanent, independent federal agency concerned with the fairness and effectiveness of the federal government's procedures in dealing with private citizens.

--U-M News Service

RG "Quote of the Week":

" You cannot find a law school in this country that doesn't turn out from time to time, through some inherent weakness, a Senator or a Congressman. Or even a President if their rating is real low."

- Will Rogers

## We need a good head on

Tired of seeing the same old people's writing every week in the Res Gestae? Want to express an opinion? Want to announce an event? Take a poll? Just drop your copy off at the Res Gestae office. It should be typed, double-spaced, if possible.

If you have trouble finding the office, that's because the RG - which publishes weekly - does not have an office like L.A.B., B.L.S.A., and the Environmental Law Society(which don't publish much); or Prospectus and the Law Review( which don't publish as often). The RG was even refused carrel space by Mr. Jerry Du Pont, personally. The RG doesn't even have a desk where the paper can be put together. (This however does supply a great comeback to those who are critics of our editorial quality. Many of them have desks.)

We do have a mailbox. It is located on the third floor of Hutchins Hall, amongst the faculty mailboxes, between Dean McCauley's office and the Staff women's restroom. Items for publication can be left there or with the receptionist on the ninth floor of the Legal Research building.

Contributions are welcomed from staff, faculty, administrators, and students. More diversity in editorial content will hopefully make the RG a better vehicle of communication.

# Tigar! Tigar!

Fact

"I am not a social philosopher, nor do I know very much about that". With this disclaimer Mike Tigar traced the relationship between the American judiciary and the Constitutional promises of freedom and fairness from the early 50's through tomorrow. Pacing animatedly before a crowd which overflowed the seating and space of the law club lounge on October 5, he described, with studied articulation spiced by historical insights and personal experiences, the role of the legal system in the conception and eventual abortion of the notions of fundamental fairness.

Professor Tigar stated that the courts first promised a fulfillment of these Constitutional promises by defining them in the late 50's and giving relief in some cases. Then, in the first half of the 60's the appellate courts began to guarantee respite from the tyrannies of the racist trial judge and his Southern community. However, in the mid-60's rising judicial impatience with the tactics of those who would demand an end to the cynical mockery of the 14th Amendment ended the certainty of appellate reversal and forced the art of advocacy to turn to new principles in the late 60's.

Tigar then delineated these principles. The attorney must abandon the notion of himself as a hired gun and take sides, hopefully on behalf of the movement to resolve the tension between fundamental fairness and law in order in favor of the people and freedom and against the status quo and repression. The lawyer can use his skills to organize for the movement, to insure that his political clients still get the full protection of the Bill of Rights, and to confront the government as it attempts

to dismantle Constitutional guarantees of fundamental freedom and fairness.

### Opinion

In response to questions from the audience, Tigar noted that the media was an available tool because of the "public interest" requirement of the FCC. Assuming that one could avoid cooption, the media could be turned to create publicity for, and thus it is presumed, acceptance of, the movement. In response to another question, he reflected that jobs were available to promote this fulfillment of notions of freedom and fairness. He suggested Reginald Smith fellowships, clerkships, law communes--based on pot and draft cases for monetary support, and law professorships as bases from which to foray out against the repression.

This systemic orientation reflects a basic conflict between Tigar and Bill Kunstler, another recent visitor from the movement. As Kunstler related when he was here, at first he discouraged anyone from becoming an attorney and suggested, instead, that one take up a more socially effective occupation. After Chicago, he stated, he saw the courts as "an enemy of the people", an enemy which could no longer be expected to benignly neglect political defendants, but which is now an active agent in the separation of dissenters. Kunstler's concept more clearly reflects the realities of the legal process. It identifies the judiciary not as the defender of personal justice and rights gone temporarily astray which can be won back to the true path by a skilled and articulate advocate, but as the permanent impediment to the rights of the people, a function it performed in the days before Warren and to which function TRB (New Republic, October 3, 1970) sees it returning.

But Kunstler's "I don't trust the law" goes even further than TRB. The suggestion is that the courts' short-lived beneficence to the plaintive plea of

fundamental fairness is but an aberrancy in a system which is not responsible to the people and must be made so by a change in form.

Tigar felt the "chilling effect" when Julius Hoffman had him extradicted, but he still thinks in terms of trial tactics. Kunstler knows that the Chicago trial only made visible the base defects and prepares court room battles.

-- Joel Newman

L&M (continued from page 7)

the subject matter I would be glad to make myself available for an open debate or discussion. . .so long as the rules of argument and rebuttal are more evenly balanced than apparently is the prevailing practice in your publication.

Yours very truly,

Harold S. Sawyer

RG Suavity (in absentia) of the Week Award:

Dean Matthew P.T. McCauley for a remark made to a woman undergraduate contemplating attending Michigan Law School. "You're smart but not logical. . .you should go to social work school."

PARTY BAND BEER

The Law (Student) Wives' Association is having a beer party, October 17, at 4:30 in the Law Club Lounge. Celebrate victory, Michigan vs. M.S.U. football game. Tickets will be \$2.50 a couple or \$1.25 single. All law students and interested parties are welcome to come and dance to a GREAT Rock Band, (if you don't believe us, ask T.S. Givens) and to drink all the beer you can. Tickets will be on sale at the door of the party, and in front of room 100 Hutchins Hall, Friday at noon.

## Editorial

There has recently been the "picking" of a Dean selection committee to choose a new Dean for the Law School. The members of the committee were chosen by President Fleming.

There are six faculty members on the committee, and two students. The two students were chosen only after President Fleming had three times asked for lists of students, presumably to find some students that would be more ideologically suited to him and/or the faculty members of the committee.

It is interesting to note that President Fleming specifically asked that the names of black students be submitted to him, and that when the name of Ed Fabre was submitted, Mr. Fleming asked for another list. Eventually two students were chosen-- Dave Le Fevre and Wayne McCoy.

Women in the Law School have written President Fleming asking that a woman be appointed to the committee.

The school of Social Work is also in the process of selecting a Dean. To that committee Mr. Fleming appointed six faculty and three students. The students of the School of Social Work objected to not having parity with the faculty.

Are the students of the Law School so apathetic that they don't care that they have virtually no voice in the actual selection of the new Dean? Not only did the Social Work committee have an additional student representative (perhaps because the Social Work students are more "activist" than Law Students?--or maybe because they apparently care more ?), but the student members of that committee have made it a priority item of that committee's agenda that students have absolute numerical parity with the faculty on the committee.

It is important to the students of the law school that they be involved in the choice of a new Dean. Not just "suggestions" which can and may well be promptly rejected, but "where the action is".

We can be sheep--as students at this Law School usually are, or we can break out of our usual lethargy and take steps to see that President Fleming appoints more students to the committee. The students of the School of Social Work care, do Law Students?

M.D.M.

LEST WE FORGET: The RG thanks the members of the committee that drew up the 'clinical law' proposal. It is because of the concentrated efforts of this group (with substantial support built up by student members of the curriculum committee during the last academic year) that an opportunity for a broader, more professional education has, at last, become a reality after years of 'discussion'.

Editor: Roger Tilles  
Associate Editor: Tom Jennings  
Feature Editors: Mike Hall, John Powell  
Articles Editor: Mike McGuire  
Staff: Joel Newman, Helen Forsyth,  
Connie Gale Richard, Bert Kau, Bob Spielman

## FOOTBALL POLL

You may well wonder, who is Ed Gudeman? Formerly, Ed was a mere law student. Now he has joined the ranks of the Delphian Oracles, and in recognition of his new status has been awarded our coveted gift certificate for the Dominick's intestine twister of his choice. Ed's sparkling performance (80% correct) was highlighted by his pick of Oregon in their 41-40 upset victory over UCLA. Nice job, Ed. As for your peerless prognosticators. . .well, everyone can have an off week. All we can say this week is that you just better watch out. We're back on our winning ways.

The tie breaker this week: pick Don Moorhead's pass completion percentage for this week's game. Guesses over 50% will not be accepted! Also, a special this week: ESSAY CONTEST--Topic: "Who was Tony Smedley and what is he most famous for? Hint: He made his mark in Illinois basketball. The most appropriate answer will receive a Dominick's submarine.

The Hammer Twins

Season's percentage: 76%

1. MICHIGAN vs Michigan State      Revenge is sweet.
2. Alamama vs TENNESSEE      Vols turn the Tide.
3. Amherst vs ROCHESTER      Yellow Jackets catch Lord Jeffs in a building year.
4. ARMY vs Virginia      Cadets come back into their league.
5. California vs UCLA      Bruins comeback.
6. Colgate vs PRINCETON      Ivy League squeaks by minor independent.
7. Cornell vs HARVARD      Ed Marinaro can't do it all.
8. DELAWARE vs Rutgers      New Jersey's finest bite the dust...again.
9. Georgia Tech vs AUBURN      An SEC thriller.
10. ILLINOIS vs Indiana      Battle of the mung heaps.
11. OHIO STATE vs Minnesota      "It's the same old song. . ."
12. Missouri vs NOTRE DAME      God has recalled Joe Moore.
13. NEBRASKA vs Kansas      Another biggie for the heartland.
14. SPRINGFIELD vs Northeastern      Chiefs still on the warpath.
15. USC vs Washington      Trojans smother Sonny S.
16. SO. CONN. STATE vs Glassboro State      Confrontation of eastern powers.
17. Valparaiso vs WABASH      Little Giants looking for berth in the Orange Bowl.
18. Wayne State vs Open      Upset.
19. Bowdoin vs Williams      Purple Cows moo. . .some more.
20. Wyoming vs UTAH      Battle of the undefeating.