

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

---

Res Gestae

Law School History and Publications

---

1969

Vol. 3, No. 9, October 24, 1969

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, "Vol. 3, No. 9, October 24, 1969" (1969). *Res Gestae*. Paper 771.  
[http://repository.law.umich.edu/res\\_gestae/771](http://repository.law.umich.edu/res_gestae/771)

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).

---

VOL. 3, NO. 9 "Exhaust all legal remedies." October 24, 1969

---

## IMPRESSIONS OF WILLARD WIRTZ

Speaking with Willard Wirtz, one has the sense of talking with an idealist who believes what he is saying. No, he is not Gene McCarthy, although his phrases ring the same poetry and his eyes speak the same sincerity and far-away yearning.

For Willard Wirtz is a man, who reveres his peace after eight years in the turmoils of public service. He has cancelled subscriptions to all newspapers, but his knowledge of current happenings belies his "strict nine month sabbatical" from the work-day world. He has no large army of youthful missionaries to carry on his shoulders, and so is free to talk with them instead of for them.

Both in the Cook lectures delivered over the past week, and in informal talks, Wirtz gives the impression that he is listening, taking in, and synthesizing information. This rare talent has probably been gleaned from working closely with students as a law professor at Northwestern, and from working with as disparate a group of leaders as one could imagine -- from Adlai Stevenson to John Kennedy to Lyndon Johnson.

And so it was that Wirtz incorporated as much of the questions into his answers, as the replies themselves. He spoke generally of reform of government in his lectures on "The Politics of Change" which he said should have been entitled "The Change of Politics." But Wirtz has sensible answers.

For instance, when asked about the right of public employees to strike, he said that the right to strike has been overemphasized by even well-intentioned experts such as Theodore Kneel, speaking here last year. Wirtz has a strong conviction that although there might be increased responsibility with unionization, a series of strikes would only arouse what is now a deep grained latent animosity in the American people to all strikes. He said that many organized labor leaders such as George Meany would be in favor of "voluntary" arbitration for public employee unions. The opposition to this plan comes from the Government employees themselves.

He also spoke of reform in a system of cohesive dialogue among the domestic cabinet members. The possibility and reality of seeing the "bottom 100,000 being knocked off the totem pole" to achieve an economic stability in our country was nothing more than a "national disgrace," based on "irresponsible dialogue." So he also characterized the talk of the possibility of the non-materialization of any "peace dividend." A sharp shift of money and manpower with reeducation is a feasible and mandatory result of the war's end.

Although insisting that he has gained a "tough skin" from public life, Wirtz has kept a very responsive interior underneath. For everything he said about the negatives of government in his lectures and conversations is followed by a ring of affirmation in the people, especially young people. After showing that law students were foresaking the big firms and the various branches of government because of their unresponsiveness and the loss of the Kennedy-government charisma, Wirtz said that the young lawyers were serving the people

in what they thought were more relevant ways. Indeed the keynote to his lectures was a new institution to be formed by the idealistic young and old, whose basic instincts want to serve in a relevant way inside of a responsive institution, a "science of community," as valid and logical as any other science.

As to a law student's education, Wirtz also called for a drastic overhaul. He said, "Instead of asking what Law has been, they must look at what is needed... As architects of institutions, future lawyers must develop the needed institutions and a system of evaluating the priorities of these." To this end, Wirtz is giving up a share of his well enjoyed sabbatical to head a joint ALI-ABA project on continuing legal education, which will be a combined study of what law education ought to be and the professional responsibility to remain well-versed in the profession.

But Wirtz's most profound mark was left on the Michigan campus on Moratorium Day, the day on which the Johnson cabinet member shared the program with Tom Hayden, and a day on which rhetoric flowed freer and more polluted than the Hudson River. It was on this day that Wirtz showed more than his abundant wit, his overwhelming warmth and candidness. It was his ability to look ahead with a clear-sighted hope that enlivened what was otherwise a day of justification and reassurance.

Sure, Wirtz called the protestors "patriots," admitted government mistakes, blamed the people and their institutions for letting the war engulf them, and called for a cease fire and withdrawal in a ninety day period. More importantly, Wirtz later said that the protest will have been nothing at all if the people's voices are not heard after this war is over. Seeking to stop "sunshine patriots" before they so appeared, he sounded a warning that all of us must continue to be heard in all places to effectuate an absolute idealism. "It can and must work," said the Secretary.

Interrupting a conversation to glance out the window at the colored trees, Willard Wirtz looked about at the sky and down at the students passing below. He seemed to equally enjoy watching both, for to this man they were one and the same. "It can and must work," said the Secretary.

Roger Tilles

\* \* \* \* \*

#### MILITARY LAW SPEECH TODAY

Presidio 21 defender Terrence Hallinan will speak at the law school today. The speech is scheduled at 4:45 in the Lawyers Club Lounge. He will also give a dinner talk in the Faculty Dining Room at 6:00. Hallinan will discuss "Military Injustice" and since he has been involved in several other military court martials, he should have a lot to say. Mr. Hallinan will be introduced by Professor Nelson, who has also done work in the same field.

For those interested in the subject of military law, there will be a National Conference on G.I. Rights on November 13-14 in Washington, D.C. Anyone interested should write to:

G.I. Defense Organization  
431 S. Dearborn, Suite 813  
Chicago, Illinois 60605

CASE OF THE WEEK

In honor of our speaker, the RG notes the following case:  
Hallinan v. Bar Examiners, 65 C.2d 447, 55 Cal. Rpt. 228, 421 P.2d 76 (1966).

\* \* \* \* \*

TO THE EDITOR

To the Editor:

First may I express deep regret that neither the October 10th nor October 3 issue carried the letter of Dean Matthew McCauley in its entirety. This was most unfortunate because it denied the Law School community the full impact of McCauley's expressions. Be that as it may, I feel it imperative that someone answer Mr. McCauley and lay open some of his fatal misunderstanding, and ineptitudes.

One senses almost immediately that McCauley lacks the ability to recognize, or the honesty to admit, that 38 Black students in a law school of 1,413 (approx.) is a problem. He similarly fails to illustrate in approaching the problem of low Black student enrollment. Yet, the most tragic flaw manifested by McCauley's letter is his apparent ineptness to propose any meaningful or viable solutions for this problem. Having felt a responsibility to answer the "rash of articles," the good Dean had a responsibility to enlighten his reading public of his or others' proposals for enrolling more Black students.

One may only speculate as to why McCauley failed to do this but, it is a gross disgrace to have as a chief admissions officer one who fails to recognize a problem and also shows an inability to initiate reasonable programs for eradication of the problem.

Sprinkled throughout the McCauley letter are catching, trite and, in some cases, insulting words and phrases. Referring to Black students as being of "disadvantaged backgrounds" or "culturally handicapped," shows at best a superiority attitude as well as an inability to recognize cultural differences. Persons who can use such shorthand phrases as the two listed above undoubtedly view their culture and background, in this case white, as being the standard and measure of all that is good and desirable. I disagree, to put it mildly. Furthermore, I am puzzled by what constitutes a disadvantaged background or cultural handicap. Is it, by the McCauley standard, economic? social? political? religious? or racial? It is this type of expressed attitude which makes me question Dean McCauley's competency to administer any serious program to significantly increase the Black student population at the Michigan Law School.

It is also significant, and insulting to Blacks, that Mr. McCauley can be so presumptuous as to assume that it took a Kerner report to resurrect the word "racist." Perhaps for the good Dean it was the Kerner report that enlightened him to "racist" and "racism," but for most Blacks racist and racism was something which did not need a report to point out. Kerner's report never became a best seller due to Black community purchases. As to the view of the Law School being racist perhaps the central issue is really one of how two contending forces view the same institution. But with or without Kerner, the issue of racism is something that McCauley,

the Dean, the defender of the admissions policy and the individual must decide for himself. And where he, as an Admissions Director, stands.

Mr. McCauley states with a self-assurance, that perhaps comes with the position of Admissions Director, that no promise of any number was ever made regarding admissions of Black students. As one who attended the meeting in question -- Mr. McCauley did not -- I can only say that I am not sure although my recollection moves in the direction of saying such a number was mentioned. However, as a mere mortal, I recognize the untenability of assuming such a self-assured posture.

It strikes me as consistent that McCauley does not view that there is a great issue of conscience at stake. Accepting as he does that really no problem exists and that there has been "good will" toward the "culturally handicapped" and those of "disadvantaged background," I too could probably say the same thing if I were in his position. Yes, I with the same self-assurance, lack of sensitivity and patronizing attitude could probably conclude also that those who would place the issues on trial are pretending, also.

Perhaps the most interesting points of McCauley's letter come last when he speaks about the attempts to "terrorize" and "Stigmatize" the Law School as undermining the efforts of faculty, etc. Let me first say that it will never suffice to attempt to defuse a major unrest by calling it an attempt to terrorize. Secondly, rationale faculty persons and others should ponder more deeply the problem they attempt to solve, if the results appear insufficient. Thirdly, as important as the "great amounts of faculty time" have been the great amounts of Black students' time. But again McCauley can only view only one side of a situation.

The sincerity of the Law School's alleged policy toward a real effort to attract and obtain Black enrollees can only be held suspect when its Admissions Director shows a lack of recognition of a problem, the lack of understanding of cultural diversities and an ineptness for bringing imaginative ideas to the situation.

The Law School must make some real, hard decisions about its admissions policy for Black Students. But moreover it must make even more decisions about those who administer the programs. The decisions may well have to shake the status quo!

Edwin Fabre

\*The views expressed do not in any way necessarily reflect the views and positions of the Black Law Student Alliance.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS HELD

In hopes of improving communication and easing tensions Neill Hollenshead, Student Board of Directors President, organized an ad hoc group meeting to discuss problems of black student admissions and black faculty selections. In attendance at the October 17 meeting were Dean Allen, Associate Dean Julin, and Professor Sandalow. Several members of the BLSA attended, including President Jim Waters and several white law students also participated in the discussion.

General reaction to the discussion by participants was that it was frank and constructive. Everyone in attendance agreed that more information is needed in several specific areas and steps were taken to obtain it. Another meeting is planned for next week.

Darryl Anderson

\* \* \* \* \*

#### JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FORUM

Mr. Stephen J. Pollak, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, will address students and faculty on Monday, October 27 at noon in Room 100. Mr. Pollak, who has indicated that he disagrees with recent policy changes in the Department, will address himself in part to the desirability of employment within the Department under present circumstances. He will discuss the practical impact of recent Civil Rights Division changes and an apparent new policy with regard to settlement of civil suits by the Department, as evidenced by the recent compromise of a suit involving the automobile industry. Professor Kamisar will be present to discuss recent changes in the area of criminal procedure.

Although the Department of Justice has declined to designate a representative for the discussion, Darryl Anderson has contacted Mr. John Walters, one of the Department interviewers who will be present that day, and expressed the hope that Mr. Walters would attend.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### LAW SCHOOL, THE BROADER ISSUES

The late collision of the law school and October 15 had something of an unprecedented effect on the insulated bowels of Hutchins Hall. Broad as the issues were, nowhere was the reaction more interesting than amongst the faculty. At a time when most members of our crusading society are taking sides and polarizing, the U. of M. law faculty has blown a brand new bag: the Activist Fraternity. Traditionally well-knit for environmental reasons, the Order opened fall activities with an ecumenical encyclical to the Daily deploring the conspiratorial intent of the LSA sit-in. Close on the print of this group-act of individual conviction, the V.N. Moratorium raised its implications. The faculty closed doors on a conference of the First Agony: social and political concerns. Historically such questions have been res non moutha for official academia and the educators again returned united.

The prospect of a tranquil lull for "cancel-no cancel" decisions was jammed by the BLSA, whose concerns somehow still exceed Viet Nam. Lacking "wisdom" when in the minority, the Faculty (with 3 exceptions) boycotted the Black Students' hearing in favor of their own - where a shortage of black participants was balanced by relevant discussion and rational thought.

Whatever the analysis of professorial posturing in the past 4 weeks, one cry rings clear: the Michigan Law Faculty is on the move. Though the charge still somewhat resembles a huddle, the flowering assertions in our catalogue may be creeping toward reality: the bestowal of a "realization of depth, breadth, and

application to life" (cat., p. 1) of each Legal Principle passed down from the pulpit. Though such presupposes a working knowledge of the ungraded side of Hutchin's doors, nowhere is this prerequisite less apparent than the classrooms. The potential of most law school "lectures" remains tarred by a church-school anachronism: the intentional avoidance of socio-political issues by the teaching staff.

Many professors recognize this hot-potato consciousness, but the case-method mambo stifles wanderings afield. Professor St. Antoine, for example, levels off labor-decision analysis at a "balancing of interests," union v. management. He has made half the semester without touching what interests, or in what foundation the balances lie. Professor Arthur Miller pauses on annual schedule to insist the state hires him only "to teach" - using the term somewhere between 'to save' and 'to suture'. He characterizes his lecture as impartial, but its neutrality compliments the anti-septic mindlessness he also condemns. Professor Charles Donahue shuns such "skirting" approaches, perfecting instead the "Linger-ing Query". Issues of social impact are tabled with a dilatory "query whether..." and left for the student to ponder throught the night. "Before Bullard," those who did so stood a fair chance of getting kicked out of Professor Miller's C.P. the next day.

Variations are endless, but the position is common. Recurrent justifications argue first that seminars are designed for efficient interchange of worldly ideas. This claim has merit, but its strong points (policy background, extended discussion, exposure to viewpoint and dissent) could also have meaning for the larger classes. Seminars are too few, too brief, and full too fast to compare favorably with related exposure all 3 years.

The second argument decrys the rostrum as a political lever: the lecturer must convey his profession - never himself. Such concepts of the "separated man" are interesting, but irrelevant here. A professor can preside over oral exchange while keeping his own foot in perspective. There is balm between partisan advocacy and educational exposure; the same decade which destroyed and student-as-virgin antiquates the professor-as-prophylactic. To faculty yet loathe to risk politics in the classroom, it is submitted that the Daily Letter took the classroom to politics. If alumni literature, the catalogue, and the admissions staff are to be believed, much law school prestige is based on the quality of its student body. (Cf. Professor Whitmore Gray on "Michigan material"). The faculty drew unilaterally on that prestige in resourcefully tying their letter to this institution. If such is their professional privilege outside these walls, they are responsible for consistency within.

Lest precedent becomes a stagnant absolute, note hopeful flutters in scattered classes: Professor Miller recently yielded his Equitable Remedies floor to the development of an extra-text theorem challenging the bases of equity itself. Professors Siegel and Knauss released classes for an October 15 symposium viewing inter alia, corporations and the war. Such splurges beyond the syllabus must not die when student strikes are gone.

Finally, a heavy responsibility rests with students themselves. Class material rotely disgorged on the platform above must be challenged from the pit beneath. Can Olin Browder pause in his beeline through T-E to speculate on the meaning and future of private property? What relevance to a civil procedure or con law

beeline through T-E to speculate on the meaning and future of private property? What relevance to a civil procedure or con law class has Professor Gray's assertion that the best research facilities win? In a day when SDS is contacting workers and the UAW is contributing to the tenant's strike, can St. Antoine lend perspective to the inertia of institutional power? In its present state, the curriculum glides around many such questions. They should be introduced for discussion or rejection. In either case professorial comment would break an embarrassing silence.

Stephen Stict

\* \* \* \* \*

HOLD ON WE'RE COMING!

Contrary to rumors, the Law Club is not quite dead socially. In fact a "social upheaval" is being planned for the month of November. All you need to take part in our mass movement is a couple of dates.

The month of November will start off with the University events planned for Homecoming. After Homecoming, the Law Club Social Committee takes over. On Saturday, November 8, 1969, the Law Club will sponsor a "Beer Barrel Polka Party" at Lake Susterka. The event is free to all Law Students and beer, music and barrels will be provided to all who attend. Watch for maps and other information about the Susterka event. One week later on Saturday, November 15, 1969, the social atmosphere becomes more subdued as the "Law Club Caberet - Formal Dinner Dance" will be held. The dinner-dance is open to all faculty and students. As in the past dinner, two bands, set-ups and hospitality will be provided for a reasonable charge. Tickets will be on sale soon.

So hold on, social cheer awaits you on: Sat., Nov. 8: "Beer Barrel Polka Party" and Sat., Nov. 15: "Law Club Caberet: Formal Dinner Dance."

Chuck Alpeet, K.T. Johnson  
Law Club Social Committee

\* \* \* \* \*

JOIN THE CONSPIRACY, STOP THE TRIAL

By now every lawyer and law student in the country has heard of the trial of the Conspiracy 8 in Chicago before Federal District Court Judge Julius Hoffman. Hoffman's mysterious rulings on the issues so far presented in the case have been the cause of great consternation in the legal fraternity at large. It seems that Hoffman's sense of delicacy had been affronted by certain lawyers failure to appear specially before the court to inform him of the news conveyed in a telegram, i.e. that they were dropping out of the case; so he deemed it appropriate that they should be locked up.

These and other rulings by Hoffman so infuriated other lawyers around the country, that on September 29 a horde of them converged on the Federal Court Building in Chicago to participate in the first militant direct action demonstration ever, organized for

given by Northwestern's dean was that the Guild is a "subversive organization".

\* \* \* \* \*

LOST

Girls ring lost in Legal Research Building. The ring has a gold band with a design on the band. The ring has 6 to 8 sets of turquoise stones and pearls. If this ring is found, please contact Miss Linda Burke, Legal Research Building, Room 1033.

\* \* \* \* \*

LEGAL ACTION COMMITTEE MEETING

The Board of Directors Community Legal Action Committee will have an organizational meeting 1:30 p.m., Sunday afternoon, October 26, in the Lawyers Club Lounge.

Students interested in establishing a legislative aid bureau to help city and local governments; creating law student internship programs within juvenile homes; mental institutions and public defender's offices; establishing criminal law programs, whereby students can travel with police while on duty and hold seminars with law enforcement officials; instituting legal survey courses in Detroit, Michigan high schools; and organizing trips to Detroit courts and local mental and prison facilities, are invited to attend this meeting. Any new ideas for this committee will be welcomed.

Bob Smith

\* \* \* \* \*

LAW STUDENTS INVITED TO MCGOVERN RECEPTION

After Senator George McGovern's VAC speech this Sunday, he will appear at a reception in the Martha Cook Lounge at 3:30 p.m. By special arrangement with the UAC Controversy Committee, Law Students have been invited to the reception. In return individual Law Students may wish to invite Martha Cook residents to the reception for William Buckley scheduled in the Lawyers Club Lounge Sunday afternoon, November 9 at 3:30 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

IN MEMORIAM

The death of Dean Kenneth Yourd is deeply felt by all at the Law School. Dean Yourd worked most closely with the student body, and as a means of memorial, we present the feelings of two students to represent us all:

For those students who knew him, and there are few who did not, Kenneth Yourd was a friend. Amidst the jagged pressures of legal education he gave a personal touch of human warmth and optimism that is so needed.

As the man responsible for student financial aid, Mr. Yourd knew more students than almost anyone at the Law School. But it was more than just his job which permitted him to bridge the gap of years. He was sincerely interested and concerned about the individual human being and not just with the money with which he was dealing. At Law School gatherings he would always come early and stay late; and would invariably introduce students to students as well as to faculty.

Kenneth Yourd reminded us that greatness is not always to be measured in terms of power but by humanness as well. He touched all of us who knew him.

Neill H. Hollenshead

The vacancy left in the Administration by Dean Yourd's so sudden death is deeper and wider than the empty office in Hutchins Hall and the empty space in the parking lot. His combination of efficiency and personal warmth was one of breath taking variety in the type of bureaucrat so finely represented in him. Who now will know his young supplicants in the hall as well as his office? Who now will know the value of a loan for Easter vacation? Who now will bring such a simple perspective to dream peddling? Maybe, after all, our taking him for granted is the tribute to his self-effacing dedication.

Kirk Rider

## A GAME OF LOGOMACHY:

Relying upon Dean Dean's assurance that he would "prepare" Dr. Intellect for the visit, Ambitious A Student returned once again to speak to the subtle and clever Intellect. He knocked on Intellect's door. Dean Dean had obviously "prepared" him.

From inside Intellect spoke: "If that is you again Ambitious A Student, I will go over your exam with you but no matter what we discover, your grade is not subject to change." Ambitious A overheard a villain's guffaw from behind the locked door. (Stage whisper) "There's your justice, troublemaker."

Grief-crazed, our young hero dashed wildly through the library stacks overabundant with books all about justice. He burst into Dean Dean's office.

Dean Dean greeted him: "I can tell by your grief-crazed look that justice has been done."

"No, Dean Dean, justice has not been done. I want to know how I can appeal this ridiculous grade which everyone seems to agree I don't deserve but which, somehow, I've gotten."

"You've had your appeal, Ambitious A Student. I've listened to you. Dr. Intellect has listened to you. What more could you want? Has Law School taught you nothing about justice?"

"All you've done is try to passify me. My grade was never subject to re-examination under any circumstances though you led me to believe it was."

"Come now, Ambitious A Student. It's not fair to say your grade is not subject to renegotiation under any circumstances."

"Well then Dean Dean, what are the circumstances? Must I prove actual malice? What if I prove the test was completely invalid?"

Asked to make responses which couldn't later be equivocated Dean Dean could no longer control his bureaucrat's impassion. "I'm not going to get engaged in dialectics with you!" he shouted.

"If you won't get involved in dialectics -- as you call it -- how do I know what my rights are?"

"I don't know why you are in law school," Dean Dean shot back, non sequitur being his favorite argumentative logical tool. "YOU DON'T BELONG HERE!"

Ambitious A Student left the office realizing that there remained only one faint glimmer of hope. He would go see University President Robbin Flaming and hope for a deus ex machina.

Will Robbin Flaming descend from the Administration Building to resolve our proud hero before the moment of perdition. See the last installment (well, almost) in next week's Res Gestae: "Robbin's Egg."

David A. Goldstein

LAWYERS CLUB

Openings are available in the Law Quad -- desirable suites in particular. For information see Max Smith in the Lawyers Club office (764-1116). After 5:00 p.m. call Billy Greenbaum at 764-8948,

\* \* \* \* \*

PROPOSED CONSTITUTION

There will be a mass meeting on the proposed new Law Students Union Constitution on Friday, October 31, time and room to be announced. Copies of the constitution will be available next week in front of Room 100.

Bob Wefald

\* \* \* \* \*

LAWYERS CLUB BOARD OF DIRECTORS BUDGET 1969-70

1. STUDENT FEES PORTION	TOTAL
Law Wives	\$ 571
LSCRRC	
Conference Expenses	80
Secretarial, Publicity	50
International Law	
Lounge Meetings	50
Foreign Student Tea	35
Publicity & Mailing	70
Miscellaneous	20
Debt Forgiven	(181)
BLSA*	
Law Wives Community Action	150
Dinner Meeting Literature	50
Lawyers Guild	
Publicity	25
Duplicating	20
Tenants Union Legal Defense	200
National Convention	100
Legal Aid	
Publicity	100
Board Secretary	25
Banking Service Fee	3
Social	2,810
IM Sports	280
Legal Action (Legal Assistance Grants)	400
Lawyers Club Council (All except pool table)	150
Student Faculty Social (Minus publicity & Secretarial	150
Placement	100
Bookstore	35
Capital Expenditures	600
Secretary and Mimeo	500

\* BLSA Newsletter will be funded by the Board if an alternative source of financing cannot be found.

General Operating		350
Orientation (Bus Tours)		100
		<u>476</u>
		\$7,500

II. DEAN'S PORTION (Educationally related items)

LSCRRC		
Summer Intern Program	400	
Speakers and Panel Programs	180	580
International Law Society		
National Dues	20	
National Conference Expenses	230	
Moot Court Brief Typing	45	
Moot Court Regional Expenses	125	
Speaker and Special Guest Program	250	670
Lawyers Guild		
Law Conferences	200	
Speakers Program	100	300
Legal Aid Society		
Recruiting	40	
Poverty Law Conference	195	
Legal Aid Materials	85	
Law Club Lounge	20	340
Res Gestae		
Salaries	600	
Mimeograph Process	769	1,369
Codicil Yearbook		
Senior Pictures	300	
Net expenses after income	438	738
Board Social Committee		
Freshman Smoker	75	75
Student Faculty Directory Salary		
	50	50
Board Speakers Committee		
Speakers Expenses	2,000	
Film Program	300	
Publicity, Postage, etc.	200	2,500
Legal Action Committee		
Prison and Mental Institution Trips	500	
Detroit Field Trips	400	<u>900</u>
		Total \$7,522

III. COMBINED PORTIONS

Student Fees Portion	7,500	
Dean's Portion	<u>7,522</u>	
	\$15,022	GRAND TOTAL

SPORTS

Your volting jock got jolts and jeers for last week's selections. Rather than throw in the towel, I shall give it one last try, and ask all entrants to submit a faculty member's name to make next week's prognostications. Certainly justice will be done. Dominick's delightful dream prize of \$2.00 goes to last week's winner, Jeff Miller.

MICHIGAN  
ALABAMA  
Wesleyan  
ARMY  
Miami (O.)  
CALIFORNIA  
COLORADO  
DARTMOUTH  
DELAWARE  
Duke  
FLORIDA  
Georgia Tech  
IOWA  
Indiana  
Illinois  
MISSISSIPPI  
KANSAS STATE  
OREGON  
PURDUE  
Heidelberg

Minnesota  
Clemson  
AMHERST  
Boston College  
BOWLING GREEN  
Washington State  
Missouri  
Harvard  
Temple  
N. CAROLINA ST.  
Vanderbilt  
U.S.C.  
Michigan State  
WISCONSIN  
OHIO STATE  
Houston  
Oklahoma  
Washington  
Northwestern (a dim Spector)  
WESTMINSTER

William Gadsby '76

All entries should be submitted only to the box at the Lawyers Club desk before 12:00 noon on Saturday. Only one entry per person. Those submitting more than one will be disqualified.

Editor: Neal Bush

Associate Editors: Don Tucker, Roger Tilles, Stephen Stitt.

Staff: Dale Berry, Tom Jennings, Walter Sutton, Lyle Stewart, Ken Mogill, Walt Hamilton, Barry George, Janice Siegel, John Trezise, Ralph Suker, Getta Wolff, Rev. Steven Solomon, Judy Munder, Abe Singer, Herman Resort

Produced and Collated: Boone's Farm Tribe.