

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

Res Gestae

Law School History and Publications

1968

Vol. 1, No. 9, November 15, 1968

University of Michigan Law School

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.law.umich.edu/res_gestae

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "Vol. 1, No. 9, November 15, 1968" (1968). *Res Gestae*. Paper 793.
http://repository.law.umich.edu/res_gestae/793

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.

WAR OR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

Joseph Sisco, the Assistant Secretary of State of International Organization Affairs, will speak on the Middle East crisis, its past and the increasingly critical relations between Israel and the Arab States, on Monday evening at 6:45 p.m. in the Club lounge. A sign-up sheet for those interested in dining that evening with Mr. Sisco will be posted Friday morning outside Room 100.

Mr. Sisco has long been enmeshed in U. S. policy toward the Middle East, and involved in the diplomatic maneuvering which has characterized our response to that continuing crisis. Since joining the Foreign Service in 1956, Mr. Sisco has been Director of U. N. Political Affairs, our representative to the General Assembly and the Security Council. He was named Assistant Secretary of State in 1965.

LIBRARY
NOV 15 1968
MICHAEL

SPOCK LAWYER EXPLAINS HOW TO DEFEND A POLITICAL DISSIDENT

Citing his own experience in the Dr. Spock anti-war conspiracy case, attorney Victor Rabinowitz Wednesday evening emphasized the responsibility of the defending lawyer in a "political case" for helping his client to publicize his political views. Perhaps 150 people filled the Club lounge to hear him describe the dilemma of attorneys in cases where the presentation of valid, technical legal arguments may conflict with the desire to popularize those views.

Mr. Rabinowitz defined a "political case" as one where the defendant confesses to the charges against him, but attempts to justify them on moral or religious grounds. He recollected an early education which led him to believe that such cases might arise in Britain or France, but not in the U. S. where freedom of speech permitted the open expression of dissident political views. He noted how mistaken that belief had been.

Some of Mr. Rabinowitz' soul-searching during the Spock trial was rather enlightening. He described two of the numerous procedural errors in the trial -- only 8 of 100 potential jurors chosen "representatively" from the population were women, contrary to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure the judge requested special findings from the jury -- and mused on the possibility of the Spock case coming to stand for the right to female representation on juries. However, these procedural questions evaded the major political issues of the illegality of the Vietnam War, and the right to express dissent to its conduct. The defendants indicated dissatisfaction with an argument so based. Rabinowitz' answer was to "throw everything into the pot." All issues, political and technically legal, were argued and will appear in the appellate brief.

Mr. Rabinowitz also mentioned the Huey Newton trial. The attorney there, a white man, steeped himself in the philosophy of the Black Panthers and argued well enough to draw a manslaughter conviction from a first degree murder charge. In the course of of the defense, Huey spoke at length from the stand on the social

conditions which produce street gunfights and a need for organizations like the Panthers.

But not all political cases ought to be argued as such. In the case of the Columbia students arrested for trespassing and resisting arrest, the penalties were so light that it was easier to pay them and get back into the political mainstream. Plans for "taking the case to the Supreme Court" seemed less fruitful.

These three cases were described by Mr. Rabinowitz as "modified" political cases: the defendants denied committing the crimes charged, but claimed that, if they had, it would have been justified, for various reasons. An example of a "pure" political case is that of the Catonsville Nine, who took records from a draft office and burned them. They admitted the charges against them, and defended solely on the ground of "better papers than children." The intriguing legal point was raised whether a defendant could ask a jury to disregard the judge's instructions in its deliberations.

In all political cases, Mr. Rabinowitz advised defending attorneys to understand their client's views and not to obliterate during the trial, but also to raise the technical legal defenses. He further pointed out, however, that "our courts are not places to try political issues." The judges are not sympathetic to such arguments and are unlikely to enjoin "the capitalistic system" or the President from conducting the Vietnam War. Law suits primarily are an opportunity for dissidents to air their views in a public forum.

Obtaining maximum exposure for these views amounts to a public relations job. The Spock defendants agreed not to talk to newsmen; Mr. Rabinowitz felt that did not afford the most effective publicity. He applauded the manner in which the Black Panthers drew attention to the Huey Newton trial by filling the courtroom and silently ringing the courthouse with their members. He suggested that one of the best strategies was to let the defendant argue his own case without counsel. Not only does the practice unsettle both the judge and the prosecutor, but the defendants' views have much greater impact than when simply mouthed by their attorneys.

During the question period, Mr. Rabinowitz noted that, since the trial, at least two of the jurors have indicated that they were strongly anti-war and in sympathy with Spock et al, but felt that they had been virtually forced by the judge's instructions to convict the defendants.

COMMENTARIES ON AN INTERVIEW WITH HUEY NEWTON

Ted Spearman

The second part of this series is dedicated to those faculty members who raised the nebulous eyebrow to the so-called obscene wording which they thought to have been used in the first article. But such obsequious gestures were expected.

The second part is also dedicated to those of you who, with kind tongues and sardonic eyes, recommend that I might better achieve my motives if I were to use a more rational approach.

And to end such slippery dedications I point to the saintly professor who found that the guerilla movement formulated and perfected by fifth graders was more useful to his self-preservation than the simple style of staying in front of his class and doing what he was paid to do.

QUESTION: You have spoken a lot about dealing with the protectors of the system, the armed forces. Would you like to elaborate on why you place so much emphasis on this?

HUEY: The reason that I feel so strongly is simply because without this protection from the army, the police and the military, the institutions could not go on in their racism and exploitation. For instance, as the Vietnamese are driving the American imperialist troops out of Vietnam, it automatically stops the racist imperialist institutions of America from oppressing that particular country. The country cannot implement its racist program without guns. The guns are the military and the police. If the military were disarmed in Vietnam, then the Vietnamese would be victorious.

We are in the same situation here in America. Whenever we attack the system, the first thing the administrators do is to send out their strong-arm men. If it's a rent strike, because of the indecent housing we have, they will send out the police to throw the furniture out the window. They don't come themselves. They send their protectors. To deal with the corrupt exploiter, we are going to have to deal with his protector, which is the police who take orders from him. This is a must.

MICH. LAW: Who gives the authority to the cops who throw the furniture out the window? Who gives the authority for the smoke bombing of thirteen year old children who are fighting for something called freedom? Who gives the authority to a nation for its inhumane acts? YOU MOTHER ! YOU. But I'm not being rational, am I? You want to see some sort of teleological layout or plan for understanding the future?

Black law students come here and find themselves surrounded by the most pathetic kind of abuse. There are the jive liberals who have already thought about the conceptual problems of blacks in a white racist society and now take it upon themselves to let blacks know what blacks have to do to beat this system. "You have to beat them at their own game. Take it easy; work within the system." When does the man, having been bitten by a snake, get down on the ground beside it and start shouting "Yasss sir, Yass sir?" Jive liberals protect the racist system. Then you have those people who are alert to the problems and show a keen knowledge of the techniques used in attacking such problems. Yet they have an abundant flow of verbage with little guts; having once wetted the bed, they have never forgotten the initial warmth while, of course, forgetting the cold, subsequent stink.

YOU ACTUALLY HAVE THE NERVE TO ASK FOR REASONS. Do you love a racist? Do you love this law school?

The law school likes to think of itself as being a 'spring board' for successful lawyers. But the law school never asks what kind of successful lawyer is needed for what kind of success.

Don't you have the courage to see that the professor before you in those classes is suppose to have more for you than just what he learned and uses. He is nothing more than a 'system success'. And to continue to be a success he must help continue the system. It takes courage to tell someone that you are more interested in what they are not than what they are. For the only strong-arm men in this school are the pedants in front of each class harboring the knowledge of your brainwashed knowledge. If you obey, you get good things; disobey and you dare his power.

But you must worry about the draft; there is no reason behind the draft, is there? Yet a perverted rational can be found as was

stated by one cracker in the dining hall to another: "It's a good way to get rid of the city trash; but why do they want to draft US?" Pretty soon 'pig' that city trash is going to draft you; or you will have to genocide it.

QUESTION: Other black groups seem to feel that from past experience it is impossible for them to work with whites and impossible for them to form alliances. What do you see as the reasons for this and do you think that the history of the Black Panther makes this less of a problem?

HUEY: There was a somewhat unhealthy relationship in the past with the white liberals supporting the black people who were trying to gain their freedom. I think that a good example of this would be the relationship that SNCC had with its white liberals. I call them white liberals because they differ strictly from the white radicals. The relationship was that the whites controlled SNCC until recently, whites were the mind of SNCC. They controlled the program of SNCC with money and they controlled the ideology, or the stands SNCC would take. The blacks in SNCC were completely controlled program-wise; they couldn't do any more than the white liberals wanted them to do, which wasn't very much. So the white liberals were not working for self-determination for the black community. They were interested in a few concessions from the power structure. They undermine SNCC's program.

Stokely Carmichael came along, and realizing this, started Malcolm X's program of Black Power. Whites were afraid when Stokely said that black people have a mind of their own and that SNCC would seek self-determination for the black community. The white liberals withdrew their support, leaving the organization financially bankrupt. The blacks who were in the organization, Stokely and H. Rap Brown, were left angry and bewildered with the white liberals who had been aiding them under the guise of being sincere.

As a result, the leadership of SNCC turned away from the white liberal, which was good. I don't think they distinguished between the white liberal and the white revolutionary; because the revolutionary is white also, and they are very much afraid to have any contact with white people -- even to the point of denying that the white revolutionaries could help by supporting programs of SNCC in the mother country. Not by making programs, not by being a member of the organization, but simply by resisting.

MICH. LAW: If you are a white law student you have much to fear from blacks; you also have a great deal to learn from us (if you become mature enough). We will not become nor do we wish to become the sterile machine you value so highly. We are not going to force our spirit into the facade of a parenthesis computer. But you have not thought of this; you cannot see what you are becoming, because it really has not mattered up to now, whether the objects in question were truly existent or non-existent. Wall Street and money are real; thus, what you are becoming must also be real, HUH? But you will abstain from thought and decide not to decide if what we see in you is possible or impossible. This system protects you in the limitless, lackey role of a law student. It gives you two words and tells you to play with them. Reason and Unreason are your correlative titles for what Western Man does best, build and destroy. In order for you to prove something you must always disprove something else. You are white and we are black; your nation has proved your existence and in tune with the song, it has disproved the black. REASON AND UNREASON.

Black people do not believe the Socratic lie of Western Man; we have understood the myth of your freedom for many centuries. Some whites are beginning to open their eyes and the penumbra will eventually leave. And when it does, we will not disprove them.

QUESTION: You indicate that there is a psychological process that has historically existed in white-black relations in the U. S. that must change in the course of revolutionary struggle. Would you like to comment on this?

HUEY: Yes. The historical relationship between black and white here in America has been the relationship between the slave and the master; the master being the mind and the slave the body. The slave would carry out the orders that the mind demanded him to carry out. By doing this, the master took the manhood from the slave because he stripped him of a mind. In the process, the slave-master stripped himself of a body. As Eldridge Cleaver puts it, the slave-master became the omnipotent administrator and the slave became the super-masculine menial. This puts the omnipotent administrator into the controlling position or the front office and the super-masculine menial into the field.

The whole relationship developed so that the omnipotent administrator and the super-masculine menial became opposites. The slave being a very strong body doing all the practical things, all of the work becomes very masculine. The omnipotent administrator in the process of removing himself from all body functions realizes later that he has emasculated himself. And this is very disturbing to him. So the slave lost his mind and the slave-master his body.

I give this outline to fit into a framework of what is happening now. The white power structure today in America defines itself as the mind. They want to control the world. They go off and plunder the world. They are the policemen of the world exercising control especially over people of color.

The white man cannot gain his manhood, cannot unite with the body, because the body is black. The body is symbolic of slavery and strength. It's a biological thing as he views it. The slave is in a much better situation because his not being a full man has always been viewed psychologically. And it's always easier to make a psychological transition than a biological one. If he can only recapture his mind, then he will lose all fear and will be free to determine his destiny. This is what is happening today with the rebellion of the world's oppressed people against the controller. They are regaining their mind and they're saying that we have a mind of our own. They're saying that we want freedom to determine the destiny of our people, thereby uniting the mind with their bodies. They are taking the mind back from the omnipotent administrator, the controller, the exploiter.

MICH. LAW: This law school believes in the function of free will. The free will gives the faculty and the administration and the white students the substance they need to nurse most, the INDIVIDUAL ABILITY TO FEEL RIGHT, THE RIGHT as right (law), only. Your abstract fantasy could be tolerated if it were not for the causal effect in reality which your fantasies create in the forms of oppression and suppression upon the lives of black people in general and black law students in particular.

But this law school (and the people here are the law school) must ever strive to be A PERSON, AN INDIVIDUAL. Historically you have all tried to obtain the inward sense of this so-called

freedom?/individual in the concept of law. But the only testament of Western Man's freedom and individuality has had to be an external THING. And accordingly, the test of subjective intelligence (or objective intelligence if you dig science) and strong volition is the external concept of liberty/POSSESSION. Possession is property and property, in turn, is law.

Historically black people were useful property; now black people, as things, are useless. The law school protects the American vision of black uselessness. The law is not concerned with useless property. The law is not concerned with black people's dignity as being human beings.

DIVERSIONS

Broadway in Ann Arbor

The PTP Play of the Month Series for 1969 schedules five recent Broadway hits, including "Fiddler on the Roof" and "Man of La Mancha", for next January-March. Single tickets will not be available until January 8, but subscriptions (with a 20% student discount) are now on sale at the Mendelssohn box office at the League from 10-1 and 2-5 daily. Since the best seats will go early, some comments seem appropriate at this time.

The most amazing thing about the series is that it is presented at Hill Auditorium, which is less suitable for staging a play than is the Law Library for studying. From many seats there is simply not a proper view. In the past I have sat in the middle of the first balcony, where the prices are more to my taste, and suffered more or less discomfort trying to see the entire stage; but I swore never to return when at Marat/Sade last year I was forced to join many others standing in the aisles in order to see the entire set. My only suggestion would be either to pay the price for the main floor or the very front of the first balcony, or to stay home. (The prices for tickets run from \$4-6; \$16-24 for a subscription.)

The plays themselves deserve much better; all five, though not particularly innovative, seem of high quality. The series opens with Robert Anderson's "You Know I Can't Hear You When The Water's Running," starring Imogene Coca and King Donovan. This comedy is in its second Broadway season, and has been well received by the critics.

"Fiddler on the Roof" is adopted from the short stories of Sholom Aleichem, and tells of the plight of a community of Jews in tsarist Russia. In reality, it is the story of parents who's children abandon the old traditions in a changing world; and the story is well told. The score includes "Tradition," "Sunrise, Sunset," and "If I Were a Rich Man," and the choreography by Jerome Robbins is outstanding. Now in its fifth season, "Fiddler" is the longest-running Broadway show, and with good reason.

"Black Comedy" is not the first result of Mr. Nixon's black capitalism. Rather, it is a tale by British playwright Peter Shaffer about what happens when the lights go out at a party. Jan Sterling, the star, falls down a lot and walks into doors, and that seems to amuse people.

"The Apple Tree" is a blend of three short musicals, and has been called by someone "one of the brightest innovations in the

theatre." Having seen some of director Mike Nichols' earlier work, I believe it. Tom Ewell and Rosemary Prinz star.

"Man of La Mancha" was a flop with the critics when it opened in 1965, but people kept going and telling their friends to go. So at the end of the year the critics voted the play about 700 awards, and everybody was happy. In my opinion, they sold out. The story line is listless, and the music (with the sole exception of "The Impossible Dream") unmemorable. The production is carried by the most imaginative set design I have ever seen and by two or three outstanding scenes. David Atkinson as Cervantes is not a good singer, but then he has only one good song. Patricia Marand, as the object of his delusions, is excellent both in her acting and singing, and her rape scene is so realistic as to titilate even Lt. Staudenmaier.

J. S.

Weekender

Films

When the best thing in town is old Andy Warhol, it's time to find other diversion. If you have free passes to use up, here is the lineup:

- Cinema Guild shows Warhol's "Bike Boy" Sat-Sun; another of his recent line of fag flicks (see below).
Tonight is S. Ray's "Mahanagar (The Great City)."
- Vth Forum highlights another Warhol masterpiece, "My Hustler," at the 11:00 showings this weekend. The subtitle, "From 42nd Stree to Fire Island" tells the story. If you haven't had enough of Louis Bunnell lately, "The Exterminating Angel" plays the regular show times.
- At the Campus is "Le Depart" directed by Jerzy Skolimowski; the Michigan presents "Camelot," which has pretty costumes; Fox Village, "West Side Story," and the State will probably get to "Barbarella," for better or worse.

SPORTS

It's you-can-throw-out-the-record-book-when-these-two-teams-get-together time again, the beginning of the end of the college football season. The next couple of weeks will decide the conference championships (the Southwest Conference is in a four-way tie), determine whether the early-season disappointments will be able to perfect long, hard comebacks (Notre Dame plays Southern Cal next week), and make or break numerous seasons for those traditional rivals who have nothing left but a chance to knock off their old buddies from down the pike.

One such epic rivalry is that between DePauw and Wabash. Boy, you can throw out . . . Numerous crucial third downs after the crucial opening whistle one team's season will have been made and the other, presumably, will have been ruined. RG fan mail (consisting mainly -- actually, exclusively -- of notes scrawled in the margins of contest entries) has sought recognition of this traditional contest and, richly deserved, it is respectfully tendered.

If your tastes run less toward small central Indiana liberal arts colleges and more towards small western Massachusetts liberal arts colleges, you will be eagerly awaiting word of the outcome of tomorrow's Amherst (for the uninitiated, the "h" is staunchly

silent) -Williams game. Like the Wabash-DePauw game, this one will bring out the alums like no homecoming ever could.

And, of course, next week the air will be filled with record books as scores of bitter scores are once again settled: Indiana-Purdue, Harvard-Yale, and Stanford-California, to name but a few. Oh yeah, and Ohio State-Michigan.

Speaking of Wisconsin, the Badgers will be in town tomorrow, eager to render that Michigan-OSU game an anticlimax. Rumor has it the Badgers are a little weak this year and this is supported somewhat by their record. Nevertheless, they have some excellent ballplayers, (particularly flanker Mel Reddick, linebacker Ken Criter, and end-safety Tom McCauley) and should be rated slight favorites over the fourthranked Wolverines. At least by us, but then we are a little prejudiced -- we went to Wisconsin. We do believe, however, that you will see tomorrow a rare sight for Michigan Stadium -- a team with a lossing record that isn't ashamed to play its heart out no matter what the point spread may be. Actually, there is some reason to believe that although you saw a bad team last weekend, you ain't seen nothin' yet.

THE DOMINICK'S/RG FOOTBALL CONTEST

Last week we had an honest-to-goodness tie between Chuck Adamek and Mike Reuling, both of whom missed three and picked the same score in the LSU-Alabama game. Two others missed just three, and a few missed four or five. Practically everybody else missed six. Robert B. Nelson managed to miss eleven. Your notes are increasing in quantity, but decreasing in quality. Where's that old sense of humor, sportsfans?

The Rules: One entry per person, pick the total score in the first game, place your entry in the contest box outside Room 100 HH or at the Law Club desk by noon Saturday. Home teams are on the right, RG picks in capitals. Last week 15-5-0, season 86-43-2.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u> </u> WISCONSIN | <u> </u> Michigan |
| <u> </u> ALABAMA | <u> </u> Miami (Fla) |
| <u> </u> GEORGIA | <u> </u> Auburn |
| <u> </u> OHIO U | <u> </u> Cincinnati |
| <u> </u> Minnesota | <u> </u> INDIANA |
| <u> </u> DEPAUW | <u> </u> Wabash |
| <u> </u> NEBRASKA | <u> </u> Colorado |
| <u> </u> DARTMOUTH | <u> </u> Cornell |
| <u> </u> Mississippi | <u> </u> TENNESSEE |
| <u> </u> FLORIDA STATE | <u> </u> N. Carolina St. |
| <u> </u> NORTHWESTERN | <u> </u> Illinois |
| <u> </u> Missouri | <u> </u> OKLAHOMA |
| <u> </u> So. Methodist | <u> </u> ARKANSAS |
| <u> </u> Oregon St. | <u> </u> USC |
| <u> </u> Tennessee St. | <u> </u> SAN DIEGO ST. |
| <u> </u> WILLIAMS | <u> </u> Amherst |
| <u> </u> PURDUE | <u> </u> Michigan St. |
| <u> </u> OHIO ST. | <u> </u> Iowa |
| <u> </u> Atlanta | <u> </u> CHICAGO |
| <u> </u> MINNESOTA | <u> </u> Detroit |

Name: _____
Phone: _____
Total Points, Wisconsin v. Michigan _____