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DON'T GUT THE FOURTH AMEND.  
Says Kamisar On The Defensive

Many members of the legal profession, most notably Chief Justice Warren Burger, have urged abandonment of the so-called "exclusionary rule" which prohibits the government from using illegally seized evidence in criminal trials.

Among other claims, critics of the rule say the measure has handcuffed the police in dealing with increasing incidence of street crime, including assault and robberies with deadly weapons, and makes gun control regulations almost impossible to enforce.

But Professor Yale Kamisar, a staunch defender of the exclusionary rule, says the measure should be maintained as a means of preventing "the government from profiting from its own misconduct."

Kamisar also maintains that the alleged connection between the rule and higher crime rates is not borne out by statistics in several states showing crime levels before and after exclusionary rules were put into effect.

"Though critics of the exclusionary rule sometimes sound as though it constitutes the main loophole in the administration of justice, the fact is that it is only a minor escape route in a system that filters out more offenders through police, prosecutorial, and judicial discretion than it tries, convicts and sentences," says Kamisar.

Views of the Law School professor are set forth in a series of articles in Judicature, a national legal magazine. A series of three articles by Kamisar is contrasted with pieces written by Judge Malcolm Richard Wilkey of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, a critic of the exclusionary rule. Wilkey is also a former U.S. Attorney and former Assistant Attorney General. The final installments of the articles appear in the current issue of Judicature (FEB'79).

The exclusionary rule, which was adopted by the federal courts in 1914 and imposed on the states as a result of Mapp v. Ohio (1961), bars the use in criminal prosecutions of evidence gained in violation of the Fourth Amendment protection against unreasonable search and seizure.

Kamisar says his defense of the rule is directed at both Judge Wilkey and Chief Justice Burger, whom he calls "Wilkey's ideological ally." Editors of Judicature say the Kamisar-Wilkey debate has generated more mail than anything published in the magazine's 62-year history.

The following is a point-by-point summary of some of Judge Wilkey's criticisms of the rule and Professor Kamisar's defenses:

--Wilkey: "We can see the huge social cost (of the exclusionary rule) most clearly in the distressing rate of street crimes--assaults and robberies with deadly weapons, narcotics trafficking, gambling and prostitution... To this high price we can rightfully add specific, pernicious police conduct (such as police perjury, harassment and corruption) and lack of discipline--the very opposite of the objectives of the rule itself."

--Kamisar: Judge Wilkey "has presented no statistical support for his assertion that there is a causal link between the high crime rate in America and the exclusionary rule, and no such empirical (Continued on Page 2)
evidence exists. In the decade immediately preceding Mapp (1950-60), crime rose much faster in many states which admitted illegally seized evidence than in the District of Columbia, whose law enforcement officers were subject to the exclusionary rule...Although Michigan had an 'anti-exclusionary rule' proviso in its state constitution from 1961-70 which permitted its police to search for and seize forearms of all types without 'probable cause' or any cause, the number of unregistered handguns increased dramatically, firearms robberies doubled and homicides committed with firearms increased fourfold." (Michigan's anti-exclusionary rule proviso was struck down in 1970 as violating the federal constitution.)

--Wilkey: "Compare the results in other countries--in England neither the police nor the criminals carry guns. Why? The criminals know that if a weapon is found they will be prosecuted. Whenever a man is caught with a gun or narcotics in his possession in England or Canada, conviction is virtually automatic--there is no denying the fact of possession, there is no exclusion of the evidence, no matter how obtained." (!!!)

--Kamisar: "Judge Wilkey's attack on the exclusionary rule is really an attack on the Fourth Amendment itself. It is the constitutional guarantee itself (against unreasonable searches and seizures)--not the exclusionary rule--which imposes limits on police operations. If the ban against unreasonable search and seizure were obeyed as it should be, there would be no illegally seized evidence to be excluded. Thus, abolishing the rule would not confer a right on our police to search 'on the slightest suspicion, it would not affect lawful police practices in any way. Only a change in the substantive law on search and seizure can do that."

--Wilkey: The exclusionary rule should be replaced with "disciplinary punishment and civil penalties directly against the erring officer involved"--an alternative which "would certainly provide a far more effective deterrent than...the exclusionary rule."

--Kamisar: If such an alternative were to constitute an effective deterrent, "the weapon still would not be brought in as evidence in the case...because the officer would not make the search or frisk if he lacked the requisite cause to do so."

--Wilkey: "The greatest obstacle to replacing the exclusionary rule with a rational process" is "the powerful, unthinking (!) emotional attachment" to the rule by some lawyers and judges "heavily imbued with a mystique of the exclusionary rule as of almost divine origin."

--Kamisar: "This cannot explain support for the rule by such battle-scarred veterans as Roger Traynor (Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court in the 1950's and 60's and generally regarded as the greatest state judge of his time) and former Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justice Tom Clark. Warren spent more years as a state prosecutor than any other person who has ever sat on the U.S. Supreme Court and during the entire 24 years Warren spent in state law enforcement work, his state (California) admitted illegally seized evidence. Indeed, Warren was the California attorney general who successfully urged Traynor and his brethren to admit illegally seized evidence in 1942. Years later, however, both Traynor and Warren became convinced of the need for the exclusionary rule."

--Wilkey: The 1961 Mapp decision "removed from the states both the incentive and the opportunity to deal with illegal search and seizure by means other than suppression (of the illegally seized evidence)." Abolition of the rule would "permit in the laboratories of our 51 jurisdictions the experimentation with the various possible alternatives promising far more than the now-discredited exclusionary rule."

--Kamisar: "For may decades a majority of the states had no exclusionary rule but none of them developed any meaningful alternatives. Between the time the Supreme Court adopted an exclusionary rule for federal prose-
This past weekend the Black law students hosted the Midwest Regional convention of BALSA. The topic of the convention was "Black Leadership in the 1980's." Thus, it seems a good time to consider Black leadership.

The issues confronting Blacks in the 1980's are manifold. But several of them are variations on the same theme, of which Bakke was only the forerunner. This is the issue of legal equality of the races, for which we and our ancestors fought so bitterly. Now that Blacks are equal under the law, isn't affirmative action "reverse" discrimination? Why should we tolerate the continued existence of all-Black colleges? Indeed, is a Miss Black America contest legal? In short, is the cost of integration the loss of Black identity? Black leaders are going to have to deal with such issues in the 1980's, along with unemployment and all the other more traditional issues.

There are assumptions implicit in these questions which will have to be closely examined. Are we really equal under the law? If we are, are we treated equally in fact? If the discrimination against Black people continues to abound how do we go about proving that the techniques for such discrimination have become much more sophisticated? What is the justification for Black, in addition to "general", institutions? It is an established fact that non-Black applications to traditionally all-Black professional schools had been and is skyrocketing.

Another question surrounds the issue of the obligation of Blacks who've "made it" to do something for those who haven't. Apathy is a problem in all groups, and Blacks are no exception. The concern for "self" permeates the Black psyche as much as it does the general population. Many Blacks bemoan this phenomenon, saying, among other things, that is in contrary to the spirit of the civil rights struggle. But perhaps the civil rights struggle, in the words of Sol Alinsky, was "for the right of Blacks to be as decadent as whites."

But the most interesting question about Black leadership in the 1980's is not what or how, but who? Who will be the Black leaders of the 1980's, and how will they be determined?

Traditionally, Black leaders have been preachers and/or heads of major organizations. Today, elected politicians can be included. (This has meant incidentally, an increasing number of lawyers. Whether this is good, bad or indifferent remains to be seen.) Personally, I don't expect a tremendous amount of Black leadership from elected officials acting otherwise than through the congressional Black Caucus. This is so because the more power a politician has, the more he or she must respond to a variety of interests, and cannot be seen to be bending over backwards for one over others. This is not to say that there is any necessary conflict between black interests and, say, what's good for the country, but you never know how people will perceive things. On the other hand, no one would expect a black politician to turn a deaf ear to black demands just because he/she also has a white constituency. But the very nature of a government official and a special interest advocate are in conflict, and we should recognize that.

As for the heads of major organizations a different problem is presented. A perfect example is Vernon Jordan. I think it fair to say that he is one of the most influential, if not the most, Black leader, with Jimmy Carter. But does that mean he is the most influential Black leader among Blacks? If he is now, he sure didn't use to be. It is the classic "chicken and egg" problem. Which came first? This particular example is not a dangerous one, but I think it shos that a black leader could well be created for us. This, rather than a problem for Black leaders, is a problem for the Black masses. They must be sufficiently aware of the issues themselves to be able to discern which spokesperson is taking them to higher ground, and which is taking them out of Hamlin and into the river. Right now that may not be a problem, but if the
Both sides demur to the facts, leaving only a single question at issue—are we in such need of such censorship? Cliche law must bow in light of serious thought. The Res Gestae may weed out smut wherever found for public consideration, if not consumption. Call it the principle for the unprincipled.

II.

Commentator William F. Buckley, Jr. comments: "Before you begin changing things, first find out just what it is that you are changing and just where it is that you are going." So, where were we. Ah, with the good Justice Holmes. We may take three approaches to the quotation in question:

1) Humor
2) Historicity
3) Self-reflection

As a joke the statement, in context, is undoubtedly humorous; it adds a new dimension to the wit and charm of the eminent jurist. But after the first pooh-pooh, the attitude which the joke imports may strike a sensitive chord. However, a worthwhile joke, as the disease of society, can hardly do otherwise. A joke makes us laugh because it is a picture of how we are, not how we say we are or how we think we are or how we would like to be. A heartfelt joke is the immortal enemy of cant and hypocrisy and pseudo-liberalism. Such jokes should be said until we hear some of it. I need only recall the mimics of Lenny Bruce or Richard Pryor, or court jesters any place or any time, to illustrate the irrepressible necessity of jokes whose purposiveness is to dent taboos. Satire does not dwell in an insensitive mind. Satire builds sensitive minds. The Holmes quip may strike our conscience, but to suppress such remarks leaves us impotent.

2. If some still find their world demoralized, when the joke is taken in context, perhaps they will address their next letter to the society of trivial girls.

(Continued on next page)
The historicity of the tradition which the quotation captures is obvious: it has been and is a man's world. Naturally then women's suffrage is a first-order concern of everyone. As Martin Luther King, Jr. told us, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

How sexism? One may blame God, except that God stands exalted by allotting Mary the virtuous role in the salvation scheme. One may blame evolution, except evolution is mindless beyond the aim of efficiency. One might even blame ourselves: men for oppression and women for submission. But surely one cannot blame the Res Gestae for its exposure of the anti-women fever, albeit through self-revealing accident. If sexism is never mentioned would it therefore cease to exist?

Blameworthiness is, of course, idle chatter, but suppression of our tradition is not a solution. To right a wrong do not just sit on it. The squasher of injustice must come to grips with the problem in every form and in all frames of mind. John Stuart Mill remarked that it is only those who keep their mind open to all things who become wise. To get wise in the cause of women's rights everywhere, in every shape and every form, one must see evil, hear evil and speak evil first. Evil does not go away by ignorance. How can we overcome our own perverse, even if innocent, views unless they are placed before us. In surprise lies the historical significance for those who seek to spring change upon us.

The Holmes remark seen in retrospect through means of self-reflection is invaluable. See, for example, C. S. Lewis, in his celebrated Screwtape Letters. Lewis writes as a devil, using perversity to steer a person to his/her true ideals. Self-reflection breaks down into two categories of inspiration--acceptance and rejection.

Those who accept the Holmes view as good doctrine may rejoice, as is their wont. Those who reject Holmes' position will rejoice with the new learning, as it is one more way in which they may rid themselves of unconsciously or unintentionally endorsing a perverse view. The conscious and intending have chance to let their morals stand the test of public exposure. The already enlightened souls must bear with others who wish to experience revelation. All must take heed to stay on guard as the struggle for women's rights requires still sharp concern.

But comes the last query: must we learn in this way? And comes the answer: yes. So deeply entrenched in our tradition is the disgraceful position of women that only by bringing to light subtle, visceral senses, as reflected by Holmes, can we uproot and rout the longstanding dogma of second-class citizenship of womankind. Make no mistake about the intangible forces: women will win. No one who has read Aristophane's Lysistrata can truly doubt the power of a woman.

III.

Caveat: A joke does not necessarily mean anything.

The aim of society is freedom. Women hope for equality with men. But the Enlightened Mature Moralists gang are their own worst enemies for they chain themselves with paranoic oppression. No man can be pure enough, since some women want to damn every iota of expression as sexist condemnation. The sole rationale of these women is ipse dixit. This conclusion is premised upon the obviously false condition that only the acquisition of headaches distinguishes a woman from a man. The issue of sex is all-pervasive in this society. Not all of it is bad. To divorce ourselves from any mention of sex amounts to intolerable overkill.

IV.

Therefore Enlightened Mature Moralists v. Res Gestae Part-Time Male Chauvinist Pigs, et al. is overruled. One may include sexist literature in public quotations. This decision only confirms the elementary, if not instinctive, principle of fact that sex speaks for itself. It is often said that one cannot legislate morality. Indeed, nor can one enforce a judicial sanction of

(CONCLUDED ON NEXT PAGE)
Two weeks ago my column gave you some of my "true confessions." Since that time the R.G. has experienced a veritable deluge of questions and requests for interviews. No one, it seems, can live without knowing my opinion on just about everything. In the interest of efficiency, I am printing the answers to the most frequently asked questions.

-No, my column is not intended as a testimonial to the Law School's need for a paper shredder.
-No, I am not the reincarnation of Martha Mitchell.
-No, I don't think Feminist Legal Services should hold weekly bake sales.
-Yes, I like red overalls very much.
-Yes, I am very disappointed that I was not even nominated for the Barristers. It's okay though; they don't want the Raw Review to be funny. And while we're on the subject... I have never had an unbearable crush on the Lord High Chancellor.
-No, I doubt if WLSA will ever co-sponsor a mixer with a U of M fraternity.
-Yes, I have, on occasion, considered a frontal lobotomy.
-No, I haven't suggested that the Social Committee sponsor a Michael Quinley look-alike contest.
-No, there is no truth to the rumor that Steve Fetter is my ghost writer... the quality of my column makes that pretty obvious!

CLUE: V = N

CRYPTIC QUIZ

PIX YDXYGUG IP FTHG GURFHIV, BHZUGFIRL
IP MHPPUXUFV GUNUG WXU VIF YXIXYUXFQ
IP W BHLU LHVM.
-- I.R.C. § 1031(e).

LAST WEEK'S SOLUTION:

"The most odious of all oppressions are those which mask as justice."

If any cliche can be used to describe "The Inspector General", the play put on by the Professional Theatre Program last week, it is that some things never change. That is true both of the corruption of small town governments, the subject of the play, and also of the tired jokes that make up the play. The biggest problem this play has is that it is so predictable that one wonders why it is being performed. There are no surprises, no excitement, and no real comedy. The humor is a combination of slapstick and old Henny Youngman (take my wife, please) jokes. Someone should take the play.

The only redeeming aspect of the performance is the fact that it was done by the PTP. It was probably the best technically smooth, most attractive, most interesting costumes, and the best acting they have done this season. Why did they put all this effort into such a tedious play? It has to be that it was part of the Russian Festival being sponsored by the U of M this month. It seems that Russia has more to offer than this. The play caused quite a stir when it was first performed in Russia, but in the land of Saturday Night Live, comedy based on governmental corruption and ignorance lacks the shock value and humor it once had.

The story revolves around the corrupt mayor of a small town who

The story is set prior to the Russian Revolution, and revolves around the corrupt mayor of a small town who discovers that a government inspector is on his way in cognito. The mayor and the rest of the local leaders immediately panic as they realize that their well-ordered by vile political system may be exposed.

When a dissipated young man on his way home becomes stranded in town with no money, the officials wrongly conclude that he must be the inspector, and set out to bribe him into making a good report to the czar. The slimy character is no more a government inspector than you or I, but he doesn't mind taking every bribe and compliment they throw his way. He ends up practically seducing (or being seduced by, the mayor's wife - it's hard to tell who is seducing whom) and then proposing to the mayor's fatuous daughter. He scoots out of town with all his loot (and without his bride) just in time to miss the arrival of the real inspector general. My thought was goodridance.

Philip LeStrange, the visiting artist, was surprising in the role of the mayor. He seemed to hold back and play his part in a more subdued manner than one would have expected, although at the end he gave the audience a taste of the magnetism that Portnoy described after his interview with LeStrange.

The funniest parts of the play involved two town landowners reminiscent of Tweedle-Dee and Tweedle-Dum. Peter Ivanovich Bobchinsky and Peter Ivanovich Dobchinsky were continually bumping into each other with well-padded tummies and interrupting each other, making communication impossible but very funny.

It's hard to say enough about the quality of the performance. Thomas Bloom, who played the phoney inspector, was exquisitely disgusting. He literally slunk and minced around the stage, showing just how blind the town's self-interest was, that they could toady up to this worm. The rest of the characters were equally believable.

As an example of mid-nineteenth century Russian theatre, this play is interesting. When the PTP adds its panache, it becomes almost funny. Indeed, if you don't mind a lot of corny humor and satire, the play can provide a very enjoyable evening.
TO THE EDITOR

We have just finished hearing semi-final arguments in the Campbell Competition and have selected the four teams of twelve that will go on to the final round. The format of the competition did not permit us the usual opportunity for congratulating one and all.

We would like to take this opportunity to go beyond those usual formal statements. Hearing the arguments and reading the briefs gave us a feeling of satisfaction that the students of this school could do such an outstanding job—that they could master a difficult area, present lucid arguments, and generally demonstrated that they are capable of meeting the tasks that await them after graduation.

As teachers we don’t always have the opportunity to see these qualities fully displayed in the somewhat confining setting of the classroom. Likewise, we don’t often have the opportunity in that setting to express our admiration and appreciation for a significant job, well done. So, we take this opportunity to express those sentiments to each of the Campbell semi-final participants.

Prof. John Reed
Prof. Peter Westen
Prof. Jim Martin

Rosenzweig Joins Faculty

The Law School has announced a new addition to the faculty. Michael Rosenzweig, presently with the firm of Rogers & Hardin, Atlanta, Georgia, has recently accepted the offer to come to Michigan.

Rosenzweig attended the University of Michigan as an undergraduate. He received his law degree from Columbia Law School in 1976. While in law school he was a Note and Comment Editor for the Columbia Law Review.

After graduating from Columbia, Rosenzweig clerked for Judge Paul Hayes of the U.S. Court of Appeals (Second Circuit).

Rosenzweig, while in private practice, has concentrated mostly in the area of corporations and securities law. Professor Thomas Kauper, on the faculty search committee, noted that this area was one which was sorely in need of additional Law School instructors, and that this, combined with Rosenzweig’s qualifications, made him the School’s choice at this time.

Kauper noted further that Rosenzweig will probably supplement rather than displace the existing corporations and securities professors.

Rosenzweig is 27 years old, and is married. His wife is a physician.
The Jane Mixer Memorial Award is given annually at the spring Honors Convocation. A special feature of the award provides that nominations are to be made by students in the Law School. No other award given by the Law School calls for this amount of student input.

The Jane Mixer Memorial Award is made to those law students who have made the greatest contribution to activities designed to advance the cause of social justice during the preceding year.

The award may be given to as many as three recipients. Students may make more than one nomination, and are encouraged to make nominations soon. All nominations must be accompanied by a brief statement describing the activities and the contributions of the nominee.

The statement should be addressed to the Awards Committee, which is the group that will make the final award decisions. Please submit all nominations and any questions to Crispin Birnbaum, 307 Hutchins Hall by March 1, 1979.

(C. Birnbaum)

This Friday, February 23, Frank Wilkinson, executive director of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, will speak in the Lawyers' Club Lounge at 1:00 p.m.

Wilkinson's topic will be the United States Criminal Code Reform Act (a.k.a. S-1, a.k.a. S-1437). As you may know, this bill would wipe out many of the civil liberties enjoyed by U.S. citizens, possibly including the right to demonstrate to protest government action, the right to picket at the scene of a strike, and the right of journalists to publish classified information, such as the Pentagon Papers.

In addition, the law is phrased so vaguely that it is tailor-made for "pretense" prosecutions, where the real intent is to suppress dissent. This is not surprising, since Richard Nixon was the main force behind the bill.

It is especially pertinent that this is being discussed now, since the "liberal" Senator Kennedy is under considerable pressure to push for the bill's passage in this session of Congress. In fact, Kennedy is one of the prime sponsors of this repressive legislation. The speech at the Law School is a part of an organizing trip that Wilkinson is making for the Ann Arbor chapter of the national organization of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation.

For more information call Carl Levine at 994-4591.

(J. McCullough)

CONSIDERATIONS (Concluded from Page 3)

apathy spoken of before continues....

It is not my purpose to attempt to provide solutions, but merely to raise the questions, and if I've gotten you to think about them, I have accomplished my goal.

(Nat Colley)
Since there is no mail delivery today, residents should think of this column as a letter and use it to avoid heartbreak. If that doesn't work, well, blame the Postal Service and not the Night Manager. In fact, whenever there is a problem with the mail it can usually be attributed to the Postal Service. Almost every day the Lawyers Club gets a large number of pieces of mail which belong elsewhere. Just last Saturday, for example, we received a bundle of mail for the School of Public Health which included at least 100 letters, several pieces of mail for the law library, several pieces of mail returned to the Law Student Spouses for insufficient address, a package for Mrs. Esther Kern at 551 S. Division, and the usual two or three dozen letters for people who seem to have never existed. Either delivery to the Lawyers Club is unusual in a way which increases the U.S. Postal Service rate of error, or that rate is incredible. I regularly am surprised by the naivete' of some Lawyers Club resident who expresses his (or her) opinion that "Newsweek always comes on Tuesday." What this really means is that the individual involved has been statistically lucky. What actually happens is that both Newsweek and Time could usually both arrive on Tuesday, but the mail people don't like to overload the mail bags. The result of that dislike compounded by other factors means that 85% of the Newsweek magazines do arrive on Tuesday, 10% on Wednesday, and the remaining 5% over the next week or so. The naive resident mentioned above simply has never fallen into the unlucky 5% who have to wait. Another favorite is the resident who has timed her (or his) last three care packages and announces to me that another is due today because: "It always takes three days from New York." Well, you can get 50 packages in a row in only three days, but I won't expect the fifty-first to arrive in three days as well. I do make some mistakes in the mail room, as do the people who help me sort. We will probably never get Thomas E. McDonald correctly distinguished from Thomas D. McDonald. If you get a piece of mail which isn't yours just push it back through your mailbox into the mailroom. I'll get it to the right person next time I sort mail.

For those of us who are continuingly interested in solo practice, I have discovered that the Placement Office has one book: How to go Directly into Solo Law Practice (Without Missing a Meal), and a bibliography of other potentially useful books. I've read the Singer book and not found it particularly useful, though. His version of "solo practice" is successful only if very few other try to work it the same way you do--and, in fact, reminds me very much of some of the mail "pyramid" schemes which rely on an everexpanding market-system. Without reliance on picking up "fall-offs" from other attorneys Singer's advice contains nothing spectacularly impressive or new. It still seems to me that there is very little available to really help a student plan a solo practice. At the Mid-Western BLSA Conference last week there was a symposium on this topic but I was in Detroit Friday morning and missed it. I hope that it was successful, and I hope that someone who was there will fill me in soon.

PINBALL SCORES------------February 18, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>machine</th>
<th>wizard(s)</th>
<th>scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jet Spin</td>
<td>K. Rouse</td>
<td>260,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buccaneer</td>
<td>Debi Kirsch</td>
<td>234,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacks Open</td>
<td>Debi Kirsch</td>
<td>305,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000,000 Man</td>
<td>Mitch Dunitz</td>
<td>950,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>J. M. Shepherd</td>
<td>107,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evel Knievel</td>
<td>G. Robb</td>
<td>436,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Mission</td>
<td>The Sleeper</td>
<td>386,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaking of filling things in, some people will want to fill me in after reading this next section, but here goes:

Once more with the groupies. I don't think they really exist! I personally think that law school groupies are a mythology which is only infrequently supported by real life. My pet theory is that the titillating existence of groupies serves to provide certain kinds of law students with convenient emotional scapegoats. A lot of male law students want, and even need to think that there are such people. It is an incredibly ego-boosting and fulfilling type of mythology. Female law students want to believe that there is some simply and easily attacked extraneous reason for the fact that male law students profess not to be attracted romantically to female law students. The periodic drives to rid the law library of groupies are a perfect example of periodic displacement of frustration. The fact is that the law library is rarely really overloaded. And that when it is overloaded, groupies are not responsible. The next time you have trouble getting exactly the seat you want, look around and see how many law students clearly feel that they need the chair space for three people and the desk space for four, in order to study properly. Is it impossible for us to recognize that the law library is pretty close
to a large residential off-campus area and that in these days of cold weather walking another two blocks might seem difficult to some undergrads. Are we so blind to the beauty of the reading room that we ignore the possibility that some people study there because it is so nice? Are we so insecure with our status as special people--Law Students--that we need petty rules about who can and can't sit in our library so we can feel more important?

If more study space is needed, especially at finals week, couldn't the LSSS ask the Lawyers Club food service to open up the dining hall with its huge, long tables? The dining hall can lock up so that no one could get further into the kitchen. It could be available from as early as 7:00 in the evening through the night. It could be kept free of groupies, as the dining hall with its huge, long tables? The dining hall can lock up so that no one could get further into the kitchen. It could be available from as early as 7:00 in the evening through the night. It could be kept free of groupies, as it is Lawyers Club property and although all undergraduates belong to the Lawyers Club, no undergraduates do (unless they also happen to be members of the Michigan bench). It would double the space available in the reading room. Obviously the kitchen staff would be nervous about their tables and chairs and other equipment. But it seems to me that it would be easier for the LSSS to protect the equipment than to keep undergraduates out of the library. And a lot nicer.

One thing I would like to do which also smacks of elitism (but really isn't, honest) is to compile a directory of U-M Law Students working in Detroit this summer. If you plan to work in Detroit, please send me your office (and home when you get it) address and phone number. I'll try to get a list out near the end of finals week. Then we can all locate each other over the summer. I've got some good friends in the law schools in Detroit, but once in awhile they get on my nerves. Those law schools do all the nasty parts of the Paper Chase and none of the good ones. Even the third year students there appear to be under the kinds of pressures that our most anxious first year students go through.

Was it the cold weather? Overflow of Saturday night parties? Surplus of good movies in town? How could a good X-rated flick lose money in Hutchins Hall? Hopefully the weather won't mess with the Barristers' Crease Ball. [Most first year students don't know by now that this is our version of a prom, and is due to take place on April 7th.] I would like to take this opportunity to plead with the Barristers to buy a different kind of champagne this year. The housecleaning staff is still using the remains from last year to clean out particularly dirty sinks in the basements.

Welcome to the world of Disco. Disco St. Patrick's Day? Help! The LSSS Social Committee and the Phid house have planned for us a "disco" St. Patrick's Day Party. A devoted and intense group of young revolutionary Irishpersons have spent the last year planning a gala real St. Patrick's Day Irish party, complete with singing, dancing, and drinking. This is coming up Saturday, March 17th in the Main Lounge of the Lawyers Club. Won't the LSSS please buy the Irishpersons some beer? Disco Susan B. Anthony Dinner? Disco Halloween Party? Disco Sherry Hour? Disco Cocktail Party? Disco Welcome Back to School Party?

* Disco Groundhog's Day at Le Chateau was great, but Disco St. Patrick's Day? Disco is fine, it is fun and provides good entertainment. But Disco is to music as traffic courts are to the law.

* This is unfair, actually Le Chateau prefers good old rock and roll.

Time to disappear with a parting shot at the construction crews. Has everyone else also noticed how uninclined they are to be civil? All of us should learn from their tactics. The layman who is confused by talks of "accrual, limitation, tort, etc." has much in common with us listening to construction explanations of why their dirt has to be in our quad. Not to mention their trucks and cars.

Some of us residents are particularly concerned with the portions of the contract which presumably require the construction company to replace our landscaping and walkways. Given the consideration they have shown so far for the quad, how many of us really expect them to willingly replace the slate slabs? How many of us expect to see concrete walkways in two years? One bit of good news I picked up last week is that the parking stickers which the pickup trucks and cars of the workers have on them are not good for parking in the quad or on grass. At least that is how it was explained to me by the University Parking and Traffic Office. If you see a construction vehicle which is where you think it shouldn't be, call the police or campus security and ask to have it ticketed. Chances are that most of the time it will be done. We all expect they have total immunity because of the offhand manner with which they treat Lawyers Club property. That isn't necessarily so, and if they can't treat the Club and the students with some consideration then why extend it to them? Some will say that such an attitude is not beneficial to the construction deadlines. I say that when the company contracted to do the job there was an implicit understanding that their behavior while doing it would be reasonable.
They Can’t Say We’re Hoarding It

A large number of appropriations marked the last Senate meeting. $300 went to the Environmental Law Society to send additional members to a pollution law conference in Washington, $125 went to the Sports Committee to increase court time for the basketball tournament, and a $75 proposal for funds to help produce an animated film poking fun at the Law School was also approved.

Debate on the film proposal was described as "long and eloquent", finally leading to amendments providing that the Senate receive a copy of the film for future use, and that it be ineligible for prizes in the upcoming talent show.

An easier request came from La Raza which asked that the Senate recommend that the Dean fund a regional conference not anticipated in their budget.

And Next Week Is More Of The Same

Budget items raised at the last meeting which will be voted on at the next one include $500 to the Social Committee for St. Patrick’s Day festivities and $100 to tune the Lawyers’ Club Piano. In general, if you've got comments on any budget proposal, drop a note at the Senate Office.

Coke Cans, Law School and Public Policy

A complaint about the continued sale in Senate-operated machines of non-deposit cans of soft drinks was voiced at the last meeting. The non-complying cans won’t be sold in the future, and arrangements with the Social Committee will be worked out to allow distribution of remaining stock at social events.

Rate The Professors

The Senate still needs volunteers to work on the faculty/course evaluation project. Anyone interested in working on it please leave a note in the Senate office or talk with Al Knauf.

Center for Law and Social Policy Externship Interviews

The Center for Law and Social Policy, Washington, D.C., is a public interest law firm representing organizational and individual clients who might otherwise go unrepresented before courts, agencies and legislative committees. The Center is also dedicated to the clinical education of law students and each term it selects about 20 students from all over the country to participate in its externship program.

Michigan law students are eligible to participate during either their fourth or fifth terms. They pay tuition to Michigan for their term in residence in Washington and, instead of being paid for their work at the Center, receive 12 units of mandatory Pass/Fail credit.

The Center is organized into legal subject matter projects (employment, health, international, media access, mental health, mine health and safety, women's rights) and each student is assigned to a particular project.

There is an effort to match student preferences for a particular subject area with the choices of the project attorneys, but there is no guarantee that students will be assigned their first choices.

Student selection at Michigan begins with an on-campus interview. Randy Bellows, director of the student program, and an attorney with the Media Access Project will be here Wednesday, Feb. 28 to interview 2d-year students interested in spending the Fall '79 term in Washington. There will also be an informational meeting at noon on Feb. 28 in Room 132 Hutchins.

For more information, contact the Placement Office or Sheila Haughey, a former Center externship student, at 662-5877.

Miscellaneous

Those persons who applied to work on next year's law school student directory should come to the next LSSS meeting on Wednesday night, Feb. 21, 6:30.

The Senate will vote on the proposed constitutional amendment to §9.8 which would allow the senators-elect to take office within 15 days of their election in the spring.
Here are my weekly rankings for Graduate Basketball (includes law tourney):
1. Dental Derelicts (5-1)
2. Epidemics (7-2)
3. Law Black'n'Blue (Law Trash) (7-2)
4. MBA Green (4-1)
5. DSD "A" (4-1)
6. Law Stin Space (Law Booters) (4-2)
7. Abar Cadaver (4-2)
8. Law Gold (5-1)
9. MBA Blue (3-1)
10. BLSA (5-2)

The Second Annual Canyon Memorial Open Law School Basketball Tournament got underway on Saturday. Commissioner Jack Butler has done a great job organizing the event, which drew a record 25 teams. Generally, the games went pretty smoothly. Please remember that many of the referees have never officiated before. Therefore, their quality may often be less than you get in intramurals.


Yo Adrian (a.k.a. Law Crimson) upset the Pistols, 50-48. Randy Kaplan scored 18 for the victors, while Joe Tilson gunned for 14 for the Pistols. Pistols look like the favorite in the losers' bracket, but face challenges from Law Detergent and the Canyon. Later Pistols shut down the 1122 PW's, 88-45. "Pistol" Pete Kupelian scored 32. Yo Adrian went on to whip Law Silver, 62-45. Stefan Stein sank 17 points for Yo. Silver had beaten 1122 PW's 67-25 in the first round, led by Paul Ruffin's 17 and "Mean" Dean Rocheleau and Art Kepes, both with 13.

Law Stin Space edged Detergent, 66-61. George Higgins scored 18. Space went on to nip BLSA, 61-59, on a bucket by Higgins with about ten seconds left.

(Continued on Page 14)
AL'S SPORTS CORNER

(Continued from Page 13)

Higgins scored 18 again while Kevin
Russell tallied 10 and Steve Weiss hit
13. James Brewer scored 20 for BLSA,
while Bruce Sanders hit 12.

In the Women's division, Law Gunners
beat Law Female, 16-9. Missy "Can't
Miss" Pollick netted 12 points for
the Gunners. The tournament concludes
next Saturday afternoon at the Coliseum.

AL'S PREDICTIONS

Winners' Bracket Third Round
Law Trash by 7 over Law Green
Law Stin Space by 10 over Yo Adrian
Winners' Bracket Fourth Round
Law Trash by 1 over Law Gold
Winners' Bracket Final
Law Trash by 1 over Law Stin Space
Losers' Bracket Final
Pistols by 8 over Canyon
Tournament Final
Law Trash by 12 over Pistols

In corec intramural basketball, the
Nursing School defeated Law Strawberry,
62-40. Sue "Farah" Funk scored 28
for Strawberry.

All three Law mini-soccer teams won
this week. Law Purple (1-3) whipped
MBA Gold, 6-1. Russ Finnestein scored
four goals, while Brooke Schumm and
Scott Smith scored one each. Law Ex-
press beat outdoor soccer champion
Rowdies, 2-1. Edwin Meysmans scored
both goals for the foreign lawyers.
Law Passers beat 0's Bahionos in a
shoot-out. The 0's tied the score
at 6 all with less than a minute to
play. In the overtime period, Passers
went ahead on Phil Schradles' goal.
But, the Bahionos knotted the score
with seconds left to play. In the
shoot-out, each team had five players
kick penalty kicks to decide the game.
Phil Schradle, goalie Steve Moser,
and defenseman John Cashen all scored,
while only 2 of the 0's kicked past
Moser. John Schubitowski, who scored
a hat trick in the game, did not have
to kick in the shoot-out, since Passers
had their last ups. Other Passer goals
in the game were scored by Charlie
Glerum (two) and "Pistol" Pete Kupel-
ian. Next week, the Passers face the
Heidelberg Lions. Although Passers
beat them twice last year, Heidelberg
is by far the class of the league.

The IM Department changed its eligi-
bility rules this year, and now allows
teams to play non-students with user's
passes in independent and all-campus

IM Scoreboard

GRADUATE BASKETBALL PLAYOFFS
"A" QUARTERFINALS
Epidemics 48, BLSA 33
Law Black'n'Blue 42, MBA Blue 38
"A" SEMIFINALS
Law Black'n'Blue 46, DSD "A" 42
"B" QUARTERFINALS
Law Red 37, Law Silver 26
Law Yellow 34, Legalese 33
"B" SEMIFINALS
Law Yellow 44, Jets 29
"A" RECREATIONAL SEMIFINALS
Law Phids 56, Law Raza 45
DSD "B" 68, Law Gray 20
"A" RECREATIONAL FINALS
DSD "B" 56, Law Phids 44
"B" RECREATION SEMIFINALS
Corpus Delecti 18, Law Bronze 14
"B" RECREATION FINALS
Corpus Delecti 32, Law Purple 9
WOMEN'S BASKETBALL PLAYOFFS
"B" QUARTERFINALS
Alpha Gamma Delta 25, Law Gunners 21
Law Female W, Mojo Mashers F
INDEPENDENT "A" BASKETBALL PLAYOFFS
The Canyon 63, Supremes 31
COREC "A" BASKETBALL PLAYOFFS
Long Shots 61, Law Maroon 30
COREC "B" BASKETBALL PLAYOFFS
Nursing School 62, Law Strawberry 40
Michigan Bar Association 33, Nursing
School 32

ALL-CAMPUS ICE HOCKEY "A" SEMIFINALS
Leopodville Leaping Lumberjacks 11,
Law Gold 1
ALL-CAMPUS MINI-SOCER PLAYOFFS
"A" PREQUARTERFINALS
Law Express 2, Rowdies 1
Law Passers 10, 0's Bahionos 9 (shoot-
out)
"B" PREQUARTERFINALS
Law Purple 6, MBA Gold 1
SECOND ANNUAL CANYON MEMORIAL LAW SCHOOL
OPEN BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT
Law Bronze 31, Hutchins' Heroes 19
Law Green 52, Law Devo 36
Law Phids 74, Law Purple 27
Law Trash 70, Canyon 40
Legalese W, Law Yellow F
Law Gold 67, Law Orange 63
Yo Adrian 50, Pistols 48
Law Silver 67, 1122 PW's 25
BLSA 42, West Philadelphia Speedboys 36
Law Stin Space 66, Law Detergent 61

(Continued on Page 15)
BARRISTERS
SMUT FILM IS:
FIASCO!

The Barrister's Saturday night showing of the porn film "Bel Ami", intended to raise money for the Law School drinking society, didn't. Instead, the Hutchins Hall smut fest turned into a fiasco, with a criminal complaint being sworn against the Lord High Chancellor John Lonsberg by the projectionist, Joel Russman.

The dispute between Lonsberg and Russman was apparently precipitated by a quarrel over the salary to be paid Russman for working the three showings. Between the second and third showings a fracas occurred in which Russman was allegedly assaulted. Several of Ann Arbor's finest arrived at 10:09 p.m. to put an end to the disturbance.

The Barrister's spring initiation is scheduled to take place in law library this Wednesday night.

Cheers!

(Ed.--This story was prepared from information contained in the Ann Arbor Police Department report. None of the principals have been contacted by the R.G.)

NEW CONSTRUCT NEWS

While the winter weather prevents the construction outside from progressing, the work continues inside the library, as the noise of the jackhammers proves.

Three major projects are in progress at this point. The subcontractor continues to remove the dirt from the Quadrangle; the demolition of areas on levels One and Three of the library where use of the space will be changed; and connection of pipes which will run from the steam tunnel that enters the north side of Legal Research, through the basement, and to the air-conditioning cooling tower, which will be on top of the existing building.

The general contractor, J.A. Fredman, claims to be making every effort to limit the noise of the construction. But what can you do to muffle a jackhammer? They have to break down walls, remove concrete, and install large pipes. The noisiest work is scheduled to be done over Spring Break, during the hours of 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., so the Library will be very (even more than now) noisy while we are all trying to achieve the perfect tan.

This work inside the building is necessary so that the heat, water and air conditioning will be ready when the new building is completed. A lot of what is going on now is preparation for the work that will be done in the Reading Room this summer.

Once the weather gets warm enough to pour concrete, you construction fans will have lots to look at.

Highest priority is put on completing the north end, adjacent to the dorm, which will be the machine room for the new addition.

Several persons have asked how the dirt can be moved out of the Quad when the frost load-limit ordinance was the reason the dirt was put in the Quad in the first instance. The ordinance does not go into effect until the weather warms up enough to thaw the frost under the roads. The uneven melting causes some parts of the streets to be softer than others and until the frost is entirely gone the heavy loads must be kept off the streets, or potholes will result.
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20

WLSA LUNCH--Bring a brown bag or buy a Lawyers' Club special and meet other women. Noon/Faculty D.R.

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW SOCIETY--will show the movie "Role of the Interest Group Leader" plus the Disney cartoon short "Litterbug" 4pm/132HH

SOCIAL COMMITTEE--Plan Night in the Tropics party, 7pm V-Bell.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21

P.A.D.--Bailiff jobs meeting, Noon/236 HH. The Washtenaw County Court Administrator and Judge Ager’s bailiff will be present to explain the details of the bailiff program.

CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY--Deadline for turning in interview cards. Noon/Placement Office. All present 2d years are eligible for Fall '79 externships in Wash., D.C.

WLSA NEWSLETTER--meeting. 1:30/WLSA office (Lawyers' Club) The staff will be reorganized and the possibility of changing the format will be discussed. Interested persons please attend.

CHRISTIAN LAW STUDENTS--Bible study, 3:35/Cook Room. Romans 12.

LAW REVUE TALENT SHOW--meeting for all participating acts (at least one representative from each) 4:00/Lawyers' Club Lounge.

L.S.S.S.--regular meeting. 6:30/LSSS Office.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD--Frank Wilkenson will speak on the Criminal Code Reform Act. 1:00/Law Club Lounge.

A NIGHT IN THE TROPICS--LSSS Social Committee party, 9 pm Law Club Lounge. $2 tickets on sale all week in front of room 100 HH 11-3:30, but not at the party. Free beer, tropical drinks, music, dancing, drawing for trip for two for week in Bahamas.

NOTICE

PETITIONS FOR THE L.S.S.S. ELECTION are now available at the L.S.S.S. Office (217 Hutchins Hall). All petitions are due by Wednesday, February 28, 1979.

FOR SALE--Plane ticket to Philadelphia one way, $50 on United Airlines. March 1, call Dave 764-8979.

WANTED--Unfortunate soul studying in Ann Arbor area for the July Mass. Bar exam to share cost of taped lectures. 971-1789 early a.m. or late p.m.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26

LAW SPOUSES--C.P.R. demonstration by the American Red Cross. 7:30 pm/Lawyers' Club Lounge.

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF LAW

HEMPSTEAD, NEW YORK 11550

SUMMER SESSION I

MAY 29-JULY 9

COURSES CREDITS
Conflict of Laws 3
Criminal Procedure I 3
Debtor Creditor 3
Evidence 4
Family Law 3
Individual Income Tax 4
International Law 2
Land Use Planning 3
Secured Transactions 3

SUMMER SESSION II

JULY 11-AUGUST 24

Business Organizations 4
Commercial Paper 3
Communications Law 3
Health Law 3
Labor Law 3
Products Liability 3
Wills, Trusts & Estates 4

For further information write or call
(516) 560-3636