TO: R.G.

A matter concerning a student who attended the Law School was resolved by the faculty last semester. The faculty believes that the student’s behavior and its action should be reported to all law students.

Attention was first focused upon the student due to an instance of plagiarism. A rather routine review made of his file during the plagiarism investigation raised questions regarding the authenticity of the credentials he had originally submitted to the Law School as a transfer student. It was discovered (and the student subsequently admitted) that his undergraduate transcript, his transcript of his first-year law grades, a letter of class rank and a letter of recommendation had been falsified.

Following a hearing, the Administrative Committee found that the student’s actual academic record would not have been sufficient for admission and that there are no circumstances under which this law school would award credit for his actual first-year work. The credit for the first year work which had mistakenly been granted upon the submission of falsified documents was withdrawn and the University of Michigan Board of Regents rescinded the J.D. degree previously awarded.

It should be clear that the basis for the rescission of the degree in this case is that no University of Michigan Law School credit has been awarded for any first-year work. In addition, there is now strong evidence that other coursework had been plagiarized. This could mean that (since credit is generally not earned for plagiarized work) the student also failed to earn sufficient upperclass credit for graduation. It has also been shown that the student has falsified his final University of Michigan Law School transcript for submission to various law firms for employment purposes.

While no disciplinary action as such has been taken by the Law School in this case, it is certainly possible that an enrolled student could be disciplined for similar action under the Law School’s Rules of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures.

A summary of the action taken by the Law School follows:
1) The J.D. degree was rescinded following the withdrawal of credit granted upon submission of a falsified first year law school transcript.
2) Various boards of bar examiners and the Law School Admissions Council were notified of the evidence the school possesses.
3) No notification has been given to appropriate federal and state prosecutors. Although it is likely that some of the student’s action was criminal, the Law School feels that sufficient action has been taken to protect the public and that an active role in the criminal area is not necessary.
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Letter From the Editor

TO: All Faculty, Student Organizations, and Staff.

The Law School Student Newspaper has recently undergone a major revision of editorial staff. We have also replaced and enlarged our reporting and writing staff.

It is the intent and declared policy of the present editorial staff to improve the quality of the student paper so that it may reflect the high standing of our law school.

Consequently, we are asking for your cooperation and suggestions in improving both the form and the content of the Res Gestae. We ask that any announcements, messages, items of interest to the law school community, big news, little news, activities here or elsewhere, opportunities, etc. be communicated to us so that the rest of the law school community may also be informed.

We intend to make a sincere effort to provide a forum for opinions and comment on issues of current interest and will be attempting to interview faculty members as a regular practice. If you are working on something which you wish to share with the entire law school or if you would like to comment on any topical issue, please let us know and one of our staff will get in touch with you.

Our deadlines force us to a 9-day lead period for those articles which are typeset and a 2-day lead period for those items which are placed in the Docket supplement.

Richard C. Stavoe, Jr., Editor

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT SPRING CONFERENCE

The 1978 Sixth Circuit Spring Conference will be held on April 7-9, 1978, in Toledo, Ohio. All law students from Michigan, Kentucky, and Ohio are welcome to attend.

The Conference will include: the Regional National Appellate Advocacy Competition, Symposium on Urban Legal Problems, Circuit business meeting and elections, Sixth Circuit Banquet, ABA Liaison Interviews, SBA, WLA, and BALSA workshops.

The registration fee is $25.00, payable by March 1, 1978. This will cover the cost of five meals and two receptions. Hotel and conference registration should be made through Samuel Nugent, Conference Coordinator, 2662 Cheltenham Road, Toledo, OH 43606.

NOTICE

After Spring Break the R.G. will change publication days from Thursdays to Tuesdays. This is being done in order to avoid missing distribution to the many students who have few or no classes after Thursday noon. Hopefully, a Tuesday distribution will be more timely for most students.

Also, the Docket will be released on Wednesdays instead of Thursdays. Consequently, the deadlines for publication will be changed to:

Articles to appear in the R.G. and advertisements...Monday, 5 p.m. 8 days prior to publication.

Notices for Docket...Tuesday, 12 noon, 1 day prior to publication.

All articles should be typed, 1½ or double-spaced, and should be signed upon submission. The writer's address and phone number should also be included.

All notices to appear in the Docket must be typed, single-spaced, on a 3½" column, ready for printing, as is.
Report: National Women’s Conference, Houston, Texas

By Jocelynne Scott

In 1848 the first National Women’s Convention was convened at Seneca Falls, New York, under the guidance of Susan B. Anthony, Cady Stanton et al. More than 100 years later at Houston, from 18th-21st November 1977, the second National Women’s Convention was staged. And for the first time in memory, a convention was staged. And for the first time in memory, a convention was staged. And for the first time in memory, a convention was staged. And for the first time in memory, a convention was staged.

Delegates from all over the United States gathered to vote upon a “national plan of action” drawn up by the International Women’s Year Committee, debated upon and added to by State meetings; the recommendations as passed to be sent to the President so that he, together with the Congress, might implement reforms designed to bring women into the mainstream. The signficance of the event was not lost upon the University of Michigan Law School. A representative was present to observe and to report back in order that this Law School would receive an account of the proceedings, unbiased by the pressures of the popular press. Now, no longer need you “turn to the poets, or wait until science can give you deeper and more coherent information” about what women want. No longer may it be said that “women don’t know what they want. Houston testifies to that. Here, an account of how women went about deciding what they want.

“The ramparts are filled and I want the world to know it...” Betty Ford, Houston, Texas, November 18

Without personal experience in American politics, it is impossible to assert categorically that spending 34 hours over four days, sitting spell-bound, in a political convention is an unusual occurrence here in the U.S. Yet, it is unusual to have spent this time among approximately 2,000 delegates and 15,000 observers bearing the title “woman”. And this was the case at Houston, where for the first time in more than two hundred years of “democracy”, women “gathered in a National Women’s Conference, charged under Federal law to assess the status of women in the United States... to measure the progress (women) have made, to identify the barriers that prevent (women) from participating fully and equally in all aspects of national life, and to make recommendations to the President and to the Congress for means by which such barriers can be removed.”

“We are women from every State and Territory in the Nation. ...We are women of many economic, social, political, racial, ethnic, cultural, educational and religious backgrounds...” Declaration of American Women.

The composition of most delegations at the Convention showed clearly the efforts made at the calling of State conferences leading up to the Houston meeting, to ensure that all views and sectors of American society could and would be represented. The youngest delegate was 16 yrs., the oldest 85 yrs.; American Chinese and American Indian delegates thronged with Hispanic delegates; women from Hawaii, wearing blue mu-mus and leis sat near black Americans, and white Americans were among them, too; housewives gathered together with working women; homemakers who at the same time are workers sat with welfare mothers; there were even six male persons, as delegates of the State of Mississippi, sitting among the mothers, widows, single women, Pacific Islanders.

Nonetheless, at a Pro-Family Coalition convention held in Houston at the same time, the view was that the majority of delegates to the National Women’s Conference were “sick”, “anti-God”, “pro-lesbian”; the arrival of the delegates was “a freak show”; the Convention supported goals based on “ungodly, immoral, anti-family and unpatriotic beliefs.” Similar ideas were expressed at the entrance to the Convention hall where crowds were greeted by the placard “I.W.Y. ...Immoral Women’s Year” held by the Rev. Billy Joe Klegg, independent candidate for governor in the State of Oklahoma, who was accompanied by a very few additional demonstrators holding signs mostly invoking God and the bible: “Righteousness Exhalteth Mississippi”; “Up With God; Down with Gays”; “Who Needs, Jews, Dikes, Abortion (sic), Communism”; “Abortion is Murder”; “Womens Libbers ...ERA ...Lesbians ...Repent ...Read the Bible While You’re Able”; “ERA is NOT the way”. Rousing cheers for the ERA met the appearance of those holding the placards: “What do we want?” “ERA.” “When do we want it?” “NOW!”

From the first day of the Conference both “sides” - the pro-ERA and anti-ERA forces appeared to be well organized. Ten States banded together to form a “Pro-plan caucus”, advocating adoption of twenty-six resolutions. The anti-ERA forces gathered under the leadership of the head of the Indiana delegation, planning to amend most of the resolutions, and to alter the rules on vote counting from a standing vote to vote by roll-call; they were also adament that they had been unfairly accused of adopting delay-tactics in State conventions, and that during this Conference their aim would be to put resolutions, in an amended form, and to remain throughout, whether or not they should be outvoted on the floor.

Bowing gallantly to the history of the occasion, Bella Abzug chaired the meeting with assistance from the gavel used by Susan B. Anthony at Seneca Falls in 1848.

Cont. on Page 6
The Michigan Law Review and the Journal of Law Reform are jointly sponsoring a Freshman Writing Competition for admission to the editorial staffs of the publications for the 1978-79 academic year.

Eligibility
All the first-year students and 1977 “summer starters” currently enrolled at the University of Michigan Law School are eligible for the Competition. Students who have completed only one year of law studies and who have been away from the Law School during the 1977-78 academic year, either on leave of absence or on a joint study program in the graduate school, and who have not previously entered the Writing Competition, are also eligible.

Dates of Competition
The Writing Competition will begin on Monday, February 13, 1978, and end at 5:00 PM on Monday, June 12, 1978. Entrants may choose any three-week period between those dates in which to do their research and writing.

Composition of the Editorial Staff—What Are the Odds for the Writing Competition
The Law Review will invite approximately 32 members of the class of 1980 to join the staff in August 1978. At least 16 of these will be chosen on the basis of first-year grades, and at least 6 on the basis of the Writing Competition. Last year, 96 first-year students initially entered the Competition, and 47 submitted papers. Seven of these students joined the Review in August 1977; 25 others joined on the basis of their first-year grades.

The Journal will extend invitations to members of the class of 1980 on the basis of either a Writing Competition paper or some other legal writing sample such as a Case Club memo or brief. The Journal will accept only one entry from each student; and students will have until 5:00 PM on June 12 to decide which writing sample to submit. Of the 48 juniors who joined the Journal staff in August 1977, 15 were invited to join on the basis of their Writing Competition papers.

Each publication will judge the Writing Competition entries and issue invitations independently. Writers who are invited to join both publications will be asked to choose between the two.

Procedure
Approximately twenty topics have been chosen. The topics are designed to be sufficiently limited in scope to make the time and length constraints reasonable. For each entrant, a random selection of five of these topics will be made. The entrant will be allowed 24 hours in which to select one of the five topics for his or her paper.

Papers will be due three weeks from the date of topic selection, or at 5:00 PM on June 12, whichever is earlier. (Note that a topic must be selected no later than May 22 in order to allow three full weeks for research and writing.)

Topics will be available from Terry Carlson in Room 410 Hutchins Hall between 10:00 AM and 11:00 AM, Monday through Friday, and at other times by special arrangement.

Students who will not be in Ann Arbor on the date they would like their three-week period to begin should leave a stamped, self-addressed envelope with Terry Carlson so topics can be mailed. Mailed-in entries must be postmarked on their due dates—again, no later than 5:00 PM on June 12. Registered or return-receipt mail is suggested—neither the Review nor the Journal will accept responsibility for papers lost in the mail.

Format of Entries
Papers should be styled in the form of a law review Note or Comment, not in the form of a memo or brief. Any recent issue of the Law Review or the Journal should provide an adequate example of the desired form.

Please observe these rules in preparing your papers:
1. 18 page maximum on text. This is suggested—no more should be necessary to deal with the topics.
2. 8½” x 11” paper
3. Double-space typed
4. Margins: Left: 1½”, Right, top, & bottom: 1”
5. Attach footnotes separately. Please do not type them on the text pages. Footnote pages do not count toward the eighteen page maximum.
6. Submit two copies of the paper to the Review in Room 410. One copy will be forwarded to the Journal.

Questions
If there are any further questions, please contact Terry Carlson (764-0542) or Jeff Ammon (763-2195).

Representatives of the Review and the Journal will attend Case Club meetings in the near future to discuss the publications and Joint Writing Competition.
National Survey Shows Reasons Why People Consult Lawyers and How They Feel About the Legal System

The results of a national survey of legal needs of the public, jointly undertaken by a special committee of the American Bar Association and by the American Bar Foundation, have just been released. The project was to get information about the legal problems encountered by ordinary citizens and to find out how they dealt with these problems, what experiences they had with lawyers, and how they felt about lawyers and the legal system.

Arising out of a period of great debate both within and without the legal profession over such issues as advertising, accountability, lawyers' fees, delivery of legal services, and problem-solving capabilities of different sectors of the population, the results of The Legal Needs of the Public have been eagerly awaited by many interested groups.

For all of the possible legal problems considered, the survey reveals that the chances of a lawyer being consulted were one out of three for a third of the problems, one to two out of six for another third of the problems, and only one out of six for the rest. Overall, lawyers are consulted for slightly less than one third of all the problems that could reasonably be considered legal problems.

Under the supervision of Ms. Curran, the National Opinion Research Center administered to more than 2,000 adults a questionnaire designed by the American Bar Foundation project staff in consultation with the ABA Special Committee to Survey Legal Needs. Queried first on problem-solving behavior in general, without identification of a legal emphasis, survey respondents were then questioned about legal problems they encountered and ways they dealt with these matters, including whether they turned to a lawyer for help. With the emphasis on personal, family, nonbusiness problems, the actual law-related situations included jobs and wages, marital matters, consumer problems, ownership or rental of real estate, crime, liability for damage or injury credit transactions, violation of civil or constitutional rights, problems involving children, wills and estate planning, settling estates, and relations with governmental agencies.

The Legal Needs study, which is designed to provide a solid factual basis for policy decisions, goes beyond mere quantification. Analyzing a wealth of data presented in over 200 tables and figures, Ms. Curran considers the effects of such background characteristics as age, sex, race or ethnic group, education, and income. She also explains the complex interrelationships among types of problems encountered, extent of lawyer use, demographic characteristics, problem-solving styles, and perceptions of lawyers and the legal system.

For instance, the general profile of the person most likely to have had a satisfactory experience in consulting a lawyer is a white male over 30 years of age whose income and education is above average for his age group. But both the frequency of lawyer use and the high degree of satisfaction among this group can be explained by the type of problem encountered—namely, real estate matters, estate planning, and estate settlement—problems easily handled by one lawyer and likely to bring satisfaction to the client.

By the same token, blacks and Spanish-speaking Americans are more likely to have negative feelings about the lawyer-client exchange not because of ethnic-based attitudes or problem-solving capability but because of the greater likelihood that they have consulted a lawyer on personal injury, property damage, problems with governmental agencies, consumer difficulties, or criminal charges—all problems carrying with them a greater risk of failure of resolution, disruption of the lawyer-client relationship, and unpredictability of costs and results.

Cont. on Page 6
Women's Conference

Cont. from Page 3

With equal aplomb she and the three first ladies present - Rosalyn Carter (why wasn't Jimmy there?), Betty Ford and Lady Bird Johnson - received and held the torch which had been carried by relay runners 2,610 miles from Seneca Falls, N.Y. All this to rousing cheers and chants of "ERA NOW!!"

The first ten resolutions on Arts and Humanities, Battered Women, programs to bring about full integration of women entrepreneurs into business related government activities, Child Abuse, Child Care, Equal Credit, eliminate discrimination in employment, education and healthcare on the basis of disability, prohibiting discrimination at all levels of education, effort to increase the number of women in office, including judgeships and policy making positions, Employment, were passed with little debate.

"It is a sex-neuter world the ERA proponents are trying to build. They want all people to be equal. But if you do this, it takes the wife out of the home and away from her family. The ERA proponents want to restructure us into a gender-free society in which you are not free to make any distinction between men and women." Phyllis Schlafly, Houston, Texas.

Although the first resolutions had not been treated as unimportant, clearly the body had been waiting breathlessly for this, the big one: "The Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified." In support of the resolution the first speaker began: "I rise on behalf of the contemporary men in 35 States who had the guts to ratify the ERA... I rise on behalf of the men who are at home tonight keeping our children so we can be here..."

SURVEY from Page 5

In fact, for those blacks and Spanish-speaking Americans that do make real estate transactions, the extent of lawyer use and satisfaction with the performance of the lawyer and the legal system are comparable to those of the typical upper-middle-income white male.

A noteworthy finding for the public as a whole was that basic perceptions about lawyers apparently remained the same through the Watergate experience. Asked to reflect on whether their response to a question on lawyers' ethics would have been different before October 1972 (the beginning of the Watergate revelations), 92% of the respondents said no. Moreover, opinions about lawyers that had changed were usually attributed to a positive or negative personal experience with a lawyer, not to events in the news and attendant publicity.

The Survey of Legal Needs is available from the American Bar Foundation, 1155 E. 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637, for $25.00.

JANE MIXER MEMORIAL AWARD NOMINATIONS

"Students in the Law School, friends, staff, faculty, and her family contributed to a fund to establish an annual award in memory of Jane L. Mixer who met an untimely death while in her first year in the Law School. The award will go to the law student who has made the greatest contribution to activities designed to advance the cause of social justice in the preceding year."

Provisions for this award further provide that "nominations for the award will be made by students in the Law School with the recipient to be chosen from among those nominated by the Scholarship and Awards Committee.

Students are encouraged to make nominations. Please submit them to Crispin Birnbbaum in Room 300, Hutchins Hall. The closing date for nominations will be 12:00 noon, March 8, 1978.

The committee would appreciate a brief statement of the activities of the various nominees thought to qualify them for the award. The recipient will be announced at the Honors Convocation in April.

--GARGOYLE FILMS PRESENTS--

TRAILER HEAVEN

FEATURE LENGTH

A feature-length collection of previews of some of the finest movies made in the past three decades. These "coming attractions" were originally designed as teasers to pique the appetites of jaded moviegoers. Today, thanks largely to the influence of California movie buffs, trailers are recognized as art forms, albeit somewhat campy, in themselves. Roughly 40 trailers will be presented, ranging in scope and taste from the famous Psycho teaser to the arresting preview for Truck Stop Women. A unique treat for movie-goers.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24

7:00, 9:00

ROOM 100 HUTCHINS HALL

LAW STUDENTS: 25c GUESTS: 75c
OTHERS: $1.00

Ms. Scott's report will be continued in the next issue of the R.G.
Day Old Bread

Ann Arbor—Elaine Mittleman, a 1977 summer starter, shocked the rejection letter world today by copping top honors in a contest that critics complained favored upper-class students. It wasn't the case for the freshwoman from Birmingham, Michigan, who edged out Lloyd Snook to win the First-and-Last Annual Rejection Letter Contest. Snook, a junior from Charlottesville, Virginia, though that he had a winning entry with his infamous "grating remarks" letter from Hunton & Williams of Richmond, Virginia:

Dear Lloyd,

At the last meeting of our Recruiting Committee, it was determined that we will not be able to invite you to return as a summer clerk next year.

A fair summary of your summer's work from the firm's perspective, I think, is that your performance on certain projects was clearly outstanding, but that your work in other areas was unacceptable. Perhaps the latter areas were those in which you had less interest. You also had a penchant for making grating remarks, both in the office and during social events. On balance, we concluded that the strength of certain aspects of your effort here was outweighed by the weaknesses shown in other areas. The decision was difficult, and we remain confident that you will be a top-flight lawyer.

We very much appreciate your interest in Hunton & Williams and send best wishes for a happy school year.

Sincerely yours,

[Name omitted]

However, Ms. Mittleman chose a somewhat different path to victory. She sent a letter and a resume to an uncle at Indiana University School of Law who said he would try to help her find a summer job. Apparently, he did more than this, or so this letter would seem to indicate:

Dear Ms. Mittleman:

Thank you for your letter and accompanying resume regarding the possibility of a teaching position at this school, and please excuse the delay in responding to your inquiry. The delay was in part to the necessity of assessing our priorities in the light of such considerations as available funding and course needs for the next year.

At the present time it appears that there will be only one teaching position to be filled during the 1977-78 academic year. I regret to inform you that while your credentials are very impressive they are not, in the view of the Faculty Recruitment Committee, best suited to the special needs of the school at this time.

We appreciate your interest in this school, and we hope that you will find a teaching opportunity where you can make the maximum use of your experience and expertise.

Sincerely yours,

[Name omitted]

Faculty Recruitment Committee
Indiana University School of Law

Cont. on Page 8
WAR RESUMES

Otis Bowen, governor of Indiana, declared war on Michigan last week. He said that Michigan's refusal to give Indiana more of the old Ohio territory was only part of it. The straw that broke the camel's back was Milliken's announcement last week that he would not supply coal from Michigan reserves for the industry in Indiana.

With Michigan troops already at the Indiana border, the state was well protected. Milliken has ordered them to take Indianapolis.

When asked if this expansionism by Michigan will continue, Milliken said, "Look, this may help to get me reelected. What with PBB and Seafarer, I need something big to win back my credibility. Anyway this is really fun. All this power is great. I plan on being the governor of the biggest, most populous state, and I'm not leaving Lansing to do it."

Reuben Askew, governor of Florida, has announced that he will put Florida's troops on reserve if Indiana is defeated. He cited the domino theory - that after Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee and Georgia are all that remain between Florida and Michigan.

In fact, Kentucky may be next. General Bo has long stated that he wants Columbus and that city is now part of Kentucky, which will not give it up in new treaty negotiations.

Superior is the location for internal strife this week. Displeased with Governor Joe Mack's appointments, multi-millionaire ex-Michigan congressman Phillip Ruppe has commissioned his own private army to overthrow the Mack regime. Ruppe has stated that if he is successful, he will attack Wisconsin and Minnesota to gain all the territory on the southern shore of lake Superior. He is of the opinion that this is all naturally part of the Superior territory, and intends to have it all under the same flag.

More Bread

Cont. from Page 7

Upon hearing of her victory, Ms. Mittleman was ecstatic: "I'm thrilled. I never thought I'd win. I mean, I had heard the rumors about the famous Lloyd Snook letter, and I didn't know whether mine could beat it. But I thought, win or lose, mine would certainly be a contender, so I sent it in. I guess the only regret I have is that I didn't get the job. It would have been an exciting challenge to try to teach after after only two-and-a-half terms of law school."

Lloyd Snook was surprised at the result, but hopes to improve next year. "I didn't get the job. But I'm happy with second-place, not that I won't be gunning for the top again next year. It should be a helluva summer."

Elaine and Lloyd have decided to contribute their contest winnings to the Ann Arbor Diaper Service in honor of Dean Susan Eklund.

RES INDIGESTAE

Thursday, Feb. 23
Lunch: Hamburger, Creamed Chip Beef on Toast
Dinner: Grilled Steak, Hot Seafood Tempter

Friday, Feb. 24
Lunch: Tamale Pie, Hot Ham & Cheese Easies
Dinner: Sweet & Sour Chicken, Fried Fish, Breaded Veal Cutlet

Saturday, Feb. 25
Lunch: French Toast w/ Sausage Pattie, Shepards Pie
Dinner: Seafood Platter, Lasagna

Sunday, Feb. 26
Lunch: Onions, Potatoes, & Scrambled Eggs

Monday, Feb. 27
Lunch: Italian Meatball Sandwich, Cinnamon Apple Fritters w/ Bacon
Dinner: Curried Lamb, Minute Steak

Tuesday, Feb. 28
Lunch: Beef Stroganoff Sandwich, Fish Sandwich
Dinner: French Fried Chicken, Liver & Onions

Wednesday, March 1
Lunch: Reuben Jr. Sandwich, Cheese Rarebit
Dinner: Braised Beef, Veal Parmesan

Thursday, March 2
Lunch: Hot Dogs, Turkey Tetrazzini
Dinner: Grilled Steak, Fried Shrimp

Friday, March 3
Lunch: French Dip Sandwich, Fruit Plate w/ cottage cheese
Dinner: Grilled Chop-Round