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**Friday**

**MOVIE**

**THE CANDIDATE**
With Robert Redford

Friday, September 24, 1976
7 & 9 p.m. Room 100 Hutchins Hall
FREE to Law Students and Spouses
ALL OTHERS $1.00

FREE!!!

**BARRISTERS MEETING**

Friday, September 24
4:00 PM - U Club
(Bring list of draft choices)

---

**Saturday**

**PARTY**

Saturday, September 25
8:30 PM - 1:00 AM or so
Law Club Rec Room
BEER & MUSIC
Private Party!!
All Law Students and their guests invited

**RESUME WORKSHOP**
Saturday, September 25
9 AM-11 AM
Room 236
Bring your resume
B.L.S.A. sponsored

---

**Monday**

UNDERGRADUATE LAW TEACHING, WINTER '76

Anyone interested in teaching undergraduate courses in the LS&A "Course Mart" during winter term should attend an organizational meeting to be held on Monday, September 27, at 3:30 PM in Room 138 Hutchins Hall.

Don Cohen
Assistant Dean

---

**Wednesday**

**SOCIAL COMMITTEE**

The Social Committee is having an organizational meeting on Wednesday, Sept. 29, 4:30 p.m. in Room 116, Hutchins Hall. All interested are more than welcome, as we need your help both in planning and executing events. Remember, $7000 is a lot of alcohol!

**DON'T LET THE R.G. BUG YOU**

Spider..............Ned Othman
Wasp..................Ken Frantz
Butterfly.............Carol Sulkes
Dragonfly...........Don Parman
Ant...................Ed Marod
Preying Mantis........MMM
Centipede...........Crusader Rabbit
Honeybee............Sandy Gross
Hornet..............Bob Brandenburg
Grasshopper.........Earl Cantwell
Ladybug.............Dot Blair
Cockroach...........Sam Othman
Firefly.............Dan Schulman
The following people have been appointed to chair their respective Committees; please contact them directly (by phone or via the mailboxes by the Law Club Desk) with any appropriate questions or problems.

SOCIAL COMMITTEE -- Donn Randall 662-3765
RES GESTAE EDITOR -- Ned Othman (R.G. Office)
ATHLETICS & RECREATION COMMITTEE (Sports) --
Mark Furhmann 761-4413
and Jack Helms 662-3765
ELECTIONS COMMITTEE -- Jesse Jones 668-7802
FACULTY/COURSE EVALUATIONS -- Joe Medved 662-6710
FILM COMMITTEE -- Rick Durden
SPEAKERS -- (still open)
RESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE (for Lawyers Club)--
Paul Jones 764-9011
and Bob Kohorst 764-9079
Note: The R.G. Editor is just confirmed by the senate not appointed.

Appointments to Faculty Committees to be announced next week.

LEGAL RESEARCH GUIDE
AVAILABLE TO LAW STUDENTS

A Guide to Legal Research in the University of Michigan Law Library, just hot off the presses, is now available, free, to all law students in Room 365 of the Law Library, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday-Friday. This 90-page volume contains information on the most commonly encountered legal research problems and, thus, should be especially helpful to law students in the evenings and weekends when reference service is unavailable.

LSSS ELECTION
FIRST-YEAR CANDIDATES

Section One
David Kern 764-9046
Charles Lowery 973-9310
Fred Rodriguez 973-2653

Section Two
Paul Jensen 608 Monroe, # 18
Geoffrey Silverman 764-8985

Section Three
Gary Peters 502 E. Madison
Mark Sterling 909 Church, Apt. 5

Section Four
John Kralik 764-8973
Juan Marquez 663-9417
Susan Swantek 994-5177

SENIOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS
Martha Haines 995-2071

*** VOTING SEPTEMBER 29 (Weds.) ***

If you are willing to be a poll worker or would just like more information, call Jesse Jones, Elections Committee Chairman, at 668-7802.

LAW STUDENT DIRECTORY
SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 1 DELIVERY

Bob Goodsell (769-8023), compiler of the 76-77 Law Student Directory, reports that the new edition should be ready for distribution by October 1. Copies will be provided to all students, faculty members, and administrative offices from central distribution points, e.g., Rooms 100 and 300 in Hutchins and the Lawyers Club Desk.

Our apologies to those who contacted us with changes or insertions for the Directory after the copy had already been run on the computer and taken to the printer in final form. In the future, efforts will be made to better publicize the deadline for submitting information, as well as to get other bugs out of the system. As it stands, it appears that this year's Directory will be more complete, more accurate, and more timely than last year's due to the conscientious job done by Bob and
3. The yearbook is for all three classes, not just the seniors. Pictures and activities of everyone in the law school be featured.

4. The yearbook is an individual effort, and is not affiliated with, nor does it receive financial support from the LSSS or the law school. If enough books are not sold there will be NO yearbook this year, or probably for a long time to come. No extra books will be ordered, if you don't buy one now it will be too late to change your mind.

YEARBOOK

1. The yearbook will continue to be on sale in front of Room 100 thru September 28.

2. This is the first yearbook in several years, and it will probably be several more years before there is another one. Don't plan on waiting until your 3rd year to buy one.

THE WEALTH OF NATIONS

The probability that any particular person shall ever be qualified for the employment to which he is educated, is very different in different occupations. In the greater part of mechanic trades, success is almost certain; but very uncertain in the liberal professions. Put your son apprentice to a shoemaker, there is little doubt of his learning to make a pair of shoes; but send him to study the law, it is at least twenty to one if ever he makes such proficiency as will enable him to live by the business.

In a perfectly fair lottery, those who draw the prizes ought to gain all that is lost by those who draw the blanks. In a profession, where twenty fail for one that succeeds that one ought to gain all that should have been gained by the unsuccessful twenty. The counsellor at law who, perhaps, at near forty years of age, begins to make something by his profession ought to receive the retribution, not only of his own so tedious and expensive education, but of that of more than twenty others who are never likely to make anything by it. How extravagant soever the fees of counsellors at law may sometimes appear, their real retribution is never equal to this. Compute in any particular place what is likely to be annually gained, and what is likely to be annually spent, by all the different workmen in any common trade, such as the shoemakers or weavers, and you will find that the former sum will
WEALTH (cont. from p. 3)

generally exceed the latter. But make the same computation with regard to all the counsellors and students of law, in all the different inns of court, and you will find that their annual gains bear a very small proportion to their annual expence, even though you rate the former as high, and the latter as low, as can well be done. The lottery of the law, therefore, is very far from being a perfectly fair lottery; and that, as well as many other liberal and honourable professions, is, in point of pecuniary gain, evidently under-recompensed.

This article submitted by
Professor A.F. Conard

PETTY POETRY
from the pen of:
Per Stirpes

(Welcome to AA y'all!
I call today's poem The Heart of Taxes.)

Watch him pace, have a care,
He's a southerner with flair,
That ole El-Heart is rolling along.

Right in class you will see
I.R.S. philosophy,
When ole Heart-Right is moving along.

You can't pass, don't change your seat,
If you do he'll give you heat,
Some gents git ornery that way,
Do a tax question a day,
Keeps embarrassment at bay,
As ole El-Heart is plowing along.

Be the first in your set
To learn Congressional intent,
As ole Heart-Right is whizzing along.

A loophole here, a shelter there,
Corporation—don't despair!
Good ole El-Heart will hep you along.

The class wonders with some sighs,
How he finds such thin bow ties,
And why he puts glasses on a chain,
But I guess that goes to show,
There are still things we don't know,
When ole Heart-Right goes rolling along.
A program dealing with "Legal Problems of the Aging" will be presented here Friday and Saturday (Sept. 24-25) by the Institute of Continuing Legal Education (ICLE).

The program begins at 9 AM Friday at the Holiday Inn West in Ann Arbor.

Among other subjects, the program will focus on regulation of facilities for the elderly; patients rights; Medicare and Medicaid; supplemental security income for the aged, blind and disabled under the Social Security Act; and federal old age, survivor and disability insurance.

The speakers will be Steven D. Pepe, associate professor and director of the Clinical Law Program at U-M Law School; Robert N. Brown, assistant professor at Univ. of Detroit School of Law and former director of the Syracuse Univ. Center for Legal Services for the Aging; and Terry Adams, a research consultant at U-M Law School who formerly was with Michigan Legal Services in Detroit.

More than 22 million Americans---or 10% of the U.S. population---are 65 years or older, notes ICLE in a program announcement.

"Their tax problems, housing problems, difficulties with social security, Medicare and Medicaid are far-ranging, confusing and often able to be solved only with the aid of qualified legal help," says ICLE.

Further information of the program is available from ICLE, 439 Hutchins Hall, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48109 (phone: 313-764-0533).

As crime rates rise, more and more police and legal authorities have urged lifting the prohibition against use of illegally-gained evidence in criminal trials.

But Univ. of Mich. law Prof. Yale Kamisar warns that the prohibition against use of such evidence---called the "exclusionary rule"---is our "only existing adequate remedy against police misconduct."

Speaking here Tuesday, Sept. 21 before federal judges attending the 39th annual Judicial Conference of the Third Circuit of the United States, Kamisar said:

"These are times of violence, but they are also times of daily revelations of FBI 'black-bag jobs,' tales of intelligence agency investigative abuses and documented accounts of unsupervised snooping, spying and provocation."

"In my judgment," Kamisar said, "there is no substitute for the exclusionary rule," under which illegally-gained evidence is considered inadmissible in a court case.

The rule, said Kamisar, "demonstrates to law enforcement officers and to the general public alike that the courts are sufficiently committed to the principles of the Fourth Amendment that when the police themselves break the law, they and other agencies of government will not be allowed to use the benefits which flow from the violation."

"Were it otherwise, the average citizen---and the average policeman---would have further reason to believe that our government is pervaded by self-seeking hypocrites," said Kamisar.

CONT. p 6
Continuing with Kamisar

The Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution protects against "unreasonable searches and seizures." A 1961 Supreme Court case required all states to "exclude" from criminal prosecutions all evidence obtained without a valid search warrant or as the result of an arrest not based on "probable cause."

Kamisar noted a recent proposal by Chief Justice Warren Burger of the U.S. Supreme Court, among others, that would abolish the exclusionary rule and replace it with a procedure allowing victims of Fourth Amendment violations to sue the government for damages.

But Kamisar argued that the Burger proposal would be of limited practicality for a number of reasons:

"If an illegal arrest or search turns up nothing incriminating, the innocent victim is unlikely to take steps which will air the fact that he was under police suspicion," said Kamisar.

"If the police illegality does uncover incriminating evidence, the potential plaintiff will often have been convicted and imprisoned before the tort (civil damage) action can be started.

"Moreover, many people---especially the poor, the black, the gambler, the prostitute, the alcoholic, the person with a 'police record' and others who are most likely to be the victims of governmental misconduct---are understandably reluctant to rile or rouse the police by suing them. They fear reprisal in the form of harassment or withdrawal of police protection," said Kamisar.

The U-M professor noted that, in the hopes of curbing crime, many efforts have been made over the years to undermine other constitutional protections of the criminally accused, such as their rights against self-incrimination and their right to an attorney in a lineup procedure.

"At a time when so many are shouting that 'the pendulum has swung too far to the left' and so many are pressing for 'a restoration of the balance,' it is sobering, I think, to recall that never (in recent history) have we not heard such cries," Kamisar told the judges.

"Moreover, the grim probability is that no one today will live to see the day when such cries are no longer uttered---when we no longer are in a 'crime crisis.'"

Yet More Yale

Dan Schulman

I begin what I hope will be a regular column with a welcome back and a greeting. The greeting is for the incoming 1st year students, fresh into this law school. The welcome back is for the returning 2nd and 3rd year students. (Sometimes it is sobering to think of ourselves as 17th, 18th and 19th graders). I am a 19th grader.

Today I want to talk about the law school. In later columns I hope to talk far less. The law school already has enough spokesmen, eloquent in the pros and cons of any law school issue. Their voices are heard in the hallways of Hutchins, in the impressive expanse of the Lawyers Club dining room. Blending together, their voices resonate with intelligence, perception and volume.

Cont. p7 Comments
Frequently they drown the smaller voices around them. It is these smaller voices that I wish to speak to in this column. (Though eavesdroppers are very welcome). I will try to talk to them in their own language, which is questions more than answers. A diet of only answers is too high in intellectual cholesterol and will eventually settle and thicken about the mental paunch, harden the cognitive arteries. Questions are lean, they thin out the accumulated saturated fats, quicken the sluggish blood, firm the mental tone. Taken alone they lack sufficient nutrients to sustain, and cause malnutrition. Taken as a supplement to the thick creams and syrups of our law school diet they are invaluable.

But today I am not raising questions. Today I am offering a greeting, a welcome back, and a small gift. The small gift is a law school gift, and it is about nostalgia.

At the end of each semester I have read farewells to this law school written in the Res Gestae. Some of them have been bitter in tone, speaking of an unhappy three years spent waiting to leave, time wasted, a joy at finally being "out of this place." As the years intervene these people will carry their bitterness as a shell and their law school years will not move along their paths with them. The experience will remain empty and buried.

Others have written farewells without bitterness, expressions of thanks and gladness. What of these others? Soon after they leave begins the looking back, the early tinges of a nostalgia that will be with them for the rest of their lives, airbrushing their memories, driving some to reunions and football games and alumni checkbooks that cannot buy what they have lost or think they have lost or think they've never had.

Here is a small truth: Those who do not smother their three years here with bitterness will feel the nostalgia when they leave. This is a small truth now but it will be a larger truth later. And there is danger in this, for the nostalgia, as they look back, will not truly reflect the experience. Things will become grand where they were in truth only good. Things which were not good will disappear (or also become grand, with a bit more effort). Somewhere inside this will all hurt, because nostalgia is a remembrance of that which can never be again (in part because it never actually was) and because nostalgia carries with it the deep, subtle awareness of its own untruth, or incompleteness of truth, or multiplicity of truth.

This is the first month of your first year, your second year, your last year. You will be gone from this school in three days, two days, or one day respectively. The faster it flees by the stronger the pull when it is only memory. Nostalgia feeds on inattention. Feel the nostalgia now. If the sun shines and the quad is beautiful, don't snidely note the lack of rain. If it snows and is cold complain away, but appreciate what you can and be aware of what you are complaining about. Five years from now you'll be sitting over a drink spinning yarns about things you were oblivious to at the time. Law school is not raw material for cocktail party anecdotes. It is not hell or heaven unless you make it so. It is nothing special. It is what we all do for three years in a prime period of our lives. Don't wait till you're gone to perceive what happened. Don't wait for your own farewell (as I am not waiting for mine) to eulogize or to curse. Do it now, do both freely. Do it well.

This is what I wish to say about the law school.
Oh, The Disadvantages of Clinical Law
By Crusader Rabbit

Every semester, over 100 students apply for Clinical Law and every semester only 30 students are chosen. It is not all uncommon for students to apply for Clinic all 6 times possible and never win the Clinic lottery. This has led to a feeling that Clinical Law is extremely desirable and essential to one's legal education. Nothing could be further from the truth. The disadvantages of Clinical Law far outweigh the disadvantages of traditional classroom instruction.

(1) Clinic requires that you dress up in at least a coat & tie (plus pants, shirt, shoes, and socks) plus matching handbag if you are a woman. But in class you can wear anything you damn please. Ties are uncomfortable, coats are expensive to dry clean, and moreover, classmates will snicker at you when you have to come to class wearing your clinic clothes. Give me a pair of sneakers, cut-offs & blue jeans, and tee-shirt or sweatshirt any day.

(2) Clinic is far more expensive than classroom education. In Clinic, the student: faculty ratio is about 10:1 while the classroom ratio is about 90:1. In addition, Clinic uses all sorts of fancy equipment like videotapes, while in the class all that's used is a few pieces of chalk. Now, who pays for this? Why the students do through higher tuition rates. Yet do all students benefit from Clinic? Clearly not. Assessing everyone a higher tuition to benefit only a handful of students is a denial of equal protection and sounds like socialism to me.

(3) You can sleep in class. You can't sleep in clinic. And it is extremely bad etiquette to sleep in court. Could lead to disbarrment before you are even barred.

(4) You can cut class. Anytime you want, as many times as you want. You can't ever cut clinic. And God help you if ever you should cut court.

(5) Clinic requires that you get involved with messy interpersonal relationships with lawyers, judges, probation department officers, welfare department caseworkers, and most messy of all -- Clients. Not court appearances, not remember important facts, distort other facts, and sometimes tell an outright lie to you, but they will also ignore your advice, act irrationally, and work against their own best interests. In class, all you have to deal with are law professors who are paragons of logic, rationality and predictability, as well as law students whom you can conveniently and easily ignore.

(6) Clinic requires that you deal with a lot of stupid judges who do not know or understand the law they are supposed to be administering. By contrast, most law professors appear to be as brilliant as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle.

(7) Law Professors will take incredibly more shit from law students than judges will. Law professors for all of their pig-headed arrogant stubbornness, are willing to listen to reason (or even, unreason) and ultimately change their minds. Judges, for all of their pig-headed arrogant stubbornness, will never change their minds no matter how wrong they may be shown to be. Moreover, law professors will tolerate a good deal of eccentricity. Try wearing a pumpkin on your head to court next Halloween and see how fast a judge cites you for contempt and throws you in the slammer.

(8) You will learn much more law in class than you will in clinic. True, the law that you are learning in class is usually abstract, general, high-level, and not at all applicable to the day-to-day legal problems that people find themselves enmeshed within. However, clinic doesn't teach you how to deal with these problems either. A client will come to the clinic, spin out some tale of woe concerning a divorce, a consumer credit transaction, a landlord-tenant problem, or a criminal misdemeanor, and the clinic law students will respond as follows:


"Well, I'll have to talk to my supervising attorney and do a little research. I'll get back to you in a week." What clinic does teach you how to do is find the right courtroom, file pleadings in the right place, and to treat judges with obsequious respect. In other words, you learn local court procedure, which ain't gonna do you much good in Detroit, Dallas, or De Moines.
### Section 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bates</th>
<th>Sr. Judge: Bruce Johnson</th>
<th>Jr. Clerk: Dennis Mullins</th>
<th>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Reed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butzel</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: John Sherrell</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Elizabeth Campbell</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Cooperrider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Beverly Heydinger</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Mary Bolda</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlin</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Scott Wolstein</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Donn Randall</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Conard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: James Cunning</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Robert Casey, Jr.</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Dean St. Antoine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiancy</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: David Crago</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Stephanie Hazleton</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Payton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clark</th>
<th>Sr. Judge: Katherine Ward</th>
<th>Jr. Clerk: Randy Hall</th>
<th>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Rosberg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooley</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Susan Falkson</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Diane Klinke</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Frank Stewart</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Phil Rodgers</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Dean Martindale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Martin Bienenstock</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Eugene Beach</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Bollinger (Fall) Prof. Soper (Winter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Stephen Dunn</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: David Swenson</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. White (Fall) Prof. Regan (Winter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Charles Wolff</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: David Case</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Vining (Fall) Prof. Kauper (Winter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Michael Nicholson</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Del Dillingham</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Dwight Dickerson</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Margaret Malchow</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Westen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowlton</th>
<th>Sr. Judge: John Hugger</th>
<th>Jr. Clerk: Carol Grant</th>
<th>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Whitman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Jonathan Lowe (Fall)</td>
<td>James Vose (Winter)</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: David Hallissey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stason</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Paul Stull</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Mike Eschelbach</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Prof. Smith (Fall) Prof. Donahue (Winter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Dana Rasure (Fall)</td>
<td>Frank Kimball (Winter)</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Ellen Spellman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td>Sr. Judge: Kevin Lucas</td>
<td>Jr. Clerk: Kenneth Laino</td>
<td>Fac. Ad.: Dean Pierce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"MALPRACTICE" from Res Jester

---

Good morning, Motley. Your surgery was a complete success.

How did my tonsils look, doc?

Tonsils? Is that what you were here for?

Tonsils? Unnnhhhh!!

Hey, I was only kidding. That's just my bedside manner.

---

"I'm not interested in what 3 out of 4 doctors recommend. I want it to be unanimous!"

---

"We're taking a survey of patients who've had operations recently, Mr. Figby... There's a prize for best answer!"

---

"I recommend surgery, Mr. Figby... that wallet has to come out."

---
READ-ONLY MEMORIES
By The Malevolent Memo Maker

You second- and third-year students thought you were rid of me, huh? Well, no such luck, turkeys! Ol' MMM is back, and you're stuck with another year of my babbling. (Hold the cheering and/or groans down, please--I'm trying to sleep thru your calling me Horrid Hypos right now).

For those poor first-year victims, a few words of explanation are in order.
ROM takes its title from the real computer-ized world--i.e., from outside those last few bastions of ignorance, such as law. The term denotes a particular type of logic unit, which "remembers" data when prodded by an electrical pulse. It's used here since it resembles most law students: It has to be kicked in the rump to remember anything; It can handle only one tiny item at a time; And it will NEVER learn anything new.

The ideas, comments, and general bull which appear under this title are just like the computer's output--totally random, not necessarily truthful, and generally of a sort which (by design or otherwise) will piss off a lot of people.

MMM makes no guarantees, implied, express, or local, as to content, humor (or lack thereof), or literary quality. If you're expecting another Hemingway, you're right--but more like Semour Hemingway than that other hack writer.

Above all, don't forget what this issue cost you. You'll have to admit, you are getting exactly what you paid for!

MMM's first "Thanks For Nothing" award of the year goes to the U of M's Parking Office. Last year, it cost me $20 to park two blocks away. This year, the lot is twice as far, and cost a whopping $50--that's 250% of last year's already-inflated rate.

In return for last year's twenty clams, I received the following benefits:
(1) My car was broken into twice; (2) Two CB antennas were stolen in broad daylight; (3) I had to pay $30 in parking tickets, from the many times I had to park on the street because the lot was full of unauthorized cars (which U of M refused to tow). This year, should I expect 250% of last year's hassles? Seems to be all I can expect--cause I sure don't expect U of M to explain its outrageous rate increase.

The legal profession somehow survived the entry of MMM into its exalted (?) ranks this summer, while I was clerking in a small law office (3 lawyers, 2 secretaries, 1 errand boy, and a property settlement in a split-pair tree). Since I'd like to go back next summer, I'll refrain from any nasty comments. (Personal to the Boss: That'll cost extra, of course).

A new ROM feature this year will be "Horrid Hypo". Each will consist of an unlikely fact situation for you to solve. The reader submitting the winning answer will receive recognition in ROM, along with a certificate good for 1 free shock treatment after finals.

"Winning answer", though, is a relative term (that is, my cousin thought of it during a recent 7-to-10 year term). There are NO right answers (as you poor first-year students will soon learn). I may pick the best answer in terms of legal principles, or in terms of absolute stupidity. Humor is appreciated, should any of you still have a sense of humor after being here.

This week's "Horrid Hypo"--A and B are in a no-holds-barred bar fight. B takes a 2x4 across the chops, and drops. Soon after, he's pronounced dead and taken to the morgue. But--one of those rare miracles takes place, and six hours later his heart spontaneously starts beating again. True, he'll be a total gork the rest of his life, but technically he's again alive.

The problem--an overzealous D.A. charges A with first degree murder, on the theory that B was, at least for a while, dead. Can he make it stick? Send your answers to MMM, by way of the RG office. Postcards are preferred; we lost an Editor and two tables to letter bombs last year, and you can't imagine how much paperwork it took to replace those tables!

Enough for this week. And don't worry about classes yet, first-year students--it'll get a lot worse soon, and then you can worry.
RG RANKINGS

In response to the biased football ratings put out by the wire services the RG panel of football experts proudly presents its own biased rankings. Points are awarded on a 20,19,18...3,2,1 basis, and first place votes are in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Michigan (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Oklahome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>(Tie) Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>LSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>USC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Arizona St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also receiving votes:

North Carolina (18), Colorado (14)
Texas (12), Minnesota (10), Florida (7)
California (5), Texas Tech. (3)
Oklahoma St (1)
Stanford (-140)

1976 STRAT-O-MATIC FOOTBALL

The 1976 Strat-O-Matic football season opened 2 weekends ago. The following is a list of the 10 teams participating in the two conferences, and the coaches:

AFC

Pittsburgh Steelers . . . Michael Marrero
(Last year's Strat-O Super Bowl champions)

Los Angeles Rams . . . . Fred Fathe
Oakland Raiders . . . . Jim Blake
Kansas City Chiefs . . . Chet LaBedz
Cincinnati Bengals . . . Ralph Hall

NFC

Detroit Lions . . . . . Charlie Wolff
St. Louis Cardinals . . John Hugger
Dallas Cowboys . . . . Dan Schulman
Minnesota Vikings . . . Mark Jensen
Green Bay Packers . . . Jim Cunningham

The teams entered are based statistically on various years' performances from 1967 to 1974. (For example, the Steelers are the 1972 edition).

After two weeks, Ralph Hall's Bengals have been the biggest surprise, winning easily over Los Angeles and Kansas City, by 19-0 and 40-3, respectively, despite the view of the experts that theirs is the league's most suspect defense. Last week, Pittsburgh downed Oakland 18-10 in a rematch of the 1975 Super Bowl.

STANDINGS going into this weekend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFC</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>NFC</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michael Marrero
Playing the favorite was the strategy employed by most of the entrants in last week's poll, as the team giving up points was the consensus pick in 34 of the 38 games. (Incidentally, a typographical error matched up Oklahoma State and Texas A&M, so that "game" was discarded).

Since there were only two major upsets last week (by Illinois and New England), the strategy of following front-runners was extremely effective. The consensus correctly picked 25 games, and the individual median was an unusually high 22-16.

Bob Jerry took individual honors by going 29-9 and predicting 40 Stanford passes (they threw 41). Don Parman was also 29-9, but was way off on the tiebreaker (he guessed 39). At the other end of the scale was Gary Schnell, who picked just 13 winners and nosed out John Nuanes 34-38 on the tiebreaker.

This Saturday's college games feature the have-nots of the NCAA earning their travel money for the season by sacrificing themselves to the teams that can pack 80,000 people into the stands regardless of the opposition (or lack of same). The weekend's theme is reflected by the tiebreaker for this week's poll. The rules for the poll are the same as last week - circle winners and cross out losers. Place your entry in the box outside Room 100 before 5 p.m. Friday, or deliver it to K-43 Lawyer's Club before noon on Saturday.

As an added attraction this year, we are offering a prize to the regular entrant who compiles the best winning percentage over the course of the season. Last week's results will not count (Sorry Bob and Don), but you must enter all of the remaining football polls to be eligible for this prize. Decision of the judges will be final on this and all other polls.

Here are this week's games:

### COLLEGE

- Navy (41 1/2) at Michigan
- Missouri (16 1/2) at Ohio St.
- Indiana (13 1/2) at Washington
- Western Michigan (27 1/2) at Minnesota
- Baylor (13 1/2) at Illinois
- Notre Dame at Northwestern (24 1/2)
- Iowa (14 1/2) at Penn State
- USC at Purdue (15 1/2)
- Michigan St. (1/2) at North Carolina St.
- Washington St. (14 1/2) at Wisconsin
- TCU (35 1/2) at Oklahoma
- California (6 1/2) at Arizona St.
- Air Force (33 1/2) at UCLA
- Vanderbilt (30 1/2) at Alabama
- Mississippi St. (13 1/2) at Florida
- South Carolina (14 1/2) at Georgia
- Tennessee at Auburn (3 1/2)
- Maryland at Syracuse (27 1/2)
- Texas A&M at Houston (15 1/2)
- Boston College at Tulane (8 1/2)
- North Carolina at Army (17 1/2)
- Temple (30 1/2) at Pittsburgh
- Rice (17 1/2) at UCLA
- Miami, Fla (12 1/2) at Colorado
- Rutgers at Princeton (13 1/2)

### PRO

- Minnesota at Detroit (10 1/2)
- Baltimore (5 1/2) at Dallas
- Cleveland (4 1/2) at Denver
- New England (16 1/2) at Pittsburgh
- NY Jets (19 1/2) at Miami
- St. Louis at San Diego (6 1/2)
- Greey Bay (17 1/2) at Cincinnati
- Oakland at Houston (6 1/2)
- Atlanta (7 1/2) at Chicago
- NY Giants (13 1/2) at Los Angeles
- San Francisco at Seattle (16 1/2)
- Buffalo at Tampa Bay (13 1/2)
- New Orleans (7 1/2) at Kansas City
- Washington at Philadelphia (13 1/2)

TIEBREAKER: What will the highest point total rolled up by one team in any of the above (College or Pro) games? Which team will be the high scorer?

NAME __________________________