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The Res Gestae

TOMMY G.:
A MAN FOR ALL SEISINS

OCT. 8, 1976
Friday

JUAN LUIS TIENDA MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP FUND

LaRaza Law Students Association wishes to remind you that, as was mentioned in the previous Res Gestae, contributions to the Juan Luis Tienda Raza Memorial Scholarship will be received on Friday, October 8 from 10 A.M. to 2 P.M. in front of Room 100 Hutchins Hall. One of our members will be at the table during that time. Contributions can also be dropped off either before or after that date at the LaRaza office, Room 114 Legal Research Building. All monies received will be applied toward the Memorial Scholarship Fund.

We would like to extend our sincere appreciation to all those who have already contributed to the Juan Luis Tienda Raza Memorial Scholarship.

Friday (Oct. 8) 3:30 PM

Law Club Lounge

VERY IMPORTANT MEETING of all those interested in the LSSS Speakers Committee.

Unfortunately, the Speakers Committee has not gotten off the ground yet this year and time is quickly running out on planning for speakers this semester. Many individuals and groups have suggested speakers, but we need people to do the necessary work to bring them to the Law School. The Committee's money is already appropriated in the LSSS Final Budget.

Since a major function of the Speakers Committee is to assist the various special interest groups that are sponsored by LSSS in coordinating and funding their speakers programs, I urge each organization to have one member attend this meeting and join the Committee. By having a representative of each organization on the Committee, you could insure that your group's needs are not overlooked as well as improve the chances of cooperative scheduling and publicity.

Saturday

TENANTS ORGANIZING CONFERENCE: SATURDAY

Tenant organizers, tenant union members, and lawyers from throughout SE Michigan will gather at the Law School this Saturday, October 8, for workshops and speeches. Activities begin with coffee and donuts at 9:00 a.m. Morning activities will be held in Hutchins Hall with afternoon sessions in the Law Club Lounge beginning at 2:00. The featured speaker will be a representative of Tenants First, a Boston tenants union. The conference is sponsored by Washtenaw County Legal Aid—Student Association and the National Lawyers Guild. Registration is $1.00.

SOCIAL NOTES

Saturday, Oct. 9, there is a football game between Michigan and Michigan State University. People in Michigan get very excited about this football game as many of them went to one school or the other. As the fans of one school "hate" the other school and its fans, this game takes on many aspects of a civil war. Brother against brother, mother against daughter, the attacks are vicious and great in number. To help everyone remain calm and peaceful, and to properly lubricate the vocal cords, the Social Committee will be pouring Screwdrivers (that's Vodka and OJ for you neophytes) and Bloody Marys on Saturday at 10 AM in the Lawyers Club Lounge. Please bring your own sandwich or munchies or, nothing at all (you'll get drunker faster. And, BEAT MSU!!!
Saturday

CAMPBELL MEETING

A meeting for participants in the Campbell Competition will be held on Tuesday, October 12 at 3:30 P.M. in the Moot Court Room. Sample briefs will be distributed.

Monday

ART AND POLITICS

Clearwater Sloop singer-songwriter and occasional law student, Fred Small, will perform topical and folk songs at Mr. Flood's Party, 120 West Liberty on Monday, Oct. 11, beginning at 9:30 P.M., no cover charge. He will also perform at the October meeting of the Sierra Club (the public is invited) on Thursday, Oct. 14, at 8 P.M. at the Ann Arbor Public Library, South Fifth and William.

His original songs concern environmental degradation, sexism, the legal profession, Pringle's Potato Chips and other burning social issues. If you've ever wanted to hear Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co. and Title IX set to music, drop by!

Thursday

SIERRA CLUB MEETING

(See Art & Politics Monday)

Goodness alone is not adequate for the exercise of government. - Mencius

Wednesday

MSA PLANS CLASS BOYCOTT

OCTOBER 13

TO PROTEST TUITION

I received a communique from Michigan Student Assembly (MSA) President Calvin Luker announcing plans for a one-day boycott of classes on October 13 (Weds.) to register a protest against high tuition charges. The plans include a rally on the Diag that morning and a demonstration in Lansing in the afternoon to bring the protest to the attention of State Legislators.

MSA is coordinating this action with the Michigan Higher Education Students Association (MHESA) and the Michigan Students Association for Lower Tuition (SALT) in a statewide effort.

I quote Mr. Luker:

"The objective of this action is twofold. 1) To draw the public's attention to the fact that the legislature is pricing higher education out of the common person's reach, and 2) To show that we, as a voting block of 300,000 strong, are not going to tolerate this action any longer.

"Michigan used to be number seven in the nation in the percentage of tax dollars returned to higher education. It now ranks 34th. On a local level, we have watched tuition leap up at a 10% per year clip. This has resulted in reduced educational opportunities for many people in the low and middle income range."

I need hardly remind the students of the Law School that tuition here increased by 13 to 16 per cent this year over last.

Anyone wishing to assist MSA in organizing the boycott or related activities should contact the MSA offices on the third floor of the Michigan Union.

-- George Vinyard, LSSS
NOTICES

COUCH DISAPPEARS FROM L.R. BUILDING!

If found, do NOT attempt to recover it or to apprehend the thieves. They may be armed and/or dangerous. Report the finding immediately to the R.G. Office, 102A L.R., 763-4332.

LEGAL RESEARCH GUIDE AVAILABLE FREE TO LAW STUDENTS

The 90 page Guide to Legal Research in the University of Michigan Law Library, just hot off the presses, is still available, free, to all law students in Room 365 of the Law Library, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday-Friday. This manual 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.

1975-76 CAMPBELL PARTICIPANTS

The following 1975-76 Compbellites have not yet fetched their fantastic pends from Mike Herbert (Law Club G-15, 764-892):

Steve Brock
Al Domanskis
Jim Hiller
Stuart Jones
James Brunner
Andy Campbell
Phil Fileri

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO OUR ED., NED!

Gavel Modern Legal Forms

G 13:57 Letter of Rejection

Dear

I very much enjoyed meeting with you in early autumn of last year. I found your firm to be simply wonderful.

Unfortunately, the "science" of selecting a law firm with which to associate is, at best, unperfected, and the decision always extremely difficult. After careful evaluation of the many excellent opportunities afforded by your firm, I have decided to eliminate you from further consideration. I am sure, however, that with the many fine attributes your firm possesses and with your excellent record, you will be able to satisfactorily fill any positions which you may have available.

I wish you the very best of luck in all your future endeavors.

Very truly yours,
THE R.G. CANDY SHOPPE

Sugar Daddy .......... Ned Othman
Sugar Baby .......... Julie
Powerhouse .......... Ken Frantz
Tootsie Roll .......... Carol Sulkes
Slo Poke .......... Don Parman
Butterfinger .......... John Mezzanotte
Chuckles .......... Crusader Rabbit
Mounds .......... Sandy Gross
Mr. Goodbar .......... Stuart Olson
Milk DUDS .......... Earl Cantwell
Marathon .......... Michael Marrero
Payday .......... Bob Brandenburg
Black Cow .......... Dot Blair
Zero .......... Dan Schulman
M & M (and M) .......... Kevin McCabe
Snickers .......... Dennis Fliehman
Chunky .......... Willy Pierce

HAPPY B-DAY
SANDY G.!

LAWYERS CLUB CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST
AVAILABLE TO NON-RESIDENTS

Students not living in the Lawyers Club may be unaware that the Club Dining Hall offers cafeteria style service of a number of breakfast items from 7:30 to 9:30 AM Monday through Friday. The selection includes toast, donuts, fresh fruit, hard-cooked eggs, and fresh coffee at prices well below those in nearby business establishments or from the mechanical monsters in the Hutchins Hall Lounge. All students are members of the Lawyers Club regardless of residential status. Take advantage of YOUR facilities for economical, high quality breakfasts or just for good coffee with friends before or after early classes.

QUESTION — What is the purpose of laws? Doesn’t everyone know right from wrong? I am told that we have over 10,000 laws. How could anyone possibly keep them all? B.L.P.

ANSWER — Laws are intended to be checks against man’s inclination to sin. Most people know right from wrong, but knowledge of the moral law doesn’t keep people from breaking it. You see, the Bible says, “We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God.” Romans 3:23. The best the police and lawmen can do is to restrain people from breaking the law, but as sin is rampant in the race, they cannot hope for total restraint. The Bible says that “The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto the Christ.” Galatians 3:24. This means that none of us is able to keep the law, that we are all sinners by nature, and that should show us we need Christ to solve the sin problem in our lives.
OPEN LETTER TO LSSS COMMITTEE
APPLICANTS

From: George Vinyard, LSSS

At its meeting of September 30, the Senate approved the following appointments by the Executive Committee to Law School (faculty and administrative) Committees: (* indicates incumbents who were re-appointed)

Academic Standards -- Bruce Engler
                        Tom Friel *
                        Sherri Toennes *

Administrative --     Peter Winkler *

Admission Policy --   Steve Belton
                        Susan Bittner
                        Bill Leavitt *

Building (ad hoc advisory) -- David Dickey
                            Sandra Gross
                            Carol Harmon
                            Steve Harris
                            John Robinson

Curriculum --         Elizabeth Hilder *
                        Dennis Holsapple
                        Katherine Ward

Placement --          Michael Adelman
                        Jeffrey Baker
                        William Brunstad
                        Calvin Keith

Student Personnel --  Carla Craig
                        Florence Sprague *
                        Gary Peters

I want to thank those who have been selected to serve as student representatives on these committees, but I especially wish to thank all the rest who signed up to be considered, particularly the first-year students who volunteered on the basis of blind faith.

Although it initially looked as if some positions would go begging, your responses to my repeated pleas for volunteers left the Executive Committee in the happy position of being able to select among numerous applicants for each position. In general we opted for experience, both on the particular committees and in Law School, and selected incumbants and upper-classpeople. This tendency was also the result to some extent of our limited time and energy for contacting each of you individually to learn more about you.

The names and interests of all those not selected are being kept on file for contacts relating to any ad hoc positions that develop during the year, as well as for use by the Executive Committee in recruiting volunteers for next year.

I hope that you maintain your interest and willingness to serve your fellow students and the Law School next year as second and third-year students. Thanks again.

Sincerely,

George

THE ADVENTURES OF PEEP 'N TOM

"PASS."
"I'VE HAD IT WITH THIS CLASS."
"A LAWYER HAS TO BE PREPARED!"
"WHEN IS PASS-FAIL DEADLINE?"
BLUE, J.: This is an appeal by the Crown by way of a stated case from a decision of the magistrate acquitting the accused of a charge under the Small Birds Act, R.S.O., 1960, c.724, s.2. The facts are not in dispute. Fred Ojibway, an Indian, was riding his pony through Queen’s Park on January 2, 1965. Being impoverished, and having been forced to pledge his saddle, he substituted a downy pillow in lieu of the said saddle. On this particular day the accused’s misfortune was further heightened by the circumstance of his pony breaking its right foreleg. In accordance with current Indian custom, the accused then shot the pony to relieve it of its awkwardness.

The accused was then charged with having breached the Small Birds Act, s. 2 of which states:

2. Anyone taking, injuring or killing small birds is guilty of an offence and subject to a fine not in excess of two hundred dollars.

The learned magistrate acquitted the accused, holding, in fact, that he had killed his horse and not a small bird. With respect, I cannot agree.

In light of the definition section my course is quite clear. Section 1 defines “bird” as “a two-legged animal covered with feathers.” There can be no doubt that this case is covered by this section.

Counsel for the accused made several ingenious arguments to which, in fairness, I must address myself. He submitted that the evidence of the expert clearly concluded that the animal in question was a pony and not a bird, but this is not the issue. We are not interested in whether the animal in question is a bird or not in fact, but whether it is one in law. Statutory interpretation has forced many a horse to eat birdseed for the rest of its life.

Counsel also contended that the neighing noise emitted by the animal could not possibly be produced by a bird. With respect, the sounds emitted by an animal are irrelevant to its nature, for a bird is no less a bird because it is silent.

Counsel for the accused also argued that since there was evidence to show accused had ridden the animal, this pointed to the fact that it could not be a bird but was actually a pony. Obviously, this avoids the issue. The issue is not whether the animal was ridden or not, but whether it was shot or not, for to ride a pony or a bird is of no offense at all. I believe that counsel now sees his mistake.

Counsel contends that the iron shoes found on the animal decisively disqualify it from being a bird. I must inform counsel, however, that how an animal dressed is of no concern to this court.

Counsel relied on the decision in Re Chicadee, where he contends that in similar circumstances the accused was acquitted. However, this is a horse of a different color. A close reading of that case indicates that the animal in question there was not a small bird, but, in fact, a midget of a much larger species. Therefore, that case is inapplicable to our facts.

Counsel finally submits that the word “small” in the title Small Birds Act refers not to “Birds” but to “Act,” making it The Small Act relating to Birds. With respect, counsel did not do his homework very well, for the Large Birds Act, R.S.O., 1960, c.725, is just as small. If pressed, I need only refer to the Small Loans Act, R.S.O., 1960,c.727, which is twice as large as the Large Birds Act.

It remains then to state my reason for judgment which, simply, is as follows: Different things may take on the same meaning for different purposes. For the purpose of the Small Birds Act, all two-legged, feather-covered animals are birds. This, of course, does not imply that only two-legged animals qualify, for the legislative intent is to make two legs merely the minimum requirement. The statute therefore contemplated multilegged animals with feathers as well. Counsel submits that having regard to the purpose of the statute only small animals “naturally covered” with feathers could have been contemplated. However, had this been the intention of the legislature, I am certain that the phrase “naturally covered” would have been expressly inserted just as “Long” was inserted in the Longshorner’s Act.

Therefore, a horse with feathers on its back must be deemed for the purposes of this Act to be a bird, and a fortiori, a pony with feathers on its back is a small bird.

Counsel posed the following rhetorical question: If the pillow had been removed prior to the shooting, would the animal still be a bird? To this let me answer: Is a bird any less of a bird without its feathers?

Appeal allowed.

Reported by: H. Pomerantz
S. Breslin
Minutes of the LSSS Meeting  
September 30, 1976

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by President George Vinyard in the Faculty Dining Room of the Lawyers Club. Members present were Janet Anderson, Deb Armaruster, Sandy Gross, Mary Ruth Harsha, Deborah Friedman, Gwen Mosley, Jeanette Ramseur, and George Vinyard.

Minutes

The minutes for the September 23rd meeting were approved as printed.

President's Report

George Vinyard reported that the Committee of Visitors will be at the Law School on October 29th. The law school directory is out. Copies can be picked up in Room 300 or at the Lawyers Club desk. The Michigan Student Assembly recognized LSSS as an official organization on September 28th. The law school representative, Bill Bay, attended the meeting.

Election Results

Section 1
*Charles R. Lowry, Jr. 25
Fred Ariel Rodriguez 18
David B. Kern 14

write-ins:
David Brenner 1
Laurie Dickerman 1

Section 2
*Geoffrey Silverman 37
Paul Stephan Jensen 20

write-ins:
Hertha Sibbach 1
Daffy Duck 1

Section 3
*Gary Peters 29
Mark Sterling 13
Pat Paulsen (write-in) 1

Section 4
*John Joseph Kralik 28
Susan Swantek 15
Ivan A. Marga 13

Announcements

Adjournment

NOTE: Anyone wishing to add an item to the above agenda or to place something on the agenda of future meetings should do so by submitting the item(s) to George Vinyard or to any other Senate Member in writing and one week in advance (if at all possible).
MORE MINUTES

Board of Governors
*Martha Haines 42

write-ins:
Argie Ant 5
Steve Brock 1
Bob Kohorst 1
Charles Lowry 1
Marvin Mandel 1
Abby O'Dess 1
Jim Schnare 1

Gwen moved to certify election results.
The motion carried unanimously.

Speakers Committee

Deborah moved that Greg Sullivan, Dave
Morosky, John Quitmeyer and one other
function as the Speakers Committee until a
Chairperson is appointed. The motion carried
unanimously.

ILS Request

Deborah moved that LSSS adopt the Executive
Committee recommendation to add $150 to ILS'
budget for convention travel; change speakers
allocation to "Speakers and Films"; and deny
further allocations at this time. The motion
carried 10 in favor, 1 opposed.

LaRaza Budget Request

Sandy moved that LaRaza be allocated an
increase in subscriptions by $4.00 and an
additional $75 for the Milan Prison Project;
with the LSSS denying other requested changes
at this time. The LSSS expressed strong
support for the other projects LaRaza
proposes. We suggest that LaRaza seek fund-
ing from other Senate Committees, and urge that
they return to LSSS if that does not work out.
The motion carried 10 in favor, 0 opposed,
2 abstentions. An amendment to add $50 for
supplies and $125 for speakers failed. The vote
was 2 in favor, 6 opposed, 3 abstentions.

WLSA Request

The Executive Committee recommended that WLSA
be denied additional funding at this time.
It was recommended that WLSA apply to Dean
St. Antoine for additional funding for the
Title VII workshop.

Course Evaluations

Gary moved to adopt the Executive Com-
mittee's recommendation of reserving $200
of Senate contingency for the course evalu-
ation conditioned upon approval of a plan.
The motion carried unanimously.

Faculty Committee Appointments

Gwen moved to approve all of the Executive
Committee recommendations. The motion
carried 12 in favor, 1 abstention.

Academic Standards & Incentives

Bruce Engler
Tom Friel
Sherri Toennes

Administrative Committee
Peter Winkler

Admissions Committee
Steve Belton
Susan Bittner
Bill Leavitt

Building Committee
Dave Dickey
Sandy Gross
Carol Gross

Curriculum
Liz Hilder
Dennis Holsapple
Kathy Ward

Placement
Michael Adelman
Bill Brunstad
Jeff Baker
Calvin Keith

Student Personnel
Carla Craig
Florence Sprague
Gary Peters

Section V

Sandy moved that the Senate adopt a policy
under which the monies in the Final Budget
allocated to Section V for an Alterna-
tive Practices Conference automatically
revert to Senate Contingency on Jan. 15,
1977 unless Section V has organized itself
and begun substantial planning for the
conference by that date.
The motion carried with 12 in favor and
1 abstention.
MORE MINUTES

October 7th Meeting

Jan moved to cancel next Thursday's meeting as President George Vinyard will be out of town and Vice President Eric Martin has been hospitalized.

The motion carried 10 in favor and 1 opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Janet L. Anderson
LSSS Secretary

WETLANDS PROJECT OFFERED BY PILS

The Public Interest Law Society (PILS) is looking for 305 law students to work on a wetlands project provided by the Environmental Defense Fund. EDF would like a survey of specific State laws and generic types of local laws which have some bearing on wetlands protection or the management of such resources.

The discussion of State schemes will include:
* What is the limit of jurisdiction
* Substantive content
* Relevant procedural requirements
* Construction with other laws
* Administrative regulations
* Strengths and weaknesses in terms of substantive protection for wetlands

The discussion of local government laws will involve the basic administrative structures by which local communities regulate such resources.

While this project may best be suited for 2nd or 3rd year students, all are encouraged to enquire. Contact Mark Kantor (764-9008), or leave a note in the PILS box in 300 Hutchins Hall.

---

LETTER

Dear R.G.:

I would like to correct an error made by the "MMM" in his column in last week's R.G. concerning the party held in the Rec. Room Saturday before last. Not only did we do a fast clean-up immediately after the party, but we also replaced the furniture and mopped the floor early Sunday afternoon. If "MMM" is not satisfied by this approach, he's invited to stick around and help next time.

Stew Olson
WHAT'S AN L-S-S-F ? ? ?

Not to be confused with our own LSSS, the Law Student Services Fund is a nationwide program of the ABA-Law Student Division designed to provide hard cash assistance to projects developed by law students working at the local level. Every year thousands of dollars are channelled into programs developed to help law students themselves, or to use law student services to benefit the surrounding community. Through its "matching-funds" concept, the LSSF encourages law schools and local benefactors to support projects which might otherwise be financially impractical.

Although we at Michigan have been blessed with reasonably good sources of funding throughout recent history, use of the LSSF program could provide organizations and individual ad-hoc groups with the financial leverage to carry out expensive but meaningful projects which are beyond the means of the Student Senate. Grants for short-term projects are made on a rolling basis, thus making it possible for a group to obtain funding for activities without regard to the vagaries of fiscal years or previously committed budget monies.

As with any good program, however, there is a "catch".

In order to be eligible for LSSF money, a school must have at least 20% of its student body enrolled in the ABA-LSD. This may appear to be another carrot-and-stick method of inducing people to join the Division, however, it is more properly a way of guaranteeing that the small and needy law schools who strongly support the ABA will have preference over the large and greedy schools who do not. The LSSF funds themselves come from donations to the Division and a few profit-generating activities. None of the $5. membership fee goes to the Fund as an inducement, in fact, the fee itself does not completely cover the cost of services provided directly to members by the Division and the ABA itself.

The purpose of this article is two-fold. For the first time in recent history, Michigan is in a position to seek funding through the LSSF, if the right efforts are made in the next few weeks. Our present ABA enrollment is approximately 90 students short of the required percentage, or the rough equivalent of a single first-year section. Starting next week, I will be accepting preliminary proposals from any groups interested in applying for the funds this year. If there is sufficient interest, we can begin the paperwork required for submission of the requests to the ABA. At the same time, I will be soliciting new memberships, especially from first-year students, in the hope of meeting our 20% quota before the first Division membership tally at the end of this month.

As always, I would be happy to answer any questions about the LSSF or the ABA-LSD in general. I can sometimes be reached at 764-8930 or found in room H-11 of the Law Club. Failing that, a simple "Hey, you" in the hallways of Hutchins is always welcome.

Jim Schnare
ABA Representative

A career in law—without law school.

What can you do with only a bachelor's degree? Now there is a way to bridge the gap between an undergraduate education and a challenging, responsible career. The Lawyer's Assistant is able to do work traditionally done by lawyers. Three months of intensive training can give you the skills—the courses are taught by lawyers. You choose one of the seven courses offered—choose the city in which you want to work.

Since 1970, The Institute for Paralegal Training, has placed more than 1600 graduates in law firms, banks, and corporations in over 75 cities.

If you are a senior of high academic standing and are interested in a career as a Lawyer's Assistant, we'd like to meet you.

Contact your placement office for an interview with our representative.
Social control and social rehabilitation--the juvenile courts have been charged with two incompatible goals and, as a result, failed to accomplish either of them effectively.


The first views the juvenile offender as a threat to the community and mandates the court to determine guilt or innocence and administer punishment.

The second sees the offender as a victim of circumstances--social, economic, psychological and biological--and attempts to supply the resources the child has been deprived of. It looks at his needs, instead of his crime.

The objectives neutralize each other, generating a system that is riddled with internal inconsistencies and paradoxes.

"Brought to Justice? Juveniles, the Courts and the Law" is the seventh and final report of the five-year, federally-funded NAJC. It examines the structure of the nation's juvenile courts, including case processing, staff characteristics, due process and service technologies such as diversion, probation and detention.

The editors, both professors in the U-M School of Social Work, found that the courts varied widely in both structure and practice, within states as well as among them. Some courts are small, hearing as few as 50 cases per year, while others process some 8,000 cases annually and employed a probation staff of over 500. Few states have a coherent structure whereby the juvenile courts are alike in each county. The typical juvenile court has no system for providing routine information and rational problem solving.

Variations and inconsistencies in the courts' handling of juveniles have been documented within every phase of the U-M study. Previous reports have noted the widely differing rates at which youth are sent through the court system, assigned to institutions, or released on probation.

Juvenile codes in each of the 50 states were so dissimilar that the NAJC found comparisons impossible. The disparities ranged from the definition of an "offense" to the structure of the court, types of detention facilities, and length of punishment.

"We have been repeatedly confronted with ambiguities and contradictions in the goals, structure and operations of the juvenile courts," Sarri and Hasenfeld state.

One source is the statutes themselves, which have been weak and vague, leaving enormous discretion to the juvenile court judge. Few distinctions were made between serious delinquency, minor delinquency, dependency or neglect. During the past 10 years, the Supreme Court, state legislatures and private and public interest groups have stimulated the development of new juvenile justice practices and revised codes.

A key issue that still needs attention, Sarri and Hasenfeld stress, is the contradiction between "youth concern" and "crime control". Courts operate under the assumption that they must protect the community, yet over 40 per cent of the cases referred to them are in fact juvenile nuisances. Court personnel themselves concede that truancy, curfew violations and the like are no "community threat," and assert that youth service agencies should handle the cases.

Instead, the courts' broad yet vague mandate over many juvenile problems enables the schools, family service agencies and even parents to use it as a 'dumping ground' for youth whom they do not want to deal with.

Institutionalizing such youth is inappropriate and in many cases harmful. The survey indicates that over half of the juveniles referred to the courts are counseled, warned and released or simply dismissed. Others may be put on probation, which is little more than surveillance. Few, however, are put in touch with needed services.
The current trends in social welfare and criminal justice programming are "decriminalization, diversion, deinstitutionalization and deterrence." Research findings have consistently shown that legal intervention does not deter subsequent criminal behavior.

In fact, statistics show that the earlier a youth is processed through the system and the more stringent the punishment, the greater the chance that the youth will be back for more frequent and more serious law violations, the NAJC report says.

The founders of the juvenile court were seeking to reduce the harsh and undifferentiated treatment that characterized youth handling in the criminal system prior to the 20th century. But the system lacks strong guidelines, consistency in case handling, and accountability.

"Past decisions have resulted in an expansion of the juvenile justice system with the expectation that youth would become more law abiding under the threat of coercive punishment," Sarri and Hasenfeld conclude.

"Since juvenile crime has continued to increase, it is clearly time to try other alternatives."
Dear "Mouth",
Your complaint is a common one among first year law students, who are not all as brave and as confident as they appear. I will make a few comments which may or may not prove helpful:
a) Relax, you are trying too hard. Read and brief the case by all means, but don't over-do things. Use horn-books sparingly, only when you wish to review or find a particular area difficult. Leave outlining for later in the term. Concepts which seem difficult now will fall into place in a few months when you have more background in the subject matter and the reasoning process.
b) Listen to the professor and fellow students very selectively. Learn to distinguish between the explanation of knowledge and the expulsion of hot air.
c) Talk to upperclasspersons who have been through the process. They may unknowingly drop a few helpful hints in spite of themselves.
d) Read the RG during class on Friday. It may make the professor nervous and maybe he won't call on you. Anyway, it's a tradition.
e) Do not sit in your assigned seat every day. This may have the same effect as (d) Supra.
f) Last of all, remember the famous Latin maxim which exhorts: "Confirmatio omnes supplet defectus, licet id quod actum est ab initio non valuit." (Translation for our Latin-Impaired readers: A defective Confirmation in the Quod is no good from beginning to end--No, that can't be right, let's get the Black's, ah yes: Confirmation supplies all defects, though that which had been done was not valid at the beginning.)

Signed (With Dry Palms)

JUICY PRUDENCE
READ-ONLY MEMORIES

By The Malevolent Memo Maker

And now, MMM's third column of the year. Admittedly, it's no big deal, but I've always heard that the third time's the charm--so maybe I'll get it right this time.

* * * * * *

This week's lead item from the news concerns a certain Boston-area law school, which shall be nameless here to protect the stupid. It seems that in 1973, a student enrolled at the school, but within a few weeks he decided that "Paper Chase" was mild by comparison. He made an extrememly wise move then--he dropped out, never to return.

Well, maybe never; he might be going back for a few alumni meetings now. He just received his degree in the mail. With high honors, yet!

Personal to the Dean: Once again, the Eastern schools have proved themselves to be years ahead of us. Why can't U of M introduce this type of innovative program?

* * * * * *

On the political scene, Jimmy Carter seems to be doing well with the undecided voters. That's reasonable, considering his undecided stands on every major issue.

* * * * * *

This week's "Thanks For Nothing" award goes to that bastion of blunders, that temple of torpidity, the U.S. Postal Service. According to the info tag on the nearby drop boxes, there's one day service to certain zip code areas, including my home town.

Well, "one day" must mean something different to them than to me. So far, the fastest any letter has gotten through has been three days. And today, I received one letter mailed sixteen days ago!

Hey, Post Office--how about taking a few "work breaks" during your day-long coffee breaks?

* * * * * *

While on the subject of mail, have you noticed that bills and third-class junk mail always arrive three times as fast as letters with checks and/or other goodies?

* * * * * *

There's an Ohio case awaiting trial that may prove a bit unusual. Two men had a very heated argument. "A" said to "B", "I hope you have a heart attack and drop dead."

You guessed it--B kicked off right on the spot, from a coronary. B had had heart trouble before, which A knew about. So, A is being held for manslaughter. A bit strange, right? Almost sounds like a hypo Donny Regan would dream up.

* * * * * *

Did you notice how few people voted in the LSSS/Board of Governors election? This would be a great time for me to say a few words against student apathy, but I really don't care.

* * * * * *

And while thinking of voting--now's the time to get your absentee ballots for the November election, if you're from out of state. Don't wait too long--without a ballot, you can't write in any votes for my candidate--"None of the above".

* * * * * *

A New York man went nuts last week, and killed his entire family by locking them in the trunk of a running auto inside a closed garage. Police were unable to pin it on him directly. However, he was arrested for at least one major charge; from the many bodies and the noxious exhaust fumes, the EPA was able to make out a clear case of heir pollution.

* * * * * *

Almost as bad was the photographer who locked his family in his unheated darkroom. They all died of exposure. Not a pretty picture.

* * * * * *

And after those rotten puns, you should know better than to expect classy humor in this rag.

* * * * * *

Keep those cards and letters coming in, kiddies! The volume of mail so far has been truly underwhelming--one more letter will just about double the number so far. But don't worry--our trained staff of 97 ex-civil service workers has just about been able to handle the volume so far, and according to the union shop steward we only need 310 more workers to double the mail room's capacity. Such a deal!
FROM THE DESK OF THE PLAGIARIST:

While rummaging through the Dean's waste-basket in search of a scoop, I ran across the following version of a well-known fable, which the Dean was obviously considering as an entry for the next edition of his Labor Law text. The RG is pleased to publish it as an example of the use of parables in the teaching of legal and social principles.

THE MODERN LITTLE RED HEN

Once upon a time, there was a little red hen who scratched about the barnyard until she uncovered some grains of wheat. She called her neighbors and said, "If we plant this wheat, we shall have bread to eat. Who will help me plant it?"

"Not I," said the cow.
"Not I," said the duck.
"Not I," said the pig.
"Not I," said the goose.
"Then I will," said the little red hen. And she did. The wheat grew tall and ripened into golden grain. "Who will help me reap my wheat?" said the little red hen.

"Not I," said the duck.
"Out of my classification," said the pig.
"I'd lose my seniority," said the cow.
"I'd lose my unemployment compensation," said the goose.
"Then I will," said the little red hen, and she did.

At last it came time to bake the bread. "Who will help me bake the bread?" asked the little red hen.

"That would be overtime for me," said the cow.
"I'd lose my welfare benefits," said the duck.
"I'm a dropout and never learned how," said the pig.
"If I'm to be the only helper, that's discrimination," said the goose.
Then I will," said the little red hen.

She baked five loaves and held them up for her neighbors to see. They all wanted some and, in fact, demanded a share. But the little red hen said, "No, I can eat the five loaves myself."

"Excess profits!" cried the cow. 
"Capitalist leech!" screamed the duck. 
"I demand equal rights!" yelled the goose. And the pig just grunted. And they painted "unfair" picket signs and marched round and round the little red hen, shouting obscenities.

When the government agent came, he said to the little red hen, "You must not be greedy." "But I earned the bread," said the little red hen. "Exactly," said the agent. "That is the wonderful free enterprise system. Anyone in the barnyard can earn as much as he wants. But under our modern government regulation, the productive workers must divide their product with the idle."

And they lived happily ever after, including the little red hen, who smiled and clucked, "I am grateful. I am grateful." But her neighbors wondered why she never again baked any more bread.

CRUSADER RABBIT

FIFTY REASONS TO GO TO LAW SCHOOL

Now that we have entered the second month of the law school year, a sobering thought is slowly dawning over most of us—namely, why the hell are we all here in law school? For those who are in need of a quick answer or two, the following list is provided as a public service:

1. To burn up some more of your parents' money.
2. To burn up some more of your own money.
3. To sink your parents further into debt.
4. To sink yourself further into debt.
5. To avoid having to look for a job and not finding one.
6. To avoid having to look for a job and finding one.
7. Because going to school is the only thing you know how to do.
8. Because you have an allergy to sunlight and must stay indoors all day.
9. Because you want to make a lot of money.
10. Because your father's law firm needs a new junior partner.
11. Because your parents want you to go to law school.
12. Because you want to go to law school.
13. Because you are a masochist.
14. Because you heard that Ann Arbor had a lot of good, cheap dope.
15. To learn how to free the innocent.
16. To learn how to free the guilty.
17. To learn all that lawyer talk so that you'll understand Perry Mason better.
18. Because F. Lee Bailey and Melvin Belli were your childhood heroes.
19. Because you talk a lot and might as well get paid for it.
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20. Because you were a high school or college debator.
21. Because you want to make a lot of money.
22. Because a nice lawyer once helped you, and this inspired you.
23. Because a shyster lawyer once shafted you, and you want revenge.
24. (For males) Because it is easy to impress undergraduate women if you are a law student.
25. (For lesbians) Because it is easy to impress undergraduate women if you are a law student.
26. To learn law from renowned and respected law professors.
27. To try to find one renowned and respected law professor who can teach.
28. To collect another degree.
29. To get something impressive to put on your resume.
30. Because you like to argue.
32. Because you loved junior high school so much that you wanted to relive the experience.
33. Because you want to make a lot of money.
34. Because Watergate convinced you that we need more honest lawyers in government.
35. Because Watergate convinced you that we need more lawyers in government who are sneaky and won't get caught.
36. Because Watergate opened up a lot of vacancies in government.
37. Because you want to run for political office.
38. To learn how to fight the battles of the poor, oppressed and downtrodden.
39. To learn how to fight the battles of the rich, privileged and powerful.
40. To avoid having to decide what to do with your life.
41. To try to be number 1 in law school just like you were number 1 in your high school and college.
42. Because successful lawyers don't have to work very hard.
43. Because you like to dress sharp like lawyers do.
44. Because you want to help people.
45. Because you want to hurt people.
46. Because you want to avoid people altogether.
47. Because you want to make a lot of money.
48. Because you want power.
49. Because you are upwardly mobile.
50. Because you have a high tolerance for boredom.

STRATOMATIC FOOTBALL

the week in review

The 1970 Detroit Lions looked as if they were beginning to perform as the experts expect in holding off the Green Bay Packers ('67), 23 to 20. On paper, the Detroit offense, highlighted by the passing and running of quarterback Greg Landry, has to be figured the best in the league. And the defense forced six turnovers on the part of the Packers, four by interception.

Around the league, Dallas remained undefeated at the expense of the Kansas City Chiefs, 27-9. The 1973 Cowboys hold a 1 1/2 game lead over Detroit in the National Conference race, after four weeks. Minnesota ('73) dropped its third game, against one tie and no victories, to Pittsburgh ('72), 24-10. The Vikings could manage only 72 yards passing against the Steelers, a matter of concern. Los Angeles (1967) downed the 1974 Cardinais, who had to operate with Dennis Shaw at QB the entire second half due to an injury to regular Jim Hart. And Oakland brought the Bengals back down to earth, 28-14, after Cincinnati had gone 3 weeks without a loss and without allowing a touchdown.

STANDINGS & THIS WEEK'S GAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFC</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>NFC</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pittsburgh at Dallas; Oakland at Detroit; St. Louis at Minnesota; Kansas City hosts Green Bay; Los Angeles travels to Cincinnati

Michael Marrero
FOOTBALL POLL

Last weekend was another tough one for poll entrants, as the consensus picks came out on top in only 12 of the 40 games. The individual median was a semi-respectable 18-22.

Gary Peters (didn't he used to pitch for the White Sox?) waltzed away with the top prize by coming up with a 29-11 record. That was 3 games better than his nearest competitor. The exciting race of the week was for the caboose position, and Mark Kellman earned that "honor" for the second straight week. This time Mark needed the tiebreaker to beat Konrad Friedemann and Tom VanDusen, who also produced 10-30 records. Five others were just one game out of the cellar.

Now on to this weekend's games. The same old rules apply--circle winners and cross out losers and place the sheet in the box outside Room 100 before 5 P.M. Friday, or under the door at K-43 Lawyers' Club before noon on Saturday.

College

MICHIGAN STATE (28-1/2) at MICHIGAN
OHIO STATE at IOWA (20-1/2)
ILLINOIS at MINNESOTA (2-1/2)
NORTHWESTERN (5-1/2) at INDIANA
PURDUE (9-1/2) at WISCONSIN
OKLAHOMA vs TEXAS (6-1/2) at DALLAS
NEBRASKA at COLORADO (10-1/2)
KANSAS at OKLAHOMA STATE (7-1/2)
MISSOURI at KANSAS STATE (24-1/2)
GEORGIA at MISSISSIPPI (11-1/2)
KENTUCKY at MISSISSIPPI STATE (4-1/2)
PRINCETON (1-1/2) at COLUMBIA
CORNELL (14-1/2) at HARVARD
DARTMOUTH At YALE (3-1/2)
PENN (13-1/2) at BROWN
SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI (24-1/2) at ALABAMA
MARYLAND at NORTH CAROLINA STATE (13-1/2)
ARMY (14-1/2) at PENN STATE
LOUISVILLE (16-1/2) at PITTSBURGH
TEXAS TECH (10-1/2) at TEXAS A&M
OREGON (20-1/2) at CALIFORNIA
SMU (15-1/2) at BAYLOR
FLORIDA STATE (14-1/2) at BOSTON COLLEGE
USC at WASHINGTON STATE (27-1/2)
STANFORD (21-1/2) at UCLA
VANDERBILT (13-1/2) at LSU

Pro

NEW ENGLAND at DETROIT (10-1/2)
CHICAGO (7-1/2) at MINNESOTA
SEATTLE (6-1/2) at GREEN BAY
ATLANTA at NEW ORLEANS (5-1/2)
DALLAS at N.Y.GIANTS (13-1/2)
PHILADELPHIA (7-1/2) at ST. LOUIS
KANSAS CITY (17-1/2) at WASHINGTON
MIAMI (4-1/2) at BALTIMORE
PITTSBURGH at CLEVELAND (13-1/2)
BUFFALO at N.Y.JETS (10-1/2)
Tampa Bay (21-1/2) at CINCINNATI
DENVER (7-1/2) at HOUSTON
OAKLAND at SAN DIEGO (9-1/2)
SAN FRANCISCO (11-1/2) at LOS ANGELES

TIEBREAKER: How many passing yards will Michigan State get against Michigan?

NAME: John Mezzanotte

RG RANKINGS

1. MICHIGAN (8) 160
2. OKLAHOMA 146
3. (TIE) GEORGIA 138
3. (TIE) UCLA 138
5. PITTSBURGH 135
6. NEBRASKA 114
7. KANSAS 107
8. OHIO STATE 101
9. MARYLAND 98
10. MISSOURI 93
11. USC 88
12. NOTRE DAME 63
13. FLORIDA 43
14. TEXAS A&M 63
15. BOSTON COLLEGE 33
16. CALIFORNIA 29
17. ALABAMA 25
18. ARKANSAS 24
19. TEXAS 23
20. LSU 20

Also receiving votes--BAYLOR (18), COLORADO (15), AUBURN (9), TEXAS TECH (7), KENTUCKY (4), MISSISSIPPI (4), NORTH CAROLINA (1), HOUSTON (2).