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University of Michigan Law School
CROSSWORD FUN!

Figure out what word or legal term belongs in each blank, and the boxed letters will spell out the name of a famous legal scholar!

5th Amendment guarantee: Due [☐]----- of Law

Dullest 1st Year course: Civil [☐]-----

Hot Dog, or former Supreme Court Justice: [☐]-----

State known for peanuts & Jimmy Carter: [☐]-----

"Chattel" is legalese for Personal [☐]-----

Lawyers' goal: To make lots of [☐]-----

Dean of the law school: St. [☐]-----

President Jerry's daughter: [☐]-----

"Cub" reporter & sidekick of Clark Kent: Jimmy [☐]-----

Our 37th President: "Tricky" Dick [☐]-----
Today

Melinda Morris, the President-Elect of the Washtenaw County Bar Association, will speak on Pre-Paid Legal Services at the PAD noon luncheon today in the Faculty Dining Room in the Lawyers Club.

General Meeting for those interested in the Feminist Legal Services, Thursday at noon in the WLSA Office.

Reginald Heber Smith will be the guest speaker at the Community Lawyer Fellowship Group Meeting, Thursday at noon in Room 236.

National Lawyers Guild meeting tonight at 9:00 at 1209 Cambridge Ct. (See the map on the Guild bulletin board for directions.)

Friday

FREE BEER AND CARTOONS

The Master Blasters (Social Committee), in association with the Film Committee, invite you to imbibe while viewing your favorite cartoon characters. Enjoy Daffy Duck, the Road Runner and many others along with old newsreels and excerpts from Marx Brothers flicks. All of this awaits you Friday the 15th at 8:30 in the Lawyers Club Lounge.

Sunday

SUPPORT THE BOTTLE BILL

A benefit supper and concert in support of Proposal A (the "Bottle Bill" initiative mandating a deposit on beer and soft drink containers and prohibiting pull-tabs) will be held this Sunday, October 17, at 6:30 P.M. at Xanadu Cooperative House, 1811 Washtenaw Avenue. $1.75 ($2.50 for non-students) buys you a wholesome spaghetti dinner, an evening of fine music provided by folk duo Aging Children and topical singer-songwriter Fred Small, and a salved conscience. Sustenance!

Tuesday

We have detected a few errors in the final class lists for some of the second and third year courses offered this Fall. This is most likely due to an error -- probably ours--at some point in the Drop/Add process. However, to be sure that you do not later suffer the consequences of an error (e.g. lack of credit or receipt of an incomplete in a course you thought had been dropped), please verify our record of your final elections with Bonnie Thomson outside Room 100 on Tues., Oct. 19 (9:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon and 2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.) or Wed., Oct. 20 (1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.).

SEMINAR AND CLINIC SIGN-UPS

Seminars and Clinical Law reservation materials for Winter Term 1977 will be available at 1:00 p.m. October 15, 1976 in Room 300 HH and outside Room 100 HH. There will be separate material for Seminars and for Clinical Law. Make sure you pick up the appropriate packets. The deadline for the return of reservation forms will be October 27, 1976 at 4:00 p.m. The results of the reservation process along with other pre-classification materials will be available about two weeks after that deadline.
Thursday

The next WLSA Steering Committee Meeting will be Thursday, October 21 at noon in the office.

Notice

Will whoever borrowed all of the poster materials (poster board, construction paper, magic markers) from the WLSA Office please return them. We don't have money to replace these items if others use them, nor to subsidize other groups' posters.

MIXER$ PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS: Many male law folk (and some others) crave the stimulation (?) of traditional "meat market" Law School Mixers.

and WHEREAS: Such events require unconscionable amounts of Law Student time, energy, and precious bodily fluids in the preparation, execution and aftermath.

and WHEREAS: The LSSS Social Czar lacks the motivation and personal resources to carry the burden alone.

NOW THEREFORE: By the authority(?) vested in me as LSSSPREZ, I ANNOUNCE AND PROCLAIM the week beginning today the official VOLUNTEER FOR THE MIXER COMMITTEE week, and request all interested persons to deliver their support and assistance to Social Czar Donn Randall (662-3765).

ss George Vinyard

PETTY POETRY

From the Pen of:

Per Stirpes

(Today's lines may help my multitude of loyal fans--all three of them--understand why I write poetry(?). I call it: Study In Blues.)

After one year of law school or more,

Studying becomes such a bore,
And always it seems

That I go to extremes

To avoid that unpleasant old chore.

I listen to records, I dust,
And watching Baretta's a must,
Call home or a friend,

Talk to plants and pretend

That there's time yet to read Antitrust.

Maybe old age is making me lazy,

Otherwise five naps a day would be crazy!
I start reading E-0
And it just goes so slow
20 minutes and my mind goes all hazy.

I ration my study-time tightly,

And do but a few hours nightly,

So when all's said and done

Though it isn't much fun,
If I'm a little behind it's all-right.

CROSSWORD FUN SOLUTION

"PERRY MASON"

Process, Procedure, Frankfurter, Georgia, Property, Money, Antoine, Susan, Olson, Nixon

VALLEY OF THE JOLLY RES GIANT

Mr. Potato......Ned Othman
Sweet Potato......Julie
Tomato............Carol Sulkes
Radish............Ken Frantz
Rutabaga.........Don Parman
Carrot...........Crusader Rabbit
Indian Corn.......Stuart Olson
Squash...........John Mezzanotte
Collard Greens....Dot Blair
Eggplant..........Earl Cantwell
Zucchini..........Michael Marrero
Scallion..........Dan Schulman
Chick Pea.........Sandy Gross
Breadfruit.......Bob Brandenburg
Chili Pepper.....Dennis Fliehman
String Bean......Eddie Cooper
NOTICES

The Law Spouses Association is sponsoring a wine and cheese tasting party on November 6 in the Lawyers' Club Lounge. Cost is only $3.00 per couple. To make reservations or for more information call Kathy Dwyer (761-4066).

CENTER FOR LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY

On Friday, October 22, Mike Harper of the Center for Law and Social Policy will be interviewing students who wish to spend the '77 Winter Semester at the Center's clinical law program in Washington, D.C. Mr. Harper will conduct a group meeting at 12:00 p.m. in Room 132 of Hutchins Hall to describe the program for everyone who is interested in attending. Students may pick up material on the Center and sign up for interviews in the Placement Office.

The Center is a foundation-funded public interest law center located in Washington, D.C., and dedicated to representing the interests of previously unrepresented citizens before agencies and courts; to analyzing legal institutions, particularly federal administrative agencies; and to providing clinical education for law students.

The Center has concentrated in the areas of consumer affairs; the constitutional rights of mental patients; hospital care for the poor; women's rights; the foreign affairs decision making process, especially trade and international environment; and energy policy.

The Center will select from three to six students from Michigan to spend the '77 Winter Semester in Washington with students from Pennsylvania, Stanford, Yale and UCLA. The students work closely with lawyers on all of the Center's cases.

Michigan students are eligible to participate in the program during their third, fourth or fifth semesters, and receive 12 units of pass/fail clinical law credit based on evaluations of their work by the Center. The students must pay all of their expenses in addition to their regular tuition, except travel back and forth to Washington. The Center has some scholarship funds for needy students and some residence lodging for single students.

For further information, see Professor Peter Westen, 1043 LR (763-1374).

OPENINGS OF LIAISON POSITIONS TO ABA COMMITTEES

The Law Student Division Section and Committee Liaison Program is a vital LSD activity. It provides a student voice in the substantive areas of the ABA. Although most liaison appointments are made in the spring, occasionally openings occur at other times. The Standing Committee on Judicial Selection, Tenure and Compensation has recently invited the Law Student Division to appoint a liaison member; his/her duties will commence with attendance at the Mid-year Meeting in Seattle (February 13, 1977 at 9:30 a.m.). The Committee regrets that it is unable to fund the position. The Standing Committee on Legal Drafting is interested in having a student liaison to work with it. Finally, the Standing Committee on Legislation would welcome a law student liaison.

Applicants must have a full scholastic year to complete as of September 1, 1976. To apply, send a letter of application with a complete resume covering student bar activities, section membership and previous LSD activities, as well as any information pertinent to the substantive concerns of the committee.

When possible, appointments are made to students with two years remaining in law school so that continuity may be achieved but merit and expertise are most important in determining selection. Geographical balance is also sought.

The letter of application and resume should be sent as soon as possible to David Stiglitz, President, ABA/LSD, University of Missouri-Kansas City, School of Law, 5100 Rockhill Road, Kansas City, Missouri 64112. With a copy to Alice E. Fried, Director, Law Student Division, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.
It's monsoon season in Ann Arbor and another week has come and gone. Before continuing last column's discussion of the differences in the way people think I must first touch upon the concept of relativity.

There is a game of chess. Conveniently enough, it is between Alvan Adams (A) and Brigitte Bardot (B). Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones are watching. Mr. Smith happens to like this particular game because he favors intricate positional play. He thinks it's exciting. Mr. Jones likes games of quick resolution, with lots of pieces taken early. He finds this game dull.

A heavy down in pieces. Both players and experts now agree that A is winning. At this instant Bobby Fischer drops in to check on the game. He sees that B has over-extended herself and is open to a quick flank attack and a forced checkmate. He silently congratulates A on his subtle and ingenious play and leaves, commenting on his way out that A "has it won."

Of course A doesn't see the line of play Bobby Fischer saw—he'd have to be a world-class grandmaster to see it. So he sighs and resigns himself to eventual defeat by B's superiority in pieces.

At this point I would say B is winning. Both players and experts would agree. Except that in saying this I am directly disputing the stated opinion of the best chess-player in the world. Considering that I know only a small amount about chess, I find this very presumptuous on my part. Nevertheless I persist in my opinion. Bobby and I meet outside the game-room. I ask him: "Who is winning?" He says. "A." "Who is going to win?"

'A. He has a forced mate." You see the difficulty I am having. I ask him: "Who has the greater advantage at this moment?" He says, "A. What greater advantage is there than a forced win?" I finally ask him, "What if A doesn't see the forced win?" Bobby replies, "Then he's a fool. It's obvious." Bobby is being characteristically uncharitable.

The problem is, B is winning. She will win. Several moves later it is over and she has won. Yet nothing Bobby Fischer said above is untrue. The forced win is there and it is obvious to him. But if what he says is true then we have a contradiction.

The whole mess could be avoided by not using the statement "B is winning." If we condition all of the above statements with clauses concerning the nature and abilities of the players and observers our questions become simple. We cannot answer the question whether the game is exciting or dull if we ask it in a vacuum. We must know—exciting or dull to whom? Early in the game the experts, Q and R, disagree as to who is winning. Without conditioning their statements you might be reluctantly forced to conclude that both players were winning. The same goes for our dispute with Bobby Fischer. If we'd taken care to place our statements in a proper context of time, place, nature of participants and nature of observer we would have been safe from these misunderstandings.

(This concern with placing statements in context is a consideration of a field called General Semantics, about which I know very little and would love to learn more).

Unfortunately, if we condition all our statements we become impossible to talk to. If you ask someone who's winning a chess game you don't want him to launch into long-winded histories or analyses—you want a quick opinion. It is far easier to say "The Earth is round" than "The consensus of opinion in the scientific community is that the Earth is round." There is nothing wrong with facilitating
THE CONTINUING ADVENTURES OF REMAINDERMAN

IT WAS FRIDAY AFTERNOON, AND DARK BENT, MILD-MANNED RACE CAR DRIVER, WAS BUSILY PREPARING FOR NEXT DAY'S QUALIFYING RUN AT THE MINI 500...

BOUND AND BLINDFOLDED, BENT IS SOON ABOARD A LEARJET BOUND FOR PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY!

ONCE THERE, HIS BONDS ARE REMOVED!

WHAT'S THIS ALL ABOUT?!

YOU WILL FIND OUT SOON ENOUGH!

THIS WAY, MR. BENT!

W-WHY, YOU'RE THE ETS COMPUTER!

CORRECT! AND NOW I WILL TELL YOU WHY YOU WERE BROUGHT HERE!

ABSOLUTELY! ALL LSAT SCORES ARE NOW ADJUSTED FOR GRADE INFLATION BY MEANS OF AN ESCALATOR PROVISION BASED ON THE CPI (CON-THE-PROF INDEX)

THE LSAT SCORES RECEIVED FROM OUR PODUNK TEST CENTER WERE HIGHLY ERRATIC THIS SUMMER! WE SUSPECT CHEATING!

I'M NOT JUST GRADE INFLATION?

THEY WERE LOST (A PLAUSIBLE EXPLANATION, GIVEN THE LEVEL OF EFFICIENCY AT WHICH WE OPERATE) AND THAT THEY WILL HAVE TO TAKE THE TEST OVER!

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
YOUR MISSION, SHOULD YOU CHOOSE TO ACCEPT, IS TO POSE AS A STUDENT TAKING THE LSAT IN ORDER TO FERRET OUT THE CHEATERS! THIS TAPE WILL SELF-DESTRUCT IN FIVE SECONDS!

EIGHT DAYS LATER, REMAIN-DERMAN SHOWS UP AT THE TEST CENTER AT PODUNK! GEE, I WONDER WHY EVERYONE IS STARING AT ME?

THE TEST BEGINS! R-MAN SOON DETECTS BEHAVIOR THAT JUST MIGHT POSSIBLY SUGGEST CHEATING!

PST! HERE ARE THE ANSWERS! PASS IT ON!

THREE GRUELING HOURS LATER, THE TEST IS OVER! BUT BEFORE ANYONE LEAVES, OUR HERO SPRINGS FROM HIS SEAT, TEARS OFF HIS DISGUISE, AND REVEALS HIMSELF AS:

THREE.GRUELING HOURS LATER, THE TEST IS OVER! BUT BEFORE ANYONE LEAVES, OUR HERO SPRINGS FROM HIS SEAT, TEARS OFF HIS DISGUISE, AND REVEALS HIMSELF AS:

REMAIN-DERMAN

TWO HOURS LATER, THE TEST SCORES ARE IN...

ALL WRONG?! WHAT ABOUT THE 78TH TEST?

SUCH FORTUNE TELLING, LADIES!

SUDDENLY, FLEMZAPPER THROWS HIMSELF AT R-MAN'S FEET!

CONCLUDED ON NEXT PG...
communication. However, we tend to get sloppy and abbreviate even further, saying "The situation is..." when we really mean "The consensus opinion is..." This is OK if we're still remembering we're talking in "shorthand." It's when we forget that we run into trouble. People don't take the time to separate observations from conclusions, facts from opinions. They don't take the time to preface their perceptions with some phrase indicating that it is only opinion. The listener is usually too lazy to make the effort either, with the end result that the "shorthand" never gets re-translated.

Why is this bad? Take the familiar statement—"He's drunk." This is a common example of a conclusion being treated as an observation. The observation is that he's moving clumsily, or staggering, or talking loudly, or smelling of alcohol—usually a combination of factors. "He's drunk" is shorthand for: "The following factors, a,b,

c,d, lead me to conclude that he is drunk." What if the statement were made as an accusation regarding the behavior of a worker in a factory or a teacher in a classroom? In a "longhand" communication the employer might be guided to investigate whether the factors leading to this conclusion could also have fit a conclusion of fatigue, depression, illness, etc. In a "shorthand" communication he might be guided straight to the conclusion, which he might without further thought treat as an observation and incorporate into a conclusion of his own. Such biases are common in our everyday lives and are insidious because they are almost impossible to detect.

Next week I am going to start tying things together. These matters are like Chinese boxes—every time you open one up you find another one inside it. Sometimes you get to the end and find they are all empty.

And sometimes not.
FROM THE DESK OF THE PLAGIARIST:

Well, sports fans, it's been seven years in a row now that I've watched my alma mater Spartans go down to defeat at the hands of the Wolverines. It does get rather tiresome. However, for all of you fellow-masochists out there who root for the Green and White, there is hope. You, too, can enjoy the annual MSU-U of M contest, if you follow the routine which I experienced this past weekend.

STEP # 1: (a) Attend a morning cocktail hour sponsored by the U of M Law School Social Committee. Pour yourself a Bloody Mary. (b) Wear nothing but green and white clothing, so you can be readily identified as a fanatic, and therefore not be held responsible for your actions. (c) Have another Bloody Mary. (d) Give your U of M friends a hard time for being afraid to root for the underdog. (e) Have another Bloody Mary. (f) Join the rest of the now-incoherent MSU supporters in a frenzied rendition of the Spartan Fight Song. (g) Have one more Bloody Mary for the road.

STEP # 2: (a) As you stumble to the stadium, make sure that you remembered to bring along your cooler full of 7 and 7's. (b) Try to sit near someone else who can offer another selection of alcoholic beverage. (c) Observe at the beginning of the game that MSU is not behind, but merely tied at 0-0. Drink to that. (d) Continue drinking throughout the first half, while proposing special toasts in recognition that the Spartans have not lost the game yet. (e) If you have carefully followed the routine so far, you won't especially care about how far MSU is behind, and when the final gun sounds, you won't be able to tell who won anyway, since the scoreboard will be perceived only as a blurred jumble of indistinguishable numbers. (f) As your friends carry you home, remember that it's not who won the game that's important, but rather how it was enjoyed.

STEP # 3: (a) Once safely home, order a large pizza with heavy everything and try to absorb some of that alcohol. (b) Crawl into bed and sleep it off. (c) Wake up in time to catch the 11:00 o'clock news, so you can watch the highlights of the game and see what actually transpired on the field during the second half. This is essential if you expect to participate in any Monday morning quarterbacking sessions.

STEP # 4: Be inconspicuous as you slink into school on Monday morning. Wear a U of M T-shirt. Don't associate with any MSU friends who might give you away. And if you finally do get cornered, unleash the most potent verbal weapon in your meager arsenal: "OH YEAH? WAIT 'TIL NEXT YEAR!!!"

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

SPECIAL TO THE RC--Social Chairperson Don Randall has consented to the publication of his recipe for pre-game Bloody Mary's:

In a 20-gallon container, mix together

12 oz. Worcestershire Sauce
2 oz. Celery Salt
9 gallons Vodka
9 gallons Tabasco Sauce
9 1/2 teaspoons tomato juice (if desired)
Salt and pepper to taste.

Dennis Fliehman

THE ADVENTURES OF PEEP 'N TOM

THE PEARL

"MR. JONES, WOULD YOU PLEASE ANSWER THAT QUESTION FOR US?"

"I'M NOT MR. JONES."

"THEN, WHO ARE YOU?"

"NO WAY MAN."
By way of a preface, let me begin this report by reminding you that this convention marks the first time in recent history that this law school has been officially represented at the annual meeting of the Law Student Division. As might be expected, my arrival in Atlanta was greeted with a combination of amazement and curiosity by the other delegates, especially those of our own Sixth Circuit, who for years have regarded our school as a "colossus of gunners in the North". As I perceived the purpose of my trip to the convention to be a dual one, I constantly attempted to establish the credibility of Michigan as an equal partner in the concerns of all law students and to simultaneously bring the experiences of a large and diverse law school to bear on the problems of the Division.

To give you a candid appraisal of my accomplishments, I must admit that you have bought, at best, a toehold in an organization often dominated by the schools which are willing to devote the most time and money to politics on a national scale. With the help of Bill O'Neill, who attended the convention as the former liaison to the Section on Corporations and Banking, I managed to take an active role in both the balloting for national officers and the consideration of numerous resolutions. Even when our suggestions on various matters did not succeed politically, we managed to present them in a manner which insured that they were considered fully and respected, if not followed.

Since I imagine that this rather nebulous introduction does little to answer your questions as to the quantitative record of Michigan as a new voting member in the Division House of Delegates, I will attempt by the following charts and enclosures to detail the business conducted and my actions with respect to it.
Election of Officers----

Names listed in order of vote in preferential balloting, with winners denoted by an asterisk (*)


Secretary-Treasurer: 1. Eppenstein, 2. Kaiden, 3. Otorowski*


The statements of all candidates are in the attached blue book, with the exception of that of Howard Brown. In general, my votes for Stoup and Carlson were motivated by my belief that they were sincerely interested in delivering services to the Division rather than furthering any specific personal or political goals. Eppenstein impressed me as a person with both personal integrity and a diligent approach to the inner workings of the Division. Brown and Charen appeared to be an ideal combination for the actual representation of the Division before the ABA. Both are extremely articulate, both have significant background in the area of civil rights, and yet they bring to the job differing styles and experiences.

Resolutions----

All votes and actions based on entire resolution, except where severance of particular sections has been noted.

Exhibit #1: Opposition to Second Circuit Certification Rules
(First paragraph severed and killed) Vote: aye Action: passed

Exhibit #2: Public Interest Study of Administrative Agency Performance
Vote: aye Action: passed

Exhibit #3: Model Code of Student Rights
(Motion to approve in principle for submission and refinement by individual student bodies) Vote: aye Action: passed

Exhibit #4: Indian Law Course Requirement
(Extensive re-draft substituted from floor) Vote: nay Action: passed

Exhibit #5: Gun Control
Vote: nay Action: passed

Exhibit #6: Condemnation of S-1
Vote: aye Action: passed by acclamation

Exhibit #7: Affirmation of Juriscan
Vote: aye Action: passed

Exhibit #8: Ninth Circuit "Minority" Concerns
Votes: 1. aye, 2. & 3. nay Action: all passed (see conclusion of report for eventual outcome on this point)

Exhibit #9: Faculty Tenure Systems
Vote: aye Action: passed

II
Exhibit #10: Student Input to ABA Activities
Vote: aye Action: passed

Exhibit #11: Prepaid Legal Services/Student Participation
Vote: aye Action: passed by acclaimation

Exhibit #12: California Professional Responsibility Exam
Vote: aye Action: failed

Exhibit #13: Bi-lingual Education in Public Schools
(on amendment to stress development of English proficiency)
Vote: aye Action: failed
(on main motion) Vote: aye Action: passed

Exhibit #14: Reciprocal Law Library Privileges
(lost on reference for further study)

Exhibit #15: Allowance of Extra Hours for Night Students
Vote: nay (see conclusion) Action: passed

Exhibit #16: ETS Hotline for LSAT Problems
Vote: aye Action: passed

Floor Resolutions----

1. On motion to appropriate $1000 for a survey of student bar associations (such as the LSSS) as a resource for all local organizations, and to appoint a National Coordinator to facilitate exchange of information:
   Vote: aye Action: passed

2. On motion to publish finally approved text of all resolutions in the Student Lawyer magazine:
   Vote: aye Action: passed

CONCLUSION----

The present time is a pivotal one for the ABA-LSD nationally, and certainly at the local level. As a whole the organization often suffers from credibility problems with its parent organization. Part of this stems from a lack of quantitative support from law students in general. Beyond the problem of absolute numbers however, lurks a more subtle qualitative one. Schools such as Michigan, which purport to exercise a "leadership" role in the field of legal education, seem unwilling to accept a comparable role in the lobbying efforts of the Division. As a result, many causes of undeniable merit are left to the efforts of their least able and articulate spokespersons. Although Michigan students have consistently been active
in promoting a variety of causes through affinity groups, we have sadly neglected our duty to expose the "elders" of our profession to the problems that they are prone to overlook.

In at least two notable cases, the Indian Law Resolution and the Night Student Course Load Resolution, I felt obliged to vote against proposals of substantive merit, simply because they were poorly prepared and and hastily amended into an incomprehensible form guaranteed to confuse the issues and lead to cynical reaction by the ABA House of Delegates. I certainly am not an elitist by nature, but after watching several meritorious proposals die at the hands of incompetent proponents (or perhaps stagger through the LSD, only to provoke adverse reactions from our less emotional counterparts in the ABA), I believe it is time for the students of Michigan to use their experience and training in an immediate and tangible way to help further the common causes of law students and those in society affected by the legal profession.

The commitment requires, of necessity, more than skill and intelligence, and I again believe that it is unfair for Michigan students to withhold the benefits of their experience with a diverse student body. In one notable near-fiasco of this summer's convention, a person of questionable credentials and even more questionable ethics proposed a facially appealing set of resolutions designed to bring an end to minority admissions problems. The proposals were ramrodded through in a flood of pseudo-sensitivity, despite dissenting speeches by the sole member of the Black Caucus present on the floor and myself. A full-scale walkout in the next session was narrowly averted when a parliamentary challenge spear-headed by the Sixth Circuit overturned the earlier action and a temporary walkout in response to a request by the Black Caucus killed the floor quorum for a revote. As the story was later explained to me, the suspicious nature of the resolutions was traceable to the fact that their sponsor was using minority issues as a springboard to garner large foundation grants for a pet project.
at Berkeley in which he had substantial financial interests.

Certainly, full participation by Michigan and by the LSSS in Division activities will never erase the bad aspects of the organization and will not automatically insure that important issues are brought home to the ABA in an intelligent and articulate manner. However, by working through the Sixth Circuit, I believe it is possible for us to have a real impact upon the Division, and through it, the ABA. On October 16, the Circuit will be holding a roundtable conference in Toledo. The choice of this site was not coincidental, but rather a deliberate attempt by the other law schools in our area to encourage our involvement in a meaningful way. In closing, I would request that you consider sending at least one representative to accompany me as a liaison to the other LSSS type organizations who will be there. I will continue to serve this organization as a voting and policy making representative on the Circuit and national level, however, I believe that it is also important for the LSSS to involve itself directly in the problems common to student governments in other area schools.

I thank you for your attention to this report and will be glad to answer any questions it raises personally.

James H. Schnare II

1976 ABA CONVENTION REPORT

Jim Schnare, the official LSSS Liaison to the American Bar Association-Law Student Division, recently filed the preceding report on his attendance at the ABA Convention in Atlanta this summer. (His attendance was funded by the Law School.) The full texts of the resolutions to which Jim refers in his report are on file in the LSSS office and should soon be appearing in the "Student Lawyer" magazine which is sent to all members of the ABA Law Student Division. For those who are interested in speaking with Jim about the Convention or his votes, he is on the Agenda for the next LSSS meeting.
LAST ANNUAL LAW STUDENT SURVEY
By Crusader Rabbit

Have you ever wondered what all of your fellow 1000 law students were thinking? Due to his extraordinary powers of ESP (and the uncanny ability to eavesdrop on law students by hiding in the bushes), Crusader Rabbit has surveyed a random sample of law students and is pleased to release the following public opinion poll:

(1) Do you like law school?
   1st year students 2nd yr. 3rd yr.
   Yes 38% 31% 11%
   No 9% 30% 83%
   Don't Know 53% 39% 6%

(2) What do you like most about Law School?
   1st yr. 2nd yr. 3rd yr.
   Coursework 20% 11% 2%
   Faculty 18% 8% 1%
   Fellow Students 14% 15% 3%
   Beer Parties 25% 43% 29%
   Other 18% 11% 3%
   Nothing 5% 12% 62%

(3) What do you like least about Law School?
   1st yr. 2nd yr. 3rd yr.
   Coursework 14% 21% 10%
   Faculty 11% 26% 19%
   Fellow Students 29% 10% 2%
   Placement Office 0% 22% 31%
   Res Gestae 6% 10% 14%
   Everything 5% 9% 24%
   Other 9% 1% 0%
   Nothing 26% 1% 0%

(4) What do you intend to do after you graduate law school?
   1st yr. 2nd yr. 3rd yr.
   Work for a law firm 24% 34% 34%
   Work for a corporation 21% 25% 25%
   Work for the government 23% 15% 16%
   Work for legal aid 14% 10% 4%
   Work in the public interest 18% 9% 3%
   Work at anything 0% 5% 18%
   Work at anything other than law 0% 2% 10%

(5) What do you think is the purpose of Law School?
   1st yr. 2nd yr. 3rd yr.
   To teach you law 78% 29% 11%
   To teach you enough law 6% 20% 6%
   Law to pass the bar exam 2% 5% 33%
   To teach you how to think like a lawyer 5% 13% 10%
   To socialize you into the role of a lawyer 8% 26% 19%
   To teach you nothing 1% 7% 21%

(6) How much time do you spend per week on Law School?
   1st yr. 2nd yr. 3rd yr.
   Under 20 hours 0% 2% 9%
   20-29 hours 7% 11% 22%
   30-39 hours 15% 21% 33%
   40-49 hours 24% 25% 14%
   50-59 hours 36% 23% 4%
   60 or more hours 18% 18% 18%

(7) Do you think law professors, in general, are good teachers?
   1st yr. 2nd yr. 3rd yr.
   Yes 49% 35% 22%
   No 11% 41% 73%
   Don't Know 40% 24% 5%

(8) Do you remember the following rules of law? (asked only of 2nd & 3rd year students)
   2nd yr. 3rd yr.
   The Parol Evidence Rule 31% 18%
   The rule in Shelley's case 6% 1%
   The Erie Doctrine 43% 21%
   Palsgraf v. LIRR (both Cardozo and Andrews views) 37% 14%
   Larceny by Bailee 22% 11%
   Incidental and Consequential Damages 18% 13%
   The Rule Against Perpetuities 9% 1%
   Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel 29% 19%
Due to the fact that so few teams are having good years, the RG panel of experts has changed its method of ranking the teams. Each expert now picks his top 15 teams, and points are awarded on a 20, 18, 16, 14, 12, 10, 9, 8, ... , 2, 1 basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>USC</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Texas Tech</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Oklahoma State</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points scored in the Big Ten this week:
- Michigan at Northwestern (40 1/2)
- Ohio State at Wisconsin (20 1/2)
- Minnesota at Michigan State (7 1/2)
- Illinois at Purdue (2 1/2)
- Indiana (9 1/2) at Iowa
- Colorado (6 1/2) at Oklahoma State
- Iowa State (10 1/2) at Missouri
- Oklahoma at Kansas (6 1/2)
- Kansas State (26 1/2) at Nebraska
- Alabama at Tennessee (10 1/2)
- Georgia Tech (12 1/2) at Auburn
- Miami, Florida (14 1/2) at Pittsburgh
- Vanderbilt (17 1/2) at Georgia
- Brown at Cornell (10 1/2)
- Columbia (13 1/2) at Yale
- Harvard at Dartmouth (3 1/2)
- Oregon (27 1/2) at Notre Dame
- Maryland at Wake Forest (13 1/2)
- North Carolina State (7 1/2) at North Carolina
- Syracuse (20 1/2) at Penn State
- Baylor (7 1/2) at Texas A & M
- Texas Tech at Rice (24 1/2)
- Mississippi at South Carolina (3 1/2)
- Kentucky (10 1/2) at LSU
- Florida at Florida State (13 1/2)
- Washington State (20 1/2) at UCLA

TIEBREAKER: How many points will be scored in the Big Ten this week?
STANDING & NEXT WEEK'S GAMES:

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

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

FOOTBALL FANATIONAL OR JUST FOOTBALL INTERESTED...
Youngster or adult...we have a game for you!

STRAT-O-MATIC PRO FOOTBALL

The Week in Review:

The undefeated Dallas Cowboys of 1973 were knocked off by the 1972 Steelers, 20 to 17. Dallas lost 4 fumbles, threw an interception, and had two punts blocked, which was quite enough to counteract the fact that they rolled up nearly 500 yards on offense (as compared to Pittsburgh's 201) and ran off almost thirty more plays than the Steelers.

In other games, Oakland continued to win, this time over Detroit (who missed a chance to gain ground on the Cowboys) by a score of 26 to 10. Minnesota won its first, a 24-0 pasting of the Cardinals. Cincinnati got back on the right track at the expense of the confused and confusing L.A. Rams. It remains to be seen whether Los Angeles will be a force in the AFC race as expected before the season. Finally, the 1970 Chiefs dropped their fourth in a row, this loss coming at the hands of Green Bay, 41-24. The Pack scored their highest point total in two seasons, at Kansas City.
FOOTBALL POLL

For the third straight week the poll entrants could have done better by tossing a coin to make their picks. The median individual score was a low 16-24 and the consensus was 12-28.

The winning entry was signed by none other than Jimmy (The Greek) Snyder. Jimmy picked 31 winners by applying the exciting and challenging method of playing the official Las Vegas spreads against those appearing on the poll. For anyone else who wants to be relieved of the tremendous pressure of picking the winners by themselves, these cookbooks picks can be found weekly in the Wednesday Free Press. In previous weeks this method would have produced approximately 500 records. Anyway, if the Greek is in town this weekend he can pick up his prize at K-43 Lawyers' Club.

In the battle for the cellar, Mark Kellman's bid for an unprecedented Triple Crown was stopped by Rick Durden, whose 6-34 "bested" Marks by four games.

Here are the top 10 to date in the cumulative poll:

1) Gary Peters 75-42
2) (Tie) "Ducky" Schofield 68-49
2) (Tie) Greg Nelson 68-49
4) Keith Ewing 66-51
5) Greg Need 64-53
6) (Tie) Stew Olson 63-54
6) (Tie) Ross "Iceman" Shugan 63-54
8) Greg Cross 62-57
9) Fred Fathe 61-56
10) (Tie) Dave Brown 60-57
10) (Tie) Blake Harrop 60-57

63 people are still eligible for this prize.

Now on to this weekend's games. In light of the low scores of the past three weeks (averaging 49-68), I have tried to soften up the spreads this time. For the benefit of new entrants the rules are as follows. Circle winners and cross out losers, and place the page in the box outside Room 100 before 5 p.m. Friday or under the door at K-43 Lawyer's Club before noon on Saturday.

COLLEGE

Michigan at Northwestern (40 1/2)
Ohio State at Wisconsin (20 1/2)
Minnesota at Michigan State (7 1/2)
Illinois at Purdue (2 1/2)
Indiana (9 1/2) at Iowa
Colorado (6 1/2) at Oklahoma State
Iowa State (10 1/2) at Missouri
Oklahoma at Kansas (6 1/2)
Kansas State (26 1/2) at Nebraska
Alabama at Tennessee (10 1/2)
Georgia Tech (12 1/2) at Auburn
Miami, Florida (14 1/2) at Pittsburgh
Vanderbilt (17 1/2) at Georgia
Brown at Cornell (10 1/2)
Columbia (13 1/2) at Yale
Harvard at Dartmouth (3 1/2)
Oregon (27 1/2) at Notre Dame
Maryland at Wake Forest (13 1/2)
North Carolina State (7 1/2) at North Carolina
Syracuse (20 1/2) at Penn State
Baylor (7 1/2) at Texas A & M
Texas Tech at Rice (24 1/2)
Mississippi at South Carolina (3 1/2)
Kentucky (10 1/2) at LSU
Florida at Florida State (13 1/2)
Washington State (20 1/2) at UCLA

PRO

Detroit (6 1/2) at Washington
NY Giants (13 1/2) at Minnesota
Philadelphia at Green Bay (4 1/2)
Chicago (3 1/2) at Los Angeles
Cleveland at Atlanta (3 1/2)
Seattle at Tampa Bay (6 1/2)
Dallas at St. Louis (10 1/2)
New Orleans (12 1/2) at San Francisco
Baltimore at Buffalo (11 1/2)
Cincinnati at Pittsburgh (3 1/2)
Oakland at Denver (7 1/2)
Kansas City (10 1/2) at Miami
Houston at San Diego (6 1/2)
NY Jets (13 1/2) at New England

TIEBREAKER: How many points will be scored in the Big Ten this week?

NAME: ____________________________

FOR YOUR OWN REFERENCE
RECORD YOUR CHOICES ON
PAGE 16