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Editorial

EDITORIAL POLICY

At the last Senate meeting the editors of RG came under heavy criticism for their editorial policy. Rather than reply to every criticism, the editors would like to place the editorial policy on record and let those who disagree with that policy talk with us in an attempt to reach an understanding of the various points of view.

LIMITATIONS IMPOSED BY OUTSIDE FACTORS:

Almost everything that is submitted must be retyped. While we do not have a secretary, we do not have one of our own. A substantial amount of her time is spent doing work for professors and priorities of the law school dictate that professors are more important than the RG. Thus, material does get typed for RG so long as the secretary can complete the work assigned to her by the profs.

The copy center reproduces RG each week. They request a 17 page limit. If the RG is any longer, it probably will have to come out on Monday.

SELF-IMPOSED LIMITATIONS:

No one is more aware of the First Amendment than a law student. At the same time, editors of a newspaper must concern themselves with responsible journalism. Certainly all notices, including the minutes of the Senate meetings will be printed if at all possible. We do have a deadline for the insertion of all material: TUESDAY NOON. If the notice comes in late, and we can get it typed, it will be inserted nevertheless. Of course, all notices should be typed or legibly handwritten.

There is a more restrictive editorial policy for letters and articles. This can be best illustrated by giving examples of what we would not print. Several years ago the cover of RG displayed a cartoon in which then President Nixon was sodomizing Uncle Sam. A further example would be the insertion of a political blurb supporting the candidacy of Mr. X for Congress or Ms. Y for Governor. Another example would be a letter from Student A calling student B (or professor B) a (Words deleted-Editorial policy.) (--------)(--------), We require both letters and articles to be signed. We will, at the request of the writer, preserve his anonymity.

WHO MAY BE A MEMBER OF RG?

Any law student.

BUDGET

The budget for Res Gestae is $1,017 per annum, of which about $800 is allocated for the payment of salaries and the rest goes for expenses such as paper, glue and stamps. Our typist and our printing costs are paid by the dean. The hourly wage comes to about 60¢.

OFFICE HOURS

We do not have office hours.

--George A. Pagano

...You have the right to remain silent...

The entire staff of RG wishes to express its admiration of the performance of the MSU football team last week. Congratulations to all the MSU alumni.

MSU
THE POLL

COMMENTS: The results of the faculty poll were tabulated on a weighted five points for best, four for second best and so forth. The results listed below include those members of the faculty who provoked significant response. "Favorable response" is listed from most favorable to less so, but still reflecting thorough approval. "Adverse response" is listed from less adverse to more so. The complete results are available in the RG office. We hope that the poll may be of some general help to those who are selecting classes for next term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those receiving significant favorable response:</th>
<th>Those receiving generally negative response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahn</td>
<td>Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, F.</td>
<td>Coffey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordby</td>
<td>Polasky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Soper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estep</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandalow</td>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Kamisar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggoner</td>
<td>Burt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Donahue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Conard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooley</td>
<td>Regan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There will be a brief fund-raising meeting for those going to the National Conference on Women and the Law on Monday, November 18, 1974 at 1:45 p.m. Bring suggestions for fund-raising.

MENTAL HEALTH LAW SOCIETY

Meeting Thursday, Nov. 21, 7:30 p.m., HH 236. Information about participating in civil commitment proceedings under the new Mental Health Statute, possibly for credit and/or remuneration. Also, planning future activities and programs.

LOST BRIEFCASE

If anyone knows the whereabouts of a black leather briefcase, left in H.H. 212 on Monday, Oct. 28, please call 764-8933, or return to Lost-and-Found on 3rd floor Hutchins. Thank You.

PHI ALPHA DELTA

Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity will host Federal District Judge John Feikens of the Eastern District of Michigan on Thursday Nov. 21. Judge Feikens will talk on "HOW TO SUCCEED IN COURT-A Federal Judge's view."

Our luncheon is at noon in the Faculty Dining Room (between the Student Dining Room and the Lawyers' Club Lounge). Everyone is invited, and free coffee is provided.

ELECTION POLL

Joel Winston won the poll. His only mistake was the upset victory of James Rhodes in Ohio. In fact, nearly all the entrants underestimated Mr. Rhodes.

Roger Rapaport, Peter Holmes, and Jim Hicks tied for second place. Close, but no cruzeros.

RAZA LAW STUDENTS

Raza Law Students would like to announce that the Law School Student Senate is having an open meeting on Monday, November 18, room 106, 4:20 p.m. in regard to serving non-union lettuce in the Lawyer's Club dining hall.

Your views and support are needed.

On Friday, November 15, the LSSS Film Committee will present Charade, starring Cary Grant, Audrey Hepburn, Walter Matthau, James Coburn, and George Kennedy, and directed by Stanley Donen. This will be our last film of the semester. Show times are at 7:30 P.M., in Room 100, Hutchins Hall. Admission is free for law students, $1.00 for non-law.

Hopefully, our problems with our projection equipment will be solved by Friday, but we make no guarantees. The people who complained about last week's show are invited to join us next semester and give us a hand. I won't hold my breath, however.

Our tentative schedule for next term (if the Film Series continues next term, and we're not sure it will) includes: The Pawnbroker, The Seventh Voyage of Sinbad, Monkey Business, Anatomy of A Murder, My Little Chickadee, All the King's Men.
ME AND THE LAW REVUE FLEA...OR THE DAY I GOT INVITED UP TO THE SEVENTH FLOOR
By Joseph C. Fenech

There I was sitting in the R.G. office on Monday morning, going through the hate mail:

"Deer Rees Gestl, yu stink!"

Ah, this writer is a veritable fount of eloquence, I thought, must be a faculty member.

"Dear Editor, I object to the policy of allowing pseudonyms, or anonymity. (Please withhold my name. I don't want anybody to think I read this rag.)"

"Dear R.G., When are the faculty poll results going to be published?
S/Jim (Stolen Book) Martin

P.S. Did I do good, huh, huh, did I do good, did I, did I, huh, huh??????"

I was in the process of crumpling up and disregarding another law school "Student Senate" directive when I heard a knock on the door.

Hmmmm, that was a syncopated knock in staccato fashion. Only a top-halfer could knock in such a fashion, I thought.

When I opened the door I was stunned! Not merely a top-halfer, but three esteemed members of the Law Revue upper staff awaited!

Are you Joe Fennish?, they asked.

No, I'm Joe Fenech.

Well Finch, one stated, we are three members of the Law Revue Upper Staff and we came down here to extend an invitation. I'm Frank Apraisel, that's Saucha Deel, and he's Ben Takin.

Glad to meet...

By the way, Funch, is this where all you

(See Invite page 6)

THE FASTER WE GO, THE ROUNDER WE GET
By Stanley Ford

First of all I would like to thank my courageous colleague "Yellow Dog" for the fine writing he deposited in RG last week, and for his awarding me a "yellow dog stick" Typical of most capitalist entrepreneurs old Yellow Dog has not yet delivered his potent "dip." I can tell because my eyes still focus. Once the fearsome "dip" is administered all gets hazy. Just like Federal Courts. A fine cheap high.

My only regret concerning the "dip" is that there no longer exists the possibility of cruising on its soothing vapours while listening to the Greatful Dead live and in the flesh. The Dead are gone. So says my copy of Rolling Stone. If I had known in 1972 that they would quit playing in 1974 I would have gone to Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. Michigan is a prestigious law school, but the Greatful Dead are sublime.

Perhaps this falls on minds deadened by too many casebooks, undergraduate ambitions and fears of drugs, long hair and inner space. But I do think that I've seen a few skulls and roses around the quad that might have appreciated the sight of Jerry Garcia, Pigpen and Winterland (or Fillmore East) zoned on the Dead's own acid kool-aid, the whole crazy experience sliding down the walls; the faster it went, the rounder we got.

The Dead kept me sane through four years in the Bay area. Two factors keep me from mumbling and drooling in the stacks here at the "Berkeley of the Midwest." Sunday night at 11:45 Professor Vince Blasi hosts a talk show with academic zombies as guests. The show could be improved if the Prof. brought out a Argentine high wire act or a Vaudeville comedian. Blasi just might become the Ed Sullivan of the law school circuit.

But even without cheap entertainment the show is a gas. So far the guests suck, with
Frank, do you have the map?, asked Saucha Deel turning toward her colleague. We've got to find our way back to the seventh floor.

Frank, Apraisel nodded, and at this point Ben Takin, who had been silent thus far spoke up:

We have here a letter for you which is a formal invitation we on the Law Revue decided to extend.

Why this letter is dated September 1st, 1973, I said.

Er...We know. When originally written, a Law Revue committee decided it had substantial probability of eventual publication, but told the writer to submit another draft. Thirty-seven drafts later a Law Revue senior editor decided that it still had a substantial probability of eventual publication, but couldn't decide if that substantial probability was a reasonable substantial probability or merely a possibility. Faced with such a complex problem, the senior editor submitted it to the Law Revue's Complex Problems Committee. This committee required further drafting, and cite-checking.

Cite-checking? On a letter?, I interjected.

Don't interrupt, French!, screamed Ben Takin. The Complex Problems Committee voted 3 to 2 that the letter extending an invitation to you did indeed have a reasonable substantial probability of eventual publication, rather than a mere possibility of eventual publication based on a substantial probability. Do you see, Finnish?

Yes,...I think.

Good. Here is your pass to the seventh floor. Keep it with you at all times, otherwise you may be disintegrated by our electronic security apparatus which is programmed to vaporize all bottom-halfers who are foolish enough to enter the Law Revue sanctum.

Later that afternoon I went up to the Law Revue offices. I was somewhat apprehensive, of course, especially when being scanned by the T.V. cameras and when the Law Revue Robot—a 12-foot mechanical behemoth which kept muttering: "CRUSH BOTTOM-HALF, CRUSH BOTTOM-HALF," and was stamped with: "MADE BY COVINGTON & BURLING"—came alongside and escorted me.

The most harrowing moment, however, came when I was walking through the Law Revue carrels. Someone shouted: "Hey, isn't that the guy who dreamed up Coif-Han, The Law Revue Flea, and is responsible for dubbing our illustrious dean as 'St. Unwound'?" "Yeah!" "GET HIM!"

At that point I was bombarded with textbooks, reporters, digests, journals, and even shiny new apples (intended as gifts for professors, no doubt). Fortunately, I managed to escape serious injury.

Finally, I reached the offices of the Editor in-Chief and his assistant. A rather imposing sign was on the door:

OFFICES OF LAW REVUE HEAD HONCHOS

BOYER U. DUMM

&

MOE M. DOWNE

(See Smith, page 7)
I went in.

Glad you could make it, Fenech. I'm Boyer U. Dumm, editor-in-chief of the Law Revue and ruler of the vurld. This is Moe M. Downe, assistant ruler of the vurld.

Hi. What is... You know of our invitation? Good. Here are the terms: You are expected to work long hours. Your work will be subject to constant review. If you are late, two supervisors other than your immediate supervisor will review your status on the Revue. This Revue review of your status on the Revue will be reviewed by our head reviewer who is then reviewed by us, the head honchos of the Revue. The pay is twenty cents per hour.

Well, that's twice as much as I get from Res Gestae. I'll take it.

Good, said Boyer U. Dumm. Your mops, brooms, and dust rags are in that closet. You can start by cleaning my office.

--The End

black letter life

'VOID'

By R. Richard Livorine

I've nothing to say this week, and nothing to write, and no urge to write for its own sake, at least not here.

So I won't.

DRIVEL

RES IPSA's LOQUITUR

This week only--just defame.

OK folks, this is it. R.I. is pleased to present the results of the faculty sex poll. We rushed this to press despite one professor's demand for a recount even before publication. (Not the same professor who finished in the second flight of the poll despite his complaints about being harassed by female students because he's so "cute".) Between 1% and 80% of the M.L.S. student body responded overwhelmingly. Here are the results.

1. Waggoner 6. Chambers
2. Kahn 7. Reed
3. Waterson 8. Plant
5. Cooper 10. Vining

11. Palmer 16. Harris
12. Rosberg 17. Soper
13. Israel 18. Westen
15. Bishop 20. Pierce

22. Conard 27. Betts
24. Gribble 28. Pooley
25. Sax 30. St. Antoine

31. Warden 36. Blasi
32. Nordby 37. Cunningham
33. Martin 38. Jackson
34. White 39. Wright
35. Polasky 40. Carrington

41. Watson-Pat's pick.

RI'S ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

"Wonder Boy "Waggoner has been uniformly well-received here at M.L.S. Let's hope his position won't lapse after he's tenured.

"Kutie" Kahn turned in a red-line performance by making it to the top of both lists. Keep up the over-achievement, K.K.!

"Mean Mary Jane "Waterson gained admission to the top five despite her graduation from an undistinguished midwestern law school.

H.T. "Hot Time" Edwards recovered from a
the exception of our own Yale Kamisar who wore his old hornrim glasses and did a credible imitation of Jimmy Cagney, (his Bette Davis was weak but recognizable). Vince looks squarely at the camera. The camera rarely moves. Neither do you once your gaze falls on the T.V. Perfect for getting you ready for Monday morning at the gothic pyramid.

It is Saturday night, however, that truly saves my psyche. I know my time has come when I approach the door and Pillsbury the fierce watchdog begins his powerful bark that soon has all of the female dogs in the neighborhood howling. The GHOUL IS ON. 11:30, channel 50. The Ghoul, savior of our erratic souls, the scumsucking King of Parma is out to flatten your head. He'll do anything folks!! He's our next president!! Many people think that he was our last president, but the actual facts are that he is a Professor at this very legal institution who undergoes a Ghoulectomy every Saturday morning! That's not true either!! No Professor here has the sheer class to be the Ghoul!! He is Unique!! He will receive a copy of the R.G.!! If we're lucky he'll talk about us!! So quit reading Newsweek and imagining what government agency you want to revitalize so that you too can be a "young turk!!" The wet head is dead! So is the dry look! Watch the Ghoul and get the fried look!!! Yellow at the edges!! Queasy Blue in the face!! Its the school colors!!!!

Good Old Greatful Dead. Good Old Ghoul. In days like this when simpering idiots like the twit who wrote "Anony-Ms" infest our common consciousness, when prices rise and finals appear round the bend, peace is where you can find it. Find it.

poor early showing by taking affirmative action to negotiate his way to a high ranking.

Ed "Cuddles" Cooper "rounds out" the top five. In a big upset "Beach Boy" Bollinger and "Peter" Westen were supplanted by "Perennial" Marcus Plant, a late bloomer. And the dean of a renouned midwestern law school finished in the bottom half, well behind "Hell-on-Wheels" Betts.

And for "Handy Andy" Watson the unequivocal winner as "Pat's Pick", R.I. offers a no-expense paid date with Pat in the psychiatric ward of the Long Beach Hospital.

Next week, R.I. returns with its usual thinly veiled slander. (We reserve the right to intentionally insult anyone, but we ask that contributors be accompanied by sufficient explanation to help R.I. avoid unintentional blows.)

That's all folks.

R.I.

Senate

LSSS RAKED OVER COALS

Day-care centers, excessive student fees, and criticisms of the Res Gestae editorial policies were the principal topics of last Monday's LSSS meeting in Room 100 of Hutchins Hall.

While law students pay a $15 fee each semester explained Treasurer Bertie Butts, the LSSS receives only $10 a year, with the rest being held by the Dean. Other LSSS revenues are $7,000 from the pinball machines, $1,000 from vending machines, $1,000 refunded from university student government fees, and other revenues that bring the total to approximately $25,000. The money is used to fund all law schools groups, the mixers and sherry hours, the Res Gestae, and other social and sports activities. Relatively little of the budget goes into the mixers, with the first one this year meeting all costs by door receipts and the second one costing $250.
While the use of student funds are not always visible to the law school community at large, many worthwhile projects are funded through the LSSS budget. Large amounts are budgeted to Legal Aid, the three minority associations, and until this year, the prison-inmate assistance program, MIAP. Funds are also held for a contingency funds to meet the need of new groups that form during the year, such as the recently-organized Feminist Legal Services.

A little used program is the Take-A-Professor-To-Lunch program. Any three law students can take a professor to lunch in the Lawyer's Club and have the professor's lunch paid for by LSSS. Non-club residents may use the program, and can either buy meal tickets or brown-bag it.

The editor of the Res Gestae will be invited to a future Senate meeting to answer criticisms against present editorial policies. The refusal to publish notices of LSS-sponsored functions and the lack of articles on law school events and activities are two of the criticisms that prompted one student to remark "People don't read the RG anymore. Putting a notice of an event in it is like putting it in the Detroit Legal News."

Several people asked that the complete minutes of the LSSS meetings be put in the RG each week, to generate more awareness of Senate operations. One student remarked on the purpose of RG: "It seems to me that it's not a free press paper, but a law school organ. They should spend more time reporting on the things that happen around here and less on the so-called humor."

Several students were surprised to learn that RG editors are paid for their hours, and asked for a fuller accounting of how that money is actually allocated.

The possibility of day-care centers within the law school was raised. Several studies done in past years have shown the idea to be unfeasable, both from the standpoint of financial costs and the availability of space within the law school. However, with the present plans for a new library addition with student office spaces now on the drawing boards, it may be possible to change the physical structures to allow for one. Interested students are invited to contact Dean Pierce for more information.

The possibility of obtaining better lunch facilities was discussed. While there may be some conflicts with the ARA over vending-machine competition, it was noted that the machine food is overpriced and lacking in nutritive value. While most students would probably want to keep the machines for all-day operations, the possibility of opening a self-serve counter during the noon hour will be discussed at a future meeting, after cost estimates have been prepared.

Alterations to the laundry room are now being finalized by the University engineers, with the hope that construction will begin soon. The breakdowns of individual machines should be reported to the Club desk, and the companies who own and service them will be contacted.

S/Bill Hays
Secretary, LSSS

LAW SCHOOL BRIDGE TOURNAMENT
November, 1974
Results (Top finishers)

1. W.C. Blanton/Stu Jones/Jim Dobson/ Pat McLain
2. Robin Freedman/Don Lewis/Dave Neuman/ John Gaguine
3. Barry White/Andy Marks/Jim Warden/ Robert Kligman
4. James Hogg/Al Simpson/Joe Freedman/ Chuck Firke
RESPONSE TO LETTER FROM HOWARD N. NEMEROVSKI:

Mr. Nemerovski suggested in his letter of October 28, 1974, that they do not represent Gallo Wines but instead represent "Gallo Sales Company, INC." In order to set the record straight, a call was made to Howard, Prim and we were told by receptionist that the firm did represent the Gallo corporation. We are happy to learn that they do not.

S/Kenneth Morse

Dear R.G.:

I was profoundly shocked to be informed via your last issue that the distinguished firm of Howard, Prim, etc. represented "Gallo Sales Company, Inc." rather than E & J Gallo Winery, Inc.". Had we known that their relationship to the sales of boycotted Gallo Wine products was so perfectly tangential, we surely would have never even considered protest activities.

It sorts reminded me of the time in 1968 when an obscure defense contractor said we had the wrong villain for our protest at the recruitment office at my undergraduate school. He felt that our efforts should be directed at Dow Chemical, since all his company did was manufacture some of the mechanical parts necessary for the distribution of Dow's napalm to the civilian populations of Indochina.

S/Jim Jenkins

TO DEAN ST. ANTOINE

Well, at least you recognize the problem. Last night you spoke to us in your introduction for Judge Gilmore, and you talked to us of the problem of "delivery of legal services to the poor." Judge Gilmore seems to see the same problem, but this letter is not addressed to him.

Well, what can we do about it? Some of us participate in legal aid, some of us are enrolled in clinical law. Other serves and have served in other volunteer and paying practices directed at the problems of the poor. It might be that, largely because of your stirring exhortation, hundreds of us will pour into the streets and become a new wave of peoples' lawyers. Could be. But that's up to us.

I submit, after all this, that perhaps your prodding was misdirected. You might find a better and more effective audience elsewhere. You might find a mirror and speak to the person you see therein--Because what the hell are you doing to solve this problem?

One might expect more from the dean of a great law school (I think that's what you called it) than mere pious pronouncements. But I find it hard to square your seeming concern with some of the things I see at this great law school (there it is again!) Like a desperately under-funded, understaffed legal aid program. Like a clinical law program which can enroll only thirty students each term. Like the absolute proliferation of courses dealing with legal problems of the poor (I think I meant that sarcastically). Like the definite lack of encouragement from our great faculty (oops!) of any sort of program for legal services for the poor. It could fairly be said that the concern of this law school for the poor and their problems, is most conspicuous in its absence.

Now maybe the problem is that nobody has ever presented concrete enough proposals to you. But one might expect great leadership from the great dean of a great law school; and in any case, I haven't heard you asking for suggestions. My only other thought is that maybe such affirmative action (dread phrase!) is beyond your powers. Maybe you've tried but your hands are tied. To that I must politely respond, bullshit.

(See To Dean page 12)
So, Dean St. Antoine, you can talk all you want about the problem of delivering legal services to the poor, once or twice a year or more often if you want. Talk away, and your talk might inspire one or two people (or maybe more). But I think your energy might be otherwise directed. In other words, sir, (and the cliche seems singularly opposite), put your money where your mouth is.

-S/Dwes Bergmann

JULIAN BOND

Dear Friend,

The enclosed clipping describes a case which may shock or surprise you, especially if you are among those who believe that the Supreme Court abolished the death penalty in 1972. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Capital punishment is still very much alive in the United States, and the life-and-death debate over its continued existence goes on.

But even among those who favor death for certain crimes, there is no debate when it comes to the execution of the innocent. And it is my firm belief that three innocent men have been sentenced to die in North Carolina's gas chamber.

Jesse Walston, Vernon Brown and Bobby Hines, three young black men, were convicted of a crime which stirs up the ugliest depths of anti-black hatred and prejudice--the rape of a white woman. Briefly, as the clipping states, the woman voluntarily entered their car one evening when they offered her a ride just outside Tarboro, North Carolina. They did have sexual intercourse with her, but the crucial question is whether she was raped or not.

I and everyone else here at the Southern Poverty Law Center are convinced that their conviction for rape was a major miscarriage of justice, and I believe some of the points listed below will convince you too:

---

1. At the woman's request, the men drove her to within a block of her home, where she got out of their car. Why would men who had supposedly just raped a woman extend such a courtesy to their alleged victim? At the time, she was observed leaving the car by several whites. Did she suddenly find her reputation at stake?

2. In contrast to the usual victim of rape, the woman was unscratched, unbruised and physically uninjured in any way.

3. The day after the incident, all three men went about their normal activities. Is this how the perpetrators of such a terrible crime would behave? Jesse Walston, who had been visiting his mother in Tarboro, soon returned to his home in Washington, D.C. But the day his mother telephoned that he was wanted for rape, he got into his car and drove back to Tarboro alone to square things.

---

(See Bond page 13)
4. The defendants were given a chance to plead guilty to the lesser charge of assault with intent to commit rape, a crime carrying a fifteen-year sentence and the possibility of parole in three years. But, to quote Jesse Walston, "We weren't going to say we'd done anything we didn't do, even if it would get us out in three minutes."

5. Although the population of Tarboro, North Carolina, the city where they were tried, is over half black, only one black person was on the jury which heard their case.

6. The jury was allowed to spend a night at home before rendering their verdict. Although the law does not require that a jury be sequestered, allowing them to go home seems, at best, an unwise procedure in a case like this. Emotions having been put on members of the jury is a strong one.

These are a few of the "hard" facts in the case, but there are other, less tangible things which are difficult and perhaps impossible to convey in a letter like this. The look in a man's eye, the tone of his voice, how he answers a particular question--these are things which Morris Dees, an attorney for the Center, has seen first hand.

Mr. Dees has been to North Carolina and talked with Jesse, Vernon and Bobby. He came away from his initial interview with them convinced that a terrible injustice has been done to these men, and he is determined to see that they shall not suffer the horrible fate of asphyxiation in the gas chamber.

To give you some idea of the remarkable courage and spirit of these men in the face of death and the dehumanizing conditions of their confinement, I have enclosed a copy of a letter written on death row, which they sent to the Center before Mr. Dees' first visit.

After this personal interview and a careful study of the summary of their trial, the Center has begun the long and arduous task of appealing their conviction. Center lawyers have made numerous appearances before the Supreme Court of the United States, and this case could well lead them back there to challenge the constitutionality of the death penalty and abolish capital punishment in this country once and for all.

**CRUEL, BUT NOT UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IF YOU ARE POOR AND BLACK**

In 1972 the Supreme Court struck down existing capital punishment laws, based on the fact that they were applied arbitrarily and discriminatorily. "Mercy clauses" written into these laws were regularly used to give lesser sentences to more affluent or socially "acceptable" defendants, while poor people and blacks convicted of almost identical crimes received the death penalty.

At present, over twenty states have written new capital punishment laws which they feel overcome the Court's objections. But, even under new laws, the death penalty still discriminates racially and economically. Of the more than eighty people now awaiting execution in the United States, well over half are black and all are poor. Jesse, Vernon and Bobby were convicted under North Carolina capital punishment laws which have seen twenty-two blacks, one American Indian and only ten whites sentenced to death.

**MUST THREE INNOCENT MEN DIE?**

We at the Southern Poverty Law Center feel it is time to put an end to unjust laws which discriminate, defy all standards of human decency and threaten the lives of innocent men. The fight to save Jesse, Vernon and Bobby--and hopefully, through their case, others now under sentence of death--will require legal talent and experience of the highest order.

Center attorneys have demonstrated their abilities by winning cases and setting legal precedents of national importance... in *Frontiero v. Richardson*, which won equal treatment for women in the armed forces and was the only women's rights case ruled on by the Supreme Court last year...in our suit which brought about reapportionment of the Alabama State Legislature under a plan which can serve as a model for states.
throughout the nation...in winning new constitutional standards in health care for the poor through our defense on the Relf girls, two black minors who were illegally sterilized...in our integration of the all-white Alabama State Troopers which has resulted in a greater percentage of black troopers here than in many Northern states.

These are a few of our past victories involving equal rights and legal defense for the poor, and our attorneys have now been hard at work for months to hasten the day when Jesse, Vernon and Bobby will be set free. It is proving to be one of our most difficult and costly cases to date, and we desperately need your support if we are to save the lives of those three innocent men.

WHAT CAN YOU DO TO HELP?

The Southern Poverty Law Center never takes any fees from those it defends, and this death penalty case will be enormously expensive. Other cases are already taxing our resources, and we have been able to continue only through the generosity of those who believe in our efforts.

That is why I have written you. Human lives are at stake, and you can help us in our fight to save them by sending a tax-deductible contribution and joining the Center in this vital struggle. We will see to it that you are kept fully informed of our progress in this life-and-death case.

Please believe me when I say your individual support can make a difference.

S/Julian Bond

P.S. A cruel twist has recently been added to this case. The North Carolina State Legislature has revoked the death penalty for rape where life is not threatened, but they have refused to make the new law retroactive. Jesse Vernon and Bobby face execution for what is no longer a capital crime. I ask you not to put this letter aside with the idea of answering it later. Please send the Center a check today for $15, $25, as much or as little as you can spare. The need is urgent.

Julian Bond
The Southern Poverty Law Center
119 South McDonough
Montgomery, Alabama 36101

MORE LETTERS

Dear Editor:

This letter is written in response to what now appears to be standard RG policy—the publishing of unsigned letters. In recent weeks this practice has increased and I think it is time for an evaluation of that policy.

RG should rightly be the forum for student opinion. Hopefully the readership can evaluate the various opinions expressed by the contributors to R.G. This is no call for censorship.

The responsible discussion of ideas should not take place in an atmosphere shrouded by secrecy. Clearly, authors of proposed articles should assume responsibility for their opinions by signing them. It is difficult to respond to an unsigned article. The reader just asks why is it unsigned? This question reflects on the strength of the conviction actually expressed by an unsigned article.

It may be, that because of the law school is such a small and closed "community", many feel restrained or inhibited. I suppose this is a legitimate argument for allowing anonymity. I do think that acceptance of such an argument is indicative of the collapse of an educational institution. In an institution which should encourage learning by the free flow of ideas, it is a sad commentary where people are

(See "All Talk, No Help")
afraid to express their opinions as their own.

Perhaps the law school has become so politicized that there is intimidation of those holding different or unpopular views. I do not believe the situation has reached such a state. I believe that RG's publishing unsigned articles only makes the collapse more inevitable. The RG should encourage open debate and criticism by only publishing signed articles. In addition RG should abandon its "Res Ipsa" column. Not only is the author of that column conspicuously anonymous, the innuendo which spews out the column borders on being destructive and in no way contributes to the openness of debate, comment or criticism at the law school. The column should be signed and innuendos should be made specific so that doubt is not cast on all those fitting the author's vague categories.

This letter is focused at RG because it has explicitly refused to accept responsibility for the articles appearing therein. Not only did the RG approve of the "Res Ipsa" column and style but RG refused to accept my responsibility for publishing the letter regarding Howard, Prim et al. The letter was signed and the purpose of my comments is not to criticize its publication. The RG comment that it is merely "a forum for student opinion," is a cop-out. RG must exercise a minimum responsibility in maintaining an atmosphere conducive to open comment and debate.

S/Stephen Godsall-Meyers '76

To Stan Ford: Who inspired Yellow Dog and myself. I would have never written RG otherwise.

To Yellow Dog:

Amidst the news of worldwide depression, starvation, cancer in every river and stream, alien chemicals in our meat and, freon destroying the ozone layer of the atmosphere, it does seem as though a wise thing for the U.S.A. to do would be to reconsider the effects of our capitalistic system and the way that it has and will affect our present and future well-being.

The continuous production of inorganic chemicals and non essential products for profit by some (while others are enslaved) can only result in the destruction of the earth.

Write on Yellow Dog!!!!

To Anony-Ms.

Be not despairs by Hardass' foul and insensitive remarks. The appearance of this fool is further support of your analysis.

To Hardass ("Res Derelicta"):

You have either been won over by the establishment somewhere along the line or you can't see beyond your nose. Can't you see that law school is a "boot camp for lawyers, where hard discipline in the development of analytical skills takes precedence over --- creative impulses and refining the Aesthetic Sense "because they continue to choosebulls like yourself who have no intuitive sense of justice and who must, therefore, be drilled in the analytical skills necessary to perpetuate this fictitious system.

What you, my enemy (no hate intended) should have learned before you came here is that in order to analyze anything properly you must first be able to see or somehow feel the circumstances. Have you no empathy barbarian???

Truthfully yours R.G.,
WHITE SAVAGE
To The Editor:

The recent letter published in Res Gestae (and later distributed separately) simply cannot be allowed to pass without comment. The author calls his letter Res Derelicta (translated "abandoned property"). One can only hope that viewpoints such as this will soon become abandoned property, although this Law School is showing no such signs.

Sir Repetitious apparently feels that he can speak for "genuine liberationists, male and female." I question his standing to do so, not only for the obvious reason that he is male, but also because he seems to have an extraordinarily negative view of women. He states: "for every truly liberated woman there are dozens of frustrated females, unhappy with themselves, bitterly lashing out at those 'responsible' for their own failure at self-integration." He openly admits his belief that most women are "frustrated", "unhappy", "bitter", "catty", "bitches!" Only a few women, the ones he labels "truly liberated", have managed to overcome their womanly traits sufficiently to prove their worth to him, as the representative of the male establishment. In one stroke he blames the victims of sexual oppression for their own unhappy fate and extols the rather odd virtue of "self-integration." Apparently women are to try desperately to conform to the male ethic, and when we fail, we must "self-integrate" our way to placid acceptance of our fate.

The analogy to boot camp is probably far apt than Sir Repetitious intended. In that peculiarly male institution inductees are shorn of their hair, their civilian clothes, and every other vestige of their prior identity. They are stripped bare psychologically, to prepare them for a complete overhaul. They learn to function in a totally alien setting, leaving behind the values, customs, and feelings accumulated over a lifetime (including their creative impulses and aesthetic sense). They learn to eat, think and sleep militarily, and preferably stop feeling altogether. The rationale given is that military and civilian societies are mutually exclusive, and they serve totally different functions. For all to long, lawyers have forgotten that they are not a separate society. Their function is to serve members of society whenever they have the misfortune to contend with the maze of governmental-legal bureaucracy. The failure of this law school to recognize that function may well have been the very problem that the anonymous woman's letter sought to address.

Finally, I would like to address the issue of anonymity. The first writer, rightly or wrongly, sought anonymity for what seemed to me obvious reasons. She was protesting the behavior of people who have the power to retaliate against her. She feared that some would exercise that power, and so chose to remain nameless. Sir Repetitious, on the other hand, was defending the dominant forces, and only had to fear the ostracism of those dozens of frustrated females. His fear only proves that we have much greater power than we think.

S/Barbara Klimaszewski

---

Reply to "Hardass" Whose Name Was Withheld By Request

I am in my third year at this law school, and I really wish that by now I could just ignore the insensitive, elitist, sexist, racist asses who seem to compromise a disgustingly large percentage of the population here. But the letter--"Reply to Anony-Ms."--appearing in last week's R.G. from some brave macho soul who desired to remain anonymous has once again pushed me to the point where I have to respond.

The condescending, insensitive tone of the

(See RE HARDASS p.27)
whole letter is really the most objectionable aspect of it, although certainly there are also specific comments in which deserve mention. What is it about so many law students (& lawyers) which makes them forget that they are human beings first of all? What is it that fosters and encourages this development of such gross insensitivity to the sufferings and needs of other people, especially those who are not like them, e.g., those who are poor or Black or Chicano or women? I didn't agree 100% with the letter from "Anony-Ms." either, nor do I always agree with what minority groups and other women have to say about their problems and solutions to them. But the vital thing is to at least react with some grain or spark of human feeling, in some way saying, "I know the pain is there and I wish I could help." If you can't at least do that, you're in pretty bad shape.

As to specific points raised in your letter:

1. If you had any sensitivity to women's problems at all, you would know that that letter did not have to be invented by an R.G. editor. It reflects the reality—or part of it—of women in this society.

2. You say, "For every truly liberated woman there are dozens of frustrated females, unhappy with themselves, bitterly lashing out at those "responsible" for their own failure at self-integration." To this I reply: (a) SHOW ME SOME PROOF OF THOSE NUMBERS (b) I'd love to hear your definition of a "truly liberated woman" (c) One of the main issues in the women's movement is precisely the difficulty which women, especially those who combine career and family, have with self-integration in a society which conspires to drive them crazy (d) Bitterness, I admit, is self-destructive. But it is very easy to sit back and say, "Now, don't be bitter!", when you don't have to go through all the shit that makes people bitter.

3. I am a feminist and I was Not "embarrassed" by the "catty comments" of "Anony-Ms.", and I will thank you to stop presuming to speak for me. Also, your tired taunt of don't criticize unless you have something constructive to offer is used over and over again by reactionaries in a vain attempt to silence critics of the status quo. If I see somebody grinding his heel into somebody else's face, I don't need a "con-

4. "The stereotypical 'Bitch'" is not, as you allege, the "bete noire of womankind". It is, rather, the favorite tool of pigs to justify everything from lack of female supervisors to wife-beating. Often, what is called being a bitch in a woman is called an aggressive personality in a man. Again, if you knew anything about the women's movement, you would know that many women are proud to be called a bitch because that means men don't like what they're saying, and if they don't like, well then honey you must be doing somethin' right!

5. Many of the professors in this school are 'narrow-minded', "fearful", sexist and racist. If you haven't experienced this by now then you obviously live in a different world than I do. The fact that 6 women are at the top of their class is no proof to the contrary. A FEW "truly superior" women have always been tolerated.

Ever heard of tokenism?!? Also, how many blacks are on Law Review?!? Ever wonder why? Also, have you ever talked to any women or Blacks about experiences in job interviewing?

6. It's true that "law schools have never claimed to be finishing schools for debutantes" but rather are "boot camps........ where hard discipline in the development of analytical skills takes precedence over giving free reign to creative impulses and refining the Aesthetic Sense." And that is precisely one of the problems. It is this
there have been some fairly heavy criticisms of the Senate and RG floating around lately, and the open meeting might have been an ideal forum for solving some of the problems, real or imagined, which are behind the bad-mouthing. Unfortunately, few people turned out for the meeting (perhaps in part due to conflicts such as the film that was showing, to a general feeling of apathy or despair, or to the fact that RG coverage of Senate doings has been less than electrifying this year). Adequate treatment of the issues was further hampered when it came to discussing the role of RG at the open meeting by the fact that no one from RG was present.

Generally, the open meeting consisted of questions or challenges by constituents answered by the members of the Senate in several ways including: (1) explanations of the limitations on the Senate's powers and sphere of influence; (2) explanations of past and ongoing Senate activities in the area complained about (for those who were unaware or misinformed, which included nearly everyone present including some of the Senate members); (3) counterchanges of constituent apathy and/or hostility; (4) explanations of limits on the Senators' time and expressions of the
view that the senate functions primarily on the policy level and should not be expected to do legwork for special interest groups. There were many other types of response to the many types of criticism offered, but these struck me as the major points.

Among the responses by constituents to the Senators' responses were the following:

(1) Much of the criticism of the Senate from the student body, especially that based on misinformation or ignorance, is a result of the fact that the student body gets very little information about how the senate operates; (2) An expression of the general feeling that the Senate should take the initiative on some of the issues brought to it by individuals, rather than establish a standard operating procedure of placing responsibility back on the persons who come forward in every case.

In light of the foregoing and admittedly risking the exposure of my own ignorance of how things around here work, I would like to publicly put the following questions to the Senate and RG. I would also urge fellow students who feel the questions are reasonable and should be answered, or those who are otherwise concerned about the Senate and RG, to attend and participate in the next LSSS meeting (I believe the regular meeting time is 4:15 on Mondays in the Faculty Dining Room).

**QUESTIONS**

*Why doesn't RG have a public editorial policy, especially with regard to straight news coverage of the major governance and administrative functions in the Law School? E.g., LSSS meetings, elections, committee appointments and the activities of the administration such as the rumored planning that is underway for a new building.*

*Why is there no effort to provide the incoming first-year students with a useful handbook including, among other things, an explanation of the structure and functioning of the LSSS and Law School Administration?*

*Even though the LSSS has no authority over the use and condition of Hutchins Hall, couldn't it establish a committee and pass resolutions to assist students who have complaints or suggested improvements in getting a fair hearing from the administration? It seems that the LSSS has interpreted suggested changes in HH which would affect everyone as the function of special interest groups.*

*Given the burden on the time of all law students, might it not be a good idea for the LSSS to have an office of its own and a certain amount of secretarial help so that the needs of constituents (including the dissemination of information and the facilitation of self-help were appropriate) could be met more efficiently?*

*Should there be clarification or perhaps reform of the relationship of the LSS to the Lawyers Club, especially in regard to control of residential policies, rents, and the collection and allocation of funds for club improvements?*

There are some suggested starting points which are intended to be constructive rather than critical. I hope they are accepted and dealt with in the spirit in which they are offered.

S/George A. Vinyard
Law Club, B-22
764-8969
Two young Michigan coeds, Wanda Loyer and Goldie Digger were sitting in their East Quad room one fall afternoon, obviously bored with the dormitory atmosphere and wondering what to do with their lives. All at once, Wanda says, "Let's go fishing! This is a great time of year to catch something."

Goldie was an avid fisher, having fished in the backwoods as well as the polluted downtown rivers. However, she was tired of that type of fishing, where the sport was in seeing how many you could catch, usually throwing them back after holding them on the line awhile. Now Goldie wanted to fish for "keepers" and not waste her bait on the "little fishes", so to speak. So she asked Wanda, "Where is a good spot to fish?"

"The best fishing is at Hutchins pond, but we should hurry, because the fish tend to hide after Thanksgiving. They come out again just before Christmas, but most of them take the many streams that branch from Hutchins pond and return to their spawning grounds. They will be back in January, but the ice is pretty thick by then and, besides, the fish will be going deeper into the pond and hibernating for the winter. So, if we don't want to wait until spring, we should get going."

Obviously interested, Goldie inquired, "Are there many fish in Hutchins pond?"

"Sure, there's always a large school of fish in the pond. The owners stock it every year, usually with some starters in the summer, but most of the fish stay in the pond for three years, which, along with annual stocking, keeps the pond pretty full."

"Wanda, what kinds of fish are there?" Goldie asked.

"All kinds. The owners import fish from all over the country, but about half are state-bred. Lotta Lurv, a friend of mine, went fishing Tuesday evening and caught a mackerel, which is rare, but not impossible. Many people think Hutchins pond only has gefitte fish, but with the right bait, you might catch anything. Lotta was so proud that she mounted her catch, but she's more serious about fishing, especially when she senses there's a "keeper" on the hook."

"I heard they put up "no fishing" signs around Hutchins pond recently?" said Goldie.

"There are signs, but you have to ignore them like many other fishers do. The owners don't want the fish disturbed, thinking that too much fishing will cause the fish to rely on fishers for sustenance. They don't really own the fish anyway, so don't pay attention to the signs."

Goldie erupted at this point, "This sounds too good to be true! Let's go Wanda!"

"Be cool, Goldie! You shouldn't be too anxious. These fish are smarter than most and can tell when you plan to hook them. If they suspect your intentions, they won't pay attention to the bait, let alone bite. Oh, they might look over the bait a while, but they have other things to do in their school rather than spend time playing with fishers. So, just pretend you're down at the pond to study the vegetation or something. Keep your bait ready--a hungry fish might come along--and you could have yourself a "keeper."

Goldie replied, "O.K., thanks Wanda. I'll just watch you. Is there anything else I should know?"

"Just one thing," warned Wanda. "When we're down at Hutchins pond, try to stay away from the horned toads."
LEFTY'S LOSERS

TEAM COMMENTS
1. Wake Forest(0-9) Only winless major college team
2. Columbia(1-6) Ignored that win over Bucknell
3. TCU(1-7) The Seven Blocks of Limestone?
4. Oregon(2-7) Training table financed by food stamps
5. Utah(1-7) Worst team in nonexistent conference
6. Florida State(1-8) Fell prey to law of averages
7. Air Force(2-7) Flying low
8. Indiana(1-8) Ought to stick to basketball
9. Ohio State(8-1) See dissenting opinion of Hayes, J.
10. Rice(1-6-1) Good change of pace from potatoes

Others receiving abuse:
Louisville, Mississippi, North Texas State, Oregon State, Syracuse, Virginia Tech, Washington State.

Fearless Forecasts:
- Game of the Week: Wake Forest(#11) v. Virginia Tech
- Rout of the Week: Texas over TCU(#3)
- Upset of the Week: Ohio State(#8) over Iowa

Special Recognition:
To those omniscient Bowl Scouts, who are presently tangling with the thorny legal dilemma: Is an unofficial offer officially revocable?

--Lefty Ruchmann

RG RANKINGS

1. Oklahoma(6)
2. Alabama(1)
3. Michigan(4)
4. Ohio State(2)
5. Nebraska(5)
6. Auburn(3)
7. Notre Dame(6)
8. Southern Cal(1)
9. Texas A&M(12)
10. Florida(9)

Others receiving votes: SMU, Georgia, Baylor, UCLA, NC State, Yale, Arkansas, Arizona State, Kentucky.

FOOTBALL POLL

Don Nicewander and John Dobetzter tied for the prize with records of 24-9. However, Don won the tiebreaker 1-2. The exact percentage correct is not available this week, but it was the best performance to date.

Circle winners. Cross out losers. Place your entries in the box in front of Room 100 by 5:00 Friday.

College
Alabama at Miami, Fla.(21½)
NC State(3½) at Arizona St.
Georgia(4½) at Auburn
Texas Tech at Baylor(2½)
Duke(20½) at Maryland
Florida at Kentucky(2½)
Illinois at Minnesota(7½)
Michigan St. at Indiana(14½)
Ohio St. at Iowa(35½)
Oklahoma at Kansas(20½)
Purdue(20½) at Michigan
Kansas St.(34½) at Nebraska
Wisconsin at Northwestern(10½)
Pittsburgh(17½) at Notre Dame
Ohio U.(17½) at Penn State
Rice(11½) at Texas A&M
Washington(23½) at Southern Cal
Texas at TCU(30½)
Tulane(5½) at Vanderbilt
Princeton(17½) at Yale

Pro
NY Giants(6½) at Detroit
NY Jets(9½) at New England
Baltimore(5½) at Atlanta
Buffalo(6½) at Miami
Cincinnati at Houston(7½)
Dallas(2½) at Washington
Green Bay(8½) at Minnesota
Los Angeles at New Orleans(14½)
Oakland at San Diego(14½)
Pittsburgh at Cleveland(8½)
St. Louis at Philadelphia(7½)
San Francisco(6½) at Chicago
Kansas City(7½) at Denver

Tiebreaker:
How many yards will Michigan gain on the ground against Purdue?

Name of entrant: ____________________________

George A. Paganu