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When grappled in the law's embrace,
   Who first betrayed an anxious face.
   And fain should shield me from disgrace,
   MY LAWYER.
Who told me I should not confess,
   That he would all my wrongs redress,
   And set me free from all distress?
   MY LAWYER.
When sick in jail I senseless lay,
   Who took my watch and ring away,
   Lest prowling thieves on me should prey?
   MY LAWYER.
Who to my wealth tenacious clung,
   And for me wagged his oily tongue,
   MY LAWYER.
Who told me was dreadful smart,
   And always took his client's part?
   MY LAWYER.
Who in court, with peerless pride,
   My rights affirmed, my guilt denied,
   And swore the State's Attorney lied?
   MY LAWYER.
And when twelve men, in one compound,
   For me a guilty verdict found,
   Who came to staunch my bleeding wound?
   MY LAWYER.
Who said my time within the wall,
   Would exceedingly be brief and small,
   The minimum, or none at all?
   MY LAWYER.
And when the judge my doom proclaimed,
   And 150 long years of exile named,
   Who looked indignant and ashamed,
   MY LAWYER.
When at the sheriff's stern command,
   I, for the chain, was told to stand,
   Who longest shook and squeezed my hand?
   MY LAWYER.
Who, when of prison clothes I'm stripped,
   And from these walls on homeward shipped,
   Will get himself immensely whipped?
   MY LAWYER.
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If you have taken a job (summer or permanent) please report it to the Placement Office. Forms for reporting will be on the table outside Room 100 and in our office.

2nd year people who had jobs last summer -- we are very interested in finding out how you found your job after your first year. The information will help us with this year's first-year people. Please stop up and pick up a questionnaire if you worked after your first year! Thanks!

Nancy Krieger

The CCFA/UAW Interim Steering Committee is open to all clericals.

Weekly meeting are on Tuesday at 7:00 and Thursdays at 7:00. 711 North University

We will be formulating bylaws and structure, and forming bargaining research committees. PLEASE ATTEND!

CCFA/UAW

Clericals General Membership Meeting Agenda: Election of Bargaining Committee 7:30 Monday, Nov. 25 Michigan Union Ballroom

Suggestions for bargaining committee members must be made by November 21. Contact Mary Fahrner at 994-5735.

**Please be prepared to present some form of identification that proves you are a clerical employee at the University.

CCFA/UAW

RG will not be published last week due to the Thanksgiving Break.

(Because of the important nature in this week's meeting, I am going to reserve my usual flippant remarks until after the minutes, and then try to explain not only what really happened, but also why.)

Minutes of Nov. 18, 1974 (Lettuce meeting)

The meeting was called to order at 4:20 by the President, in room 150. About 50 spectators were present, as the meeting had been advertised as an open meeting to discuss the lettuce boycott.

A film of scenes from the confrontation between UFW-AFL/CIO farm workers and Teamster strike-breakers was shown first, as an opening statement for the pro-boycott forces. The film showed peaceful farm workers being beaten and taunted both by police and Teamsters; although the shots were professionally edited to emphasize the plight of the the farm workers, one or two scenes of men being beaten by police could not have been faked. Overall, it was a very moving presentation of the inability of farm workers to obtain union representation of their own choice.

Next, Frank Ponce presented the opening statement for pro-boycott side. Denying that the freedom of choice argument was valid in this case, he said that no one has a right to demand that a representational institution commit a morally wrong act. He presented a petition with about 160 signatures from law students supporting the boycott.

Lefty then presented the opening statement for the "freedom-of-choice" side. He denied that his position in this matter is any way represented a lack of concern for the farm worker's cause. Rather, he said, the issue was whether or not to let the individual law student make his own decision whether to respect the boycott or not. Our present system, with both UFW and non-UFW lettuce available, allows each student to make his own choice. He noted that 85% of the lettuce consumed in the law club over the last two years has been non-UFW, and that

(See Minutes p.17)
**THE DREAM**

By Roger Rapaport
(Disclaimed by his wife, Jane who said: 'Oh Roger."

As everyone knows the highest honor one can receive at the U of M Law School is not being on Law Review, but rather being one of the select few to win the Rag Gesture football poll. In light of this, I feel it is my duty to share with the rest of the Law School community a Dream I had this week.

**SCENE I**

(Myself, a poor, hardworking law student sitting on the R.G. table in front of Room 100, clock on the wall at my back says 4:45, it is Friday afternoon).

Myself: "Mr. Fenrock, how nice to converse with the esteemed editor and chief of the Rag Gesture."

Fenrock: (Always the diplomat), "I wish I could say the same to you, unfortunately one in my position can not afford to be seen talking to people who are not at least of Law Review Flea-caliber."

M: "One question before you go sir. Please?"

F: If you must ask, go ahead. But be quick.

M: Since there are some extra rags on the table I was wondering if I might possibly fill out some extra football polls?"

F: "There are no rules limiting entries, so be my guest. As a matter of fact, for two bucks I think I'll fill out some extra polls also."

Scene ends with myself carefully filling out another poll while Fenrock with a speed and dexterity never before seen in man's history, manages to grab, fill out, and sign the remaining three hundred and forty two polls, thus clearly showing off the qualities that make him R.G. editor. (Yeah putting up with this kind of bull-shit.-J.C.)

(SEE DREAM P. 8)

**CAMP**

**A LETTER FROM BOO TCAMP**

By Stan Ford

The following letter was found in the men's room at the Village Bell. But before we get to that, a note to my editor. Joe, glad to see you got the job cleaning floors at the Law Review Office. I wanted it, but your GPA was a bit better! Keep those floors clean, Joe. Law Review types are known to drop their briefs a lot, and we don't want them to get dirty. Could you imagine having dirty briefs at a powerful interview with a high class firm! Yellow Dog does it but he's a mighty fine legal beagle.

A second note: to the readers. My uncle is named Jerry but his friends call him Sam. After reading the letters to RG and Res Trashitoria I'm beginning to realize that some of you folks think that RG has an editorial policy that goes beyond cut and paste. Fools. The only time I see the editors is when they sell their postcards in the stacks, man. This is an anarchic rag that reflects what you want to write. So you think that the RG "editorial policy" discriminates against your values. TSK, TSK. You stand revealed once again, you're PARANOID.

Now the letter. Read it or my uncle Jerry will start a war with Egypt and draft you!

Dear Mom:

Hello from intellectual boot camp! I just came back from the barracks where we creamed some undisciplined first year students. Boy, this is fun! Just like dad said it would be. All his Hitler Youth Camp manuals have come in handy as has his combination slide ruleswitchblade. We get to be men here, except for a few women. We take showers with each other and compare and see who has the shiniest boots!

June has left me! I tried to get to her to go to the Law Spouses meetings when she got lonely while I was out doing hard, disciplined, things with other rugged, analytical-

(SEE CAMP P. 8)
Law School Student Senate  
Budget  
1974 - 1975

**L.S.S.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film Committee</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Committee</td>
<td>5,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Committee</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers Committee</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Contingency Fund</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: $13,350.00**

**Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Res Gestae</td>
<td>$1,017.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Alpha Delta</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Spouses</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Law Society</td>
<td>870.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Law Students Alliance</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Raza Law Students</td>
<td>575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid Society</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.I.A.P.</td>
<td>1,776.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.S.C.R.R.C.</td>
<td>230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law Society</td>
<td>950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers Guild</td>
<td>679.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest Law Society</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Law Students</td>
<td>905.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.A. - L.S.D.</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Law Critique</td>
<td>650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barristers</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codicil</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: $12,002.00**

**SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phi Alpha Delta</td>
<td>$535.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Advocates</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Legal Services</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid Society</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Law Society</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: $1,415.00**

**Total Budget: $25,352.00**
### Expense Statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Accounts</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual Expense</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film Committee</td>
<td>$1420.00</td>
<td>$1847.16</td>
<td>[$427.16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Committee</td>
<td>3320.00</td>
<td>3875.35</td>
<td>[555.35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Committee</td>
<td>901.00</td>
<td>799.42</td>
<td>101.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers Committee</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
<td>894.80</td>
<td>2605.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year's Debts</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1284.10</td>
<td>[1284.10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Items</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>534.79</td>
<td>[534.79]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1057.83</td>
<td>557.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Fund</td>
<td>1703.00</td>
<td>321.74</td>
<td>1381.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Gestae</td>
<td>1017.00</td>
<td>1036.99</td>
<td>[19.99]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph: Alpha Delta</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>216.00</td>
<td>[71.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Spouses</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>212.75</td>
<td>[12.75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Law Society</td>
<td>795.00</td>
<td>881.34</td>
<td>[86.34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.L.S.A.</td>
<td>1375.00</td>
<td>1013.09</td>
<td>361.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Raza</td>
<td>710.00</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid Society</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>493.00</td>
<td>507.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAP</td>
<td>2050.00</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law</td>
<td>1155.00</td>
<td>549.57</td>
<td>605.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers Guild</td>
<td>309.00</td>
<td>211.77</td>
<td>97.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womens Law</td>
<td>665.00</td>
<td>415.04</td>
<td>249.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA-LSD</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>97.99</td>
<td>82.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Law Critique</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>634.86</td>
<td>15.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barristers</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>499.24</td>
<td>.76³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR LAW</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$22,435.00</td>
<td>18,750.83</td>
<td>3,684.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Treasurer's Report
LSSS
As of July 1, 1974

Revenues:

Accounts

Pinball Machines $6912.00
Vending Machines 5917.84
Movies 766.50
Mixers 578.25
S.G.C. Allocation 944.35
Law Student Fee Allocation 7600.00
Miscellaneous 1626.47
Cash on hand--prior year 5786.63

TOTAL REVENUES * $30,132.04

Expenses

Organizations $18,750.83
Vending 5,018.67
Pledge for Club Refurnishing 4,000.00

TOTAL EXPENSES $27,769.50

CASH SURPLUS July 31, 1974------------------$ 2,362.54

Notes

1,2 These accounts were not included in the budget but are listed separately from the contingency fund for emphasis.

3 The Barristers have still to furnish a satisfactory accounting from the Grease Ball. (Final accounting was presented in Sept.)

* Revenues were increased this year by the Barristers returning $ 370.00 to the Senate and M.I.A.P. repaying.$2777.91 recovered through a Federal grant.

These figures can be added to the cash surplus in determining monies available for disposition in 1974-75. $ 1415.00 of these funds have already been allocated.

11-11-74
Bertie N. Butts, Treasurer
SCENE II

(The next Tuesday. Scene opens with myself, feeling quite relieved, leaving the men’s room fittingly placed right next to the R.G. office.)

Pious Pagonello (calling loudly) "ROGER, ROGER RAPAPORT", just the man I wanted to see.

M: (Feeling quite honored) "Me. Why?"

PP: Well, I have some good news for you, and I have some bad news for you.

M: "Let's hear the good news first."

PP: "You had the highest percentage in last weeks football poll."

M: (Dancing on the ceiling and jumping for joy) "Pious you've made me the happiest man alive today. Now I have $2.00 for the Sammy Davis crusade against phlebitis. I can hardly wait until Friday's paper comes out so that I can send copies of the article to my friend and family. What an honor, now I could die tomorrow and die happy."

PP: (A stern look on his face and a righteous gleam in his eye) "Roger, I never said you won, all I said was that you had the highest percentage. Unfortunately because you entered more than once I disqualified you.

M: You what?

PP: "I disqualified you. On Sunday after the results were in I decided to make and Ex-Post-Facto Rule that no-one who enters the poll more than once will be allowed to win.

M: "But Ex-Post-Facto Laws are not allowed under the Constitution.

PP: "Roger, I'm only going to say this once, so get it straight. When it comes to the poll there is no constitution, just the word of God, and when it concerns the poll, I AM GOD.

M: "But, But", (Showing that even the most dignified of law students can stutter when faced with a bureaucratic Stone Wall), "I cleared my entries with Jock Fenrock, (SEE DREAM P. 9)
your editor in chief.

PP: "Since when would Fenrock a mere Editor-in-Chief, great and glorious though he is, rank higher than the football poll God. And, I have spoken.

(Enter Fenrock, not seeing me but screaming at the top of his lungs)

F: "Let's run another libelous cartoon about that jerk Kiburz in this week's paper. (Seeing me Fenrock stops raving, his eyes shift nervously, he breaks out in a sweat and begins to sharpen the R.G. office's letter opener, a brass maltese Buzzard)." "Roger, good to see you. Sorry about the poll, but Pious is the football poll God and you should have cleared your second entry with him.

M: "But Jock you told me that," (Accidentally taking a step in Fenrock's general direction).

F: (Screaming hysterically) "Back you peon, not one step closer or this letter opener will claim one more life for Malta. Now listen, this is a Law School paper, set in a major Law School, so no one really expects the poll to be run fairly. To see that the poll is not run fairly Pious has got to be able to change the rules at will. We feel that a rigged and crooked football poll is much more exciting and hard to win than a fair poll, and therefore that the R.G. poll gives law students a greater chance to increase their legal thinking power. The real trick with the R.G. poll is not to guess the winning team, that's too easy, but rather to guess what the rules will be this week.

M: (Not really accepting this logic, but sensing defeat and thus turning to go.) "By the way, in passing, just who did "win" last weeks poll."

PP: Funny you should ask that. Last weeks winner was a woman who had never entered the poll before. Her name was Allison Steiner, one of the three hundred and forty two Allison Steiner's who entered the poll last week.

Needless to say, I woke up screaming.

Jane Rapaport: "Oh, Roger!"
Dear Res Gestae:

The columns of Stan Ford throughout this semester, and the initial offerings of Yellow Dog and White Savage, are indispensable contributions to the law school dialogue. To all responsible members of the community, it is readily apparent that these writers see the important contemporary issues with an uncommonly clear moral vision. My requests are humble and easily accommodated: First, that their views be more widely disseminated in the pages of Res Gestae; and second, that their writings hereafter be signed. As they may be reluctant to reveal their names, I assert in support of that request a widely shared and deeply felt need among their fellow students.

The existence of this need is supported by Mr. Ford's recent classification of law professors as cheap hucksters. Before R.G. provided a long-overdue forum, such free expression was confined to the toilet stalls of Hutchins Hall, where, besides having very limited exposure, it may not have received the serious consideration it deserves. I must confess, to my embarrassment, that I had heretofore regarded professors as the moral equals of other people—perhaps a trifle more erudite than your run-of-the-mill clod, but no different from the rest of us in judgment and moral sense. The opposite conclusion is now inescapable.

Thoughtful reflection, against the backdrop of Mr. Ford's incisive criticism, now has made it clear to me that our law professors are no more than a bunch of lechers, thieves, racists, moral bankrupts, crypto-fascists, and establishment dupes. Why do we put up with them? As most of us will agree, law students as a class (with the exception of law review members) are generally without serious character deficiencies. Are there compelling reasons for our subordination to our moral inferiors? I can think of none. Yet, in spite of being exposed daily to evidence of the true nature of professors, I couldn't see it without Mr. Ford's prodding.

This trio's insight is not confined to questions of human nature. Directly or impliedly, they have courageously attacked institutions which traditionally have been free from criticism in academic circles, such as sexism, capitalism, the military-industrial complex, slavery, and the law review. Nor have starvation, cancer, poverty, and pollution been spared their outrage. These refreshing winds of academic freedom are heady stuff. Until recent issues of R.G., our minds had not been opened to these problems. I now look forward to a good stiff blast against the real sacred cows around this place—General Motors and the Republican Party. Is that too much to hope for?

Messrs. Ford, Dog, and Savage may have some apprehensions about making their true identities known. Perhaps an example from last week's R.G. will dispel their fears. A sarcastic letter was sharply critical of Dean St. Antoine; yet it is possible that the writer, who signed his name, will escape any official sanctions for being uppity. (On the other hand, public criticism of the Dean may be a special case, with each student entitled to sling one mudball. Among the student body it seems to be beyond dispute that he is a pious, insincere, hypocritical old fool, an insensitive pawn of the power structure who despises women and minorities. Surely he is aware of his shortcomings, and does not resent being reminded of them. Besides, he's heard of the (See Letters p 11)
First Amendment, hasn't he? Perhaps one paragraph of a future R.G. might profitably be devoted to a solicitation of student opinions of the Dean, with a submarine sandwich awarded to whomever can accuse him of the gravest venality.

Some may argue that the moral edification of law students can be accomplished in spite of this trio's anonymity. This is only partly true. Many of us probably have the good fortune to share a class with one of the three, but don’t know it. If we were aware of their credentials (amply established in the pages of R.G.) while they were speaking in class, we could give their comments the weight they deserve. Furthermore, those of us who, because of timidity or a retarded social conscience, need character guidance, also need paradigms and role-models in human form. Pseudonyms just won't do. I'm sure it's neat to have a secret identity—just like Batman and Robin—but the gratitude of the law school community will make this loss easy to bear.

If the identities of Ford, Dog, and Savage are revealed, no doubt a handful of unenlightened students would regard them as bombastic moral cowards, whose only acts of courage are getting up each morning to face what to them must be an insufferable world, and crawling to a law school they regard as a dunghill. Yet this narrow-minded group is small and without influence; no account need be taken of its views.

I am aware that some of the positions asserted in this letter are unrestrained, candid, and offensive to those in positions of power. I recognize the danger of having my grades reduced, and my legal career impeded, by angry professors and administrators who feel threatened and deeply wounded by my opinions. Yet those of us who take uncompromising stands are prepared to endure any unjust retaliation that may result. We've got real guts.

/S/ Jeff Butler

object

To The Editor:

I was very impressed with the letters from Barbara Klimaszawski and Marjorie Van Ochten, in last week's Res Gestae. They provided a thoughtful response to the offensive piece of trash distributed by Sir Repititious and more than adequately stated the views of most women law students.

However, was once more raised by the inane "article" (to dignify it) written by Ken Hemming and buried on page 21. The problem with many male law students in their inability to take sex discrimination seriously, as witnessed by the scene in Labor Law last week. Women will continue to be put down in our society so long as it is still socially acceptable to make jokes about "Women's Lib" (how I hate that term) and the stereotyped roles of women in America. I don't doubt that both Mr. Hemmings and the staff of R.G. consider themselves too progressive socially aware to write and print an article of questionable taste about Steppin Fetchit. So why do women have to take this shit?

The "Humor" of R.G., while sophomoric and oftentimes of questionable taste is usually not offensive to other minorities in this school. All we ask is that you get off our backs and treat us like people.

S/Betsy Snider '76
Letter To The Editor:

It is frightening to see Julian Bond, champion of the oppressed, justifying the oppression of one class in order to give another. The invalidity of capital punishment does not inquire a perpetuation of the very myths about rape that have been used to oppress women for generations. That these concepts of rape are unfounded has been demonstrated repeatedly, but obviously require constant restatement therefore:

(1) It is outrageous to expect a woman in fear of bodily injury possibly death to resist a rape. It is especially outrageous when there are two or more assailants.

(2) Statistics show that most rapists are not insane sadists, but "normal men." Therefore, evidence that men engaged in normal activities cannot be a basis for refuting that they also raped.

(3) Consistent with point 2, there have been countless examples of rapists extending courtesy to their victims. This is not surprising when one remembers that many rapists believe they are doing a woman a favor by raping her. Bond does an injustice to the people on death row by confusing their course with innuendos as to the guilt of rape victims.

S/Joanne Bettem

To The Editor

Julian Bond's analysis of the "hard" facts in the Jesse Walston, et al, case, shows the mushiness existent in the legal system's "fairy tale reasoning" in rape cases. It is enlightening and frightening to see the intended exposure if the innocence of the accused based on the usual tirade of worn-out false assumptions, misconceptions about the crime of rape coming from the "progressive" trouble-shooters of the Southern Poverty Law Center. The apparent worthiness of their effort to save three men lives from the gas chamber is undermined by the sloppy misconceptions used to wend outrage from the reader and money from the pocket. Unfortunately the letter tends to alienate this reader who is sympathetic to primary issues at stake, namely the continued existence of capital punishment in the United States and the alleged discrimination of a court and jury against three black men convicted of rape.

S/Louise Ponte

(We apologize for the typographical errors in the above letter, but the original was difficult to read.)

But I, being poor, have only my dreams;
I have spread my dreams under your feet;
Tread softly because you tread on my dreams.
—Yeats, "He Wishes for the Clothes of Heaven" (1899)

To The Editor:

While I recognize the futility of attempting to persuade this law school community to give a damn about anything except its own provincial concerns, I am moved to write in response to Student Senate's meeting on Monday where the question of the Lawyers Club's non-participation in the lettuce boycott was discussed. While I was distressed that Senate again voted to maintain at least pending a student referendum the lawyers club practice of purchasing scab lettuce, I was more disturbed by the attitudes expressed by those who opposed the boycott.

The Senators, and speakers from the audience, who opposed lawyers club participation in the boycott did not even have the courage of their convictions. Instead they covered behind the slogan "freedom of choice," an insidious concept that was used for 100 years to support racial segregation in this country; was a major ideology advanced by employers and courts to prevent unionization by working men and women and is today the rallying cry of Louise Day Hicks and her cohorts as they stone Black Children.
on their way to school in Boston. But "freedom of choice" is more than a political tool to be used by those supporters of the status quo, who are made comfortable by, and from, it. It is an illusion which must be dispelled. The law school does not remain "neutral" by voting to continue its purchase of scab lettuce, and it certainly does not give those in this community who do not want their money spent on such products a "choice".

There is something monstrously selfish about white, middle class law students who side with racist, exploitative growers and lend the weight of their institution to the attempted destruction of the struggle of the migrant workers in this country for a modicum of human dignity and a living wage, simply because they, or their colleagues want the privilege of eating iceberg lettuce every day.

In response to the fact that all the other dorms on this campus honor the UFW lettuce boycott, a most ingenious argument was advanced: We are a professional school and are sufficiently mature than those 18 year olds in the other dorms to dispense with this nonsense of lending institutional support to something as "inappropriate" as a moral and political issue.

That is exactly what is wrong with this institution. Somehow we are inculcated with the notion that maturity and training in a professional discharge us from any responsibilities to conscience, much less to justice. What is needed here is not a re-enforcement of that dangerous training, but a re-affirmation of that "immature undergrad" in all of us that ought to cry out for justice and human dignity when faced with issues like the lettuce boycott.

The ultimate decision of Senate, after they had voted to continue the purchase of scab lettuce, was to submit the issue to a binding referendum of all those who live or eat in the lawyers club. For those who vote in that referendum it is essential that this issue not be viewed as a vote on the illusory "freedom of choice" which is not a freedom at all, but as a vote of conscience that says "I want or don't want my institution to support the struggle of farmworkers for a decent life." Let all of us, including those "mature professionals" on Student Senate, admit that we are faced with an issue we cannot remain "neutral" on and admit that however we vote we are taking a stand.

S/ Alison R. Steiner

"Yes, Mr. President, the lettuce will still be there."

As members of this law school, (whose interests the LSSS is charged with representing); and more importantly, as members of the Chicano community, the "plight" of whose brothers, (the migrant farmworkers) was aired in the LSSS meeting this week, we would like to express the following opinion.

We have only disgust for the manner in which President Terry Linderman, "presided" over the 1½ hour session on Monday, November 18, 1974. The chief item on the agenda was whether the LSSS was to go on record in favor of serving only UFW-label lettuce in the Law Quad. It was clear from the very beginning that President Linderman was biased against the issue of banning non-UFW lettuce from the Law Quad dining hall.

Somewhere we read that the Presiding Officer was supposed to run an organization's meeting in a neutral, objective, non-biased manner. Somewhere we read that editorializing from the chair was supposed

(See Letters, p.14)
(LETTERS)

to be kept to a minimum, if present at all. In any event, perhaps, we were too emotionally involved in the issue to see that Mr. Linderman was actually running the meeting in a manner that would have made any reader of Robert's Rules of Order beam with pride.

And then 6:00 P.M. rolled around and Mr. Linderman banged his mighty gavel and said, "Let's adjourn this meeting and go eat some lettuce." You may correct us Mr. President on the first part of the quote; perhaps you didn't say "Let's adjourn this meeting". Perhaps you used other words to that effect. But the reference to the lettuce was loud and clear.

We thank those Senators that voted to support la causa. We also thank those that voted their conscience and did not try to hide under meaningless banners such as "freedom of choice."

We're only sorry that more could not be done to expedite the session. The meeting seemed to pose a terrible inconvenience and delay for Mr. Linderman. Access to the salad bar at the Quad was barred to him for one-and-a-half solid hours.

Venceremos!
La Raza Law Students

Dear RG,

Both sides of the LSSS debate on the lettuce boycott missed the point in Monday's debate. Supporters of the motion to eliminate non-UFW lettuce from the law club dining room claimed that morals were that freedom of choice was the only issue involved.

The truth is that we are really balancing the rights of a minority to have an option available, against the rights of the majority to discontinue conduct which is seen as immoral. That is assuming that students who eat in the dining room and who also eat iceberg lettuce are a minority of the total LSSS constituency.

Where one strikes that balance depends on the relative importance of the rights involved in a given case. Some have analogized our lettuce issue to freedom of religion, speech, or abortion, areas in which freedom of choice is allowed even though many groups are morally outraged by some of the choices available.

The LSSS properly refused to directly remove the scab lettuce without more evidence on the sentiments of regular law club diners. It would have been a hollow victory for the boycott supporters to coerce a result which could probably be obtained through more palatable means. The Senate did not vote against the boycott; it voted against forcing everyone to go along with it. That is an important distinction.

Personally, I am much more comfortable with the motion that did pass, which was to have a referendum of dining room users, which is the specific constituency involved. This has the advantage of putting the question directly to the people for whom the lettuce is bought. I hope that those diners who are presently uninformed about the UFW plight will take the time to learn more about it before the vote, because the issue is a compelling one.

S/Ken Cobb

personal

Well, we thought it was going to be a circus, and it was.

We saw a film depicting senseless brutality on the part of police officers and strikebreakers, and then proved how easily tempers may be lost in such situations by starting a shouting match among ourselves. If we had not been a group of sissy professional graduate students, there might have been some fists thrown at our meeting as well.

I heard some very rude comments by pro-boycott forces while the "freedom-of-choice" speakers had the floor. I heard no such remarks aimed against the boycott people.

(SEE PERSONAL P 18)
INTO THIS WORLD WAS BORN AARON, A CIMMERIAN, WEAK-EYED AND NARROW-SHOULDERED. TO READ AGAIN THE DUSTY BOOKS OF LAW OF THE LOST ATLANTIS...


—THE NEMEDIAN CHRONICLES

THE CIMMERIANS WERE A RACE OF STRONG MEN AND BEAUTIFUL WOMEN...

AARON COULDN'T DO THOSE THINGS OTHER BARBARIAN BOYS COULD DO....

HIS ARMS WERE TOO WEAK FOR THE SWORD...

...EXCEPT, OF COURSE, FOR AARON...

...HIS EYES WERE TOO BAD FOR THE SWORD.
Although Aaron was very smart...

(Always saying smart things)

In barbarian society he was just about useless......

So when all the other males went off for the hunt, Aaron stayed back and shelled peas......

... and so Aaron was a pretty marginal barbarian until one day....

... an ancient stranger arrived in the village......

Thus by clever Socratic sophisms......

Well, perhaps young man, I should ask you the question...... Suppose one of those pens was poisoned and the merchant who sold you those pens had represented that the pens were in fact......

What do you do, ancient stranger?

The ancient stranger introduced Aaron to the lost study of law....

(to be continued)
such a ratio meant that there was a significant portion of Lawyer's Club residents who were not boycotting the non-UFW lettuce.

The availability of UFW iceberg lettuce was discussed. Barry White, chairman of the Food Committee, said that while Michigan UFW iceberg lettuce was available in the late summer months, when winter comes the only sources are shipments from California. On the average, such iceberg lettuce are available one day a month, because the Lawyer’s Club has to compete with smaller supermarkets for the limited supplies not going to large chains stores. Barry noted that the Senate passed a motion last year that the highest priority must be given to obtaining UFW iceberg lettuce, and Sherry has done so whenever possible.

The issues in the debate narrowed quickly. No one argued the merits of the Farm Worker’s stand. The pro-boycott Jones repeated that the Law School, as an institution, has an impact on the problem by the mere fact that we purchase Teamster lettuce. One speaker said that freedom of choice was an invalid argument in moral issues, because he had not been given any freedom of choice to fight in an immoral war in Vietnam, the Farm Workers had not been given any freedom of choice in selecting a union, and Negroes had been denied freedom of choice for a hundred years preceding the Civil War.

The anti-boycott Jones replied that freedom of choice, no matter how much abused in the past was still a desirable thing. They noted that institutions had subverted freedom of choice for worthwhile purposes, such as abortion decisions, and that no general statements could be made vis-a-vis the morality of institutional decisions in general. Several residents of the Lawyer’s Club asked that they be given the right to make their own choice, because eating lettuce that tasted good was more important to them than supporting the boycott.

A motion for a 15-minute recess was defeated.

A motion was made that "The Law School should join with the rest of the University community by boycotting non-UFW lettuce.” This motion was defeated by a vote of 8-7. The Senators voted as follows:

1. Carol: Yes 9. Howie: No
5. Lu (by signed proxy) No 13. Bill §2: Yes
7. Joe: No 15. Bill: No
8. Lefty: No

A motion was then made to put the question by referendum to the entire law school. An amendment was made to limit the vote to those persons who lived in the Lawyer’s Club, or who had purchased meal contracts there, or who had purchased tickets in lots of 6 or more. Further, to limit it to students who appeared on the record for the lunch meal of Monday, Nov. 18. The amendment was passed, 9-5.

The referendum motion as amended was then passed by a vote of 12-3.

A motion was then proposed to give any resident of the Lawyer's Club a refund out of his room and board payments if he supported the boycott and the referendum went against the boycott. This motion was tabled.

President Linderman then asked for a motion to adjourn, noting that it was after 6:00, the usual time for adjournment because of dinner conflicts. A motion for adjournment was made from the floor. Terry then declared the meeting adjourned and left the room.

The Vice-President then rose to his feet and requested that the Senators vote on adjournment. The motion to adjourn was defeated.

A motion was then made that "The Law School should join with the rest of the University community by boycotting non-UFW lettuce.” This motion was defeated by a vote of 8-7. The Senators voted as follows:

1. Carol: Yes 9. Howie: No
5. Lu (by signed proxy) No 13. Bill §2: Yes
7. Joe: No 15. Bill: No
8. Lefty: No

A motion was then made to put the question by referendum to the entire law school. An amendment was made to limit the vote to those persons who lived in the Lawyer’s Club, or who had purchased meal contracts there, or who had purchased tickets in lots of 6 or more. Further, to limit it to students who appeared on the record for the lunch meal of Monday, Nov. 18. The amendment was passed, 9-5.

The referendum motion as amended was then passed by a vote of 12-3.

A motion was then proposed to give any resident of the Lawyer's Club a refund out of his room and board payments if he supported the boycott and the referendum went against the boycott. This motion was tabled.

President Linderman then asked for a motion to adjourn, noting that it was after 6:00, the usual time for adjournment because of dinner conflicts. A motion for adjournment was made from the floor. Terry then declared the meeting adjourned and left the room.

The Vice-President then rose to his feet and requested that the Senators vote on adjournment. The motion to adjourn was defeated.

(See Minutes p 13)
A motion to reconsider the referendum motion was passed.

A new referendum motion was made, with the following provisions:

1. The voting population shall be limited to Lawyer's Club residents and others as specified in the first motion.

2. The outcome of the referendum will be binding on the Senate.

3. Passage of the referendum will require a simple majority (50% + 1 of people voting)

4. There will be extensive publicity prior to conducting the vote.

5. The exact wording of the referendum, to the general effect of boycotting all non-UFW lettuce, will be decided upon at the next meeting.

An amendment that only people voting to boycott on this referendum would be entitled to a refund if it should fail was defeated.

The above motion was passed.

A motion to censure President Linderman for trying to adjourn the meeting without polling the Senators was passed.

A motion to adjourn was passed. (This is the end of the official minutes. Below are my personal comments--B.H.)

There is no question in my mind as to which group had the better manners, and respect for the right of the individual to speak freely, for that matter.

Most of all, I saw nothing in the entire program that impressed me that the pro-boycott forces were right. There was a lot of talk about whether or not we had either a conscience or a sense of morality. I don't think the existence of either of these was really an issue some people were just bad losers, and wanted to take us through a little verbal abuse. I lost my temper once, when a pro-boycott speaker accused me of forcing him to pay money for the purchase of lettuce he wanted to boycott, thereby condemning thousands of Chicano workers to a sub-human existence. This statement was totally stupid. The only motion made regarding a refund of money had been tabled until next week, not defeated, and I personally don't think that placing the decisions in the hands of the residents of the Law Club has actually condemned anyone to a sub-human existence. If the vote goes against the boycott, then he might have appoint. But until that vote is taken, any such allegations are totally incorrect.

I mentioned before that I found many of the pro-boycott forces rude. Several of them refused to recognize the authority of the chairman to preside over the meeting, including his right to recognize speakers. They simply shouted, daring anyone to shut them up. This is not the way a meeting is run, and I am really surprised that these people have gotten to law school without learning that.

That's enough steam to let off, I suppose. Now I'd like to explain why I voted against the boycott, and what went into that decision.

I do not live in the Lawyer's Club. I have only eaten there one time. Therefore, I am not in a good position to know how most people there feel about the boycott. I do know, from our last open meeting, that most law students feel that they should have voice equal to the next person's about how things are run around here. Before taking away that right, I'd like to know that a majority of those students agree with the

(SEE PERSONAL, p.19)
principles involved.

The only hard information I had was from the Food Service, stating that 85% of the lettuce consumed was non-UFW. I was told, however, that many students simply did not eat lettuce at all, and that 85% figure was therefore inaccurate. No one that I talked to could tell me how many people actually ate the lettuce, although I did find out that three big rims of it disappeared at most meals.

What I did was this: I asked the pro-boycott people to bring me some figures, obtained by counting or however they wanted, of how many people ate non-UFW lettuce. Until they told me otherwise, I said, I had to assume that a majority of the Club ate the non-UFW lettuce.

Well, they never gave me a figure. From the tone of their arguments in the meeting, it sounded like they were accepting the fact that a majority of the people ate the non-UFW lettuce, because they talked about the right of a minority to impose moral views on a representational institution, I asked them, at the meeting, for some kind of convincing evidence about numbers. What I got was a comparison of the number signatures on petitions: 160 pro-boycott. 120 freedom of choice. Neither one was a significant figure. So, when the time came to vote, I voted the will of the majority as I saw it, and we defeated the boycott.

Now, as to what happened when Terry left. I thought the meeting had been adjourned. We had talked about long meetings before, and I thought we had decided to end them about 6:00. I was tired and hungry and wanted to go home. I almost did. But then Ken called for a vote on adjournment, and no one wanted to leave because the others might vote in his absence and the vote might go the other way. So we stayed. We voted to make the referendum binding on us, even though we had just gotten through making up our minds not to boycott at all. I don't disagree with the vote; I just wish we could have done it in the first place and saved a lot of bother.

Now, as to the vote censure, Terry--and these are just my opinions--I don't think he did anything wrong. He puts in more work than anyone else on the Senate, and it's his responsibility for making sure the meetings are run right. He followed the same procedure we've followed all year for these meetings--and I think that when we continued it without telling him we disfavored his right to be present and speak on the issues. If a member wants to leave a meeting, or not attend in the first place, that's o.k. But holding a meeting without telling a member is not fair. It's wrong, and that's how I see it.

There's going to be more on this in the days to come, and our next meeting will deal with some questions and some criticism for the RG staff. Hopefully, the people who edit RG are big enough to take honest criticism like grown-ups, but the way my story was buried last week makes me wonder. Anyway, thanks for reading through all this.

S/Bill Hays
Secretary, LSSS

STAFF:

Joe Fenech
George Sagano
Harry Zeliff
Stan Ford
R. Richard Livorine
Jessy Siegel
Ken Hemming
Kurt Thornbladh
Dot Blair
relief

FOOD STAMPS
By Ken Hennning

Now that the holiday season is approaching and we can expect the price of turkey to skyrocket along with everything else, many of you frugal law students probably wonder whether a tuna fish sandwich or a ballpark frank wrapped around a slice of Kroger enriched white bread is really anything to be thankful for. Those of you whose budgets are like mine have reached the bitter realization that we either skip eating altogether or quit splurging on bic pens and legal pads. Don't despair, there is an alternative food stamps!

There are a couple of reasons why I am informing others about the availability of this aid. One, I know that many students are cutting it close financially, as usual, and they don't need that pressure added to the other pressures we have. And two, I think first-hand experience as a welfare recipient will be a good input during your three-year legal education. Sitting in the lobby of social services with others waiting for dolles from the government, and one comes away realizing what a game the government is playing on everyone by crying about tax dollars going to welfare, implying people are living high off the government. Some people are, but you won't find them in the lobby of the social services department collecting welfare.

Anyway, the Washtenaw County Department of Social Services is the place to apply for food stamps. From the law quad, take State Street north to Huron, turn left to Main Street, turn right to Catherine Street, turn right again and it's directly on your right behind the post office. Take proof of Ann Arbor residence (rent receipt or checkbook entry will do), bank and checking account books, and any receipts for other household or medical and dental bills. If you are working, may still qualify. I believe the cut-off for a single person is just over $200.00 per month. You can apply at the Social Services Department from 8:00 a.m. to noon and from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, but expect to wait an hour or so. You may get the stamps the same day you apply, but there may be a delay up to a week. So, those of you who haven't done so and think you might qualify (if you think you might, you probably do), get down there today.

QUIZ
LEGAL MOVIE TRIVIA QUIZ

From the National Council of Law Reviews

For 5 points each, match the following actors and actresses with the movie description opposite. Score: 100-90 excellent; 85-75 very good; 70-65 fair; 60-50 poor; 45-below where have you been?

1. SPENCER TRACY A. Professor Kingsfield in "Paper Chase"
2. WALTER BRENNAN B. Justice Oliver W. Holmes in "Magnificent Yankee"
3. LEE REMICK C. Lady lawyer in film version of "Adam's Rib"
4. TYRONE POWER D. Chief Judge in "Judgment at Nuremberg"
5. LOUIS CALHERN E. Murder defendant in "Witness for the Prosecution"
6. HENRY FONDA F. Raymond Burr's Della Street
7. WARREN WILLIAM G. Rape victim in "Anatomy of a Murder"
8. JOHN HOUSEMAN H. Juryman in "12 Angry Men"
9. KATHARINE HEPBURN I. Judge Roy Bean in 1940's "The Westerner"
10. BARBARA HALE J. 1930's films' answer to Perry Mason
11. LEWIS STONE K. Murder victim who falls into Gloria Swanson's pool in "Sunset Boulevard"
12. PAUL SCOFIELD L. Prosecuting attorney in "Inherit the Wind"
13. BURT LANCASTER M. Judge Hardy of Carville
14. FREDRIC MARCH N. Crooked lawyer in 1963's "Fortune Cookie"
15. WILLIAM HOLDEN O. "Birdman of Alcatraz"
16. WALTER MATTHAU P. Oscar winner as "Man for All Seasons"
17. RALPH BELLAMY Q. Finally escaped in "Papillon"
18. FAY DUNAWAY R. Franklin D. Roosevelt in "Sunrise at Campobello"
19. TONY CURTIS S. Bonnie Parker
20. STEVE MCQUEEN T. "The Boston Strangler"

RES IPSA’S LOQUITUR

Don't name names--just defame

Res Ipsa received more comments about the faculty sex poll than it did votes....And we were particularly offended by the critic who suggested that this column was an attempt to open up meaningful discussion....

What faculty member had to rush home last week to show his wife the results of R.I.'s poll?....And what faculty wife has had all her worst suspicions about women law students confirmed?....And speaking of worst suspicions confirmed, how come the student senate gives us "freedom of choice" in the lettuce boycott, but not in publishing the results of the faculty poll? (how's that for "specific innuendo," Steve?)....And speaking of saving faculty necks, our most esteemed contracts professor has only shown up for one class this year, so his under study has been forced to teach for him. But doesn't he know a dime won't call London?...

What law professor confirmed our worst suspicions by determining 24 of 28 grades through coin-flips. (We hear his next seminar will be called "The lawyer as gambler."....What 2nd year LSSS representative is so well known at Fraser's Pub that the bartender begins pouring a pitcher of his favorite before he's three steps in the door?....What law school professor gives T-F quizzes in which he asks "trick" questions, reminiscent of highschool?....Which one doesn't?....What law review member already knows where he wants to clerk next summer but continues to milk law firms in other popular cities for all-expenses paid vacation trips, this depriving genuinely interested hopeful's of the opportunity....

What law professor believes that the "Operation Intercept" marijuana didn't work because hard-up dope smokers just switched to heroin?....(and then there were his colleagues who took to growing their own instead.)

We are in a position to greatly encourage contributions to R.I., since we received some substantial bribes to change the results of the faculty sex poll. So make us an offer (but we still might refuse). Keep up the contributions: Res Ipsa c/o Lawyers Club Desk.

R.I.
Wednesday morning and it is coming down. Less like flakes, more like white raindrops, but white for sure, and falling for sure, and being stirred, swirled, and rolled by the windy artistry that sculptures drifts. I stand at the window feeling cold and warm all over and watching it fall.

I remember my tradition of watching first snow until it stops no matter the time, place, or manner. I remembered many times, I remember many times.

But knowing that my keenly disciplined, analytic, legal mind stops for no such nonsense, I go to contracts saying 'if it is still snowing when class ends then perhaps I have a chance.'

And contracts ends and it is still snowing and I forego the Free Press and watch.

She calls, she from two years ago when we watched, and she's calling from her office now and tells me that she's watching and though we haven't seen each other for at least a year or more she thought about me and called.

I remember too, I do remember and I tell her so. I remember many times.

It is holding the ground. The last vestige of summer clarity losing out to the full winter beauty. If it keeps up there will be walking tonight.

It keeps up, blankety hands finding every vagary of buildings and lawns and still coming and I go walking though it's late.

A pristine frosty night, I submit myself to the soft massage and make my way to the Arb to confirm suspicions. They are confirmed as there must be a hundred people there doing things people do when they're young and have a place like that to do them in. And every year they do them and every year I climb the fence and walk until the wind and cold distance swallow up their voices and I plunged into the silence of the cemetery.

And there are no footprints here, just the rolling expanse of unmitigated virginity making me uncomfortable for a moment. The grave stones jut up at all angles creating strange shadows and patterns against the white backdrop, the whip-cream trees looming bare but dignified with their glossy white limbs creating in argument that there is beauty and freedom though the leaves are gone.

I walk and walk and walk hoping each new step might reveal just one more clue.

And the ever-present embarrassment comes to me. It being so trite to go somewhere alone to walk and watch new snow, and for that moment I bitterly resent it all. But that is the fool's criticism as beauty is no less for the common appreciation.

I walk and walk and walk until too cold and search for the exit and home, trying to imagine what facial expression Friedrich would choose for me were I and this part of his canvas. Upon leaving I rest assured that his meticulous perception would unerringly uncover an exhilarated grim contemplation.

And what has it to do with Law School?
LEFTY'S LOSERS

Richard Nix on's return to health has been cheered by members of the Bottom Ten selection committee, who want the ex-President to award the dreaded Kuharich Trophy to the worst major college football team.

Mr. Nix, regarded as an impenetrable author on football, performed a similar presentation five years ago, when both he and the Texas Longhorns were on top. He and the president of the college football association, Mr. Nixon, regard the game as an impenetrable mystery.

Mr. Nixon's return to health has

The Complete Bottom Ten:

1 Wake Forest (8-2) Clinched conference cellar.
2 Columbia (7-2)
3 TCU (7-2) Clinched conference cellar. (1.3 violations)
4 Oregon (7-2)
5 Iowa (7-2)
6 Penn (7-1)
7 Texas (7-1)
8 Maryland (7-1)
9 Rice (7-1)
10 Syracuse (7-1)

Other Receiving Abuse: Mississippi, Oregon State, Washington State, Western Oregon State, Washburn State, Western Missouri State.


The Week's Upset: TCU (#3) at Rice (#9) Clinched conference cellar.

The Week's Rout: Air Force (#7) at ND

The Week's Upset: Rice (#9) at TCU (#3) clinched conference cellar.
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FOOTBALL POLL

Dan McGill's .697 led the pack. The average percentage was once again mediocre, .469. That isn't even worth a C+.

Since the RG (RG) will not be published next week, this week's edition will include a poll for the next two weeks. The polls are considered separate and distinct. Same directions as usual.

This Week's Poll

College
Arkansas at Texas Tech(4½)
Baylor(½) at SMU
Stanford(6½) at California
Duke(5½) at North Carolina
Houston at Florida St.(14½)
Yale at Harvard(6½)
Northwestern(13½) at Illinois
Indiana at Purdue(1½)
Michigan St. at Iowa(13½)
Tulane(9½) at LSU
Maryland at Virginia(23½)
Michigan(6½) at Ohio St.
Athens(6½) at Sparta
Minnesota(17½) at Wisconsin
Mississippi(10½) at Mississippi St.
Oklahoma at Nebraska(14½)
Air Force(27½) at Notre Dame
Washington at Washington St.(½)

Pro
Dallas at Houston(13½)
Philadelphia(6½) at Washington
St. Louis at NY Giants(7½)
Minnesota at Los Angeles(4½)
San Diego(10½) at Green Bay
Chicago(7½) at Detroit
Atlanta(6½) at San Francisco
Miami at NY Jets(16½)
Buffalo at Cleveland(7½)
New England at Baltimore(7½)
Kansas City(8½) at Cincinnati
Denver(10½) at Oakland
Pittsburgh at New Orleans(10½)

Tiebreaker: Who will gain more yardage, Archie Griffin or Gordie Bell? How much more?__________________________

THANKSGIVING POLL

College
Auburn(14½) at Alabama
Arizona St.(½) at Arizona
Army(10½) at Navy
Rice(7½) at Baylor
Miami, Fla.(7½) at Florida
Georgia Tech(10½) at Georgia
Notre Dame(3½) at Southern Cal
Oklahoma St.(27½) at Oklahoma
Penn St. at Pittsburgh(2½)
Tennessee at Vanderbilt(1½)
Texas A&M(7½) at Texas
Mississippi(4½) at Tulane

Pro
Washington(6½) at Dallas
Green Bay(6½) at Philadelphia
Kansas City(7½) at St. Louis
NY Giants at Chicago(7½)
New Orleans(11½) at Minnesota
Denver at Detroit(½)
Los Angeles at Atlanta(10½)
San Francisco at Cleveland(2½)
Baltimore(10½) at Buffalo
San Diego(½) at NY Jets
New England(10½) at Oakland
Houston(7½) at Pittsburgh
Cincinnati(6½) at Miami

Tiebreaker: How many yards will Anthony Davis gain against Notre Dame?__________________________

George A. Pagano

RG RANKINGS

1 Oklahoma (6) 11 Texas
2 Michigan 12 Houston
3 Alabama (1) 13 Penn State
4 Ohio State 14 Michigan State
5 Nebraska 15 California
6 Southern Cal 16 Miami, O.
7 Notre Dame 17 Florida
8 Auburn 18 NC State
9 Texas A&M 19 Baylor
10 Maryland 20 Kentucky

Others receiving votes: Wisconsin, UCLA, Oklahoma State, Pittsburgh, Georgia, Texas Tech, Arkansas.